Ramus 46 (1&2) p.118–134 © Aureal Publications 2018.
doi:10.1017/rmu.2017.6

REPETITION

Erik Gunderson

The 'present' essay is but a tissue of 'quotations'. Some are in quotation marks.[1]

1. First

It is not easy to know where to begin.[2] Standing at the crossroads, one sees innumerable tracks leading in every direction down well-worn paths. Can one really say anything new, or is one condemned to repeat the already said? A possible way forward—but it has already been tried before…—is to double down on repetition. If one repeats enough and with sufficient diversity among the repetitions, then maybe among the interference patterns generated among so many different standing waves centered upon so many different points there will emerge something novel, the echo of a voice never heard before. And this would be the voice of an author, the voice of Seneca, for example.[3]

Different orders of repetition can be noted in Seneca's tragedies. One can attempt a rough and ready taxonomy of them. One finds both rhetorical repetition and literary repetition, or, what amounts to the same thing, but put differently, repetition at the level of language and repetition at the level of themes.[4]

Senecan tragedies are filled with tropes and figures that double words, sounds, and ideas. The texts are packed with features that rhetoricians would denote as alliteration, anaphora, polyptoton, homeoteleuton, *geminatio*, and *repetitio*.[5] The vocabulary of repetition and return saturates the plays. Words like *retro,*

1. Derrida (1981), 287.

2. I would like to thank the editors for their thoughtful, engaged, and productive comments.

3. See also Owen (1968) on the problem of finding Seneca's originality amidst his traditional aspects. The secret, he says, can be seen in *Moral Letter* 84 and the story of the way bees gather pollen in order to make honey. Trinacty (2014), 13-16, argues similarly. See also Henderson (2004), 46-48, on this same letter.

4. One will note, though, that this essay does not offer a specifically rhetorical exploration of Seneca's tragedies. See instead something like Wray (2009).

5. A single example: *geminatio* is a stylistic feature. See Cic., *De or.* 3.206 (which is itself repeated verbatim at Quint., *Inst.* 9.1.33). Compare *Inst.* 9.3.28f. and 9.3.41-45. Next, the same thing, but differently: *geminatio* is a (criminal) feature of Seneca's style and emblematic of the epigrammatic (artificeial) quality of Seneca's dramaturgical productions. See Quint., *Inst.* 8.5.18: *facit quasdam sententias sola geminatio, qualis est Senecae in eo scripto quod Nero ad senatum misit occisa matre, cum se periclitatum uideri uellet: 'saluum me esse adhuc nec credo nec gaudeo'* ('A number of sound bites are yielded by doubling alone. Take for example Seneca's epigram in that letter Nero sent to the senate in the wake of his mother's murder where the emperor wanted to give the impression that he himself had been in danger: "Neither do I believe nor do I rejoice that I am safe"'). See also Boyle (2011) on *iam iam* at *Oed.* 28: 'emotional duplication (*geminatio*), often at the beginning of a line of verse, is a

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

iterum, bis, and *semper* abound. Similarly, verbs beginning with the prefix *re-* themselves recur.

Meanwhile amidst the verbal repetition we find literary repetition. And this too occurs at multiple layers. We find literary repetition between authors, that is allusions.[6] But there are also self-repetitions, places where Seneca doubles something he says elsewhere.[7] There are also scenes and structures whose generic type recurs both between plays and within the same play such as stychomythic exchanges and choral odes.[8]

The repeated return from the underworld of a ghost who delivers the prologue can be taken as an emblematic moment of structural return. Tantalus does this in the *Thyestes*, and Thyestes' ghost does this in the *Agamemnon*.[9] And in making such a dramaturgical choice, Seneca repeats and expands the gesture of other tragedies as well as repeating and expanding from within his own corpus.[10] Nevertheless, even as the revenant Tantalus emphatically says 'again' in the fourth line of the prologue to the *Thyestes*, there is much that is novel and non-standard in this dialogic prologue.[11]

2. Zweimal ist immer

'This time at last. "This time at last".'[12]

I wish to emphasize a particular species of thematic repetition, namely the return. And I wish to explore return within two plays rather than across the

feature of Seneca's tragic style: e.g. …' Boyle then gives nine examples of *iam iam* as well as numerous examples of still more doubles such as *nunc nunc*, *me me*, and *ite ite*.

6. Littlewood (2004), 6: 'As any commentary shows, Senecan tragedy is stitched together from lines of Virgil and Ovid: this is its primary material.' Stronger still is Schiesaro (2003), 223: 'Seneca's tragedies stem from a continuous, even obsessive confrontation with their [tragic] models.' Note that Littlewood's primary source of repetitions is not quite the same as Schiesaro's. Trinacty (2014) offers a book-length examination of Seneca's intertextual relationship to his antecedents.

7. Tarrant (1976) on *Ag.* 15: 'Seneca's descriptions of hell invariably include a catalogue of the famous sinners.' Tarrant (1976) on *Ag.* 181: 'The ode on mutability is a hall-mark of Senecan tragedy.' He lists examples from five different plays.

8. See Trinacty in this volume for a discussion of Seneca's intratextuality and its relationship to intertextuality. See especially his observation on the manner in which Virgil's epic monologue turns into dramatic dialogue at the end of Seneca's *Agamemnon*. Meanwhile Sampson's essay on misdirection points out that repetition can be more important for the differences it enables. Raising expectations and then subverting them can also be part of the game. Littlewood makes a convergent point as he closes his essay in this volume: repetition can be but a prelude to upstaging.

9. See Boyle (1997), 34: the two plays repeat one another abundantly at a structural level and yet have an 'ideological distinctness' and occupy 'quite different worlds'.

10. Boyle (1997) argues this at length in his fifth chapter, 'The Palimpsestic Code'.

11. Tarrant (1985), 86: 'The scene has no obvious model in extant Greek or Roman tragedy.' The moment indirectly affirms Trinacty (2014), 4f.: Seneca's innovations arise out of rhetorically inflected returns to the literary past.

12. Derrida (1981), 291.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whole corpus. We will look at the *Agamemnon* and the *Oedipus*. The motif of the return is not a simple one, and it too can be elaborately subdivided if one chooses: return can be mere repetition; return can defer even as it repeats; return can augment as it repeats; return can mark the beginning of some new order or the end of some old order; return can specifically represent disaster or tragedy. None of these species, though, is necessarily cut off from a rich interaction with other aspects of the general question of repetition.

The speech of Eurybates in Seneca's *Agamemnon* is emblematic of the problem of repetition. Clytemnestra asks a newly arrived Eurybates about Agamemnon's travels. Eurybates replies by telling her of Agamemnon's 'returning foot' (*reducem pedem*) and safe landing.[13] Clytemnestra at once asks for a repetition and expansion of the messenger's account. She expands the metrical and narrative travels of Eurybates by making a double imperative to him: *pande… pande…* (*Ag*. 404f.).

Eurybates' prolix account of the voyage back retards the plot of the *Agamemnon* even as it foretells the doom of the Argive leader. As he makes this account we can see a number of verbal repetitions that are themselves joined to the theme of repetition. And, further, all of these repetitions are also retelling the story of the poetry itself: *reduces pedes*, then.[14]

For instance, when the army is given the 'sign for return' (*signum recursus*, 426), this is also the opening of the way forward as the fleet sets sail (*aperitque cursus*, 430). The initial journey is pleasant, and one repeats the expression of that pleasure: *iuuat* appears twice in rapid succession.[15] The repeated occasion of pleasure is the leaving behind of Troy and, of course, the thought of a return that is inevitably bound up with this departure.[16]

As they sail the victors retell for one another episodes from the Trojan war.[17] And so Eurybates' retelling of the journey also tells of a series of retellings. Seneca's own portrait of retelling is also innovative and a way forward: we have a supplement to the Homeric material both in the fact of the retelling and in the substance of the tales told. The two-line summary of the inset song

13. *reducem expetito litori impressit pedem* ('He planted his returning step upon a longed-for shore', *Ag*. 401). And feet themselves return to furnish key images in the exchange between Agamemnon and Clytemnestra (810-950). See also Ginsberg in this volume for a discussion of Polynices' (multiply) Oedipal repetition, return, and error in the *Phoenissae*.

14. But see as well Garelli-François (1998), 18, on Eurybates as emblematic of Seneca's innovative relationship to the motif of the messenger.

15. This verbal repetition is itself repeated later both when the Chorus uses *iuuat* twice in rapid succession (*Ag*. 664 and 666) and then again when Cassandra raves (*Ag* 750, 751). And, finally, Cassandra herself repeats this same repetition of *iuuat* in the penultimate line of the play (*iam, iam iuuat uixisse post Troiam, iuuat* ['Now, now I am glad to have lived beyond Troy, yes, glad'], *Ag*. 1010). The variation lies in taking only one line to do what had formerly taken two.

16. (Eurybates) *iuuat uidere nuda Troiae litora, / iuuat relicti sola Sigei loca* ('We delight to look upon the denuded shores of Troy. We delight to see the desolate landscape of an abandoned Sigeum', *Ag*. 435f.).

17. *Ag*. 446: *bella narrat*. This is itself a retelling of Virgil's *arma canere*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

begins where Homer ends, namely with the ransoming of Hector's corpse in *Iliad* 24, and then it continues on with material not covered by Homer but instead famously on offer in Virgil, namely the death of Priam.[18]

These embedded micro-epics give way to an inset 'choral' interlude that flags the whole speech as itself being a poetic work in miniature. A group of dolphins begins to frolic around the ships as they sail. Programmatic language abounds.[19] The play of the dolphins is iterative, reciprocal, and circular.[20] They precede the ships and trail behind them; now they do this, now they do that; they circle the ships and they circle them some more.[21] The language of poetic repetition abounds. All the while the sight of Troy fades away behind the fleet.

And yet, as we all know, the end of one story is merely the prelude to the next, even as this next story is but the deferral of the one that will follow it. And so Eurybates transitions to the next episode: a reversal of fortune. A storm arose to beset the fleet after the sun set on that glad day. A collection of repeated consonants gives us our first warning that something is amiss: first a run of m's, then some c's, some l's, and presently double u's.[22] The last of these pairs is the strongest: *uentis uenturis* ('winds to come'). The repetition is not just of a mere initial letter but a whole cluster of letters.

The message of the repetition is not retrospective but instead forward-looking: 'Beware of that which is yet to come.' This fusion of immediate past, ominous present and disaster to come is emblematic of the tragic repetition more generally within this play. A decidedly mixed set of pasts is about to give way to an echo of itself that is both louder and more violent. And in such a combination of features and effects we can feel the approach of Seneca *tragicus* and his own poetics.

---

18. *Hectoris fortis minas / currusque et empto redditum corpus rogo, / sparsum cruore regis Herceum Iouem* ('The threats of brave Hector, / his chariot, his body restored and consigned to the pyre at a price, / Hercean Jove splattered with a king's blood', *Ag.* 446-48).

19. Dolphins themselves are 'programmatic' within the poetic tradition, and they evoke dithyrambic choral dance. See Csapo (2003). And this dancing is itself associated with the motif of rebirth. See Kowalzig and Wilson (2013), 11.

20. *tunc qui iacente reciprocus ludit salo / tumidumque pando transilit dorso mare / Tyrrhenus omni piscis exultat freto / agitatque gyros* ('In a calm sea this way and that they frolic / and with broad back leap through the swelling wave: / dolphins spring forth everywhere across the main. / They set spirals spinning…', *Ag.* 449-52). Tarrant (1976) on *reciprocus*: 'An extremely rare word in poetry, and far from common in prose.' 'Ludic' dolphins also appear in Livius Andronicus' *Aegisthus* fr. 2, *tum autem lasciuum Nerei simum pecus / ludens ad cantum classem lustratur* ('Then the sportive snub-nosed flock of Nereus / frolicked in time to the music and circled the fleet').

21. *et comes lateri adnatat, / anteire naues laetus et rursus sequi; / nunc prima tangens rostra lasciuit chorus, / millesimam nunc ambit et lustrat ratem* ('They swim alongside as our companions. / They delight to outstrip the fleet and then again to follow it. / Now touching the fleet's first prow they frolic as a chorus, / now they circle and review the thousandth ship', *Ag.* 452-55).

22. *tum murmur graue, / maiora minitans, collibus summis cadit / tractuque longo litus ac petrae gemunt; / agitata uentis unda uenturis tumet* ('Then a heavy low noise: / more is menaced as it tumbles down from the highest hilltops. / The shore's long expanse and the crags groan. / Waves swell, set in motion by the winds to come', *Ag.* 466-69).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A catalogue of winds ensues. Catalogues are themselves regular features of Seneca's plays. Here the accumulation of winds yields a chaotic storm. But within the confusion we find a balanced symmetry of repetitions and calibrated variations: wind repulses wave and wave resists wind.[23] This symmetrical repetition gives way to a tragic involution as the language folds in even more tightly on itself. The fleet fails in an unending spiral of sameness set against itself: *ipsa se classis premit / et prora prorae nocuit et lateri latus* ('The fleet presses against itself, prow wounds prow, side side').[24]

The fleet was overwhelmed by the storm, says Eurybates: art yielded to the evils upon them, *ars cessit malis* (507).[25] The announcement of the end of artistry, unsurprisingly, marks exactly the point where one can find it. What ensues is a rewriting of a set of conceits familiar to readers of Virgil and Homer.[26]

Even when the storm breaks the troubles do not end: instead the place where the land bends back on itself yields a narrows just as perilous for the fleet as the storm had been.[27] Many ships find themselves dashed on the rocks. Repetition is destruction: 'Traversing the same ground in the opposite direction', the ships break up on the shore.[28] The language doubles and repeats, the ships divide and scatter.[29] The broken breaks, *fracta frangit*.[30] And this itself repeats while inverting Virgil's *seruataque serues*.[31]

The doubleness set within the pseudo-incidental messenger speech is emblematic of a problem of iteration that suffuses the macro structure of the play. As far as the main plot of the *Agamemnon* is concerned, we can take Cassandra as the character who most emphatically delivers the message that repetition is tragic. When Cassandra has a vision doubling arrives at once. Forms of *geminus* are twinned in two successive lines, the second of which contains a second word for doubling, namely *duplex*.[32] And yet this very line reproduces and modifies the same double of doubling found in Virgil's *Aeneid*.[33]

---

23. *uento resistit aestus et uentus retro / aestum reuoluit* ('Wave's swell struggles against the wind and back again the wind / wheels the wave', *Ag.* 488f.).

24. *Ag.* 497f.: and compare *redditam reuomit* ('regurgitates the restored') in line 500.

25. Art set against storms is Ovidian: see Tarrant (1976), *ad loc.*

26. Tarrant (1976) compares Hom. *Od.* 5.306ff. and Virg. *Aen.* 1.94ff. to Seneca's 512ff. Pypłacz (2010), 54: Seneca will exaggerate each of the elements of his models.

27. See *Ag.* 561: *feruetque semper fluctus alterna uice* ('Ever seethes the swell moving now here, now there'). Compare *Ag.* 564: *Isthmon, arto qui recuruatus solo…* ('Isthmus, which bent back with a narrow band of soil…').

28. The translation is from Tarrant (1976).

29. *pars uehitur huius prima, pars scopulo sedet; / hanc alia retro spatia relegentem ferit / et fracta frangit* ('This ship sees the foremost part of itself sail off while part sticks to a rock. That ship strikes another which reverses and retraces its course: / broken it breaks', *Ag.* 573-75).

30. On this collocation, see also Trinacty and Sampson in the first article of this volume.

31. Virg. *Aen.* 2.160. See Tarrant (1976), 283.

32. *sed ecce gemino sole praefulget dies / geminumque duplices Argos attollit domus* ('But behold the day resplendent with a twin sun. / And a twin Argos raises aloft domains double', *Ag.* 728f.).

33. *et solem geminum et duplices se ostendere Thebas* ('[who saw] a twin sun and Thebes display itself doubled', Virg. *Aen.* 4.470). The scene describes lovesick Dido who is repeating the experience of Pentheus (*ueluti demens Pentheus* 4.469). And Virgil has obviously asked us to note that he has

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The literary past is the literary present is the literary future: one concatenates a set of homologous, interlocking and yet carefully differentiated links.[34] Cassandra finds herself looking backwards both in her own history and in literary history.[35] She sees all over again the judgement of Paris (732). And then she turns to the present and sees the dead Trojans in the underworld (745). Finally she effectively looks into the future and thereupon declares that what is to come is what has already been: 'Behold, wretches: the fates wheel themselves backwards.'[36] The invocation is itself double: it is made both to an internal audience and to the external audience.

Hereupon Cassandra bursts into song. She first sings of Virgilian Furies.[37] And next she sees what nobody else on the stage can see: Tantalus in the underworld.[38] And yet the audience has indeed already seen a vision from the underworld, the one offered by Thyestes' ghost in the prologue. Thyestes was not just reported to us at second hand but was really there. We saw what she sees. The text wheels itself backwards. And yet this is precisely the engine of its forward movement: Seneca makes un-present that which was once explicit and he simultaneously makes explicit that which was once latent.

The look backwards in history to Tantalus is the prelude to the future death of Agamemnon.[39] And, in fact, the closing scene where Aegisthus appears offers the involuted and polluted re-presentation of Thyestes' prologue. Thyestes' son-and-grandson wheels the fates back upon themselves as well as the structure of the play back upon itself. And so too does this scene with Cassandra furnish the fitting introduction to the first and only appearance of Agamemnon himself in

himself reproduced and modified Euripides' *Bacchae* 918f.: καὶ μὴν ὁρᾶν μοι δύο μὲν ἡλίους δοκῶ, / δισσὰς δὲ Θήβας καὶ πόλισμ' ἑπτάστομον ('Indeed I think I can see two suns / and Thebes with its seven mouths doubled').

34. Compare Boyle (1997), 112: 'Senecan tragedy contains its own autobiography: past and future.'

35. See Trinacty (2014), 199-214, for a close reading of the manifold details.

36. *spectate, miseri: fata se uertunt retro* (*Ag.* 758). *Fata se uertunt retro* receives its own treatment in the fifth chapter of Schiesaro (2003), a discussion of dramatic time in Senecan tragedy: 'By creating a framework in which certain sections of the play appear to revolve back to a point in time that has already been treated, and by substituting iteration for linearity, these tragedies make repetition an essential modality of tragic representation', 186). Compare Motto and Clark (1985) on the play's 'backwardness'.

37. Tarrant (1976) on *Ag.* 759ff.: 'The Furies whose approach is imagined by Cassandra have little direct connection with the avenging spirits of Aeschylus' *Choephoroe* and *Eumenides* and Euripides' *Orestes*, and are based instead on the picturesque descriptions of earlier Latin poets, in particular that of Virgil's Allecto.'

38. I hope that I will be forgiven for side-stepping the debate over whether or not these plays were ever staged. I believe that a notional performance works just as well as an actual one for the points that I am making.

39. This motif of back-and-forth is also replayed not just internally to the house of Atreus but also externally for the Trojans who are the doubles of the Argives. Cassandra's vision of Agamemnon's death is celebrated with exclamation, 'Conquered, we conquer!' (*uicimus uicti Phryges*, *Ag.* 868).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this play. The man who will never return to the drama that bears his name enters with the words: 'Finally, I return!' (*tandem reuertor*, 782).[40]

Mad Cassandra is unafraid to die. But before she falls she tells Clytemnestra that she has no regrets: 'Now, now I am glad to have lived beyond Troy's fall, glad I say' (*iam, iam iuuat uixisse post Troiam, iuuat*).[41] At the end we have a retroactive look: now her supplementary life suffused with woe has a happy meaning. The surfeit of existence is legitimated 'here here and now now' at a juncture where one looks backwards with the certainty that there is nothing to come, at least for oneself.

Glad, glad indeed: her double declaration of affect itself repeats a structure we have seen before. We saw it when the Argive host gladly sailed away from Troy and lost sight of its smoldering ruins. We saw it again when the Chorus sought to mingle its tears with those of Cassandra.[42] And now we see it as the play closes. And Cassandra herself has a double status: she is both a living speaker and already dead. That is, the perspective from which she utters *uixisse* is not that of a woman who is glad 'that she lives' but rather 'that she has lived'. Her present life is already her past.

One line remains in the play, and it is shared between Clytemnestra and Cassandra. The former says, 'Madwoman, die!' And the latter says, 'Even to you will come madness' ([Cl.] *furiosa, morere.* [Ca.] *ueniet et uobis furor*). Madness is repeated. The present turns into the future. 'You' will become 'you'. The transitivity of pronouns that lets them float between concrete persons doubles for the slide between times and texts that allows, or, rather, compels repetition—even as one inevitably notes differences arising at the very same moment.

And so, back to the beginning. Said the ghost, 'It pleases me to return' (*libet reuerti*, 12). The pleasure of the revenant is matched by the gladness of the dying woman. Seneca's 'poetics of repetition' carves out a novel space for itself in and by means of the Stygian shadow that haunts the text as its prelude and its destiny. All of the dead poets are back: one has to stare at them unflinchingly. One repeats their verses. One says what they said and sees what they saw. And yet one is not, for all of that, a mere nullity. It is possible to find a sadistic negative pleasure even if one is forced to live 'after Troy' and 'after Homer's Troy' and after 'Virgil's Troy'. Seeing one's own tragedy gives pleasure. And even if one was mad to have enjoyed doing so, the ones who live on after ourselves will themselves suffer the same fate. *Forsan et haec olim…*

In fact it is Seneca's ghost who will haunt the text-to-come as its enabling monster. See, then, the *Hercules* by not-Seneca. And next see the *Octavia* by someone else who is also not Seneca. Indeed this second not-Seneca seems to

40. On the irony of the moment, see Shelton (1983), 173. See also Trinacty in this volume for more on *iam iam*.

41. *Ag.* 1111.

42. On the chorus itself, see Aricò (1996) and Shelton (1983), 170f.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have mistaken the first not-Seneca for Seneca.[43] And, fittingly enough, the author of the *Octavia* gives a bit part in the drama to Seneca himself.

3. Second

…everything begins in the folds of citation…[44]

The untidiness of the theme of repetition should by now be clear. The different layers of it are often folded into one another. Verbal repetitions cluster next to places where one finds literary reminiscences and these latter are themselves passages where return in general is in play. But a turbid confluence is not quite the same thing as an orderly convergence. One return might defer another, such as the repetition of an old crime. Meanwhile the crime repeated moves backwards as well as forwards. There is no point in giving any one dimension or element here 'priority' given that 'the prior' is itself under examination. Nevertheless, one is left with the sense that these repetitions are all in a sort of incestuous relationship with one another.[45] If only someone would solve the riddle of repetition and detect identity amidst apparent heterogeneity.[46] Then we could be done with it all once and for all. A charming wish, but also one that cannot be fulfilled.

The riddle of the sphinx in Seneca's *Oedipus* is a *carmen*, and readers of the *carmen* that is the *Oedipus* themselves have a riddle to solve.[47] The answer to the riddle is always one and the same, though: 'Oneself'. The man who knows that 'a man' goes on all four in the morning is happy to elide the rest of the implied syllogism: 'And I am a man. Therefore I…'[48]

The one who answers the riddle never believes that the answer is anything more than a simple noun, a stand-in *nomen* that can be endlessly as well as harmlessly repeated. Even—if not especially—*ego* becomes textual and not subjective. Indeed intertextuality saves yes-it's-actually-me from ever appearing on the scene. Only 'me' is ever there. But the very story of Oedipus tells us time and again that the answer to the most important question is a proper name.

43. See Ferri (2003), 53.
44. Derrida (1981), 316.
45. See Ginsberg in this volume.
46. Different-but-same: 'Which creature walks on four legs in the morning, two legs in the afternoon, and three legs in the evening?'
47. *carmen poposci* ('I demanded the *carmen*', *Oed.* 98). Boyle (2011) on line 98: *carmen* is likewise a common word for verse prophecy. See Hyginus and Ovid. And compare Sophocles as well. See also the discussion of Medea's *carmen* in Trinacty and Sampson in the first article. In case we missed it, *carmen* is repeated a few lines later at *Oed.* 102*: ac triste carmen alitis solui ferae* ('I unraveled the baleful riddle of the wild winged beast'). Cf. Boyle (2011) on line 102: *triste carmen* also means 'tragic song'.
48. See Curley (1982), 100f., on the universal generalizability that one ought to recognize when pondering the Sphinx-and-Oedipus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

And this name is one's own name. This knowledge, of course, arrives too late. And such a tardy arrival is quintessentially tragic.

Oedipus can be, time and again, a site for the emergence of a poetic project. But any such project has to embrace a specifically Oedipal fate: it makes a forbidden return and its productivity is all done under the sign of abomination, incest, involution, and the promise of still more crime.[49] Even the poet who might somehow imagine that he has fled sufficiently from his original only winds up fulfilling this fate.[50] And the very fact that moral culpability seems itself to be irrelevant within the *Oedipus* is all the more unnerving: 'There is (seemingly) no reason to have a guilty conscience, and yet everything I am and do is *nefas*.'[51]

King Oedipus has a problem: each new day brings more death to his people. The past, present, and future are all filled with death. And 'novelty' only means funerary repetition. *Semper nouis* is a phrase that designates an endless collection of laments before pyres.[52] It's death again and again, and the chorus also sings of the same repetitive woes: we Thebans are dying. The form and the contents of the verses merge: *premiturque iuncto / funere funus*.[53] One death is literally joined to the next death that comes in immediate succession. The Stygian ferryman is constantly at work (*assiduo conto*, 169). Meanwhile Seneca's assiduous debt to Virgil is again in evidence.[54]

Nevertheless, amidst the same, one also detects a claim of difference. The plague that has fallen upon Thebes is iterative, but also something new. Deaths may repeat, but they are nevertheless novel, at least on their face: *O dira noui*

49. Move on to to Braund's essay in this volume and observe the love of anaphora on Garnier's part. And note especially Garnier's repetition of being-and-nothingness as this Oedipal child of Seneca *tragicus* writes up the story of the house of Laius: *C'est.. / Ce n'est pas… / Ce n'est pas…* Meanwhile the line ends sound the same even as they attempt to draw distinctions: *horreur* vs. *erreur:* error is not horror, one hopes. And, disturbingly, we hear and feel a connection between *pense* and *imprudence*: thought is not folly, one prays.

50. I am using 'fate' rather loosely. It is possible to read the play with a much more technical relationship to the question of fate. See Davis (1991) who intervenes in a well-established area of inquiry.

51. On the irrelevance of moral culpability within the play see Müller (1953), 459f. On Senecan *nefas* see the third part of Dupont (1995). On Oedipus' guilty conscience at the opening of the play see Boyle (1997), 92f.

52. *inter ruinas urbis et semper nouis / deflenda lacrimis funera ac populi struem / incolumis asto - scilicet Phoebi reus* ('Amidst a city's ruins and ever renewed / tears shed over corpses in need of lament and a people become a confused heap / I stand here unharmed: assuredly Apollo's culprit', *Oed.* 31-34). Note Oedipus' sense that he is somehow exceptional and standing apart from the iterative process (albeit with tears in his eyes). Oedipus is very keen on his exceptional status. Boyle (2011) on *Phoebi reus*: the genitive is pointedly ambiguous, 'defendant before Phoebus' and/or 'guilty of Phoebus/fate'.

53. *Oed.* 131f. See Caviglia (1996), 90-92, on the role of the chorus at this juncture.

54. Boyle (2011) on lines 166-70: 'Again Seneca's cue is Virgilian—this time Virgil's famous description of Charon at *Aen.* 6.302-05… Seneca's *cumba* (166), *senio* (168), *crudo* (168), *conto* (169), *turbam* (170), *uectare* (170) are verbal debts to this passage. Cf. also *HF* 764-68.' We can also note that the underworld of the *HF* repeats the repetitions of the *Oedipus* in more ways than one. See the notes on *Oed.* 180f.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

facies leti / grauior leto.[55] For those willing to stare at a face rather than to glance at it, the form of the sentiment is not especially novel, nor are its contents.[56] A repetition can be heard in this choral imputation of novelty. Nevertheless a self-willing of tragic gravity amidst return is, of itself, the hallmark of Senecan-*cum*-Oedipal poetics. It is a hybristic *fiat* that has dire and disgusting origins and outcomes. And in the self-willed-*cum*-self-blind moment of that emergence, Senecan tragedy happens and acquires its 'legitimate' authorial signature.[57]

Creon returns from asking the oracle to explain what is wrong with Thebes. Oedipus interviews him. Creon tells Oedipus that Laius' death needs expiation. Creon has heard and correctly interpreted the oracle. Indeed, it hardly needed interpretation. Unlike so many others, this oracle is clear, explicit and not in the least bit ambiguous in its explanation of why a plague has descended upon the land.

Oedipus, though, seems able only to understand riddling truths that need decoding.[58] Or perhaps he actually needs the structure of truth to be somehow riddling and full of detours.[59] And then as well the answer he seeks is always abstract and impersonal and never concrete and intimate. Yet what he does not appreciate is that he is skilled at unravelling involuted riddles because he is himself so perversely involuted.

The bulk of the *Oedipus* consists of repetitions of this same message, 'You, you are the problem.' And yet all of it merely defers the moment of final recognition and reversal on the part of Oedipus: 'The "you" was me.' In the interim Oedipus keeps on receiving his own message in inverted form, but he cannot bring himself to make it his own, even though, of course, it already is.[60]

As with the long messenger speech in the *Agamemnon*, the divination scene in the *Oedipus* is a novel intervention into the poetic tradition that nevertheless

55. *Oed.* 180f.

56. Boyle (2011) on lines 180f.: 'Seneca seems fond of this kind of polyptoton—*morte peor… mortis locus*, "place of death worse than death", *HF* 706; *peior… bello timor… belli…*, "fear or war worse than war", *Thy*. 572… On the "novelty" of plague, see Thuc. 2.47.3, Lucr. 6.1125. For the conceit, cf. Ov. *Tr*. 1.2.51 and Sen. *Tro*. 783: *o morte dira tristius leti genus*, "O form of death more grim than dire death".'

57. Derrida (1988), 20: 'Effects of signature are the most common thing in the world. But the condition of possibility of those effects is simultaneously, once again, the condition of their impossibility, of the impossibility of their rigorous purity.'

58. *ambigua soli noscere Oedipodae datur* ('To Oedipus alone is the understanding of riddles given', *Oed.* 216). This is how he asks for the contents of the oracle: 'Make it a riddle, so I alone can figure it out.'

59. Derrida (1987), 354f.: '[T]he *Umweg* is not a derivative type of path or step. It is not a passing determination, a narrower or stricter definition of the passage, it is the passage. (The) *Weg* (is) *Umweg* from the first step of the step [*pas du pas*].'

60. The inverted message is my message: a maxim much repeated by Lacan. See, for example, how he opens the *Écrits* by saying it yet again (Lacan [2006b], 3f.). New readers will be hearing this for the first time, if, of course, they are able to hear it at all.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

highlights repetition.[61] Manto's description of the turning back of the bull's blood repeats the warnings about return that we have already seen: *sed uersus retro / per ora multus sanguis atque oculos redit* ('But turned back / through mouth and eyes copious blood pours [*redit*]', *Oed.* 349f.). Boyle is merely 'tempted' to draw a connection to *reuolutus* at 238, but I think it quite necessary to do so.[62] In fact Manto shortly gives the formula for reading repetition: difference lies in return. *Mutatus ordo est, sede nil propria iacet, / sed acta retro cuncta* (365f.). The formulation is stunning in that it is both nonsensical and makes all too much sense of both the play itself and Seneca's poetic method more generally.[63] One way of rendering the lines is 'Nothing lies in its own proper place *at present* because there has been a return to the past.' The reappropriation of that past and the wrenching from their 'seats' of various passages and conceits allows for the generation of a mutant text with a new order. And this new order mimes, with a scandalous, foul difference, some primordial order.[64] Meanwhile, in the very same gesture, it offers a script for the future and the forward-movement of 'everything'.[65]

This supplementary scene of sacrifice unlocks the logic of the Senecan supplement. A new *Oedipus* that is nevertheless all too faithful to the old texts of the *Oedipus* arises when a secondary scene gets worked up, filled with new-but-old notions, and then articulated by a character that would otherwise be mute in some other treatment of the drama. The unborn calf *alieno in loco* (374) is, then, not just incestuous Oedipus and/or his children, it is also Manto herself as well as Seneca himself. The detour of this sacrifice repeats Oedipus' own attempts at detour: the message is old news; the message is staring us in the face; and yet one hopes to defer the message's future arrival.

When the sacrifice ends Oedipus asks Tiresias to tell him what it all means. Gone, of course, is his pride in riddle-solving when what most matters is pretending that these signs are cryptic. Tiresias plays along and says that the name of the killer can only be discovered by necromancy. And so the rituals will be repeated. That is, after the unparalleled scene of sacrifice the play contains yet another scene of religious import, albeit this time done off-stage rather than on-stage. The repetition of the rite, albeit heterodox in content, is nevertheless executed via 'conventional' dramatic forms: it takes place off stage and is reported by a

61. Boyle (2011), 186, on lines 291-402: 'This extraordinary scene is one of Seneca's invention and owes little to the Oedipus-Tiresias scene of Sophocles… [W]e are given one of the most surprising scenes in extant ancient drama, involving a Roman sacrifice and a ritual inspection of animal entrails.' But, as Dupont (1995), 202, notes, what one sees is unintelligible within the traditions of Roman sacrifice. A multiple break, then. See also DeBrohun in this volume.

62. Boyle (2011) on line 350.

63. See also Poe (1983), 146, on the emblematic quality of the line.

64. Boyle (2011) on *mutatus ordo est* in 366: 'a reprise of Lucretius' description of the arrangement of atoms.' Lucretius: wrong philosophical sect; wrong genre; wrong context. And yet perfectly fitted to present purposes.

65. Boyle (2011) on *acta retro cuncta* in 367: 'this focus on "reverse" picks up on Apollo's *reuolutus* (238) and anticipates Oedipus' *retro reuersas* (870).'

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

witness to it. Conversely, the first rite is radical and inventive from a dramaturgical standpoint, but nevertheless relatively conventional *qua* religious rite.

A necromantic rite summons the ghost of Laius and it compels him to speak. The message that is forced from the returned Laius is not itself novel. Instead we are told again about a maternal return in language that is itself repetitive and whose repetitions contain both returning return-words and sounds that repeat themselves:[66]

> egitque in ortus semet et matri impios
> fetus regessit, quique uix mos est feris,
> fratres sibi ipse genuit—implicitum malum
> magisque monstrum Sphinge perplexum sua.
>
> (Sen. *Oed.* 638-41)

> He drove himself into his own origins, and to his mother
> he brought again children ungodly. A custom for what beasts,
> the begetting of one's own brothers? The evil folds in on itself,
> a prodigy more perplexing than his very own Sphinx.[67]

Every step forward was a step in the opposite direction. Forging ahead, Oedipus made a return. Producing children, he regressed. The result is something tangled and tragic, and yet also 'more'.[68] Oedipus' crime recapitulates Seneca's own crime. The answer of the riddle of how to write tragedy is itself a tragic answer: to go ahead, go back; to do it better, make things worse. And yet, there seems to be no room for a fecund *ingenium*: it has all already been written and performed. And so, repeat the repeated all over again: *sit magis perplexum hoc monstrum meum*!

Repetition has the power to forge these links, and something new albeit monstrous arises amidst this return to origins. Language has been made to fold over itself: *énumère/mère*.[69] And all of this is an outrage, a *père*-version, that incestuously returns and repeats in a de-authorizing moment of authoring.

Nevertheless, Oedipus himself has trouble imagining any cut made to the link between citation and authority, between return and identity. He is not a Derridean, not a Lacanian, and not even a Freudian. When Oedipus learns unambiguously that he is the child of his own wife (867), he immediately asks for a repetition of the original crime, but with a difference that will secure the fantasy of origins and their purity: hell's regent should snatch him into its depths and undo all of the genealogical doings.[70]

---

66. Boyle (2011) on these lines: '[N]ote the complex, alliterative patterning of the original… The alliteration is reinforced in the Latin by quadruple homoeoteleuton.'

67. On the Sphinx as truly 'his own': see Mastronarde (1970), 300-05.

68. See also Cowan's meditations on Senecan 'moreness' in this volume.

69. See Derrida (1981), 322.

70. *dehisce, tellus, tuque tenebrarum potens, / in Tartara ima, rector umbrarum, rape / retro reuersas generis ac stirpis uices* ('Gape, earth, and you, master of the shadows, / to deepest hell,

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

His criminal identity and its legitimate punishment 'cites' the original crime and generates a paralogism: the legitimacy of the punishment will somehow make up for the illegitimacy of the return. *Retro reuersas* and *uices* cover both the transgression and the reparation. Punishing an illicit return-to-origins will offer a return-to-order that will displace that other, maternal and fecund return with a deathly in-the-name-of-the-father return. But as a parricidal father to his own siblings, Oedipus can only aim to cite rather than to actually embody the law that he invokes. And attempts at citation are not going to hit their mark. Indeed, his *rector umbrarum rape* sentiment can itself be re-read in a variety of perverse manners. For example, one can hear instead in it, 'Rape me ghost-father, much as I seized-and-assaulted my mother after assaulting you.'

When the messenger repeats the deliberative speech in which Oedipus determines to blind himself we find a slightly modified position. Despite the overwhelming sense of repetition and return that induces his own despair, Oedipus nevertheless clings to his sense of uniqueness and sees in it a way forward and a source of further 'innovation'.[71] But no sooner does he repeat the word 'novelty' than he begins repeating the word for 'repetition' itself. And this, of course, is the answer to the 'riddle' of 'Senecan' tragedy 'itself':

> iterum uiuere atque iterum mori
> liceat, renasci semper ut totiens noua
> supplicia pendas—utere ingenio, miser:
> quod saepe fieri non potest fiat diu.
>
> (Sen. *Oed.* 945-48)

> To live again and again to die:
> yes! Eternal rebirth so that anew time after time
> you can pay the painful price. Use your wits, poor fool:
> let what cannot happen but once happen at length.

One life and one death is not enough for Oedipus/*Oedipus*. Given his exceptional status, it is necessary to find a way for him to find a way to repeat his story over and over again so that he can supplement it with ever-repeated and yet also ever-new punishments. The sentiment obviously works as an allegory for the position of the poet who would write about Oedipus: 'Use your wits, poor fool.' One

lord of the shades, snatch me, / a perverse, inverted interchange of birth and blood', *Oed.* 868-70). Boyle (2011) on these lines: 'Oedipus' initial request is that he be plunged into hell … There is also a suggestion of a "return to the womb": see below. The explosion of alliteration and assonance in the lines enhance their declamatory power.' See Schiesaro (2003), 196, on the manner in which *dehisce tellus* itself appears thrice in Seneca's plays.

71. *illa quae leges ratas / natura in uno uertit Oedipoda, nouos / commenta partus, supplicis eadem meis / nouetur* ('That Nature who warps her fixed laws in Oedipus' case alone, a nature who contrived unparalleled [*nouos*] births, let that same nature be revolutionized [*nouetur*] for my punishment', *Oed.* 942-45). Boyle (2011) on *nouos*: 'Seneca seems fond of this sarcastic use of *nouus*.' He then lists six parallels from a variety of plays.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

needs to make use of one's genius in order to bring him back to life. In fact, a poet is in a converse position to the tragic hero: for a poet, Oedipus can indeed 'happen often' (*saepe fieri*), but a poet strives to make sure that he 'happen for a long time' (*fiat diu*). Anyone can write about him, but not everyone can be remembered for having written about him.

Some special innovation amidst the return is required. A sort of 'wretched genius' is required, one that knows itself to be transgressing as it goes back and returns to the folds of citation and yet nevertheless does so precisely to find new crimes and new punishments. A key gambit of Seneca's seems to have been the reduplication of return itself. Not the first, of course, to see return as a motif, he nevertheless aggressively pursues it at every possible layer of his poetic craft.

Oedipus himself exits the stage and ends the play with a final repetitive catalogue. 'Violent Dooms, Disease's baleful quake / Emaciation, black Plague and frenzied Woe, / go ye with me, with me. The service of these guides pleases (*libet*).'[72] This play ends where the *Agamemnon* begins, with a sort of 'pleasure principle' that has been fundamentally commingled with sorrow and despair.[73] And in each case the way forward and the way back are both tainted by a super-saturated mythical-literary-historical circumambience.

The 'here and now' is never merely itself, but it is also filled with echoes and reminiscences. It is always also 'pregnant with death' and a 'necrotic offspring'.[74] Any attempt to articulate the present situation entails embracing this 'duplicity' of one's own criminal condition and turning it into the illegitimate principle according to which one acts/writes. The rotten, over-ripe fruit of this bitter labor is the mad echoing of Senecan tragedy.

4. Finally

'The epigraph does not stand outside the text'[75]
—or—
'Un dessein si funeste,
s'il n'est digne d'Atrée, est digne de Thyeste.'[76,77,78,79]

A praise of polysemy, virtually mandatory in some quarters, is hardly adequate to the situation in these tragedies. There is nothing noble about repeating the past

72. *uiolenta Fata et horridus Morbi tremor, / Maciesque et atra Pestis et rabidus Dolor, / mecum ite, mecum. ducibus his uti libet* (*Oed.* 1059-61).
73. Contrast the Stoicizing interpretation of *libet* at Henry and Walker (1983), 136.
74. Compare Schiesaro (2003), 189, on non-closure in Seneca's *Thyestes*: 'To deny closure means that everything will happen again and again, that regression will know no end.'
75. Derrida (1981), 338.
76. Crébillon (1812), 172: 'A plan so fell, / if it is not worthy of Atreus, it is worthy of Thyestes.'
77. Poe (1884), 416.
78. Lacan (2006a), 9. But there one sees *un destin* ('a fate') instead of *un dessein* ('a plan').
79. Derrida (1987), 494.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or even setting down models for the future. Perhaps the audience of such a spectacle initially feels a longing to find adequate words of reverence for the sovereign alluder/intertexter.[80] But such paeans befit a benighted chorus singing to Agamemnon or to Oedipus: all hail the king! Meanwhile Seneca has de-authorized all moments of self-authorship for such characters. And any return to the source on our part in order to 'decode' the riddle of Seneca's return to the source makes a farce of the tragic and its criminal logic of repetition.[81]

Any reading that keeps Seneca within the horizon of allusivity condemns him in advance: nothing has happened; it has all been seen before; this is either worse because the same or worse because different.[82] The critic stands at a crossroads, and an old man stands before him: who is this man? Is he just a sad and angry stand-in for someone else, or is he of himself generative? This makes for a portrait of the sad scientist: 'The will projects its powerlessness on time, and in this way gives time its *irreversible* character: the will cannot reverse *the flow of time*—the non-willed that time establishes as an accomplished fact. This produces, in the will, the spirit of *revenge* against the unchangeable, and a belief in the punitive aspect of existence.'[83] A portrait of the gay one: 'Zarathustra's remedy is to re-will the *non-willed.*'[84]

Seneca has embraced the catastrophic fact of his belatedness, the curse under which he was born.[85] He has re-willed his condition. And in so doing he has achieved an end: '[T]he re-willing has as its object a multiple alterity inscribed within an individual.'[86] The multiple alterity within Seneca is conjured by way of endless iteration and an affirmation of the productive power of iteration.[87]

And Seneca manages to make his repetitions 'differently productive' than are other varieties of repetition. What emerges in Seneca's dramas is, of course,

80. Polysemy and the myth of authorial intentions: Derrida (1981), 350. Conversely the heterogeneity of writing really does offer a way forward (Derrida [1981], 356).

81. Contrast the theodicy of orthodox Stoic repetition at Long and Sedley (1987), 52: the best happens over and over again. On the one hand, Stoic readings such as Staley (2010) continue to yield productive accounts of Seneca. But, on the other, the Stoic elements within the plays have always also been pointedly warped. See Gunderson (2015), or, much more briefly, Lefèvre (1981).

82. A logic that has an analogue in Bloom's parricidal 'anxiety of influence' (Bloom [1997]). And I am resuming while modifying a line 'first' opened up at Schiesaro (2003), 223: 'The pervasive characteristic of Seneca's tragedies is their belatedness: they represent an anachronistic return to the past, a frustrated desire for lost forms mediated by an overwhelming and oppressive intertextual memory.' See also Schiesaro (2003), 224: 'If all post-Ovidian literature is programmatically self-conscious to a very high degree, Seneca's own narcissism takes the form of a sustained critique of authorial responsibility as it is showcased in the author's staged counterparts—a group of obsessed, determined criminals.'

83. Klossowski (1997), 67 [original emphasis].

84. Klossowski (1997), 67 [original emphasis].

85. Seneca's *Moral Letter* 79 offers a portrait of the advantages of coming last to the literary banquet. See Trinacty (2014), 10-13: the letter's very language for figuring innovation amid tradition is itself a reworking of that tradition. And see also the preface to the present volume on the possibilities for writing in the first century CE.

86. Klossowski (1997), 69. I suspect that not everyone will recognize 'his' or 'her' Nietzsche in this formulation, but I wish to stick with it nevertheless as a means of reading Seneca.

87. Many will have noticed that I am repeating but altering Hinds' account of tendentious repetition within Latin verse. See the fourth chapter of Hinds (1998).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'horrific', but the horrors are never either exactly new or exactly old. On the one hand, the simple grotesqueries may fascinate briefly, but their very iteration tends to leech them of any novelty they might once have had. Nevertheless, on the other hand, Seneca presents a revolt against the idea that 'you can get used to anything'.

And so an uncanniness arises at the very site of pseudo-familiarity. There really is something horrible about incest, and no matter how many times one has heard the Oedipus story, one will experience subjective revulsion the very second one lets repetition be other than itself, that is, at the moment one sees in it something more than the 'mere' external repetition of an all-too familiar story. Seneca has managed to find within the all-too-familiar the secretly unfamiliar.[88] But this is just another way of saying that he has found a way for what was 'out there' as a mere collection of texts to become something 'in here' for the subject, and a site at which something is felt.[89] Can one precipitate in even the best-read audience, an audience who can effortlessly untangle the riddle of which limping line is Virgilian and which Ovidian, a sensation that Oedipus is not Some-Antecedent-Author's *Oedipus* but rather 'me'?

Such is one of the key challenges facing an artist who wants to do more than represent tragic subjects as bigger, older, or otherwise other than the normal subject and so to leave them as ultimately indifferent objects of abstract pity and fear. And yet this subjectivation of tragedy does not entail the finding of some new object, but instead it requires the *refinding* of an old one.[90]

The multiple layers of repetition—phonic, thematic, literary—amplify one another and yield a sort of feedback that over-loads the simple circuit of identical return where input is the same as output (less loss via waste or decay).[91] Ideally what returns is the horror of the revenant itself, that is, an encounter with the undead surplus thing from which 'you'/you have been hiding all along.[92] Cassandra's posthumous life is gladdening. Thyestes' return from the underworld pleases. The repetition automatism of the Senecan apparatus performs its own species of necromancy. It repeats a species of repetition that is indigenous to the self.[93] Repetition is about 'me', namely a proper noun who thinks that that particular pronoun is a mere shifting signifier with which I need not identify. The revenant literary tradition has a message. And the contrived moment of Senecan repetition touches me—not 'me'…—to the quick even as it seems merely to rehash yet again some much-rehashed old story.

88. Freud (2001a), 245: The *unheimlich* is secretly familiar (*heimlich-heimish*).

89. Freud (2001a), 241: '[T]his uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression.'

90. Freud (2001a), 222, and compare Lacan (2006a), 34.

91. See Henderson (1983) on the programmatically violent sound-effects when Seneca turns the amplifier up to 11 in the *Medea*. A productive poetic feedback-explosion occurs.

92. This topic has a rich Lacanian bibliography. See, for example, Žižek (2006), 17-18. And all of this can be traced back to Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (Freud [2001b]).

93. Freud (2001a), 238: '[W]hatever reminds us of this inner "compulsion to repeat" is perceived as uncanny.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This moment of 'repetition' is not supposed to be a farcical, secondary performance but rather a tragic, originary scene of self-implication. 'There is a tragic and a comic repetition. Indeed, repetition always appears twice, once in the tragic destiny and once in the comic aspect. In the [tragic] theatre, the hero repeats precisely because he is separated from an essential, infinite knowledge. This knowledge is in him, it is immersed in him and acts in him, but acts like something hidden, like a blocked representation.'[94] The author's infinite literary knowledge (of Attic drama, of Virgil, of…) is nevertheless not capacious enough to keep him from writing these tragedies. For did he really know it all, he would know better than to head out to the crossroads and to quarrel with men of an earlier generation.

Like Oedipus, the author can not really help himself: 'it' (*Es/ça*) writes itself through him. The tragedy is that there is some 'mere' (inessential) surplus representation in him that, despite any sovereign mastery of the riddles of the logic of the sign, nevertheless emerges from the productive encounter between an Oedipal (parricidally) (self-)authorized author and the mother that bore him. And it is this scandalous, inauthentic, errant, incestuous revenant-*cum*-remnant that is most authentically 'his'.[95]

He seemed for a moment to be a mere copyist or a man with a flair for pastiche, and yet… 'This rivalrous and duplicitous identification… far from entering into the symbolic space of the familial triangle…, endlessly carries off the triangle into a labyrinth of doubles without originals, of *fac-similes* without an authentic and indivisible letter, of forgeries without something forged, thereby imprinting on the purloined letter an incorrigible indirection.'[96] A blind man (again) wanders off: *mecum ite, mecum*. Incorrigibly indirect, Senecan tragedy has done it doubly anew, both anew-as-iterative and anew-as-afresh: it has shown the way forward to the next tragedian. '"Even to you will come madness."'

University of Toronto
e.gunderson@utoronto.ca

94. Deleuze (1994), 15.
95. See also the final two chapters of Gunderson (2015).
96. Derrida (1987), 492.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2017.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press