

# ACHILLES TATIUS AND SOPHOCLES' *TEREUS*: A CORRIGENDUM AND AN ADDENDUM\*

In an earlier publication in this journal<sup>1</sup> I argued that reminiscences from Sophocles' lost *Tereus* may be hiding in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitopho* 5.3.4–5.3.6 and 5.5.3–8, where the myth of Tereus and Procne is recounted. In that article, I envisaged the possibility that a hitherto latent fragment from *Tereus* may be culled out of *Leucippe* 5.5.4 ἔδνα τῶν γάμων αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι λαλεῖν, namely:

<× — ∪ — × — ∪> ἔδνα τῶν γάμων  
δίδωσιν αὐτῇ μή τι γηρύειν ἔτι

δίδωσιν αὐτῇ μή τι γηρύειν ἔτι was suggested to me by David Kovacs *per litteras*.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately his suggestion was garbled in transmission, and in the printed article the second line begins αὐτῇ δίδωσιν. This cannot be right since the unemphatic or anaphoric forms of αὐτός (αὐτοῦ, etc.) are not found in line-initial position. I wish to make it clear that Professor Kovacs, whose contributions to Greek tragedy are many and distinguished, is not responsible for this blemish.

It now strikes me that another tragic reminiscence, possibly also from Sophocles' *Tereus*, may be detected in *Leucippe* 5.3.5 Θράξ ὁ Τηρεὺς ἐνύφαντο Φιλομήλα παλαίων πάλην Ἀφροδίσιον. The association of violent or illicit sexual congress with wrestling brings to mind two Aeschylean passages in which the metaphor is prominent. The first is *Agamemnon* 1206 where Apollo is called παλαιστής in his capacity as Cassandra's lover. The second is *Suppliants* 296, where παλαίσματα is Butler's emendation – accepted by M.L. West in his Teubner edition – of the nonsensical MS παλλαγμάτων (cf. παλαισμάτων already Stanley). Hermann's τὰμπαλάγματα, which was more or less the vulgate before West,<sup>3</sup> has been shown by Friis Johansen and Whittle to be more dubious than its nearly universal acceptance might suggest:

The word ἐμπαλάγματα cannot mean 'embraces', but denotes 'entanglement', as Headlam points out in his translation. Headlam himself explains it as 'liaison, an entanglement in the snares of love' [...] but this idea cannot be conveyed by the bare subst.; the abstract sense *liaison* is perhaps possible [...] but is hardly what the context requires.<sup>4</sup>

West<sup>5</sup> has made a strong case for Butler's emendation, and adduced numerous non-tragic parallels (from the *Theognidea* down to Paulus Silentarius) for the idea of

\* I am grateful to David Kovacs for his truly valuable help with this paper, and to the *CQ* editors for giving me this opportunity to set the record straight regarding a textual suggestion by Professor Kovacs which I had unfortunately misreported in an earlier article (see below in the text). Naturally, whatever faults remain are entirely my own responsibility.

<sup>1</sup> *CQ* 56.1 (2006) 220–38.

<sup>2</sup> As indicated in *CQ* (n. 1), 224.

<sup>3</sup> Wecklein, Headlam, Mazon, Weir Smyth; τὰμπαλάγματα ἦν Wilamowitz, Vürtheim, Murray, Rose, Page. See H. Friis Johansen and E. Whittle (edd.), *Aeschylus: The Suppliants* II (Copenhagen, 1980), 237 (*ad* 296).

<sup>4</sup> Friis Johansen and Whittle go on to consider emending into περιπαλάγματα or περιπαλάγματ' ἦν ('the physical twining-round involved in the anthropomorphic intercourse of Zeus and Io'), but as they admit the word is unattested.

<sup>5</sup> *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990) 139–40.

‘sexual wrestling’ or ‘sexual battle’.<sup>6</sup> Since the idea is such a common one, there is of course no way of positively proving that *Leucippe* 5.3.5 echoes a *tragic* passage. However, as a look at n. 6 will confirm, use of *wrestling*-imagery to refer to the sexual act is rare: it is rather images of fighting or of training and exercising that prevail. Moreover, aside from Paulus Silentarius, the use of *πάλαισμα*, *παλαιστής* and the like as euphemisms for sex seems to be limited to Aeschylus. In addition, *πάλην Ἀφροδίσιον* in Achilles Tatius contains an epithet which in tragedy occurs only in Sophocles (fr. 166 Radt *κάφροδισίαν ἄγραν*). It is not beyond belief, then, that *Leucippe* 5.3.5 may conceal a reminiscence of a tragic trimeter, e.g. × — *παλαίων Ἀφροδίσιον πάλην* (Kovacs *per litteras*), which would preserve Tatius’ phraseology practically intact. There may, however, be a difficulty here, in that the only tragic instance of *Ἀφροδίσιος* that is metrically unambiguous, namely S. fr. 277.1 Radt, scans with short first syllable (in S. fr. 166 the word is *in crasi*). This is, of course, no fatal objection *per se*, considering that *Ἀφροδίτη* sometimes has a long first syllable (E. *Ba.* 225, 459; *IA* 1159; fr. 23.2, 26.1, 898,1 Kannicht). However, since Sophocles does not seem to use *πάλη* (fr. 1130.10 Radt is of uncertain authorship), a reconstruction involving *πάλαισμα* might have more to recommend it. The putative Sophoclean original could have been e.g. *Ἀφροδίσιουσιν ἐμπλακεῖς παλαίσμασιν* (the three-word trimeter may have attracted attention to a climactic moment), or perhaps *Ἀφροδίσιον πάλαισμα τῇδ’ ἐπεμβαλὼν*. There are, of course, numerous other possibilities.

Université de Montréal

VAYOS J. LIAPIS

vayos.liapis@montreal.ca

doi:10.1017/S0009838808000311

<sup>6</sup> Here are the parallels cited by West: Thgn. 1335–6 ὄλβιος, ὅστις ἐρῶν γυμνάζεται οἴκαδε ἐλθὼν, / εὐδὼν σὺν καλῷ παιδὶ πανημέριος; Eup. fr. 171.2 K.-A. οὐδ’ οἴκαδ’ ἐλθὼν τὴν σεαυτοῦ γυμνάσεις δάμαρτα;; Ov. *Her.* 5.140–1 *ille meae spoliū uirginitatis habet, / id quoque luctando*; Suet. *Dom.* 22 *assiduitatem concubitus uelut exercitationis genus clinopalem uocabat*; Apul. *Met.* 2.17 *proeliare...comminus...derige et grassare nauiter et occide moriturus...hodierna pugna*, and 9.5 (*Veneris*) *colluctationibus*; Paul. Sil. *A.P.* 5.259.5–7 *κεῖ μὲν παννυχίησιν ὀμιλήσασα παλαιστραῖς / ταῦτα φέρεις* [i.e., bruises], ὄλβου παντὸς ὑπερπέταται / ὅς σε περιπλέγδην ἔχε πήχεσιν. We may add *ἀγχεῖν*, a technical term from wrestling used with sexual innuendo in Herodas 1.18: see Headlam/Knox ad loc.

## VEILED OR UNVEILED? (PLUT. *QUAEST. ROM.* 267B–C)

ταῖς δὲ γυναῖξιν οὐδ’ ὅλως ἐξῆν ἐπικαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν; ἱστορεῖται γοῦν ὅτι πρῶτος μὲν ἐξέβαλε γυναῖκα Σπόριος Καρβίλιος ἐπ’ ἀτεκνία, δεύτερος δὲ Σουλπίκιος Γάλλος ἐφελκυσταμένην ἰδὼν κατὰ κεφαλῆς τὸ ἱμάτιον, τρίτος δὲ Πόπλιος Σεμπρόνιος ἀγῶνα θεωρήσασαν ἐπιτάφιον. Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 267B–C. (Nachstädt, Sieveking, Titchener 1971).

Were women not at all allowed to veil their heads? At any rate it is recorded that Spurius Carvilius was the first to divorce his wife on account of her barrenness, that Sulpicius Gallus was second to do so, after seeing his wife pulling her *himation* over her head, and that Publius Sempronius was the third – his wife had gone to watch the funeral games.

Plutarch’s source for these anecdotes was in all probability Valerius Maximus. Plutarch is known to have made use of the Roman moralist elsewhere in his