Charles Segal, Language and Desire in Seneca's *Phaedra*. Princeton University Press 1986

TEN

Seneca's Patricide and the Trace of Writing

I

As the secondary elaboration of a celebrated classic, Seneca's *Phaedra* is at nearly every point conscious of its literary ancestry and therefore of its literariness. The ghost of Euripides haunts every line. Seneca has his own message to convey; but, because that message is inextricable from his implicit commentary on the Euripidean play, his work calls attention to its textuality, that is, to its status as a work *written* in response to a pre-existent text that the author knows, presumably, through reading. It thus stands in a context of verbal artifice and artificiality; and its very existence implies and demands a hermeneutical orientation toward the literary past. The work itself has come about, in part, through the author's critical, interpretive stance toward a body of pre-existent literature.[1]

Such a text reveals the activity of its creation, the processes through which it produces meaning by asserting its relation (difference, sameness, agreement, hostility) to another text. It thus stands in relation not only to an "external" reality—a world of objects—but also to a world of literary discourse, a realm of texts.

This textuality involves a kind of double vision. In its bifocality Seneca's play takes a long, clear view of the mythical events which it dramatizes, but also looks down at the palimpsestic writings close at hand, the verses of Euripides (and also of

[1] For this notion of "text," see Barthes (1979). Barthès also stresses the continuation of this hermeneutic activity as the reader "produces" or "plays" the text (79ff.). For intertextuality and artifice, see also M. Riffaterre, "Intertextual Representation: On Mimesis as Interpretive Discourse," *Critical Inquiry* 11 (1984) 141-62, with further bibliography; also my essay, "Underreading and Intertextuality: Sappho, Simaetha, and Odysseus in Theocritus' Second *Idyll*," *Arethusa* 17 (1984) 201-9, with the literature there cited.

Ovid) half-visible and necessarily half-hidden by their present transformation. Interpreters of the play are inevitably involved in this double vision. To read the play in any depth is to recognize it as "the intertext of another text."[2]

This textuality, or intertextuality, surfaces most urgently in the motif of the sword. The sword not only takes the place of the dialogue that might have been spoken (and in the Euripidean *Hippolytus Crowned* is spoken) between father and son; it also takes the place of the letter, the written message, through which Phaedra in Euripides' extant play makes her accusation. In the lost *Hippolytus Veiled*, Phaedra probably made her accusation in person. She must have had some physical evidence to substantiate the charge, but we do not know what it was. In the second (extant) *Hippolytus*, Euripides softened the moral outrage of her face-to-face denunciation of Hippolytus to Theseus by having her commit suicide first and leave the incriminating letter.[3] Her suicide there was by hanging, not by the sword, as in Seneca's play.

The sword as proof of Hippolytus' guilt may well be original with Seneca. On present evidence we cannot be certain that Euripides did not use it in the lost *Hippolytus Veiled*.[4] Yet, as Hans Herter has argued, it is unlikely that Hippolytus, at the crucial moment, would complicate the dramatic gesture of covering himself up in shame (the gesture from which the *Hippolytos Kalyptomenos* took its name) with the very different action of drawing the sword.[5] Stage action aside, the two actions belong to very different moods, not easily reconcilable with one another. Also the violence of Hippolytus' gesture of twisting Phaedra's hair to pull back her head and expose her throat to his

[2] I take this phrase from Barthes (1979) 77.

[3] See Herter (1971) 52f., 57f.; also his "Theseus und Hippolytos," *RhM* 89 (1940) 288 with note 28.

[4] Friedrich (1953), 132, and Zintzen (1960), 88 and 103ff., argue that the sword motif derives from Euripides' lost play. For strong arguments in favor of Senecan originality here, see Herter (1971) 71-73, with the notes; Barrett (1964), p. 44 with note 2; Dingel (1970) 51ff., especially 54-56.

[5] Herter (1971) 71f.

blade seems more like Seneca than Euripides. Its closest model is Roman rather than Greek, Aeneas' slaughter of a helpless suppliant after the death of Pallas, a passage which in turn echoes Neoptolemus' killing of the helpless Priam.[6]

In the "speech" of the sword Seneca deliberately and unmistakably alludes to the device of the incriminating tablet of the surviving *Hippolytus*. There Theseus, reading the letter of his dead wife, exclaims, βοᾷ, βοᾷ δέλτος ἄλαστα, "The tablet shouts, it shouts things not to be forgotten" (877).[7] Here Phaedra says, *hic dicet ensis*, "The sword will tell" (896). In both cases the critical "speaking" is transferred to an inanimate object. The small signs on the hilt, furthermore, make the sword itself a form of writing, with a message that Theseus has to "read."

In Euripides, Phaedra appears, quite literally, as a trace in letters. In Seneca, Phaedra's presence with the sword, is the necessary complement to the absence of Hippolytus who has abandoned it and fled in horror. The Euripidean Phaedra's absence, in death, makes that silent speech of the letter more powerful than any living voice could be. In Seneca Phaedra's display of the sword in the private space of her chambers creates a symbolical reenactment of repressed fears and desires, all concerned with incest, among the three major characters.

The unspoken *monstrum* that Theseus reads on the hilt is only partially Hippolytus' terrible crime; it is also the monstrosity that Theseus calls up from the hidden part of himself. The replacement of the name of the son by the *monstrum* of the sword/phallus is parallel to the replacement of the Name of the Father (904f.) by the *monstrum* from the sea, with its overtly phallic shape (1015f., 1045-47). In both cases the "monster" is in effect the unspeakable form of Oedipal fears and desires: the son's sexual possession of the father's wife and the father's virtual castration of the son (1099).

Seneca precipitates the tragic crisis not through words (or through the traces of words on Phaedra's tablet) but through

[6] Virgil, *Aen.* 2.552f. and 10.534f.; see Grimal (1965) ad 707f.
[7] On this passage, see Segal (1982a) 148f.; also (1983c) 31f.

the very instrument of the unspeakable crime. His sword stands for a writing that speaks without words and replaces the verbal message of the Euripidean letter with a signifier of what may not be spoken. He probes the subsurface world of the unconscious through a rhetoric that is itself a special reading of Euripides, a reading that replaces explicit writing with emblematic image. Thus his play revolves around a knowledge that is present tangibly in the letters of the text but resists being spoken overtly onstage or written down on a tablet. Replacing tablet by sword is an index of this concern with what remains as image, just below the level of verbal articulation.

Without Euripides' plays, of course, Seneca's intertextual effect would not be possible. It results, at least in part, from the engagement of his imagination in reading and rewriting Euripides. The small figures on the hilt are not only a substitute for the letter of Euripides' Phaedra; they are also the mark of Seneca's substitution of his own play for that of Euripides. Thus they are a figure for the textuality of his work.[8] They point to the process by which writing generates meaning; and they indicate, at some level, the derivative work's consciousness of itself as a production of signs within a recessive series of highly coded systems, extending back from Ovid to Euripides and thence to the mythical corpus behind Greek drama.

[8] Recently Fantham (1982), whose book reached me only after I had written most of my study, has emphasized this textual aspect of Senecan drama, although in a perspective different from mine: "Ultimately the play would be known through written copies, and only the readers would experience the plays as complete works" (p. 48). "As a prose writer (Seneca) was used to achieving the effect of instruction through words alone, and I believe he was content to let the words serve as the unaided medium of his dramatic poetry" (p. 49). Even as early as the fourth century B.C. tragedians began to compose for readers: cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.12.1413b3-16; also *Poet.* 26.1462a11-17; see Albin Lesky, *Greek Tragedy*, trans. H. A. Frankfort (London and New York 1967) 204; G. F. Else, *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument* (Cambridge, Mass. 1957) 635f., 640f. Silent reading is not as foreign to classical antiquity as is sometimes claimed: see Knox (1968). On the other hand, we should remember that in Seneca's day works were still "published" (at least in part) by being recited and that the practice of private readings in literary circles somewhat blurred the distinction between the written text as we book-readers think of it and a text intended for recitation or performance.

The "monster" that Theseus reads in these small signs, as in the miniature, symbolic form of the written text, expands to the overpowering reality of the *monstrum* soon to be described by the Messenger. The scale abruptly shifts from miniature and figural monstrosity on the one hand to the gigantesque, exaggerated shape in the narrative "event" on the other, from the symbolic mode to the representation of something massively corporeal. In this shift the text reveals its power to create images that we accept as living beings. Differently viewed, these small signs function as the letters of a writing that both requires and presupposes the supplement of imagination that makes words—whether written or spoken—into "reality."

The phantasmagoric quality of Seneca's plays is related to his self-conscious elaboration of a text that has been experienced through reading, for it is the texture and evocations of the words, rather than the action per se, that carry the meaning. Words fixed by a previous literary experience are elaborated to refract reality in the artificial light of rhetorical description. Language functions as the active medium of displacement, as the area where something analogous to the Freudian "transference" occurs.[9] Language here serves less as a transparent window to a signified than as a translucent screen behind which appears a chain of other signifiers.

II

Wilamowitz once observed that Seneca's Medea (the character) seemed to have read Euripides' play of that name.[10] The same could be said of the characters Phaedra and Hippolytus. Johannes Geffcken developed Wilamowitz's remark: "His [Seneca's] characters reflect not on their fate but on the known story (*Fabel*). Atreus has already a kind of tragic consciousness of his

[9] Freud's "transference," Shoshana Felman (1977), 137, remarks, could be defined as such a "movement of displacement through a chain of signifiers."

[10] U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Tragödie* 10 (Berlin 1906) 4.

act; Deianeira rages in an already prescribed madness."[11] Seneca perceives his characters through the medium of a previous writing. The sword of the *Phaedra*, I would suggest, calls attention to this trace of a prior writing that is absorbed and then effaced by the play. Through such traces, Seneca marks both the origins of his work and also the effacement of those origins in the new work that results.

For Euripides, close to an oral culture in which writing still contains an element of novelty, intrusiveness, and power, the relation of the silent speech of writing and the discourse of oral speech has to do largely with the problem of knowledge and deception in a public world of evidence, proofs of guilt or innocence, juridical truth.[12] Seneca is fully immersed in a written culture and farther from the notion of the oral "truth" of myths, wise sayings, customs, and traditions that remain valid because they are alive on the lips of men. For him the relation of written to spoken discourse has more to do with the private, inner world, the gaps in consciousness that correspond to gaps created by the distancing process of writing itself, particularly in its attempt to record the hidden movements of the soul.[13]

The old debate about whether Seneca's plays were intended as stage performances or as closet dramas may perhaps be

[11] J. Geffcken, "Der Begriff des tragischen in der Antike," in *Bibliothek Warburg: Vorträge 1927-28*, ed. F. Saxl (Berlin 1930) 158.

[12] See Segal (1982a) 149 apropos of Euripides' *Hippolytus*. See especially *Hipp*. 921-31 and 1074-77.

[13] This issue has perhaps some applicability to Seneca's prose writings as well, especially to the *Epistles*. On the one hand these claim a spontaneity, openness, and frankness of tone (e.g., the opening of *Epist*. 17, 23, 26, 56, 57, 65), but on the other hand they self-consciously present a highly structured, rhetorically defined personality. They speak the voice of a cultural and moralistic, literary tradition as much as that of a particular individual; yet by their form and the occasional nature of some of their contents they also claim the freshness and casualness of the passing moment that communicates a transient individuality. Whatever Seneca's original intentions of self-revelation, he deliberately and artistically creates this quality of the occasional and the momentary as an act of conscious premeditation and contrivance. Ostensible self-revelation is in fact the artifice of self-(re-)presentation. The soul of Seneca the man, then, is enveloped and inevitably concealed by the authorial persona shaped by the opportunity of letters and conditioned by the very fact of writing. Much the same situation applies to the letters of the younger Pliny.

looked at afresh in this light: that is, their form does not betray a simple commitment to either mode of reception. They can be read satisfactorily both as staged dramas and as literary texts. Whatever the historical reality (and recent scholarship is no nearer a definitive solution), the very fact that the issue cannot be easily decided points to a special quality in the works themselves, a hesitation between public and private discourse, between the full "presence" of an enacted, orally created world realized three-dimensionally by actors onstage, and the studied absences of a writing that "speaks" in its paradoxical silent voice to a reader.[14]

From another perspective, the sword is the visible mark of Seneca's own "anxiety of influence."[15] It is the trace of the earlier writer's absence. In place of the letters (writing) of the absent poet (the tablet of Euripides' Phaedra), Seneca puts the sword. With the sword that replaces/effaces the Euripidean tablet, he has made his predecessor into a ghost, a trace of a trace of speech. That "writing" is also, to some extent, the letter of Ovid's Phaedra in *Heroides* 4, another work that calls attention to its textuality in letters.[16] Having symbolically usurped the creative power of the "father," Euripides and Ovid, Seneca leaves behind the sword—exactly as his character, Hippolytus, in another fiction about a son replacing a father (that is, in the lie of Phaedra), has left behind a sword. In both cases this substitution is the signifier of a crime against the father.[17]

[14] The fact that the ancient "reading" of a written text often (though not always) took place aloud does not change this relation. The reading, even *alta voce* and even by a servant/lector, still bears the self-conscious marks of the absent author and the sharp designation of the fact that the text, not the man himself, is "speaking." On the existence of silent reading, see Knox (1968) and above, note 6.

[15] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* (New York 1973), especially 6, 10, 30; see also Ferrucci (1980) 162, 166.

[16] Compare also Phaedra's writing in Ovid's *Heroides* 4.7-14, where the composing of the letter enables her to break her reserve of silence and "speak" to Hippolytus: see Paratore (1952) 224; Giomini (1955) 28; Jacobson (1974), p. 148 with note 16.

[17] See Felman (1977) 206f.: "There are letters from the moment there is no master to receive—or to read them: letters exist because a Master ceases to exist. We could indeed advance this statement as a definition of literature itself . . . : literature (the very literality of letters) is nothing other than the Master's death, the Master's transformation into a ghost." Also p. 146, apropos of Henry James' *Turn of the Screw*: "How can one write *for* the very figure who signifies the suppression of what one has to say to him?"

Seneca's substitution of sword for letters thus partakes of what Derrida, commenting on the "fatherless word" of Plato's *Phaedrus* (275 d-e), calls the "patricidal subversion" of writing.[18] This is the process by which every writing kills its father and replaces the authority of the spoken word, the living Presence, with the trace, the sign of absence. The written word evokes the presence of that which it signifies, but under the sign of the letter, the symbol of a symbol, the mark of an absence. Writing is the signifier of a signifier, the graphic for the verbal sign (the sound of the voice), which in turn is the indication of the thing. The process of writing is a process of leaving traces, of making visible a distance between language and the solidity of presence that language attempts, and pretends, to close.[19] Seneca compounds the tracing of traces by using a double-edged symbol, a sword that annihilates a father's authority in his house, replaces the letters in the writing left by his own literary "father" (the tablets of Euripides' *Hippolytus*), and thereby inscribes his text into an infinite series of writings, words disseminated *in* the absence of fathers and *as* the absence of fathers. Possessing an ambiguous, asexual procreation of their own, however, these words about desire also claim the fertile power of the mother and break silence with their written "mark" (*nota*, 691) to create their own *ambiguus infans* (693).

The act of framing and distancing effected by letters and by literature always carries with it the possibility of subverting the ideology that it depicts. This potential subversion is probably inherent in the polyvalent meaning of complex literary works. Seneca's *Phaedra*, thanks in part to its Euripidean model and

[18] Jacques Derrida, "La pharmacie de Platon," in *La dissémination* (Paris 1972) 87: "Depuis la position de qui tient le sceptre, le désir de l'écriture est indiqué, désigné, dénoncé comme le désir de l'orphelinat et la subversion parricide. Ce *pharmakon* n'est-il pas criminel, n'est-ce pas un cadeau empoisonné?"

[19] For this view of writing, see Jacques Derrida, *La voix et le phénomène* (Paris 1972), especially chap. 6.

also to its own engrafting of the Roman concern with the *pater-familias* on the Greek material, is such a work. The re-assertion of the father's authority, after the disasters that result from his absence, is undercut by the violence that the father reintroduces into the sword as an emblem of that authority. The scene shown through the small signs on the sword's hilt is a microcosmic condensation of the role of the father. It presents the father as the center of order and continuity, assuring and safeguarding the succession of his property. But it also presents that paternal guardianship as a potential source of murderous jealousy and fearful monstrosity.

Through the literary echoes of the sword, the work reflects on itself as a constellation of multiple meanings, sometimes pulling in opposite directions. Thus the *Phaedra* (in this respect like the *Aeneid*) simultaneously asserts and questions, defends and violates, the patriarchal order. The hilt is both a symbolic microcosm of that order crystallized into art and an agent involved at an intense moment in the vicissitudes of that order. This ambiguity corresponds to the ambiguity of the father himself, who both banishes and enacts violence and monstrosity from/in his realm.

The sword and its hilt form the emblem of a realm whose inscribed story of a patriarchal order ("the glory of the race of Athens") is cancelled out by another story, a story told not *on* but *by means of* the sword. These small signs on the hilt thus lead us to a mirror-like regress of letters-within-letters and stories-within-stories. The shifting perspectives and interactions of truth and deception in the story told by the hilt reflect back to us the shifting perspectives and changing points of view contained in the story told by the play as a whole, by the "signs" that compose its text. Taken at the level of seriousness that the situation demands, the miniature plot embossed on the sword (a plot that is itself a palimpsestic tissue of intertexts: Euripides' *Aegeus* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*) forces on us the awareness of all the fictional plottings that make up the work—those of the Nurse, of Phaedra, of Euripides, and of Seneca himself.

Desire arises in (and as) the absence of the father or master or model (Theseus, Euripides, Ovid), the desire to claim or possess the procreative power of the father. This power could be explained as desire for the phallus or for the scepter or for the kingdom or for the creative energy that belongs to the literary tradition, to the poetic "fathers" of Greece.[20] But to reduce the complex overlays of textual echoes to a simplistically Freudian phallic symbolism, rigid to the last, is to impoverish the suggestiveness of the work. As Theseus and Hippolytus meet only through the sword which emerges in the space created by the absence of the father, so too Euripides and Seneca meet most directly in the regression of signs, letters, and stories behind the sword. The sword fills the place left by the tablet, those written letters that Euripides' Phaedra, like Euripides himself, has left behind after his/her death.

The sword is, therefore, doubly the trace of a writing: it takes the place of a written tablet, which is in turn the trace of a voice—the voice of the dead Phaedra and of the dead Euripides. The sword is the mark of the newer author replacing the older, the son replacing the father. In these self-conscious literary echoes, the sword also signifies the displacement of a prior writing by a new creative thrust, a substitute mastery of the signifier of the phallus, which finally succeeds in driving that weapon home, incestuously, into the empty place where it has been so lacking and so desired.

The sword, as we have seen, is also the meeting place of Seneca with another father, Ovid.[21] We have noted how Seneca, "rewriting" *Metamorphoses* 7.422f. in *Phaedra* 899f., has put his own more elaborate sword in the place of his poetic father's. This replacement of an older sword by a newer also occurs in a context concerned with the succession of father and son, rightful succession in the case of Ovid's sword-bearer (Theseus to Aegeus), wrongful succession as we view Seneca's sword-bearer

[20] Compare Dionysus' "longing" (πόθος) for the "generative poet," the γόνιμος ποιητής, in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (96).
[21] See above, chap. 8, sec. VII, pp. 170f.

in the terms of the fictions that Phaedra has so successfully spun around him.

III

As the sign of an absent writing, the sword is also, in another way, that which has made Seneca's tragedy possible. Phaedra's death by the sword is a condition of the play's existence, literally in that it constitutes the end of the story, and in a remoter sense in that it is the genesis of the story in the creative processes of the unconscious. By leaving Phaedra unsatisfied (or, more accurately, by recreating in his own words the myth of her hopeless desire), by having her penetrated by the sword of tragic love-in-death and not by a surrogate of his own phallus, Seneca makes the play, at some level, a substitute for his own fantasies and desires. The play protects him from the deadlock of Phaedra's tragic conflict between pleasure and duty and marks his successful passage along the path of socially acceptable sublimation, a path that his heroine refused to take. The sword, then, also marks the place where he has found a satisfactory substitute for Phaedra, resisting the temptations that she held out to Hippolytus. For the reader too, whether male or female, the pleasure in the play has some of its roots in the satisfaction of that substitution.

Viewed from the perspective of the audience, the sense of completeness and inevitability characteristic of classical tragedy has to do with the intense arousal of desire on the one hand and the acceptance of the absolute impossibility of fulfilling that desire on the other—the acceptance, in other words, of the necessity of sublimation without denying its problematical qualities. What Kenneth Burke remarked about audience involvement, though in a somewhat different context, is relevant here: "Form is the creation of an appetite in the mind of the auditor, and the adequate satisfying of that appetite. This satisfaction—so complicated in the human mechanism—at times involves a temporary set of frustrations, but in the end these frustrations prove to be simply a more involved kind of satisfaction, and further-

more serve to make the satisfaction of fulfilment more intense."[22]

The shift of the meaning of the sword in Phaedra's last scene, on a Freudian view, encourages reality over phantasy, ego over id or superego, and ego-integration over ego-dissolution. If the play gives pleasure by satisfying unconscious fantasies about incest and patricide and involves us by arousing our unconscious fears of monstrous maternal and paternal figures, it also allays our guilt about such pleasures and calms our anxieties about such terrors by showing us the punishment meted out to illicit desire. The process is analogous to the Freudian principle of negation (*Verneinung*): we can tolerate our repressed wishes by marking them with a negative sign. By disapproving of the repressed material, we protect ourselves from it, and also from the knowledge that this material is in fact part of ourselves. That is, we deny that it is really "ours." The tragic paradox—the contradiction between the pain of the contents and the pleasure of the literary form—is due in part to this interplay between elaboration on the one hand and denial (by punishing the "evil") on the other.

Luring us to take pleasure in the vicarious fulfilment of tabooed desires, the sword is the strongest signifier of our complicity in Phaedra's lie, our sympathy for her, our interest and participation in her desire. Like the servants and the chorus, we make the suppressions and suspensions that allow the sword to do its "speaking" for her. Imaginatively and emotionally, we join in their sympathetic silence so that the plot may go forward and the sword find its destined, inevitable goal, just where we want it to be.

In its ambiguous function as both a symbol of desire and a murderous weapon, the sword links the three main characters in their precarious interchange of the roles of agent and victim. The deaths of Phaedra and Hippolytus as agents of one another's destruction may satisfy some of our demand for moral and

[22] Kenneth Burke, *Counter-Statement* (New York 1931) 40.

psychological order; but their deaths as victims of one another point to something less easily reduced to moral or rational coherence: a blind force of desire for which no ultimate explanation is offered. It is in this elemental power of the irrational drive of desire, whether labelled a divine force as in Euripides or a failure of reason to overcome passion as in Seneca, that the tragic dimension of the story lies. Seneca ultimately follows Euripides in maintaining this interpretation of the myth.

For us, therefore, the sword cannot be the instrument of finality, as it is for Phaedra in her last gesture of the play. In our experience of the play we recreate the chain of signifiers behind the sword and undergo the deceptions and clarifications that they work on us. As a microcosm of the entire play, the sword is also a trap, luring us to violate its "reserve of silence," to speak about what it deliberately elides from speech, to articulate consciously what it leaves as suggestion or as intimation, to continue its plotting, and to fill with further writing and further speaking the silences of its own "small signs."

ELEVEN

Closure, Form, and the Father

I

The last scene of the *Phaedra* has a peculiarly complex form of literariness and textuality, for Seneca here "contaminates" Euripides' *Hippolytus* with the *Bacchae*. He suppresses the reconciliation between father and son that closes the extant *Hippolytus* and instead develops his own version of the aged, enfeebled father-figure, Cadmus, who pathetically recomposes the mutilated corpse of Pentheus.[1]

Just below the surface of Seneca's text, with the attempt to recompose mutilated fragments of a once beautiful form, lies Seneca's own authorial problem: recomposing into a beautiful unity the now scattered pieces of a past tradition: the two Hippolytus plays of Euripides, possibly his *Aegeus*, the finale of the *Bacchae*, Sophocles' *Phaedra*, even Ovid's Fourth *Heroides*, and the seventh book of the *Metamorphoses*. The self-conscious blending of two separate plays of Euripides at this point, *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae*, gives this issue an immediate grounding in the text.

Obviously a scene of such intense emotion should not be made over into a heavy-handed allegory of poetics, nor do I wish to diminish the powerful impact of the surface meaning. Two aspects of the scene, however, will bear further scrutiny: the ultimate failure of Theseus to "form" his son's body into the coherence necessary for burial, and the rapid shift from the more or less objective concern with form and beauty (*fingit*, *forma*, *decor*, *facies*) to bitter accusation of the fates and of the gods (1271f.; cf. also the self-accusation of 1249-52).

The burial of Hippolytus' scattered remains comes at the chorus's initiative, not Theseus'. While he laments, castigates his

[1] For Cadmus' role as a surrogate father in the *Bacchae*, see Segal (1982) 211f. and 323-27.