19. See Schefold, *op. cit.* 59 (House of Arrius Polites) and 147 (House of the Vettii); this too is reproduced by Curtius, 247, fig. 146.
20. Orestes, Pylades and Iphigenia, Schefold, *ibid.* 117, 260, 278; the heroes alone, Schefold, *ibid.* 184 (at an altar) 200, 224 and perhaps 242.
21. The painting from Herculaneum is 19, fig. 3 (n. 26) in Philippart, also illustrated in a line drawing in Roscher, *Ausfuhrliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Romischen Mythologie* s.v. Orestes 6.1001. On the Munich sarcophagus (Munchen Glyptotek c363) see Philippart 24.G1.
22. Cotta Maximus, the addressee of *ex Ponto* 3.2, is the younger brother of the Messallinus for whom Ovid composed *Tristia* 4.4. According to Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978) 125f., Ovid's nine letters to Cotta begin with *Tristia* 4.5 (as it were a pair with 4.4 to Messalinus) but continue after Ovid's last letter to Messalinus with three letters in *ex P.* 3; nn. 2, 5 and 8. But just as Ovid writes no letter to Messallinus after *ex P.* 2.2, so he leaves Cotta alone after Book 3.
23. *Cumque ego de vestra nuper probitate referrem (nam didici Getice Sarmaticeque loqui / forte senex quidam . . . / reddidit ad nostros talia verba sonos* (3.2.39-42). The poetic ring of *ad nostros sonos* suggests but does not compel the reader to imagine a verse encomium like Ovid's ultimate achievement in Getic, the supposed *Laudes Augusti* featured in *ex P.* 4.9.
24. To authenticate the traveller's tale. The architectural term *basis* occurs here for the only time in Ovid.
25. For the Roman (mock-Roman?) elements in this narrative compare *femina . . . taedae non nota iugali / quae superat Scythicas nobilitate nurus* (55-56) *sic instituere parentes (mos maiorum!* [57]) and Thoas as *clarus . . . / nec fuit Euxinis notior alter aquis* (59-60).
26. In Euripides, Iphigenia can read (760-787) or at least remember what she dictated, but she cannot write; she had to have the letter written for her by a prisoner who was later sacrificed (584-847). We cannot determine whether Ovid forgot this detail, rejected it as an anachronism, or deliberately omitted it for narrative economy.

PHILOMELA'S WEB AND THE PLEASURES OF THE TEXT: OVID'S MYTH OF TEREUS IN THE *METAMORPHOSES*

Charles Segal
Harvard University

Despite the humane protests of writers like Vergil and Horace (one need think only of the *Fons Bandusiae* ode), the Romans seem to have enjoyed violence.[1] In places, Ovid seems to trade on this taste for blood; it is hard otherwise to account for the detail in which he describes the battles in the house of Phineus in *Metamorphoses* 5 and in the house of Pirithous in *Metamorphoses* 12.[2] Ovid does not deal so deeply as Vergil does with the moral problems of violence and suffering in the world-order; and the *Metamorphoses*, in fact, often makes us wonder how sensitive Ovid is to such questions. Is he aware of the problematical nature of the pleasure which his violent narratives arouse?

One of the most difficult passages in the poem for these issues is the episode of Tereus' rape of Philomela in Book 6. The details of Philomela's severed tongue and Tereus' Thyestean feasting on his son are worthy of Seneca, who in fact seems to have drawn heavily on Ovid here.[3] The story comes, appropriately, amid other tales of cruelty, torture and murder, especially within the family: the gods' killing of Niobe's children (6.218ff.), the flaying of Marsyas (6.385ff.), Tantalus' alleged cannibalistic

This study was prepared during a Fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California. I am grateful for financial support at the Center, which was provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities (No. RA 20037-88) and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

slaughter of his son (6.407ff.) just before; Pelias' death at the hands of his daughters and Medea's killing of her children shortly after (7.297ff., 394ff.). Unlike these episodes, however, the tale of Philomela is also a story of sexual violence, probably the most lurid sexual violence in the poem. Ovid even intrudes his narrative presence, in the first person, to distance himself from the ugliest detail by a statement of disbelief (6.561, *vix ausim credere*).[4]

What follows on this incredulity is a re-focusing of the story on belief and evidence. Repressed into silence by the savage act of cutting out the victim's tongue, the story needs to find its proper mode of utterance. *Quid faciat Philomela*: how to narrate this horror? To conceal his crime, Tereus utters fictitious groans, and with tears wins "faith" or "credibility" for his story of Philomela's death (565-567):

> *dat gemitus fictos commentaque funera narrat;*
> *et lacrimae fecere fidem, velamina Progne*
> *deripit . . .*[5]

The juxtaposition of the undeserved *fides* of his false story with the *velamina* of Procne prepares us for the next phase of the tale, namely a mode of narration that will tell the events by non-verbal means. Philomela's "silent mouth lacks a witness to the deed" (*os mutum facti caret indice*, 574), but she "weaves purple marks upon the white threads in witness to the crime" (*purpureasque notas filis intexuit albis / indicium sceleris*, 577-578). This silent weaving answers the non-verbal device of "tears" by which Tereus won "credence" for his lie (566).

Here, as elsewhere in this highly self-conscious poem, Ovid calls our attention to the textuality of his work: his web of words recreates and includes communicative events which are spectacular for their suppression of speech. Io's proto-writing in the poem's first book or the weaving of Arachne and Minerva or the overwhelming of Orpheus' voice will be familiar examples. The *notae* of Philomela's weaving are virtually the "letters" of a written message—in fact, a "song," or a "poem," *carmen*, like the present one—which Procne "reads" (*legit*, 582), as if "unrolling" a scroll (581f.): *evolvit vestes saevi matrona tyranni / fortunaeque suae carmen miserabile legit*.[6] But she immediately represses this communication into silence—a silence which another authorial intrusion marks as extraordinary (*mirum potuisse*, 583). Unlike Tereus, she does not weep, for she has neither words nor tears, but is totally absorbed in the "image" that those "purple marks" have made her see (583-586):

> *et (mirum potuisse!) silet: dolor ora repressit,*
> *verbaque quaerenti satis indignantia linguae*
> *defuerunt, nec flere vacat, sed fasque nefasque*
> *confusura ruit poenaeque in imagine tota est.*

The self-reflexive nature of these gestures needs little comment. But Ovid does not forget the message in the medium. These *notae* are not just the "letters" of his text; they are also the "marks" of a brutal crime, to which their color bears "evidence."[7] Thus the signifying marks of the art-work (a "text" in the etymological sense) return at the end of the poem as the marks of blood that remain stamped upon the face of nature in perpetual witness of the savage deed (669-670):

> *neque adhuc de pectore caedis*
> *excessere notae, signataque sanguine pluma est.*

By shifting between these two meanings of the *notae* as both textual and extra-textual marks, Ovid also looks beyond the frame of his tale to the moral codes which surround, qualify, and certainly problematize the pleasure of his text. Philomela's weaving is both the art-work of the tale and the agency of revenge within the tale. This double function of the weaving, as a tableau of unspeakable horror and as a message that involves us in the demand and the necessity of its being read and understood, holds the contradiction between the violence and the pleasure of the text: the pleasure of and in the violence, and the pleasure in the poetry which recreates the violence. This text exemplifies the mimetic skill that, in the depiction of sadistic sexual pleasure, may invite the male reader or hearer to voyeuristic complicity in the crime,[8] as it perhaps may invite the female reader to complicity in the vengeance. But, as the web of words that calls attention to its textual origins, it also distances us from the crime and allows us, like the unbelieving narrator himself, to take the full measure of its horror. The plumage of metamorphosis that entitles Ovid to weave this tale into the "text" of his poem is forever marked with blood (669f.).

By calling attention to the perversion or suppression of speech throughout the episode, as we shall see, Ovid refuses to dignify the libidinous violence or to endow it with a prurient attraction. We are not invited to repeat the crime, as Tereus does (562).[9] Instead, the crime is doubly repressed into silence. It becomes a symbolic representation, an *imago*, which excites horror and re-

venge. Procne, the tale's first "reader," unrolls the woven narrative as a contemporary of Ovid would unroll the poem; and she is the model for the later reader's immediate reaction. What she finds is a tale whose horror outstrips the power of words: *silet: dolor ora repressit* (583).

The combination of physical outrage and the suppression of speech forms an indirect commentary on the events. Lust makes the Thracian warrior eloquent (*facundum faciebat amor*, 469), so that he becomes craftily persuasive through both his words and his tears (470-474). The inversion of cultural values would be appreciated by an audience for whom Athens was the home of rhetorical training. Having won Philomela by speech and by tears, Tereus is moved by neither (535). *Omnia turbasti:* his crime confuses the basic linguistic categories, as well as the sanctities, of kinship (537f.; cf. 605f.).[10]

Philomela's role henceforth is to "struggle to speak" (*luctantemque loqui*, 555f.; cf. *tua facta loquar*, 545). Tereus has used all the means of persuasion at his command (cf. 460-466); Philomela, made dumb, proves the more effective communicator. The revenge self-consciously echoes these inversions of speech and silence. Procne, as she prepares her response, "seethes with silent wrath" (*triste parat facinus tacitaque exaestuat ira*, 623). Her silence recalls Philomela's, but her "seething" links her with the violent intensity of Tereus (cf. *aestuat*, 491). Like Tereus too, she disregards the pleas of her victim, her child, Itys (640-642).

Philomela, at the climax of the vengeance, has her most intense longing for the speech of which Tereus had robbed her: *nec tempore maluit ullo / posse loqui et meritis testari gaudia dictis* (659f.). Her frustration, however, is compensated for by Procne's excessive eagerness to announce her "cruel joy" in the revenge (cf. *gaudia*, 653 and 660), so that she cannot keep silent any longer (653-655):

> *dissimulare nequit crudelia gaudia Progne*
> *iamque suae cupiens existere nuntia cladis*
> *"intus habes, quem poscis," ait.*

The failure to suppress her speech in these "joys" is not only the mirror-image of Philomela's situation; it also harks back to the eager joy of Tereus' victorious persuasion: *exsultatque et vix animo sua gaudia differt* (514). The echoes suggest the moral structure of the tale: the crime begets its own vengeance. But they also link the three main figures together in a pattern of reciprocal violence,

into which they are frozen forever by the metamorphosis (cf. 666-674).

These crimes within the house not only destroy the security of domestic space; they also fit the savagery of the deed to the savagery of the land. Ovid plays the center of the civilized world—Athens—off against its dubiously civilized periphery, Thrace.[11] He introduces Tereus in a splendid verse-paragraph, listing the glorious cities of Greece, with Athens conspicuous by its absence (6.412-423). Athens is harassed by "barbarian troops," against whom "Thracian Tereus" offers his aid (6.424). Tereus thus enters the poem as *Threicius*, and as an ally against *barbara agmina* (423f.). The collocation proves ironical, for Tereus himself is the true *barbarus* and is so called as he carries out his crime (515, 533).[12] *O diris barbare factis*, Philomela calls him in the last speech that she will ever have (533).

Having entered the poem with the "victory of a glorious name" in a battle for Athens and against barbarians (*clarum vincendo nomen habebat*, 425), Tereus wins an evil "victory" over his Athenian victim, proving himself truly a barbarian (513-515):

> *"vicimus! exclamat, "mecum mea vota feruntur!"*
> *exsultatque et vix animo sua gaudia differt*
> *barbarus . . .*

This cry of conquest marks a turning point. Tereus now reveals the hidden savagery of his character. He lifts the veil of assumed *pietas* (cf. 474 and 482); and the first of the episode's four animal images follows at once, comparing him to an eagle carrying off a hare in its hooked talons (516-518). The animal imagery will recur for the horrors of his crime (527-529, 559) and for Procne's revenge (636f.), until it becomes reality in the metamorphosis at the end. In the tale's pattern of mimetic violence, the birds of prey initiate and close the cycle of crimes against kin (cf. 516f. and 673f.).

These interlocking motifs of suppression of speech, corrupted *pietas*, barbarian status and animality form the thematic armature of Ovid's tale. Together they shape the structure of reversals in which violence meets its condign punishment in an almost exact imitation of itself.

Ovid also uses a more formal articulation of the action, punctuating the human events by a larger divine framework of seasonal or sacral time:

iam tempora Titan
quinque per autumnos repetiti duxerat anni
cum blandita viro Progne . . .
438-440

iam labor exiguus Phoebo restabat equique
pulsabant pedibus spatium declivis Olympi
486-487

signa deus bis sex acto lustraverat anno:
quid faciat Philomela?
571-572

tempus erat quo sacra solent trieterica Bacchi
Sithoniae celebrare nurus: nox conscia sacris
587-588

Of these temporal markers, the first sets the disaster into motion; the second introduces the success of Tereus' scheme; the third indicates the duration of Philomela's imprisonment; and the fourth leads her to freedom and vengeance. This temporal movement is measured by something grander than the impatience of human desire (cf. 514 and 653) or the necessary intervals of a long sea-voyage, although that too marks major stages of the narrative (cf. 422, 444-446, 511-520).[13] This sacred time could suggest a larger world-order framing the events. Yet the very remoteness of these celestial phenomena (especially in the first three passages above) also sets off the moral isolation of the human world and the absence of gods. This story takes us about as far from a clear divine justice as any tale in the poem. We are immersed in the dark night of human passions, as Ovid carefully points out at the beginning and end:

pro superi, quantum mortalia pectora caecae
noctis habent
472-473

tantaque nox animi est
652

There is, to be sure, a kind of poetic justice in the fact that the nocturnal banquet of Tereus' deception is answered ultimately by Procne's night of Bacchic rites on the mountain (487-494 and 588-590, where *nox* is repeated three times). Yet the only god explicitly mentioned is Bacchus, in brief apostrophe (596).[14] Even the metamorphosis at the end comes without benefit of divinity.

It follows as the external manifestation, almost ratification, of the bestiality which the main actors have already been enacting among one another. Compared to an eagle seeking its prey with its talons (516f.), Tereus has already undergone an inner metamorphosis before he becomes, literally, the hoopoe with its "armed face" (*armata facies*, 673f.). The bestiality in Tereus' character has already been marked by adjectives like *ferus* and *saevus* (549, 557, 464, 581).

Procne undergoes an analogous change as she emerges from the Bacchic ritual with a new identity: not *blandita viro Progne* (440), but *Progne terribilis* (595), goaded by the furies of her grief. Tereus, for a moment, could imagine himself as a potential Paris, carrying off a Greek woman to a barbarian land for a second Trojan war: *aut rapere et saevo raptam defendere bello* (464). Procne, however, has a deeper and even more sinister register of mythical echoes to play upon. She becomes an Agave who rends her child, a Medea who kills her offspring, and a Clytaemnestra who would inflict multitudinous wounds on her faithless husband: *aut per vulnera mille / sontem animam expellam* (617f.; cf. Aeschyl., *Ag.* 866-868).[15]

To this demarcation of the story by temporal divisions corresponds an equally sharp set of spatial contrasts. The chief mechanism of Tereus' plot is to lure Philomela from the civilized city of Athens and from the safety of her father's house to the desolate forest in the wild land (520f.). This movement from a civilized house to the wild and from a great city to lonely Thracian forest also gains force from the comparison of Philomela, at her first appearance, to naiads and dryads of the forest (*quales audire solemus / naidas et dryadas mediis incedere silvis . . .*, 451-454). We may be reminded of the lament of these forest dwellers over their kinsman Marsyas at his bloody end shortly before (390-395). That lament created a contrast between painful physical violation and a tranquil sylvan or pastoral landscape: *nec quicquam nisi vulnus erat; cruor undique manat, / detectique patent nervi* (388ff.); *et nymphae flerunt, et quisquis montibus illis / lanigerosque greges armentaque bucera pavit* (394f.). For Philomela, likened to a naiad, the remoteness of nature is threatening. There are no compassionate Nymphs or Fauns in this deserted forest, and the mutilated woman is thrown entirely on her own resources.

The violence implicit in the shift from Athens to Thrace is also symmetrical with an abrupt spatial shift within Thrace. The two Athenian sisters move from enclosure to dangerous wild-

ness, and then back to a domestic interior. When they are reunited inside Tereus' the house, their mood is very different from their previous domesticity. Procne's maenadic freedom on the mountainside puts an end to her previous identity as Tereus' complaisant wife (cf. 428ff., especially 440: *blandita viro Progne*). Philomela too had begun in the shelter of her own house, though under the authority and protection of a father, not a husband. But as the father proved unable to see through the evil designs of Tereus, the nocturnal festival of welcome blends into the dark night of lust in Tereus' heart (486ff.; cf. 472f.); and the "Bacchic" drink served in cups of gold returns as Procne's vengeful Bacchic riot in Thrace (587, 596).[16]

Philomela's slender weaving enables her to find a way through her heavily walled prison: *fugam custodia claudit, / structa rigent solido stabulorum moenia saxo*, 572f.). She had initially threatened Tereus with just such an exposure, filling the forest with her cries of accusation (544-547, especially 546f.: *si silvis clausa tenebor / implebo silvas et conscia saxa movebo*).[17] Now she breaches these walls not by sound but by a silent witness (cf. 574, *os mutum facti caret indice*), which is the product of artfulness in more senses than one (cf. *ingenium, sollertia, callida tela*, 575f.).

Procne's second response to the message is no longer stupefied silence (582-586, *supra*) but a violent exit from the house at night (*nocte sua est egressa domo regina*, 590), to join the Thracian women on Mt. Rhodope. The toponyms *Sithoniae* and *Rhodope* underline the Thracian character of the ritual. Procne takes up *furialia arma* and makes her way *per silvas* (594). "Stirred up by the wild madness of grief" (594f.), she leads the women in bacchantic rage. Later, in the infectious spread of violence, she will dress Philomela in bacchantic garb (598f.). Amid the Dionysiac howls (*exululat euhoeque sonat*, 597), she penetrates the remote forest, "breaks down the doors" of her sister's prison, and carries her off, amazed, "within her own walls" (*adtonitamque trahens intra sua moenia ducit*, 600). She, thus, exactly undoes the act of Tereus, who had "dragged" Philomela "into" the forest: *in stabula alta trahit silvis obscura vetustis* (521). Enclosure in the remote forest was previously in the service of lust. Now it becomes a fearful enclosure within the criminal's own body, which he would be only too willing to throw open: *et modo, si posset, reserato pectore diras / egerere inde dapes immersaque viscera gestit* (663f.). A crime committed across vast distances is answered by a crime committed in his own most intimate household and, finally, within his own interior flesh.[18]

The parallels and inversions between the beginning and end multiply as the tale goes on and clearly form part of the terrible mimetic violence of the revenge plot.[19] Tereus' helpful "conquest" of a barbarian army in Athens' behalf degenerates into a libidinous "conquest" of his sister-in-law (reversing the direction of his voyage) and then into his own being "conquered" by the collusion of two women (425, 483, 513, 525, 612).[20] The first appearance of Procne and her child Itys combines the motifs of the Eumenides, the marriage torch and the figurative bird of prophecy (430-434), all of which return as part of the crime and its punishment.

The Eumenides at the beginning (430f.) become the Furies (literal or figurative) who avenge the violation of marriage later (591-595, 657, 662).[21] The torches (*faces*) of marriage, coming straight from a funeral, overdetermine the ominous atmosphere (*Eumenides tenuere faces de funere raptas*, 430). They then become the metaphorical "torches" of Tereus' desire (480) and then of Procne's lust for revenge (614). And the birds, of course, recur at the cardinal point of Tereus' victorious lust (the eagle-simile of 516-518) and its defeat and punishment in metamorphosis (666-674). The *blanditiae* with which Procne appeals to Tereus for her sister's visit (*cum blandita viro Progne*, 440) returns in her horrible vengeance for the crime that she has thus innocently set into motion (*blanditiae*, 626, 632). The joyful "leaping about" of Tereus at the apparent success of his plot (*exsultat*, 514) becomes the "leaping" of his son's boiling flesh in the caldron (*pars inde cavis exsultat aenis*, 645). The displacement of speech into weaving becomes a female "unveiling" that transforms apparent feminine helplessness into decisive and bloody action (cf. 566f., 576ff., 604). The male weapon of the sword or iron (*ensis, ferrum*) undergoes a parallel shift from agent to victim (551ff., 611f., 617, 643), until it fixes Tereus forever in his role of aggressive pursuer (666). As we have already noted, the repeated motifs of *pietas*, tears, night, fire, conquest, joy, weaving, speech and silence mark the major stages of crime and punishment.[22]

How seriously are we to take this working out of an immanent moral law in the *Metamorphoses*? Is Ovid just exploiting the *grand guignol* possibilities that a Thracian barbarian's goriness would permit? Does he expect us to appreciate the violence and horror as an example of what he can achieve in his blending of tragedy and epyllion? It is, of course, hard to be certain in the case of so protean a poem. One has to acknowledge that here, as elsewhere, Ovid does not resolve the deep moral issues that his narrative

raises, particularly, as in this case, the problems of innocent suffering and gratuitous violence.[23]

In one respect, at least, Ovid seems to show himself aware of the grimness of his tale, for the next episode casts a similar narrative into a very different mood. This tale, the story of Boreas and Orithyia, is virtually the comic mirror-image of the story of Tereus and Philomela. It allows us to see the murderousness of the preceding tale in comic relief and thus offers perspective on its outrageous crimes.[24]

The Tereus story contains a harsh asymmetry in its moral structure, for the parallelism between the male violence of lust and the female desire for revenge is not exact. Not only is the former individual and the latter collective, but the women's crime develops only as a response to Tereus'. He was the initiator and aggressor, the women are avengers. Horrible as their vengeance is, it has some justice on its side. The dehumanization of all three characters in the final metamorphosis, however, does not discriminate between degrees of guilt, and in fact, rather, encourages us not to judge. The closest Ovid comes to recognizing the tragedy of Procne's maternal love turned into child-murder is the brief hesitation and monologue at 624-635. Once decided, she is almost as monstrous as Tereus. Such is the effect of the tigress simile of 636f. and the pathos of Itys' death as he stretches out his arms to his mother, who does not even turn her face away as she strikes (639-642).[25]

The justice that is never mentioned in the case of the women has a prominent place at the beginning of its sequel, the story of Pandion's successor in Athens (677f.):

> *sceptra loci rerumque capit moderamen Erectheus,*
> *iustitia dubium validisne potentior armis.*

At the beginning of the Tereus episode these attributes of power (but not of justice) belong not to the Athenian king, but to his future son-in-law, *quem sibi Pandion opibusque virisque potentem / . . . iunxit* (426-428). The weakness of that Athenian king and father is now replaced by a strong father-figure. Erechtheus will not surrender his daughter to a Thracian husband, divine though he is (682ff.).[26] Boreas, then, like Tereus, resorts to violence. Indeed, his highly rhetorical soliloquy, in which he reminds himself that he is a big bad storm-god, full of potential *saevitia* and *vis* (687ff.), may recall Tereus' readiness to play the role of Paris and launch a massive war (cf. 461-466). Like Tereus too, he yields to the blazing fires of passion (708) and carries his Athenian beloved off to the snowy wilds of Thrace (707ff.).

Unlike Tereus, however, Boreas makes his Athenian captive his wife and the mother of twin sons (line 711 may be an intentional echo of 581). The bird-metamorphosis that follows is now gradual and happy rather than sudden and destructive (cf. 666-674 and 714-718). The two sons, Zetes and Calais, have their wings as part of the joint attributes of both parents (*gemellos / cetera qui matris, pennas genitoris haberent*, 712f.). For the young Itys, "likeness to father" meant death (*a ! quam / es similis patri*, 621f.): here it is the source of special powers that ensure heroic success. These bird-like qualities emerge only in the due course of the Boreads' maturation (714-718), just when they are useful for their spectacular and literally radiant breaking away on the Argonautic expedition (720f.):

> *vellera cum Minyis nitido radiantia villo*
> *per mare non notum prima petiere carina.*

These are the closing lines of the book; and they offer an image of bright, happy, and expansive travel, in contrast to the movement toward enclosure and darkness in the tale of Tereus (cf. especially *iubet ille carinas / in freta deduci . . .*, 443f., of Tereus' ill-fated voyage from Thrace to Greece). They also show us the children of a Thraco-Athenian union reaching a glorious adolescence rather than being cut off horribly in childhood.

In his account of Procne's *furor*, Ovid recollects, and asks us to recollect, the maenadic *furor* of Vergil's Amata and, to a somewhat lesser degree, of Dido (*Aen.* 7.385-405, 4.300-303).[27] In this way he assimilates Procne's terrible, if just, vengeance to the most familiar literary models of female violence. Because these echoes (along with others noted earlier) mark the self-conscious literariness of Ovid's narrative, they also take us back to the problem of literary pleasure, the problematical pleasure of the text in this most unpleasant tale. The sudden shift from forest to mountain to interior of the *domus* (cf. 601, *ut sensit tetigisse domum Philomela nefandam*) destabilizes the image of woman as a helpless victim, held prisoner for the sexual pleasure of a man. Rape is answered by maenadic *furor*; violation of the ties between husband and wife and between sister and sister is answered by the violation of the bonds between mother and son and between father and son. Incest is answered by filicide and cannibalism.

The maenadic imagery, however, keeps us from a fully sympathetic identification with the avengers and prefigures their total loss of humanity in the metamorphosis at the end. As Bacchants, the women become embodiments of irrationality rather than representatives of a retributive moral order. This recourse to the Dionysiac pattern, like the three-way metamorphosis that follows it, both marginalizes the women's response and minimizes its justice and its tragedy.[28] None of these transformations of identity provides a satisfactory moral resolution.[29]

Yet these armed women on the mountainside, with the irresistible strength of maenads that we know from Euripides' *Bacchae*, also show us a different image of the female body. It is not the passive object of uncontrollable, lawless male pleasure, but it is full of strange power and quite capable of murder. The Greek tragedies with similar endings—Euripides' *Medea*, *Hecuba*, *Bacchae*, and perhaps Sophocles' lost *Tereus*—do not opt for the facile solution of metamorphosis, but leave us in shocked contemplation of this enormity of female hatred and vengeful force. In the case of Ovid our aesthetic pleasure might be less, but our moral pleasure might be greater and deeper if that shock-effect were less tamed by the pseudo-resolution of metamorphosis to which the poem is committed.

NOTES

1. See the recent study by C.A. Barton, "The Scandal of the Arena," *Representations* 27 (1989) 1-36. There is a balanced discussion of the problem of violence in the *Metamorphoses* in G.K. Galinsky, *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1975) chapter 3, "Ovid's Humanity: Death and Suffering in the *Metamorphoses*," pp. 110-157, especially 138-140.
2. On 552-560, for example, F. Bömer remarks: "Hier beginnt ein Katalog von Scheusslichkeiten . . ., den Ovid, ebenso wie anderswo, in genusslicher Ausführlichkeit schildert . . ."; F. Bomer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen, Buch VI-VII* (Heidelberg, 1976) 151. See also Galinsky, *op. cit.* 126-132; H. Diller, "Die dichterische Eigenart von Ovids Metamorphosen" (1934) in Michael von Albrecht and Ernst Zinn, eds., *Ovid*, Wege der Forschung, vol. 92 (Darmstadt, 1968) 333f.
3. See Bomer, *op. cit.* 117; also his commentary *ad* 560 (153) and 647-674 (172ff.). The similarities between Ovid and Seneca's *Thyestes* may, of course, be due to a common source, whether Accius or Sophocles.

4. On this authorial intervention and its function of distancing Ovid from the monstrous protagonist of the story, see Bömer, *ibid.* 154.
5. For the motif of *fides* and *pietas* in the episode and their corruption, see A. Ortega, "Die Tragodie der Pandionstochter in Ovids Metamorphosen," in W. Wimmel, ed., *Forschungen zur Romischen Literatur* (Festschrift Karl Büchner) (Wiesbaden, 1970) 217 and 220-222. The motifs run throughout the tale, signalled by the repetition of *pius* and *fides* and the derivatives: cf. 474, 482, 496, 498, 503, 535, 539, 566, 629, 635, etc.
6. The identification of Philomela's web with a mode of writing seems to have been part of the tradition: see Bömer, *op. cit. ad* 582 (158).
7. I fully agree with P.K. Joplin, "The Voice of the Shuttle Is Ours," *Stanford Literature Review*, 1.1 (1984) 25-53, esp. 26ff., in her criticism of G. Hartman, *Beyond Formalism* (New Haven, 1970) 337, for eliding the violence against the female body and "celebrat[ing] Language and not the violated woman's emergence from silence" (26). My emphasis is on violence more than on gender, though of course the two cannot be entirely separated in this case.
8. See the comment on Shakespeare's version of the rape scene in *Lucrèce* by Joplin, *ibid.* 33, n. 16: "The poet's eyes are hardly less lewd than the rapist Tarquin's . . ."
9. This added horror of the repeated violence may be original with Ovid; see Ortega, *op. cit.* 218 with n. 8.
10. There is also a cruel irony in the fact that Philomela's "last farewell" as she leaves Athens proves to be the last words that she will ever speak there: *supremumque vale pleno singultibus ore / vix dixit* (509f.). On the special pathos of *supremum* here, cf. 10.62 and 134, 12.526.
11. On the Thracians as uncivilized, see Bömer, *op. cit. ad* 458 (131f.). As in the incestuous births of Byblis and Myrrha, Ovid chooses a setting at the edges of civilization for the violation of basic human laws (cf. 9.640ff., 10.476ff.).
12. For Tereus as "barbarian," see Ortega, *op. cit.* 218.
13. There is also a progression here from the more or less neutral statements of the first two voyages to the third, which takes place under the sign of Tereus' lust, as his predatory eyes never leave Philomela (515). The significance of his last voyage is also marked by the *cum-inversum* clause of the arrival: *iamque iter effectum iamque in sua litora fessis / puppibus exierant, cum rex Pandione natam / in stabula alta trahit* . . . (519-521). For other aspects of narrative structure, see Ortega, *op. cit.* 215f.; B. Otis, *Ovid As an Epic Poet* (Cambridge, 1970²) 408-410.
14. Cf. also the *insignia Bacchi* just afterwards (598) and the metonymic use of Bacchus for wine in 488f. (*Bacchus in auro / ponitur*), to be discussed later.

15. The episode also has a number of other intertextual allusions. Often noted is the echo of Apollo's pursuit of Daphne in Tereus' lust for Philomela: 6.455-457 and 1.492-495, on which see G.A. Jacobsen, "Apollo and Tereus: Parallel Motifs in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *CJ* 80 (1984-1985) 45-52. The ill-omened wedding at the beginning (6.429ff.) is perhaps recalled in the story of Orpheus, 10.3-8. In both cases the resemblances set off the bestiality of Tereus and the violence of this tale. Cf. also the motif of the final farewell (509), which also recurs in Orpheus' story (10.62), as well as elsewhere: see Bomer, *op. cit. ad loc.* (141). Cf. the seduction motif of 463f. with the story of Procris in the next book (7.739f.), and see Bomer, 133.
16. This passage is perhaps a possible reminiscence of the disastrous banquet of Dido at the end of *Aeneid* 1, esp. 1.685f.; cf. Bomer, *op. cit.* at *Met.* 6.488f.
17. One wonders if these lines are a reminiscence of Eur., *Hipp.* 1253f., especially as accusation by non-spoken means is involved.
18. Note too that Tereus' tears here (*flet modo*, 665) are no longer feigned, as before.
19. This structure of infectious violence could be described in the terms of R. Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (1972), tr. P. Gregory (Baltimore, 1977), especially 41ff., 158ff., but such an analysis would perhaps only show how little the moral issues of the myth are here resolved. For a criticism of such an approach see Joplin, *op. cit.* 45-47.
20. This reversal may go back beyond Accius' *Tereus* to Sophocles' play on that subject: see Bomer, *op. cit.* 117f. and Otis, *op. cit.* 406f. If so, the plotting and vengeance of Hecuba against Polymestor in Euripides' *Hecuba* may give us an idea of how it might have been handled in tragedy.
21. On the motif of the ill-omened wedding see Bomer, *op. cit. ad loc.*, 124.
22. For example, night: 472f., 486ff., 588-590, 652; fire: 455ff., 460, 466, 492, 609, 614f., 645f.; silence: 574, 583-585, 622f., 632, 660; joy: 514, 653, 660; tears: 471f., 504, 523, 535, 566, 585, 610f., 628, 665. See also W.S. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6-10* (Norman, OK, 1972) *ad* 671-674; Note too, how the motif of "not containing" one's passions moves form Tereus to Procne: *nec capiunt inclusas pectora flammas*, of Tereus' lust in 466; *ardet et iram / non capit ipsa suam Progne*, of Procne's vengeful wrath in 609f.; see Bomer, *op. cit. ad loc.*
23. On these questions see my "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Greek Myth in Augustan Rome," *Studies in Philology* 68 (1971) 371-394, especially 377ff., 384ff.

24. M. von Albrecht, "Ovids Humor und die Einheit der Metamorphosen" (1963) in Von Albrecht and Zinn, *op. cit.* 432, observes: "Vorwiegend dustere Bucher, wie das sechste und achte . . . haben ein brausend-heiteres Finale."
25. Cf. 7.340-342, where Pelias' daughter, even with her good intentions, cannot look. See Galinsky, *op. cit.* 131f. on the "untragic presentation of tragic material."
26. Note too, the motif of *blanditiae* here (685). Unlike those of the Tereus story (440, 626, 632), these do not succeed. For other parallels between the two tales, see Anderson, *op. cit.* 237 and *ad* 6.717-718.
27. *Met.* 6.587, *quo sacra solent trieterica Bacchi*, seems to be a conscious echo of *Aen.* 4.302, *ubi audito stimulant trieterica Baccho* . . . On Ovid's assimilation of Vergil's language of *furor* elsewhere see F. Bomer, "Ovid und die Sprache Vergils" (1959), in Von Albrecht and Zinn, *op. cit.* 192f.; see also K. Buchner, "Ovids Metamorphosen" (1957), *ibid.* 388f. On the Bacchantic imagery of Dido and Amata, see now M. Suzuki, *Metamorphoses of Helen* (Ithaca, 1989) 111ff., 130ff.
28. See the interesting feminist critique of just this literary pattern in Joplin, *op. cit.* 45-47: "The Greek imagination uses the mythic end to expel its own violence and to avoid any knowledge of its process. Patriarchal culture feels, as Tereus does, that it is asked to incorporate something monstrous when the woman returns from exile to tell her own story" (47).
29. Otis, *op. cit.* 211-215, for example, gives a good description of the dehumanization of the two women, but, in my opinion, too easily regards the metamorphosis as the "solution of their catastrophe" (215) rather than as the problematization of justice in this world of sub-human behavior.

THE TWO WORLDS OF THE POET

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON VERGIL

ROBERT M. WILHELM
AND
HOWARD JONES,
EDITORS

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DETROIT