

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES' *ANTIGONE*

My recent edition of *Antigone* (Warminster, 1987) was not intended primarily as a contribution to textual criticism. I did no work on the manuscripts, and little work on tracing the sources of old conjectures. Nevertheless, some of my thoughts on the text may merit fuller discussion than I was able to give them in a beginners' edition. And there have been more recent developments: in particular we now have a new Oxford Text of Sophocles with a companion volume of *Sophoclea*,<sup>1</sup> and I have benefited from stimulating discussion with Dr David Kovacs, who has kindly allowed me to see a draft of some forthcoming notes of his own.

2–3                    ἄρ' οἷσθ' ὃ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν  
                         ὅποιον οὐχὶ νῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;

Jebb's note on the grammatical issue displays all his ingenuity and sensitivity. If his defence (with ἐκτί understood after ὃ τι) does not succeed, none will. And yet one feels that so elaborate a defence should not be needed, and the initial impression of sheer redundancy in ὃ τι... ὅποιον is not to be dispelled. Jebb's defence is rejected by Dr Kovacs and by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson,<sup>2</sup> probably rightly.

But I do not share Dawe's worries about the phrase νῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν.<sup>3</sup> It is a familiar idea, not least in the context of Oedipus, that the consequences of pollution can be spread over several generations (we need look no further than *Ant.* 593–8). To Antigone, in her bitterness, it seems that all the ills that *might* have been spread over several generations are instead being concentrated in one. The idea might make little sense as serious theology, but it is rhetorically effective, and that is what matters. The worst that can be said is that it is not very clearly expressed.<sup>4</sup>

Dr Kovacs has an ingenious solution which has yet to be published. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson have a solution that will win few adherents: to mark an aposiopesis at the end of line 2 and write ἄ, ποῖον in 3. The tragedians use aposiopesis sparingly, and always for a reason. Here we must suppose that Antigone at first intended to say ἄρ' οἷσθ' ὃ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν οὐχὶ νῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ; (or else we have no means of guessing what she did intend). But that expresses her meaning just as clearly and forcefully as the revised version ποῖον... τελεῖ;. So the change of construction is pointless.

I prefer to take my cue from the fact that each of the two lines 2 and 3 looks sound in itself. They could form part of two parallel sentences, though not of the same sentence. So I propose marking a lacuna after 2 – e.g.

ἄρ' οἷσθ' ὃ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν  
                         <παρεῖς ἀνατεῖ τῶν γένει στέρξει ποτέ;  
ἄρ' οἷσθα πῆμα τῶν γένει προκειμένων>  
                         ὅποιον οὐχὶ νῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;

<sup>1</sup> H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson (eds.), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford, 1990); eadem, *Sophoclea* (Oxford, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> *Sophoclea* (n. 1), p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, iii (Leiden, 1978), p. 99.

<sup>4</sup> It would be clearer on one of the interpretations which Jebb rejects, 'Do you know what Zeus will fulfil, which he will not fulfil while we live?' But this would be a most contorted way of expressing oneself.

One might also seek to kill another bird with the same stone by including the phrase ἄτης ἄτερ (wholly intractable where it stands at 4) in the missing lines: ἄρ' οἷσθα πῆμα λυγρόν οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ or the like.

106-9                    τὸν λεύκασπιν †'Αργόθεν†  
                          φῶτα βάντα πανσαγίαι  
                          φυγάδα πρόδρομον ὀξυτόρῳι  
                          κινήσασα χαλινῶι.

108 ὀξυτέρῳι K s.l., RVZfZo: -πόρῳι S: -τόρῳι rell.

Lloyd-Jones and Wilson<sup>5</sup> draw attention to my 'singular lack of imagination' in denying that ὀξυτόρῳι... χαλινῶι in this context could refer to a bridle of compulsion. But the point at issue is not my power of imagination but that of the Athenian audience, who would hardly, I think, have found the metaphor intelligible (let alone appropriate). In such passages as *Trach.* 1260f. and Aesch. *P.V.* 672, quoted as parallels by Lloyd-Jones,<sup>6</sup> the sense is clear and explicit, while here the single word χαλινῶι, without any assistance, must be understood as a metaphor for compulsion in a context in which *literal* bridles could easily be in question.

Blaydes's ὀξυτόνῳι, which I print, will refer to the wind (or the horses' breath) whistling past the bits as the army retreats in full flight. The idea comes from Aesch. *Sept.* 122f., διὰ δέ τοι γενύων ἱππίων κινύρονται φόνον χαλινοί. Borrowings from Aeschylus, and especially from the *Septem*, are very frequent in this ode.<sup>7</sup> I do not insist that Blaydes's conjecture must be right, but it is an improvement on any of the manuscript readings.

110-13                    ὃν ἐφ' ἀμετέραι γαῖ Πολυνείκης  
                          ἀρθεῖς νεικέων ἐξ ἀμφιλόγων  
                          ὀξέα κλάζων  
                          αἰετὸς εἰς γὰν ὥς ὑπερέπτα,

Most modern editors mark a lacuna before ὀξέα κλάζων, but Jebb, and now Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, prefer to amend 110 to read ὅς... Πολυνείκους (Scaliger). I have two main reasons for preferring the latter solution.

(a) The passive ἀρθεῖς should mean 'sent out' or 'led out'<sup>8</sup> (the fact that αἶρω in the active can be used intransitively to mean 'set out, depart' is plainly irrelevant). But this does not suit Polynices, who was a leader and instigator of the expedition.

(b) If there *were* a lacuna, the missing words would have to be something like ἤγαγε· κείνος δ' (Nauck), supplying a subject for the new sentence as well as a verb for the old; for what follows clearly refers to the army, not to Polynices. But strong punctuation in mid-metron is unusual in Sophocles' non-lyric anapaests, except where an exclamation or other very short 'sentence' makes it unavoidable. There is a cluster of instances at *Aj.* 1403, 1413, 1419 (all in a passage condemned, rightly or wrongly, by Dawe<sup>9</sup>), and a sprinkling in Euripides. I do not, however, count *Soph. Trach.* 977, 981, 986, 991 (certainly lyric), nor *Ant.* 377 (where most editors punctuate

<sup>5</sup> *Sophoclea* (n. 1), p. 119.

<sup>6</sup> *CQ* 7 (1957), 15.

<sup>7</sup> See J. F. Davidson, *BICS* 30 (1983), 41-51.

<sup>8</sup> These translations reflect the usual senses of αἶρω in military contexts (though a more literal sense is to be felt with the metaphor of the eagle). Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea* (n. 1), p. 119, prefer 'roused', 'sent aloft'. My point that the passive suits the army rather than Polynices remains valid in any case.

<sup>9</sup> *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, i (Leiden, 1973), pp. 173-5.

Of Kamerbeek's arguments on the other side, the only one that matters is that ἐφ' ἀμετέροι γὰρ is awkward in the same sentence as εἰς γὰρ. And this is met by changing εἰς γὰρ ὦς to ὦς γὰρ – a highly desirable change in any case, for reasons which Dawe gives.<sup>11</sup>

121-2 πλησθῆναί τε T

138-40	εἶχε δ' ἄλλα τὰ δ' ἄλλα τὰ δ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις ἐπενώ- μα στυφελίζων μέγας Ἄ- ρης δεξιόχειρος.	138a 138b
--------	--	--------------

The farrago of manuscript readings in 138 is reduced by most editors to εἶχε δ' ἄλλαι τὰ μέν, | ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις .... There may be no decisive metrical objection to τὰ μέν with *brevis in longo*, despite the lack of pause at the corresponding place (152, χοροῖς | παννύχαις);<sup>14</sup> but this reading makes the antithesis impossible to sort out. Jebb, for instance, supposes that ἄλλαι is not answered by any of the following words but

<sup>14</sup> No such objection emerges from T. C. W. Stinton's exhaustive discussion of pause and period-end, *CQ* 27 (1977), 27–72 = *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 310–61. He shows, however, that period-end without pause is unusual, and he evidently rejected τὰ μὲν here.

means 'otherwise than he had expected'; that τὰ μὲν is answered not by the neuter ἄλλα δ' but by the masculine ἄλλοις (this is what his rendering implies, though it is not what his note says); that ἄλλα δ' does not answer any of the preceding words but participates with ἄλλοις in the sense 'various dooms'; and that ἄλλοις thus does double duty. This is self-refuting.

Lloyd-Jones and Wilson rightly start from the majority reading τὰδ' or τὰ δ' rather than τὰ μὲν, but arrive at a remarkable tongue-twister, εἶχε δ' ἄλλαι τὰδ'· <ἀλλ'> | ἄλλ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις.... For obvious reasons ἀλλά is hardly the word to insert here.

I see no reason, however, to despair with Dawe, for Wecklein's τὰ τοῦδ' gives us what we need, namely a masculine pronoun to be answered by ἄλλοις, so that ἄλλαι can be answered by ἄλλα: 'His fortune went one way, while to others great Ares... assigned other fates.'

It remains to ask whether Triclinius was right to change ἄλλα τὰ δ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις to ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις (presumably by emendation, though the apparatus of my edition is wrong in implying an *anowned* emendation), or whether we should shorten further to ἄλλα δ' ἄλλοις (a possibility hinted at by Kamerbeek), reading παννύχοις rather than παννυχίοις at 153. To the doubled ἐπί as preposition and preverb there can be no objection (cf. *O.T.* 469); but I have found it surprisingly difficult to point to a clear instance of the preposition, whether with dat. or acc., in a purely dative sense. Metrically there is nothing to choose between choriamb and cretic. παννύχοις, printed by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson against other editors, is much better attested than παννυχίοις, and is the form used by Sophocles elsewhere (*Ant.* 1152, *Aj.* 929).

Finally, in 140, editors generally read δεξιόχειρος, so that fates were assigned by 'great Ares, smiting, a right-hand trace-horse'. The objection to this is not just the mixed metaphor (Müller) but the feebleness of the unqualified participle στυφελίζων, where we need 'smiting *hard*' or the like. Love of the *difficilior lectio* can be taken too far, and it seems far preferable to read δεξιόχειρος and to take it adverbially with στυφελίζων (like e.g. *Trach.* 927 δρομαία βᾶσα). For the form Müller compares *Il.* 1.402 ἑκατόγχειρος (neither -χειρος nor -χειρος compounds otherwise occur until late authors). Relevant also is Pind. *Ol.* 9.111, εὐχαιρα, δεξιόγυιον.

We now have:

εἶχε δ' ἄλλαι τὰ τοῦδ',  
ἄλλα δ' ἄλλοις ἐπενώ-  
μα στυφελίζων μέγας Ἀ-  
ρης δεξιόχειρος.

150-1

ἐκ μὲν δὴ πολέμων  
τῶν νῦν θέσθαι λησμοσύναν·

151 θέσθαι RSVT, fort. L<sup>ac</sup>: θέθε L<sup>pc</sup> rell.

The *utrum in alterum* principle creates a presumption in favour of θέσθαι rather than θέθε. Imperative infinitives do occur in tragedy (e.g. *O.T.* 462, 1466), and choruses do sometimes address commands to their own members. M. Kaimio,<sup>15</sup> however, divides all such commands into three categories ('Ritual exhortations... suggesting dirge, joyous song, hymn or dance', 'Dramatic exhortations... suggesting movements and actions', and 'Exhortations... attracting the attention of others'), none of which quite fits here. And this abrupt command to unnamed addressees is far from natural, especially as it is then coupled with the first-person ἐπέλωμεν (153), which includes

<sup>15</sup> *The Chorus of Greek Drama* (Helsinki, 1970), pp. 121-43.

the present singers in the proposed celebrations. It is hard to resist the conclusion that *θέσθαι* was governed by a word now lost.

There is room to supply such a word, since 150 begins with a string of dispensable monosyllables. *ἐκ*, indeed, would be much better away, for, as Müller notes, it is one thing to talk of sleeping after (in place of) tossing on the sea (*ἐκ πολλοῦ κάλου εὔδοντα*, *Phil.* 271f.), another to talk of 'forgetfulness after wars' when forgetfulness of wars must be what is meant.<sup>16</sup> And *δῆ*, placed where it is, must emphasise *πολέμων*, which is not a word deserving such emphasis.<sup>17</sup>

Nauck proposed *χρῆ* for *τῶν*, Müller *χρῆ* for *ἐκ*. More natural than either would be *ἀκμὰ*, 'it is high time', for *ἐκ μέν*.<sup>18</sup> The ellipse of *ἐς τί* is normal (*Aj.* 811, *El.* 22, *Phil.* 12; Aesch. *Ag.* 1353; Eur. *El.* 275, 684), though not invariable (*Soph. El.* 1338; Aesch. *Pers.* 407).

241-2                    εὖ γε στοχάζημι κάποφράγνυσαι κύκλωι  
                             τὸ πρᾶγμα· δηλοῖς δ' ὥς τι σημανῶν νέον.

Dawe has referred in suitably sarcastic terms to 'the rows of poles which editors are so fond of erecting here'.<sup>19</sup> The Greeks had a word for many things, but 'you set up rows of poles, with nets hung between them, for yourself' is unlikely to be one of them; and anyway nets of this kind were used for trapping animals, not for warding them off.<sup>20</sup> The neglected emendation *στεγάζημι* (Jacobs), however, seems faultless. Editors have perhaps been frightened of a mixed metaphor,<sup>21</sup> but two weak metaphors side by side would presumably give no more sense of incongruity than 'you are covering yourself and fencing yourself round' in English.

Some account must be given, however, of Bergk's conjecture *τί φροιμάζημι*, accepted by Müller. It is flat beside the lively sarcasm of *εὖ γε* ..., but the words are quoted by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1415b.21) immediately after *Ant.* 223, and a fragmentary commentary on the *Rhetoric*<sup>22</sup> explicitly tells us that they were spoken by Creon in this scene. They occur also at Eur. *I.T.* 1162, but could have occurred in more than one play.

The first point to make is that these two words, whatever their source, are clearly an interpolation in Aristotle's text. The scholiast (loc. cit.) mentions that they were

<sup>16</sup> The idea of taking *ἐκ* ... *θέσθαι* *ληγμοσύναν* together to mean *ἐκλαθέσθαι* (Kamerbeek and others) is indeed desperate. It is curious that there is another redundant *ἐκ* at 1056, *τὸ δ' ἐκ τυράννων αἰσχροκέρδειαν φιλεῖ*; but I cannot believe that Sophocles had fallen into an unfortunate but temporary habit of inserting *ἐκ metri gratia* before genitives. Hartung's *δ' αὖ* seems too strongly adversative for a *tu quoque* retort, but the variously attributed *δέ γε*, which Pearson accepts, is suitable (cf. *Aj.* 1150) and perhaps right.

<sup>17</sup> Müller was not justified, however, in objecting to the hiatus before *ἐκ* on the ground that there is no pause at the corresponding position in the strophe (135). Period-end without pause, by Stinton's definition (n. 14), does occur; but Stinton does not, in fact, regard *Ant.* 135 as an instance, since he considers pause to be admissible there (p. 35 = 320).

<sup>18</sup> Or possibly *ἀκμὰ μέν* for *ἐκ μέν δῆ*. Anyone objecting to *τῶν νῦν* (and I can see some reason for doing so) would then be free to consider substituting *νῦν δῆ*.

<sup>19</sup> *Gnomon* 54 (1982), 236, alluding to the conjectures *στοιχάζημι*, *στοιχίζημι* and *στιχίζημι*, and the recurrent but unfortunate idea that *στοχάζημι* itself could bear the same sense. Etymologically, no doubt, it could, but it would be most surprising to find such a complete change of meaning in so familiar a word.

<sup>20</sup> M. L. West, *BICS* 26 (1979), 107f., suggests that the Guard is blocking off escape routes to guide the discussion in the direction he wants. But this takes us even further from the text, which, on this view, does not refer explicitly even to nets, merely to rows of poles.

<sup>21</sup> So C. W. Vollgraff, *Mnem.* 46 (1918), 182 – though at least he realised the merits of this reading.

<sup>22</sup> H. Rabe (ed.), *Comm. in Arist. graeca* xxi. 2 (Berlin, 1896), pp. 328f. (= pp. 161f. Spengel).

missing from some copies.<sup>23</sup> *Ant.* 223, with the speech that follows, is an excellent illustration of the point Aristotle is making, that defensive preambles are characteristic of slaves. The words *τί φροιμιάζη* illustrate merely the use of the word *προοίμιον* to denote such a preamble, a usage which a reader might wish to gloss but which Aristotle himself takes for granted.

The scholiast on the passage provides a rather inaccurate account of the situation at *Ant.* 223 and a detailed paraphrase of the passage 223–36.<sup>24</sup> He then continues with *τὸ δὲ 'τί φροιμιάζη' τοῦ Κρέοντός ἐστι λέγοντος 'τί προφέρεις τὰ κύκλωι καὶ τὰ ἔξω τῆς ἀποστολῆς; τάχιον οὖν εἰπέ τά, ἐφ' οἷς ἀπεστάλης, καὶ μὴ φοβοῦ.'* Thus he takes no account of lines 237–40, and what he does say, apart from the one word *κύκλωι*, does not read at all like a paraphrase of 241f. The natural inference is that, if he can be trusted at all, he found the words *τί φροιμιάζη*, not at 241, but immediately after 236; and a lacuna at that point is indeed possible. But I do not trust him. He prided himself, we may suppose, on having tracked down the source of Aristotle's first quotation, and felt that the second quotation ought to be a reply to it. He waded laboriously through some of Sophocles' text without finding the words, and lacked the time or inclination to search further. So he simply pretended that he *had* found them, confident that none of his readers would check.

There is more to be said about *Ant.* 241f. Editors generally take *ἀποφράγνυσαι* as transitive (citing Thuc. 8.104.4), which might be thought slightly awkward after the intransitive *στεγάζη*. But it is anyway hard to see what 'you are shutting the matter off in a circle' could mean. If *τὸ πᾶγμα* could mean 'the blame' (Jebb) anywhere, it could hardly do so here, as the reference to the matter of the Guard's report is fixed by 238f. So I take *ἀποφράγνυσαι* as intransitive, and *τὸ πᾶγμα* as adverbial acc. with both verbs: 'Well do you cover yourself and fence yourself round in the matter.'

That is if 242 is genuine. But I have not found a close parallel for *τὸ πᾶγμα* as adverbial acc.; the repetition of the phrase after 238f. is unattractive in any case; and the rest of the line is feeble enough, even if we charitably translate *τι νέον* as 'something strange' rather than 'some news'. Although the expression is idiomatic, as Dr Kovacs points out to me (cf. *Aj.* 326), deletion is an option to be considered.

515–16

AN. οὐ μαρτυρῆσει ταῦθ' ὁ κατθανὼν νέκυς.

KP. εἰ τοί' εἴη τιμαῖς ἐξ ἴσου τῷι δυσσεβεῖ.

516 *δυσμενεῖ* R

While *δυσσεβεῖ* is acceptable, *δυσμενεῖ* is preferable for two reasons. Firstly the word *δυσσεβής* has just occurred with a different reference at 514. Secondly Creon will make the point that Polynices was a bad man at 520, and that (after *πορθῶν γε τήνδε γῆν*) is where he can logically make it without fear of contradiction. With *δυσμενεῖ* at 516 the argument moves constantly forward, while with *δυσσεβεῖ* it moves in circles.

But one would not accept *δυσμενεῖ* as an emendation; so we must consider what weight can be given to a reading found only in R. R is a fairly wayward manuscript,

<sup>23</sup> Jebb's theory that the words *τί φροιμιάζη* were omitted by scribes of Aristotle because they could not be found in the text of Sophocles is almost as strange as Müller's theory that the words *ἐν τισὶ τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὐ κεῖται* actually refer to copies of Sophocles, not of Aristotle. Such interest in the text of a tragedy would not be characteristic of ancient Aristotelian scholars.

<sup>24</sup> The paraphrase does not seem to attest any interesting variants. At first sight the words *οὐδὲν κοὶ μέλλω εἰπεῖν ἤτοι οὐχ ὁ ἀποδεκτόν κοὶ μέλλω εἰπεῖν* might seem to point to *κεῖ κοὶ* (an attractive conjecture attributed to Erfurdt and Wunder) at 234. But this impression is dispelled by the words *τέλος δὲ ἐνίκησέ με ὁ λογισμὸς τὸ ἔλθειν εἰς σέ*.

but it is also the only member of the GQR group to contain this play (and *Trach.* 1–372). Places in *Ant.* and *Trach.* where a reading reported from R alone is of interest are:

*Ant.* 190: R's ὁρθῶς is not unattractive<sup>25</sup> and is shared, according to Colonna's apparatus, by MS. A of Dem. 19.247. But it is a *facilior lectio*, and one that could have occurred to scribes of Sophocles and Demosthenes independently.

*Ant.* 548: R reads βίου μοι τοῦ λελειμμένης πόθος, and the trivial error λελειμμένης should not distract attention from the striking variant βίου...πόθος. It is difficult to imagine any scribe viewing φίλος with the fastidious scruples of a Nauck or a Housman<sup>26</sup> and using his memory of *O.T.* 518 or *El.* 822 to amend the line better than Nauck or Housman managed to do. On the other hand, if βίου...πόθος were original, the reverse corruption would be easy enough (βίος by assimilation, then φίλος to restore sense). Lloyd-Jones and Wilson now adopt βίου...πόθος, as I should have done.

*Ant.* 687: R's χιτέρω is adopted in Pearson's and Dawe's texts (and mine). Since the paraphrase of ΣΜ has καὶ ἑτέρως, this may well be an ancient reading even if not the truth (see separate note below).

*Ant.* 726: R's διδασόμεθα δεῖ has the merit of not making sense, and could, as Dawe notes,<sup>27</sup> be a relic of Semitelos's διδασόμεθ' ἃ δεῖ.

*Ant.* 899: Although Dawe conjectures καὶ σοί, he rightly comments that R's δὲ καὶ σοί probably arose from 'mere instinct for the natural rhetoric of the poetry'.<sup>28</sup>

Certainly not *Ant.* 1244: R's πάλαι is accepted by Dawe,<sup>29</sup> but the idea that Eurydice drifted off before the end of the messenger speech is refuted (quite apart from considerations of dramatic convention and the parallel of *Trach.* 813) by the first words of the line, τί τοῦτ' ἂν εἰκάσειας;. πάλιν is no more objectionable here than ἄψορος at 386.

*Ant.* 1299: The three readings τήνδ' (R), τὰδ' (LZf) and τόνδ' (the rest, except S, which has τόδ'), should all be independently derived from Postgate's τὰν δ',<sup>30</sup> which Dawe rightly adopts. This looks significant, as no scribe had any reason to change τόνδ' to τήνδ' here.

*Trach.* 331: R's οἶκιν, which Dawe<sup>31</sup> and Easterling read, is doubtless right, but *could* be a lucky accident.

This is not copious evidence, but it is enough to establish R's credentials as an independent witness and to allow us to accept its reading, on a balance of probabilities, at *Ant.* 516.

611–14                    τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον  
καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει  
νόμος ὃδ'· οὐδὲν ἔρπει  
θνατῶν βίῳτι πάμπολις ἐκτὸς ἄτας.

This is an annoying corruption, which does not appear to go deep but obscures the sense at the climax of the ode.

The first question to ask is whether νόμος ὃδ' refers backward to a law contained in the address to Zeus (604–10) or forward to οὐδὲν ἔρπει κτλ. The latter is usually preferred, but the former is strongly favoured by the asyndeton at 611, implying a close link between 611ff. and what precedes. Moreover, if there were no such link, there would be nothing to explain the address to Zeus (604–10), which has no *obvious* relevance to the sombre concerns of the rest of the ode. The 'Hymn to Zeus' at Aesch.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Vollgraft (n. 21), 358f.

<sup>26</sup> *The Collected Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge, 1972), i.210f.

<sup>27</sup> Dawe (n. 3), p. 48.

<sup>28</sup> Dawe (n. 3), p. 111.

<sup>29</sup> Dawe (n. 3), p. 119.

<sup>30</sup> J. P. Postgate, *Mnem.* 52 (1924), 16. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson misreport the conjecture as τὰνδ'.

<sup>31</sup> Dawe (n. 3), p. 41.

Ag. 160ff., which was surely in Sophocles' mind here, begins just as abruptly, but then leads us back through a transitional passage (176–83) which shows that the supreme power of Zeus is all too relevant to the miseries of human existence. If νόμος ὁδ' refers back, we have a similar transition here; otherwise the audience will have to supply this paradoxical connection for themselves.

The subject of ἔρπει will now be νόμος, allowing us to deal with πάμπολις by the palaeographically obvious expedient, Musgrave's πάμπολος. It is pedantic to object that a law cannot come upon men's lives,<sup>32</sup> for the power of Zeus, which the 'law' embodies, certainly can, and the slight looseness of expression is nothing out of the way for Sophoclean lyrics.

It remains only to remove the asyndeton at 613; and a better way of doing this than Boeckh's οὐδὲν ἔρπων (adverbial οὐδὲν being unnatural here) is οὐδ' ἐφέρπει (cf. 585):<sup>33</sup> 'and it does not come upon men's lives in its greatest force without disaster'.

Others adopt either Heath's πάπολύ γ' or Lloyd-Jones's βίोटος πάπολος (the latter perhaps preceded by οὐδέν'). Besides implying an inferior transition after 610, these readings are open to other objections. The Greek is in either case slightly unnatural: Heath's conjecture places γε oddly late in the sentence, while οὐδέν (or οὐδέν') ἔρπει θνατῶν βίोटος πάπολος is not easily intelligible as meaning 'to no mortal creature comes vast abundance'.<sup>34</sup> And the maxim expressed by both readings – that the gods punish human prosperity – is not what we expect. The idea is alluded to at *El.* 1466f., *Phil.* 776–8, both of which can be seen as mere *façons de parler*, but is never stated as a doctrine in Sophocles, despite obvious opportunities at e.g. *Ant.* 1155ff., *O.T.* 1186ff. And Antigone and Ismene, although they are princesses, are not very suitable as paradigms of human prosperity.

687 γένοιτο μέντ' ἄν χατέρωι καλῶς ἔχον.

χατέρως R: χατέραι K

Jebb renders 'and yet another man, too, might have some useful thought'; but we badly need a word for 'thought', and it is hard to see why so simple an idea should be so obscurely expressed. Either χατέρως (which receives support from ΣΜ but does not occur elsewhere in tragedy) or χατέραι would be slightly easier than χατέρωι, but neither carries real conviction. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson bracket the line (Heimreich), but it does not look much like an interpolation.

No one seems to have noticed the full implications of ΣΜ, δυνατόν σε καὶ ἐτέρως καλῶς μεταβουλεύσασθαι. The last word cannot be mere scholiastic amplification since γένοιτο ἄν without an infinitive could not mean anything like δυνατόν. It looks as though the scholiast's copy had χατέρως καλῶς φρονεῖν, in which case the original text was χατέρωι καλῶς φρονεῖν. Jebb, with no thought of emendation, cites Pl. *Symp.* 211d, εἴ τωι γένοιτο αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν ἰδεῖν; and Sophocles has the same construction at *Phil.* 324 and *O.C.* 607f. The odd-looking corruption may need no

<sup>32</sup> So Lloyd-Jones (n. 6), 19.

<sup>33</sup> Thinking along the same lines, H. Rohdich, *Antigone* (Heidelberg, 1980), p. 114 n. 209, proposes οὐδ' ἐνέρπει, which I have also seen attributed to Lachmann. But ἐμβαίνω, ἐμβάλλω etc. are presumably survivals from a time before ἐν and εἰς were differentiated, and give no more warrant for \*ἐνέρπω than for \*ἐνέρχομαι. M. Griffith, *JHS* 110 (1990), 217, feels that my text makes 'an improbably pessimistic general statement', but it would be hard to imagine anything more pessimistic, for the families concerned, than the opening of this ode; and my interpretation of 613–14 does not exclude the possibility that there are others on whom the power of Zeus impinges less.

<sup>34</sup> For the former objection see Lloyd-Jones (n. 6), 20. For the latter see P. E. Easterling in *Dionysiaca... Presented to Sir Denys Page* (Cambridge, 1978), p. 152.

special explanation, as arbitrary substitutions do occur in manuscripts, but it is possible to imagine a rubbed papyrus on which *ΦPON* could be read as *EXON* and the rest of the word could not be read at all.

752 ἡ κάπαπειλὼν ὦδ' ἐπεξέρχῃ θρασύς;

Jebb's facing translation, 'How! doth thy boldness run to open threats?', implies that ὦδε θρασύς goes with ἐπεξέρχῃ, while his note, rendering 'Dost thou go the length of e'en threatening so boldly?', tells us that it goes with κάπαπειλὼν. It is the facing translation that gives us the sense we want, for 751 is the first line of Haemon's that could be taken as a threat at all. But can ἐπεξέρχῃ take a complement in the nominative? Perhaps so if we assume some illogical influence from the construction of ἐξέρχεται seen at e.g. *O.T.* 1011, *ταρβῶν γε μή μοι Φοῖβος ἐξέλθῃ καφής*.

The participle remains a problem. Jebb assures us that 'The participial clause defines the manner of ἐπεξέρχῃ, and so is practically equiv. to ὥστε καὶ ἐπαπειλεῖν etc.'; but how can it be? 'You go so far in threatening' and 'You go so far as to threaten' are quite distinct ideas. Unless future editors can find an explanation that eludes me, they should consider writing *κάπ' ἀπειλὰς* (cf. *O.T.* 265, *κάπ' ἀντ' ἀφίξομαι*) or *κάπαπειλεῖς*;<sup>35</sup>

836-8 καίτοι φθιμένη μέγ' ἀκούσαι  
τοῖς ἰσοθέοις ἔγκληρα λαχεῖν  
ζῶσαν καὶ ἔπειτα θανούσαν.

836 φθιμένη Z<sup>16</sup>: -αι LKAUY: -ωι L s.l., SVZcZ<sup>16</sup>: -αν RZO: -ην T

Most editors read μέγα ἀκούσαι (Seyffert) in 836 to avoid beginning a sentence with a paroemiac, and κύκληρα (Schaefer) in 837.<sup>36</sup> Some, including Müller and Dawe, also mark a lacuna after 837 (Wolff). This lacuna appears necessary, not because this anapaestic passage has to be the same length as 817–22, but for the sake of the sense. Without a lacuna, as I remark in my commentary, 'the reference of "in life" is obscure; for Jebb's explanation, that "Niobe, like Antigone, was in the fulness of her vitality when she met her doom", is hopelessly feeble. And "in death" is not much better, for, if Niobe is immortal, and if Antigone's fate is nevertheless to be compared to hers, "death" is the one word that must be avoided.' Something like <εἰ δέ φημι βροτῶν γ' ἔξοχα πράξειν>, then, is wanted.

This raises a question whether Seyffert's μέγα ἀκούσαι is after all correct, or should be replaced with μέγα ἀκούσῃ.<sup>37</sup> The two readings must be reckoned equally close to the paradoxos, since scribes who wrote φθιμένην (and θνατῶν Ἀΐδαν at 822) would naturally have Doricised ἀκούσῃ also. It may be said that 'against her will' imports an extraneous idea into the passage; but the idea is relevant enough, and ἀκούσῃ has the advantage of simplifying the grammar (we no longer have one infinitive dependent on another) and giving more obvious sense to καί.

There is a separate (very minor) issue in 838. Corréption in non-lyric anapaests has been discussed by W. S. Barrett,<sup>38</sup> who lists unavoidable instances in Euripides and reasonably concludes that it would be unsafe to remove the avoidable ones. He says

<sup>35</sup> After κάπαπειλεῖς; there might be a temptation to improve the rest of the line with ὦδ' ἄρ' ἐξέρχῃ θρασύς; (but ἐπεξέρχῃ is in itself a suitable word) or τῶιδ' ἐπεξέρχῃ θράκου; (but εἰς τὸδε would be the normal idiom).

<sup>36</sup> Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea* (n. 1), p. 136, seek to defend ἔγκληρα, but κύκληρα, even if not certain, is a clear improvement at little cost.

<sup>37</sup> If there were no lacuna the question would not arise, since the infinitive ἀκούσαι would be needed to prevent contradiction between φθιμένην and ζῶσαν.

<sup>38</sup> *Euripides: Hippolytus* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 432f. Page on Eur. *Med.* 131ff. is less accurate.

that there are also unavoidable instances in Aeschylus, Sophocles and comedy, but I can find none in Sophocles (*Trach.* 973 and 995, as well as the instances avoidable by prodelision at *Trach.* 971, 972 [?] and 986, are certainly lyric).<sup>39</sup> It seems fair, then, on balance, to remove the few avoidable instances by writing *κάν* at *Ant.* 383, *κάπαινον* at 817, *κάπειτα* at 838, *κάκαρνάνας* (Tyrwhitt) at fr. 271.3 (*Inachus*), and (if there were no worse corruption) *κάτρείδαν* at fr. 887.2. It is entirely possible that Sophocles himself wrote *scriptio plena* in *Antigone* and *Inachus* despite marking the crasis in other plays, but our task must be to use modern convention to represent his probable intentions.

881-2                    τὸν δ' ἐμὸν πότμον ἀδάκρυτον οὐ-  
                              δεῖς φίλων στενάζει.

I take this opportunity to correct a mistake in my edition. I intended to adopt the above colometry, which is that of A. M. Dale<sup>40</sup> and is easily scanned (3 cr. + ithyph.). Others divide the cola before οὐδεῖς, and Dale considers this possible, treating it as 'two trochaic dimeters, the second syncopated, palimbacchius + tr.'. But a period ending in a full trochee is very rare,<sup>41</sup> and best avoided.

890                    μετοικίας δ' οὖν τῆς ἄνω στερήσεται.

The line must be considered in the light of the instances of *μέτοικος* at 852 and 868. In prose, and at several places in tragedy, a *μέτοικος* is specifically an expatriate; and D. Whitehead<sup>42</sup> argues that the root meaning is not 'coresident' but 'home-changer'. Be that as it may, 'coresident' must be the meaning at 852, given that *μέτοικος* governs the datives οὐ ζῶσιν, οὐ θανούσιν.<sup>43</sup> Whitehead, indeed, takes the words differently (p. 36): 'a metic, (belonging) neither with the living nor the dead.' He presumably wishes the datives to be governed by some word hidden behind the gloss οὐτ' ἐν βροτοῖσιν οὐτ' ἐν νεκροῖσιν. But the word-order tells strongly against this.<sup>44</sup>

At 868 either meaning would make sense, but it is only reasonable to assume the same meaning as at 852, understanding αὐτοῖς out of πρὸς οὓς: 'And to them I go... to share their home' (Jebb). True, this involves a theoretical inconsistency with 852, where *Antigone* was *not* to be *μέτοικος* with the dead. But that is merely because her fate is being looked at from different (and equally pathetic) aspects: as buried alive she will be cut off from the living and the dead, but then she will, after all, die, and so share the fate of her relatives.

At 890, then, *μετοικίας* should mean 'coresidence'; and this is a welcome conclusion, since *Antigone* is not an immigrant in the world above. It would be

<sup>39</sup> All the Aeschylean instances are in *Persae* (60, 542, 629), as are two out of four instances of *avoidable* correption (39, 52). Since *Persae* stands apart from the later plays in many respects, there is a case for eliminating avoidable instances elsewhere by reading *κάμηνίτωι* at *Supp.* 975 and *χῦπερβορέου* at *Cho.* 373.

<sup>40</sup> *Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses*, ii (*BICS* Suppl. 21.2, 1981), p. 29.

<sup>41</sup> Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1968), p. 75; M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), p. 103. The analysis in Dawe's *Conspectus Metrorum* (tr. dim. | ia. dim. cat.) involves anaceps next to anaceps and is inadmissible (cf. Dale, loc. cit.).

<sup>42</sup> *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* (*PCPS* Suppl. 4, 1977), pp. 6f.

<sup>43</sup> While prepositional *μετά* with dat. is essentially epic, compounds such as *μετέχειν* in Attic commonly take dat. of the person shared with (and gen. of the thing shared in).

<sup>44</sup> Aesch. fr. 246d (= 53 N), *πεδοίκου χελιδόνος*, is rightly glossed *κυνοίκου* by Hesychius. Similarly at Aesch. *Ag.* 57 I take the vultures to be merely 'coresidents' with the gods. (Fraenkel's note, for all its eloquence, never addresses the simple question: if the lofty eyries are not the vultures' proper home, in which they have citizen rights, where is that home, and when did they migrate from it?) Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 836-7 judiciously allows that the *μετα-* element can be felt either as 'among' or as 'the *μετα-* of change'.

fanciful to suggest that her true home, in Creon's eyes, is the House of Hades; and certainly she has never dwelt there before. 'Coresidence', however, seems to require a dative (as at 852) or a word from which a dative can be supplied (as at 868, *Ag.* 57), and the MSS. do not provide one. But it is very easy to do so by emendation: read *τοῖς ἄνω* (cf. 1068).

981–7

ἀ δὲ σπέρμα μὲν ἀρχαιογόνων  
 ἄντας· Ἐρεχθεῖδαν,  
 τηλεπόροις δ' ἐν ἄντροις  
 τράφη θυέλλαισιν ἐν πατρώϊαις,  
 Βορέας ἄμππος ὀρθόποδος ὑπὲρ πάγου,  
 θεῶν παῖς· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκείναι  
 Μοῖραι μακραίωνες ἔσχον, ὦ παῖ.

At 982 Lloyd-Jones and Wilson do well to revive, and perhaps to adopt, the anonymous conjecture <ῆν> ἄνασσ'.<sup>45</sup> They oddly do not mention<sup>46</sup> that it not only removes a curious use of ἀντάν but greatly improves the metre: we now read ἀγχίπολις Ἄρης (not ἀγχίπολις Ἄρης) at 970, and this gives exact responsion while eliminating the dubious feature of a resolved long immediately before 'natural' double-short in aeolics.<sup>47</sup> I wonder, however, whether a king's granddaughter can be called 'queen by birth', for the title ἄνασσα normally belongs to a king's consort, and could not easily be inherited through the female line. Anyone who is prepared to accept the *sense* of ἄντας', whether as 'met' or as 'partook of', might consider obtaining the desired metre by writing ἀντιάς', even though this form (regular aor. of ἀντιάν, as opposed to ἀντιάε from ἀντιάζειν) is not found elsewhere.

At 985, since caves are not to be found above hills, ὀρθόποδος ὑπὲρ πάγου cannot be directly governed by the same verb as τηλεπόροις ἐν ἄντροις;<sup>48</sup> so commentators tell us that it is governed by ἄμππος. For this to be so, (a) the adjective must have the force of a participle, 'running beside horses'; (b) the time to which the quasi-participle refers must not be that of the verbal action τράφη but that of intervals within it or of the resultant adult state; (c) the horses in question must not be ordinary horses but ones with aeronautic properties. The last point is addressed by Lloyd-Jones,<sup>49</sup> who points out that storm-winds (the θυέλλαι just mentioned) can be personified as winged horses; but ἵπποι in a compound word should be just horses, possessing the accepted characteristics of the species, not an exotic variety. And, while Cleopatra's brothers Zetes and Calais were certainly imagined as winged, no other account credits Cleopatra with any superhuman attributes. No myth requires her to fly, and she need not have resembled her brothers any more than Helen (another daughter of a god and a mortal woman) resembled hers.

In this ode, perhaps, anything is possible, but a simple change to ὑπαῖ makes things so much easier that I can hardly doubt it: 'She was reared in a distant cave among her father's storm-winds, a horse-swift Boread beneath a steep hill...'

<sup>45</sup> First reported by Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921), p. 351 n. 3.

<sup>46</sup> *Sophoclea* (n. 1), p. 139.

<sup>47</sup> I should probably reconsider my judgement that the same anomaly at 797 is not serious; and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson should reconsider their acceptance of the anomaly at 1124.

<sup>48</sup> ὑπερ- in compounds can mean 'beyond' in space (e.g. ὑπερπόντιος, Ὑπερβόρειοι), but prepositional ὑπὲρ hardly ever does so. The only reference in LSJ s.v. A.I.3 is *Od.* 13.257, τηλοῦ ὑπὲρ πόντου (which looks like a valid example, though even this is taken differently by Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.* s.v. B.2.1.e). At *Od.* 14.300, ὑπὲρ Κρήτης, 'beyond Crete' is only one of several suggested interpretations. At Aesch. *Sept.* 90 ὑπὲρ τειχέων does not mean 'beyond the walls' (see Hutchinson *ad loc.*). At Eur. fr. 578.4, ποντίας ὑπὲρ πλακός, there may be a suggestion of news coming over the sea.

<sup>49</sup> Lloyd-Jones (n. 6), 24–6.

The emendation must stand or fall on the above argument, but, if it stands, it may help us to find relevance in this notoriously obscure exemplum. Danae and Lycurgus resembled Antigone, not just in being royal persons who suffered misfortune, but in being imprisoned in caves (947, 958). So, when we are told that Cleopatra inhabited a cave, our first thought is that this too must have been a place of imprisonment. But it cannot be so if in the same breath the Chorus describe Cleopatra as flying freely through the air. Commentators are therefore forced to suppose that her upbringing in the cave was, like her ancestry, a mark of privilege, even though this means divesting μέν and δέ (981–3) of any contrastive force (Jebb's translation has 'and'). And then, to give the exemplum some relevance, they import a reference to a later imprisonment of which Sophocles' text says nothing, and for which the evidence, as Winnington-Ingram admits,<sup>50</sup> 'could hardly be weaker'.

Reading ὑπαὶ at 985, I suggest that μέν and δέ at 981–3 mark a contrast<sup>51</sup> between noble ancestry and an unhappy existence, a contrast which is picked up by *Βορέας ἄμυππος ὀρθοπόδος ὑπαὶ πάγου* and again by *θεῶν παῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκείναι κτλ.* (no punctuation after *παῖς*): 'As for her, she traced her descent from the ancient line of the children of Erechtheus, but was reared in distant caves among her father's storm-winds: a wind-swift Boread beneath a steep hill; a child of gods but upon her too the long-lived fates bore hard, child.' This involves an irregularity at 986, where *θεῶν παῖς ἐφ' αὐ* would be logical; but it is natural that Sophocles should have preferred a paratactic construction<sup>52</sup> since ἀλλά and καί are needed to mark the paradox.

Cleopatra's disastrous marriage, then, was preceded by nothing but an oppressed childhood. Her whole life was unhappy, as might have been expected in the barbaric land of Thrace, to which her mother Oreithyia had been brought by force. Difficulties remain, for it is still true that the emphasis of this strophic pair falls on the blinding of Cleopatra's sons, not on her imprisonment; but we have made progress if we have found that her imprisonment is mentioned at all. The logic of the exemplum (admittedly tenuous) now runs thus: 'Thrace (home of Lycurgus) was also the scene of a dreadful crime which was the culmination of the miseries of another royal person who suffered imprisonment (namely Cleopatra), and she too exemplifies the irresistible power of fate.'

## 1034–6

κούδὲ μαντικῆς  
ἄπρακτος ὑμῖν εἰμι· τῶν δ' ὑπαὶ γένους  
ἐξεμπόλημαι κάκπεφόρτισμαι πάλαι.

1035 δ' om. Laur. 31.1<sup>ac</sup>

Despite the lack of close parallels, I am willing to believe in ἄπρακτος, 'not practised against', especially when I look at the proposed alternatives. Stephanus's ἀπρατος is to be shunned for the reason that Jebb gives, while Pallis's ἀτρωτος or ἀπληκτος concedes too much success to Creon's enemies.

But something is clearly wrong here, for there is no reference for the demonstrative τῶν. Omission of δ' looks promising, but will not do by itself; for ὑμῖν now refers to the prophets alone, and Creon cannot say to them 'you do not leave me untried even with prophecy.' That is why omitting δ' entails also reading Semitelos's *μαντικοῖς* in

<sup>50</sup> R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Sophocles: an Interpretation* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 106 n. 46.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *BICS* 36 (1989), 155 – though I cannot accept many of her conclusions. The logic of the passage is not made any easier if we see Cleopatra as a possible criminal rather than an unambiguous victim.

<sup>52</sup> In epic this is familiar: the construction at e.g. *Il.* 2.38, *νήπιος οὐδὲ τὰ ἥϊδη*, is a paratactic equivalent of that at e.g. *Il.* 8.177, *νήπιοι οἱ*... A comparable licence which is common in tragedy is that of substituting a finite verb for a participial construction: e.g. *Ant.* 252, 256, 814–16, 920.

1034, as Jebb and Müller perceive; and *μαντικοῖς* has the further advantage of improving the grammar, for, as Broadhead notes,<sup>53</sup> *μαντικῆς* can hardly be genitive of agent if we have *ὑμῶν* as dative of agent as well.

So far, we have arrived at the text which Müller favours; and it is not impossible. The shift from 'you all' to 'you prophets' is awkward, however; and we may wonder, with Jebb, why Sophocles should have written *μαντικοῖς* and not *μάντεσιν*. This text cries out for a further change, namely *ὑμῶν*<sup>54</sup> as partitive gen. after *μαντικοῖς* (one might have expected *τοῖς μαντικοῖς*, but cf. Eur. *H.F.* 846, *Bacch.* 472): 'and I am not left untried even by the prophets among you.'

We now find that it is possible, if we wish, to reinstate *τῶν δ'*. *τῶν* as relative might still make the passage run more smoothly; but the use of *δέ* to link a negative statement to a positive corollary (the sort of *δέ* which Jebb renders 'nay') is common enough.

1068–73  
 ἀνθ' ὧν ἔχεις μὲν τῶν ἄνω βαλὼν κάτω,  
 ψυχὴν τ' ἀτίμως ἐν τάφῳ κατώικισας,  
 ἔχεις δὲ τῶν κάτωθεν ἐνθάδ' αὐθιγῶν  
 ἄμοιρον, ἀκτέριστον, ἀνόσιον νέκυν.  
 ὧν οὔτε σοὶ μέτεστιν οὔτε τοῖς ἄνω  
 θεοῖσιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ σοῦ βιάζονται τάδε.

1069 κατωίκισας K

At 1069 it is not easy to decide between the acceptable vulgate *ψυχὴν τ' ... κατώικισας* and Dawe's elegant *ψυχὴν γ' ... κατωίκισας*; but I would in any case reject the clumsy attempts of Bothe (*ψυχὴν ἀτίμως*) and Bergk (*ψυχὴν. ἀτίμως τ'*) to make *τῶν ἄνω* depend on *ψυχὴν*. *τῶν ἄνω* is well treated by Moorhouse<sup>55</sup> as an 'independent' partitive gen. – not common (though *Ant.* 6 looks like another example), but not to be doubted.

1068, then, contains *ἔχεις* as an auxiliary, followed by a partitive gen. plural. In the answering line 1070, encountering the words *ἔχεις δὲ τῶν κάτωθεν ...*, we expect the same construction; but we then find ourselves forced to take *ἔχεις* as 'you keep' and the gen. as either possessive with *νέκυν* ('a corpse belonging to the gods below') or separative with *ἄμοιρον* ('a corpse with no share in the gods below'). Clauses that are parallel in thought need not be parallel in construction, but we can fairly object to being led up the garden path like this. Jebb characteristically sees the difficulty in the changed sense of *ἔχεις* and tries to deny its force – without, I feel, much success. As for the genitive, neither the possessive nor the separative interpretation gives natural sense in itself.<sup>56</sup> And there is a further problem in *ὧν* at 1072, which has no suitable antecedent.

On the other hand, I do not agree with Dawe and West that *ἄμοιρον* requires a genitive; for, if a corpse is said to be portionless, we need not be told what its portion should be, and the parallel of Pl. *Laws* 9.878b (cited by Bruhn) is as close as one could wish. Moreover, the effect of the tricolon in 1071 would be spoilt if just one of its three adjectives were qualified by a genitive (such as Dawe's *θυῶν*, to which there are other objections, or Blaydes's *ταφῆς*).<sup>57</sup>

The upshot of all this is that what we appear to need, in place of *θεῶν*, is not a genitive but a participle answering to *βαλὼν* in 1068. If so, the answer can only be

<sup>53</sup> H. D. Broadhead, *Tragica* (Christchurch, 1968), pp. 75–7.

<sup>54</sup> So Broadhead, though in the context of a much more radical emendation, *καπὸ μαντικῆς ἀφρακτος ὑμῶν εἰμι, τῶν ὑφ' ἧ γόμος*.

<sup>55</sup> A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (*Mnem. Suppl.* 75, 1982), p. 57.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Dawe (n. 3), pp. 113f.; West (n. 20), pp. 108f.

<sup>57</sup> So Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea* (n. 1), p. 142.

αχεθών: 'and you have kept here one of those below, a corpse dispossessed ...'<sup>58</sup> For the form cf. 1200, *El.* 754, as well as the dubious fr. 242. The antecedent of ὦν in 1072 is now τῶν κάτωθεν, and there is no need (with Dawe) to suspect corruption or interpolation in 1072–3.

## 1215–20

ἴτ' ἄσσαν ὠκέϊς καὶ παραστάντες τάφῳ  
ἀθρήσας, ἄρμον χώματος λιθοσπαδῇ  
δύντες πρὸς αὐτὸ στόμιον, εἰ τὸν Αἴμονος  
φθόγγον συνίημι ἢ θεοῖσι κλέπτομαι.  
τάδ' ἐξ ἀθύμου δεσπότου κελεύεμασι  
ἡθροῦμεν' ...

Dawe marks no fewer than three lacunae between ἀθρήσας in 1216 and the answering ἡθροῦμεν in 1220, slowing the narrative to a snail's pace.<sup>59</sup>

The first lacuna, after 1216, makes things slightly easier in that it allows 'standing by the tomb' and 'entering to the actual door' to qualify different verbs. But it does not solve the main problem of 1216, namely the meaning of ἄρμον...λιθοσπαδῇ; and it has the undesirable side-effect of separating the clause εἰ...κλέπτομαι from ἀθρήσατε, with which it perfectly coheres.

On 1216 I have nothing new to suggest. My edition doubtfully adopted an old suggestion<sup>60</sup> that ἄρμον χώματος λιθοσπαδῇ refers, not to a gap made by pulling stones out, but to stones drawn up to seal the mound; but I was conscious (to satisfy the curiosity of Lloyd-Jones and Wilson) of giving a strained sense to λιθοσπαδῇ, and that was one reason for my lack of conviction. No less desperate is Lloyd-Jones's ἄγμον,<sup>61</sup> a word which means 'fracture' in medical writers and 'cliff' at Eur. *I.T.* 263, *Bacch.* 1094 (the only tragic instances), but never 'gap' or 'hole' (we must not be misled by English uses of 'break' and 'breach'). West conjectured ἄρμον...λιθοσπαδῇ as object of ἀθρήσας, 'observe the stone-gaping joint';<sup>62</sup> but αὐτὸν is not the same as χάσκειν, and anyway the joint would need looking *through*, not looking *at*.

Dawe's second lacuna, after 1218, seems to have no point at all. Asyndeton at 1219 is justified by the backward-looking τάδε.

The third lacuna (Hermann's), after 1219, removes the need for the slightly arbitrary emendation κελευσμάτων and for taking τάδε as a very flat internal acc. with ἡθροῦμεν ('we performed this act of looking'). But the whole of 1219 is displeasing (ἀθύμου feebly underlines the obvious after the vigour of the direct speech), and the best solution is to delete the line (a neglected possibility which seems to have first occurred to Meineke). The interpolation is like that of Aesch. *Sept.* 457 'by somebody who missed the connection of λέξω with λέγ' (451)' (Hutchinson *ad loc.*).

**1277ff.** Modern editions refer to the character who enters at 1277 as Ἐξάγγελος. The idea seems to be due to Triclinius, who had presumably seen the word in manuscripts of *O.T.* (1223ff.), and who imported it also at Eur. *H.F.* 922.

The word was certainly not applied by Sophocles to any of his characters, since in his day the dramatists made no significant distinction between those few 'messengers' who happen to report from the house and those who report from elsewhere. The word dates back to Thuc. 8.51.1, but only in the sense of 'informer, betrayer of a secret'

<sup>58</sup> Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *loc. cit.*, misreport this conjecture as αχεθων, which they regard, apparently, as a genitive, and describe as 'unspeakably flat'. Griffith (n. 33) objects to 'a clumsy repetition after ἔχεις', but it is not clear that ἔχεις and αχεθων would have been felt as parts of the same verb, or that, if they were, the effect would have been any worse than 'you have had' in English.

<sup>59</sup> Dawe (n. 3), pp. 117–19.

<sup>60</sup> J. I. Beare, *Hermathena* 13 (1905), 82–6.

<sup>61</sup> Lloyd-Jones (n. 6), 26f.

<sup>62</sup> West (n. 20), 109.

– a usage that can have nothing to do with drama, since the related use of ἐξαγγέλλω dates back to Homer. Presumably the word came to be applied to drama at a time when messenger functions had become more specialised and ‘out-messengers’ more usual.

For a modern editor the word serves a purpose in distinguishing between different messengers in *O.T.* But it does not do so in any other play; and since editors are compelled to write Ἔτερος Ἄγγελος elsewhere (Eur. *Phoen.*, *Bacch.*, *I.A.*, to say nothing of plays where the difficulty is evaded with Θεράπων, Φύλαξ and the like), it might be more consistent to do so in *O.T.* also.

In *Antigone* there is no reason at all to use the word, for it is only natural to suppose that the character who reports Eurydice’s death is the same one who entered to check up on her at 1256. It is strange that even those editors who explicitly make this assumption in their commentaries continue to use the word Ἐξάγγελος in their texts – presumably from sheer delight in technical jargon.

London

ANDREW BROWN

**Addendum** On 881–2 I should have referred to L. Parker, ‘Trochee to Iamb, Iamb to Trochee’, in *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 331–48. Parker does not discuss this passage, but some which she does discuss, notably *O.C.* 1735f./1749f., could be cited as parallels for the traditional colometry there. The correct colometry may be a more open question than I thought.