

THE RHETORICAL USE OF FAMILY TERMS IN SENECA'S *OEDIPUS* AND *PHOENISSAE*

MARICA FRANK

THE DELIBERATE AVOIDANCE of a proper name is well attested in classical literature, where it may arise from a variety of motives: for example, ignorance of the name (Ter. *Ad.* 891, Vergil *Aen.* 1.327–328), the desire to suppress a name potentially offensive to the listener or addressee (Juv. 13.248–249), the need for discretion (Soph. *Phil.* 852–853, Cic. *Att.* 6.4.3, 6.5.1–3), guilt, hatred, or other strong feelings associated with the bearer of the name (Eur. *Hipp.* 350–352, Cat. 8.4, 7, 12). Sometimes only the fact of the avoidance of the name is striking; in other cases the name substitute itself is rhetorically pointed.¹

It is normal in Greek tragedy (as in epic) for characters to address and refer to one another for the most part by periphrases once they have been introduced to the audience.² In Senecan tragedy too, the proper names of *dramatis personae* occur relatively infrequently, considering that in declaimed drama³ one might expect more proper names as an aid to identification, since the audience cannot see the characters. Although Seneca uses periphrases freely, there are instances in Senecan (as in Greek) tragedy of a character's deliberate avoidance of a proper name. In *Agamemnon*, for example, Clytemnestra appears deliberately to avoid using Agamemnon's name as being painful or abhorrent to her, referring to him rather as *vir* (156, 201, 265, 579),⁴ *ille* (164, 178), *pater* (166), *victor* (262), *coniunx*

My thanks to Professor David Scourfield and to Dr Fred Jones who read and commented on an earlier draft of this article. I am grateful, too, for the valuable advice and suggestions of the anonymous readers.

¹See especially Donatus on Ter. *An.* 380, 612, 899; *Eun.* 618, 627, 1072; *Ad.* 210, 2134. For these references and for those cited earlier in the paragraph, I am indebted to Dr Fred Jones who kindly made available to me the manuscript of his forthcoming book, *Nominum Ratio: Aspects of the Use of Personal Names in Greek and Latin*.

²Aeschylus, in particular, is sparing of the personal names of *dramatis personae*: there are, for instance, only eleven references by name to characters in *Agamemnon*.

³Despite the conclusion of D. F. Sutton (*Seneca on the Stage* [Leiden 1986] 61) that Seneca probably intended his tragedies to be performed on stage in a normal Roman theatre, his ineptitude as a dramatist (manifested, for example, in the fact that in *Phoenissae* there are no entrance cues and only two exit cues [359 ff., 427], Eteocles has to be identified by a process of elimination, and the Satelles is never identified) and the importance of the individual scene in his plays, make it more likely that the tragedies were intended to be declaimed piecemeal, and to be known in their entirety only through written copies (so E. Fantham, *Seneca's Troades* [Princeton 1982] 48 f.).

⁴All references are to Otto Zwierlein's OCT (Oxford 1986).

(398, 404, 1003), *rege regum* (291), *regi ac viro* (301), while, by contrast she uses Aegisthus' name freely (260, 979, 986). In *Medea*, Medea does not use Jason's name when speaking of him to Creon, who is part of the new family that has taken Jason from her; instead she calls him *ducum ducem* (233), *hunc* (234), *unum* (235), *tuus gener* (240), *crimen* (246), *comitem* (273), *illi* (276), *maritus* (279).⁵ In *Thyestes*, Atreus avoids using Thyestes' name until 259, although he refers to him 11 times before that (as *frater* 178, 191, 194; *hostem* 186; *invisum caput* 188; *ille* 197, 220; *vir* 199; *perfidus* 235; *frater hostis* 241; *dirum caput* 244). When he does finally utter the hated name, it is in response to the Satelles' asking him what weapon he will use to avenge himself on his brother; the impact of his reply *Ipsio Thyeste* is increased by his previous avoidance of the name. In *Hercules Furens* when Lycus approaches Megara to be his wife, he does not address her by name, but deliberately uses the lengthy and formal periphrasis,⁶ *O clarum trahens/ a stirpe nomen regia* (359–360), which has far more point than the name would have had: Lycus is not interested in Megara as Megara; he desires her precisely because (as he has already made clear in his soliloquy at 332–357) her royal blood will compensate for his lack of it, and so make his usurpation of the Theban throne more palatable to the people.

In *Oedipus* and, more consistently, in the fragmentary *Phoenissae*,⁷ Seneca avoids proper names, not because the names themselves carry associations (as in the examples from *Agamemnon* and *Medea* cited above), but because of the rhetorical mileage to be gained from the use of kin terms as name substitutes.⁸ It is admittedly normal in classical tragedy for family

⁵ Seneca may be trying to convey the ambivalence Medea feels towards Jason by making her shun the intimacy of the name. Jones (above, n. 1) suggests also that Medea, who is trying to propitiate Creon and so gain a postponement of her banishment, may avoid Jason's name so as not to seem too proprietorial about him. Furthermore, through her use of at least two of the name-substitutes, *crimen* and *maritus* (possibly also *tuus gener*), Medea seems to be suggesting to Creon that Jason is a not entirely desirable son-in-law. See also C. D. N. Costa, *Seneca: Medea* (Oxford 1973) on *Medea* 218 ff.

⁶ John G. Fitch, *Seneca's Hercules Furens* (Ithaca and London 1987) 359 f., observes that the formality of the address suits Lycus' "ultra-politeness."

⁷ There seems to me no reason to doubt either the unity or the dramatic nature of the *Phoenissae*. The two fragments (1–362 and 363–664) belong to a single play and are linked by verbal echoes, shared motifs, and, in particular, the theme of the fraternal conflict. The absence of choral odes suggests that they were never written because Seneca did not complete the play. The final act is also missing. See Marica Frank, *Seneca's Phoenissae: Introduction and Commentary* (Leiden 1995) 1–16.

⁸ One can compare Cic. *Clu.* 12 where Cicero says of Sassia: *mater enim a me in omni causa, tametsi in hunc [sc. Cluentium] hostili odio et crudelitate est, mater, inquam, appellabitur . . .* Sassia's crime was an unnatural one for a mother and Cicero stresses this by repeatedly referring to her as *mater*. See also Ovid *Met.* 10.467 f.

members to refer to, or address, one another using kin terms. In Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, for example, Oedipus uses the names of his daughters only three times (Ἀντιγόνη 1, 311; Ἰσμήνη 357); for the rest he calls them individually τέκνον (9, 27, 81, 213, 216, 327, 328, 332, 353, 388, 410, 412, 845, 1204), παῖ (188, 321, 329, 722, 846, 1104, 1112), and θύγατερ (170, 225, 398), and together παῖδε (493, 1644), παῖδες (1471, 1542, 1633), τέκνα (1611), ὃ σπέρμ' ὄμαιμον (330), and ὃ φίλτατ' ἔρνη (1108). Similarly, Oedipus' name is used only once by his daughters (in line 14 Antigone calls him πάτερ ... Οἰδίπους); elsewhere he is called only πάτερ.

However, what is normal is not necessarily neutral: the context is all-important. In *Oedipus at Colonus*, where Oedipus' identity and the genetic confusion resulting from his crimes are not the principal focus, the use of family terms is not rhetorically pointed. Only twice does Sophocles draw attention to the ambiguous relationship between Oedipus and his daughters and in each case he does so by using more than a simple family term (ὃ σπέρμ' ὄμαιμον 330, κοιναί γε πατὺς ἀδελφαί 535). This suggests that the family terms themselves (τέκνον, παῖς, θυγάτηρ) are not loaded in this play as they are in Seneca's Theban plays. In the plots of these dramas the distortion of normal family relationships resulting from Oedipus' parricide and incestuous marriage is central and in both plays Seneca highlights the confusion of these relationships by his use of family terms—*coniunx*, *mater*, *parens*, *natus*, and so on, which in the context are fraught with ambiguity. It should also be noted that τέκνον and παῖς are less specific than the Latin *natus* and *nata* (Seneca does not use *filius* in the tragedies and *filia* occurs only once) and need not reflect a biological parent-child relationship.

In Seneca's *Oedipus*, where the rhetorical use of family terms is noteworthy but less thoroughgoing than in his *Phoenissae*, the employment of the device before the anagnorisis is a form of dramatic irony similar to that which pervades the first part of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* (where, however, it does not revolve around the use of family terms).⁹ In line 81 of Seneca's play, Oedipus, sensing that he is destined for a fate even more terrible than that which his subjects, gripped by the plague, are suffering, expresses the desire to flee *vel ad parentes* (whom, of course, he believes to be Polybus and Merope); and immediately Jocasta completes the line with *Quid iuvat, coniunx, mala . . .*. The juxtaposition of *parentes* and *coniunx*, the fact that *parentes* is spoken by Oedipus and *coniunx* by Jocasta, and that both terms are drawn together into a single verse is extremely pointed. In fact, neither Oedipus nor Jocasta addresses or refers to the other by name throughout the play; this is particularly striking since there

⁹See, e.g., 105, 137 f., 249 ff.

is no name avoidance among, and with reference to, other characters.¹⁰ Clearly Seneca saw the rhetorical potential in using family terms in the context of ambiguous family relationships.

The use of family terms offers rhetorical opportunities also in Act 4, in the exchange between Oedipus and the Corinthian messenger. The irony is heavy when, in response to the messenger's announcement *quietem Polybus aeternam obtinet* (785), Oedipus replies *edissere agedum, quo cadat fato parens* (787, with *parens* prominently placed) the answer to which the audience well knows. Oedipus' next utterance, in which the family term is again emphatically placed—*Genitor sine ulla caede defunctus iacet* (789)—intensifies the irony in a way the use of the proper name could not. Oedipus' state of knowledge finally converges with that of the audience when, in response to his question *qua matre genitus?*, Phorbas reluctantly replies *Coniuge est genitus tua* (867). Here, as in 81, the sharing of the line between two speakers, in this case Oedipus and Phorbas, results in the drawing together of *matre* and *coniuge*, separated only by the awful *genitus*. When Oedipus realizes his true identity, he calls on the citizens to kill him, in terms which tie in with Seneca's consciously rhetorical use of family terms in the play. It is no coincidence that he says *me petat ferro parens, / me gnatus, in me coniuges arment manus / fratresque . . .* (872–874), or that he urges himself finally *gratare matri liberis auctam domum* (881), the macabre horror of which exhortation is enhanced by the juxtaposition of *matri* and *liberis* (given additional weight by its position following the caesura). It may not be fanciful to see the same kind of rhetorical consciousness operating in Oedipus' opening speech, where, in his description of the far-reaching effects of the plague, he says *omnis aetas pariter et sexus ruit* (53) and in illustration of the statement, *iuvenesque senibus iungit et gnatis patres / funesta pestis* (54–55): in the context of the play, the plague acts as a catalyst in the discovery that a particular young man and a particular old man, a son and a father, are indeed joined in an unnatural and macabre way.

The pointed use of family terms between Oedipus and Jocasta reaches its first climax at 1009 ff., after the anagnorisis and the self-blinding, where Jocasta says: *Quid te vocem? / gnatumne? dubitas? gnatus es: gnatum pudet; / invite loquere gnate . . .* (1009–11). The repeated use of *gnatus* seems to reflect Jocasta's desire to make contact with Oedipus on the basis of the legitimate relationship between them and to blot out the incest which has polluted it. Her attempt fails since Oedipus recognizes her voice—*matris, en matris sonus!* (1013)—but cannot bear to have any contact with

¹⁰Oedipus uses Creon's name at 203, 399; Creon uses the names of Teiresias and Manto at 289 f.; the Nuntius refers to Oedipus by name at 916 and the Chorus to Jocasta at 1005; at 216, 943, and 1003 Oedipus refers to himself by name.

her even as his mother, since he cannot, like her, deny the more sinister aspect of their relationship. His apparent sense that the ambiguity of their relationship is reflected in their names for each other is confirmed in 1023 where he begs Jocasta not to speak to him, *per omne nostri nominis fas ac nefas*, i.e., neither as mother nor as wife.¹¹ The awareness of the significance of family terms thus exists on two levels: both within the drama in the mind of Oedipus (and to some extent in that of Jocasta too) and outside the drama as a rhetorical weapon in the armoury of its creator. This two-tiered consciousness is reflected in the sharp rise in the occurrence of family terms in Act 5 after the anagnorisis: with eighteen family terms in 64 lines, the frequency at this point is even greater than it is on average in *Phoenissae*¹²—one family term in every 3.5 lines.

The second climax of family terms occurs at the point of Jocasta's suicide (1034 ff.), where again she ponders what name to use, this time of Laius: *hoc iacet ferro meus/ coniunx—quid illum nomine haud vero vocas?/ socer est* (1034–36). The separation of *meus* and *coniunx* by the line-end (1034–35) introduces a significant hesitation before *coniunx* which suggests the doubt that Jocasta goes on to express in the question which follows. Her subsequent use of *socer* marks a psychological shift from denial to acceptance. In 1009 ff. she is insistent that it is right for her to call Oedipus *gnatus*, thereby denying that he is also *coniunx*; but by 1034 ff., as a result of Oedipus' brutal refusal to collude in her self-deception, she has moved to despairing acknowledgement that just as Oedipus is not merely her *gnatus*, so Laius was not merely her *coniunx*, but is now revealed also, more immediately and far more terribly, as her *socer*. The final statement of the ambivalent relationships in the play comes with Jocasta's last words: *hunc, dextra, hunc pete/ uterum capacem, qui virum et gnatos tulit* (1038–39): Oedipus and Jocasta, who call each other only *coniunx* in the first part of the play (81, 773) and only *gnatus/ mater* after the anagnorisis (881, 939, 1010 f., 1013, 1020, 1031), are now acknowledged to be who they are—both mother and son and husband and wife. Moreover, by using the plural *gnatos* Seneca draws the children of Oedipus into the web of confused relationships.

When one turns to Seneca's *Phoenissae* the phenomenon of name avoidance in favour of the pointed use of name substitutes is even more strik-

¹¹For this consciousness of the significance of family names, cf. Sen. *Agam.* 984–985, where Electra describes Aegisthus as *per scelera natus, nomen ambiguum suis, / idem sororis gnatus et patris nepos*; *Herc. Fur.* 387–388, where Megara, speaking of Oedipus, says *quid geminum nefas / mixtumque nomen coniugis gnati patris?*, 1246–48, where Amphitryon appeals to Hercules not to commit suicide *Per sancta generis sacra, per ius nominis / utrumque nostri, siue me altorem uocas / seu tu parentem . . .* On the *nomen sacrum* in Senecan drama, see Charles Segal, "Nomen Sacrum: Medea and Other Names in Senecan Tragedy," *Maia* 34 (1982) 214–246.

¹²In *Phoenissae*, a family term occurs on average once in every 4.2 lines (see Appendix).

ing. *Phoenissae* is the only Senecan drama in which no character addresses another by name at any point.¹³ Furthermore, only once does a character refer to another by name (in 554 Jocasta mentions Oedipus by name). Characters constantly both address and refer to one another in terms which indicate their consanguinity, and words indicating family relationships occur more frequently in *Phoenissae* than in any other Senecan tragedy: a family term occurs on average once in every 4.2 lines of *Phoenissae*, whereas the next most frequent occurrence is once in every 7.2 lines of *Thyestes* (see Appendix).¹⁴

The extraordinarily high incidence of these terms in *Phoenissae* is clearly not due only to the subject matter: *Thyestes*, for example, is also very much concerned with family relationships, but it does not exhibit the same abundance of family terms. Rather, in *Phoenissae*, particularly in the first half of the play (1-362), words denoting kinship are used as a rhetorical device to stress the genetic chaos which reigns in the Theban royal house.¹⁵

The effect of the frequent use of family terms is a cumulative one, but there are some striking individual cases. In line 2, Oedipus addresses Antigone as *nata* (given a slight emphasis by its position immediately following the caesura) which occurs in close proximity to *parentis* (line 1), *patris* (line 2), and *patrem* (line 3); the effect is to reinforce or underpin the oblique reference in these lines to Oedipus' incestuous activities (*genuisse vel sic* line 3). *Nata* is similarly used in 229-231: *nata, iam sensum tui, / quae pars meorum es criminum, infelix pater / fugissem*, where, in addition, both *nata* and *pater* are emphatically placed (as is *pater* in 190). In line 50, *discede, virgo. timeo post matrem omnia*, the contracted nature of *post matrem*¹⁶ creates a rhetorically powerful ambiguity, since in the absence of any explicit reference to the incest it is not clear whether *matrem* means "my

¹³Although there is an instance of self-address ("Oedipu," 178). In ps.-Sen. *Octavia*, the only vocative of a name is used by the Chorus (*Poppaea* 369).

¹⁴These statistics are based on the incidence of family terms in the dramatic episodes only. I have omitted words denoting relationships of affinity, e.g., *socer*, *gener*, *altor*, but have attempted to include all nouns and adjectives denoting consanguinity. I have not taken into account family terms which occur in choral odes: since these are unrelated to the development of the plot and tend to deal with general themes or with mythological background, family terms which occur in them are of scant relevance to this study. I have, however, included in my calculations lines at the end of choral odes which are not part of the lyrics proper, but which introduce the next act, e.g., *Phaedra* 824-834.

¹⁵Cf. Apul. *Met.* 10.3 where, by contrast, there is a marked avoidance of the family term; of the stepmother in love with her stepson Apuleius says, *ad se vocari praecepit filium—quod nomen in eo, si posset, ne ruboris admoneretur, libenter eraderet*, and he subsequently refers to the stepson only as *adolescens* and as *iuvenis*.

¹⁶Cf. Sen. *Troad.* 744 f., *ipse post Troiam pater / posuisset animos*, Med. 637, *ipse post terrae pelagique pacem*, ps.-Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 79, *post feras, post bella, post Stygium canem*; see R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1* (Oxford 1970) on Hor. *Od.* 1.18.5 *post vina*.

mother" or "your mother." A similar ambiguity involving *mater* occurs in line 211, where Antigone asks Oedipus: *natos fugis matremque?* *Matrem* here most obviously and most pointedly refers to Jocasta as the mother of Oedipus (i.e., "your children and *your* mother"), but it could also apply to Jocasta as the mother of Eteocles and Polyneices (i.e., "your children and *their* mother"). The ambiguity is heightened by the word-order; because *fugis* precedes rather than follows *matremque*, *natos fugis* stands as a unit, with *matrem* separated from it. There is further ambiguity of this kind in the use of *parens* and *natus* in 225, since, in the context, *parens* could refer to either of Oedipus' parents as well as to himself, and *nati* could apply equally to Oedipus and to either of his sons: in other words, the sentence could mean either "Do I receive any sounds through my ears by which I may hear the name of a parent or of a son?," or "Do I receive . . . the name of 'parent' or 'son'?" In this instance the ambiguity serves to reinforce the effect of *incestificus* (223).

In the mini-*suasoria* at lines 182 ff., in which Antigone produces the reasons why Oedipus should *not* commit suicide, it is striking that within 34 lines she addresses Oedipus four times using a family term.¹⁷ Were Antigone and Oedipus members of a conventional family, there would be nothing remarkable in this, since, in a situation where one person is trying to obtain something from another, the former tends to use the name of the latter frequently as a means of stressing the relationship, whether real or imaginary, between them. But in this drama about an unnatural family, Antigone's repeated use of family terms serves as a reminder of the genetic chaos for which Oedipus is responsible. The result is that, while on one level she is trying to persuade Oedipus that he is not guilty, on another level her words emphasize the hideousness of the incestuous tangle which he has engendered. In 204, *et hoc magis te, genitor, insontem voca*, the juxtaposition of *genitor* and *insontem* is particularly striking.¹⁸

Nowhere in *Phoenissae* are Eteocles and Polyneices identified by name; all the characters, including—most strikingly—those to whom they are not related, refer to them by family term: the Nuntius calls Polyneices *frater* in 324 and the Satelles refers to the quarrelling pair as *fratribus* (401) and *fratrum* (439). This seems to be part of the rhetorically pointed use of family terms in the play. The device is inverted in the lines from 272–287, when, after the most detailed mention so far of the fraternal conflict, Oedipus seems to avoid calling Eteocles and Polyneices his sons (he uses *qui* in 274, *manus* . . . *alias* in 275 f., *hic* and *ille* in 281 f.). The avoidance of this family term suggests Oedipus' dissociation and estrangement from

¹⁷ *parens* (182, reinforced by *natae* 183), *pater* (190), *genitor* (204, 215).

¹⁸ Cf. 305 f. where the effect of *dum in domo nemo est mea / nocentior me* is enhanced by *Nata* which follows immediately.

his offspring, and lends considerable impact to his bitter acknowledgement of them in 287, *ut esse genitos nemo non ex me sciat*.

The second half of the play, in which Oedipus does not appear, focusses on Jocasta's attempts to dissuade her sons from war and mutual slaughter. Here Seneca's preference for family terms serves not only as a reminder to the audience of the genetic confusion in Oedipus' family, but also, within the internal reality of the play, to strengthen Jocasta's appeals to her sons. In 408 f., *petere qui fratrem volet,/ petat ante matrem*, the parallel positioning of *petere* and *petat* and the withholding of *matrem* until the end of the sentence emphasises the fact that only by murdering their *mother* (the most impious of thoughts) will the brothers be able to attack each other. In fact, the clustering of references to Jocasta's motherhood in 403 ff. is striking: Antigone addresses her as *parens* (403) and *mater* (406) and Jocasta refers to herself as *matrem* (409) and *matre* (410). It is as their mother that Jocasta intends to appeal to Eteocles and Polyneices and the emphasis is on the respect due to her motherhood. The juxtaposition of *nate* and *maternas* in 500 is also pointed.

In 621–624, *frater*, *pater*, and *mater* are used in a particularly interesting way. Jocasta urges Polyneices to find other lands to conquer, saying: *quin ipse frater arma comitatus tua/ tibi militabit. Vade et id bellum gere/ in quo pater materque pugnanti tibi/ favere possint*. It all sounds very cosy—a family united in support of a son's military enterprises—but quite unreal. In view of what has been said and done in the preceding 620 lines of the play, it is hard to imagine the implacably hostile Eteocles and Polyneices fighting side by side in brotherly harmony, and even harder to conceive of Jocasta and Oedipus sharing the same hopes and fears for their son, since in 334 ff. Oedipus expresses the hope that they *will* destroy Thebes. This unconvincing picture of a united and mutually supportive family was perhaps intended by Seneca, capable as he was of acute psychological insight, to convey Jocasta's longing for just such a family, and also to suggest her inability or refusal to accept that her family is fundamentally flawed.

Because Seneca emphasises kin terms so much in *Phoenissae*, the use by Jocasta in 554 of Oedipus' name has considerable impact (Oedipus' name occurs in three other places—89, 178, 313—but in all of these it is used by himself). The effect of Jocasta's saying *Occurrat tibi/ nunc Oedipus* rather than, say, *Occurrat tibi/ pater tuus*, is to play down Oedipus' paternal role (to which she appeals in 537 ff.) and to present him rather as a public figure whose exacting moral standards should have a sobering effect on any impulsive young man about to plunge into *nefas*.

Worthy of brief consideration are the instances in *Oedipus* and *Phoenissae*—three in each play¹⁹—where Oedipus uses his own name rather than a

¹⁹ *Oedipus* 216, 943, 1003; *Phoen.* 89, 178, 313.

a pronoun, a family term, or some periphrasis (e.g., *Oedipus* 80, *infaustus hospes*).²⁰ Of these instances one (*Phoen.* 178) is a self-address, the remainder are self-references. All are rhetorically pointed, as self-naming invariably is. The self-address in *Phoenissae* 178 f., *audies verum, Oedipu:/ minus eruisti lumina audacter tua,/ quam praestitisti*, has the effect of focussing Oedipus' attention on an unpleasant fact, which he would prefer not to face.²¹ As far as the five cases of self-reference are concerned, in *Oedipus* 216 and *Phoenissae* 313 the use of the name suggests Oedipus' consciousness of his (erstwhile) public status as a great man and a doer of brave deeds (in *Oedipus* 216, in addition, it alludes to the possible etymology of the name as derived from οἶδα; this is made clear by *noscere*, which is otherwise peculiar in the context). In *Oedipus* 943 and 1003, and in *Phoen.* 89, it emphasises rather his freakishness as a perverter of natural laws, and his isolation—in each case one might translate "such a one as Oedipus."

In conclusion, it may be said, firstly, that not only does Seneca consciously exploit, from the outside as it were, the ambiguity inherent in the use of family terms in his Theban plays, but within the world of the dramas themselves both Oedipus, at the end of *Oedipus*, and Jocasta, in the second part of *Phoenissae*, display an awareness of the emotive and moral power of kin words.²² Secondly, the persistent use of family terms sustains the theme of genetic chaos in the Theban royal house and thereby contributes to the important identification made in both plays²³ of Oedipus with the Sphinx: both are distortions of nature, both bring destruction to Thebes, and the tangle of Oedipus' family relationships is as hard to unravel as the Sphinx's riddle.²⁴

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND
1 JAN SMUTS AVENUE
JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA

²⁰On Oedipus' self-naming in Sen. *Oedipus*, see Segal (above, n. 11) 244–245.

²¹For this use of the speaker's/author's own name, cf. Cat. 8.1, 19.

²²The "inside/outside" distinction is fundamental in Petr. *Sat.*, where Petronius at times distances himself stylistically from the *persona* of Encolpius, the narrator, in order to be able to satirize him; see Peter George, "Style and Character in the *Satyricon*," *Arion* 5 (1966) 336–358.

²³In *Oedipus* 641, Oedipus describes himself as *magisque monstrum Sphinge perplexum sua*, and in *Phoen.* 118 ff., he desires Antigone to place him on the rock vacated by the Sphinx on the grounds that he is a *monstrum . . . maius* (122).

²⁴See *Phoen.* 131–137. For a detailed examination of the verbal links and imagery that unite Oedipus and the Sphinx in Sen. *Oedipus*, see Donald J. Mastronarde, "Seneca's *Oedipus*: The Drama in the Word," *TAPA* 101 (1970) 300–305.

APPENDIX

*Occurrence of Family Terms Outside Choral Lyrics*²⁵

	Total	HF	Tr.	Ph.	Med.	Phae.	Oed.	Thy.	Ag.
<i>(g)nata</i>	19	0	5	6	3	0	1	0	4
<i>(g)natus</i>	129	23	19	14	17	15	14	20	7
<i>parens</i>	96	16	14	18	3	14	17	7	7
<i>genitor</i>	56	13	3	10	5	12	5	7	1
<i>mater</i>	103	5	25	31	12	11	15	1	3
<i>pater</i>	138	24	17	25	17	9	10	17	19
<i>paternus</i>	27	1	5	6	2	3	3	3	4
<i>frater</i>	91	8	1	25	10	4	4	33	6
<i>fraternus</i>	9	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	2
<i>maternus</i>	14	0	5	4	0	1	2	0	2
<i>filia</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>coniunx</i>	75	18	11	3	11	10	6	3	13
<i>uxor</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>soror</i>	25	4	1	3	2	4	3	1	7
<i>maritus</i>	9	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	2
<i>genetrix</i>	7	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1
<i>patrius</i>	24	4	3	4	2	4	1	2	4
<i>filius</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>liberi</i>	32	2	3	4	8	0	2	11	2
<i>aus</i>	12	2	2	2	1	1	0	3	1
<i>auia</i>	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>nepos</i>	13	0	4	1	2	0	0	3	3
Total	882	121	120	160	101	93	84	113	90
Total no. of lines excluding choral odes		1050	950	664	768	1047	758	817	755
Average distribution of family terms: one per x no. of lines		8.7	7.9	4.2	7.6	11.3	9.0	7.2	8.4

²⁵Figures based on Zwierlein's text.