

SOPHOCLES, *ANTIGONE* 2–3

Ant. Ὡ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα,
 ἄρ' οἴσθ' ὃ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίου κακῶν
 ὅποιον οὐχὶ νῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεεί;

The duplication ὃ τι...ὅποιον has caused much trouble. However, schol. on 2 explains ὃ τι by ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅποιον. The ὅποιον may well have begun life as an intramarginal gloss written against the beginning of 2–3, which the next scribe mistook for the first word of 3 in the text, and dropped the original first word, which on this hypothesis would not necessarily bear any literal resemblance to ὅποιον. As for what this word was, there are obviously many possibilities; if for instance it was *θανόντος*, that would make explicit the contrast between the dead Oedipus and νῶν ζώσαιν, in a manner helpful to the context.

46 Walton Street
 Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

POUR ENCOURAGER LES AUTRES: ATHENS AND
EGESTA ENCORE

A propos of his earlier attempt¹ to demonstrate, by means of measurements, computer-enhanced images and laser technology, that the archon of IG i³11 was Antiphon (418/17), not Habron (458/7), Mortimer Chambers now² quotes with approval the favourable verdict of J. Tréheux:³ 'la mesure des intervalles entre les lettres, la superposition des photographies multiples et, surtout, le bombardement du marbre par un rayon laser ont prouvé (les photographies en couleur A et B ne permettent pas d'en douter) qu'il fallait lire et rétablir *Ἀντ]ιφόν* (a. 418/7).' It is the purpose of this further reply to give encouragement to those others who, like myself, still remain unconvinced.

This may seem needlessly to prolong a rally which Chambers would claim was decisively concluded by his volley in 1990. He clearly does not concede that I saved match-point with my return in 1992.⁴ However, it is my belief that some may feel that we are not yet even in the final set, far less at match-point. This issue constitutes a gruelling five-setter, which may well yet end in a tie-breaker when evidence acceptable to all is finally produced.

In the meantime I should ask for the forbearance of 'spectators' if I again try to squeeze the ball back over the net into the court of my adversaries.⁵ To do so, I shall follow the sequence of arguments in Chambers' most recent paper.⁶

¹ See M. H. Chambers, R. Galluci and P. Spanos, 'Athens' Alliance with Egesta in the Year of Antiphon,' *ZPE* 83 (1990), 38–63 (hereinafter Chambers 1990), with Plates I–III and colour Plates A, B (= Acta of the International Seminar in Greek and Roman Epigraphy, ed. Ian Worthington, Bonn, 1990, 38–63).

² See 'The Archon's Name in the Athenian-Egesta Alliance (IG I³ 11),' *ZPE* 98 (1993), 171–4. (Cf. also Chambers' paper in *CJ* 88 (1992), 25–31, especially the Addendum on pp. 29–31).

³ *REG* 104 (1991), 469.

⁴ See 'Through a Laser Beam Darkly: Space-age Technology and the Egesta decree (I.G. i³ 11),' *ZPE* 91 (1992), 137–46 (hereinafter Henry, 1992); and cf. also my comments in *The Anc. Hist. Bull.* 7 (1993), 49–53.

⁵ At least the issue is being pursued in a gentlemanly way, with little or no racket-abuse. *Absit odium epigraphicum!*

⁶ See note 2 above, *ZPE* 98 (1993), hereinafter referred to as Chambers, 1993.

I. PHOTOGRAPHS

Chambers stresses that the 'crucial evidence' in his case is constituted by the photographs, and simply turns the verdict over to the reader, apparently in the belief that the evidence of his colour Plates A and B is beyond challenge. At the risk of repetitiousness, I can only restate and expand on what I argued before:

(i) In the case of the putative iota in stoichos 35, on what basis are we expected and able to differentiate between the vertical stroke and the other traces descending to the right from the top of this stroke? Why is the former to be retained as a genuine letter trace and the latter to be disregarded? Here the judgement remains subjective; it is not an objective demonstration of the truth. Chambers is right to claim that the reader must decide for himself or herself: *quot homines (vel feminae), tot sententiae*.

(ii) As for my criticisms of the phi in the laser-induced alleged *ΦONE* of Plates II and III, Chambers has completely misunderstood my argument.⁷ I was not claiming that 'the marble may have been distorted by the blows of the mason's chisel'⁸ or that the alleged phi (or any other letter) 'suffered distortion through microcracking within a bulbous zone'.⁹ What in fact I was attempting to do was to provide a technical explanation of exactly what happens when marble is struck by a chisel. I was in no way challenging the assumption of traces left within the stone which might be detected by a laser beam, as can be seen from the wording of my final sentence, which seeks to *confirm* the potential of the technique: 'this zone of microcracking might indeed be detected by variation in the transmission of light intensity, as a laser beam scans through the material.'¹⁰ I was not suggesting that the marble may have been distorted by the blows of the mason's chisel; what I was stressing was that no piece of marble is ever perfect i.e. without flaws within its structure. Thus, by shooting a laser beam through from the back, one will pick up these flaws *as well as* the sub-surface microcrack zones left by the original cutting of letters on the surface.¹¹ Hence, a shot from the *front* would help to avoid distortion caused by such possible internal flaws in the marble, particularly so in a block of such thickness as the one in question.

(iii) In the case of the alleged phi in stoichos 36 I really fail to see how an impartial observer could ever feel completely convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that it 'is of the same shape as the only completely preserved phi, namely that in the name Euphemos, line 15.'¹² Chambers had originally argued¹³ that, in the phi in line 15, the vertical 'stops at the bottom of the loop and neither bisects it nor appears at the top,' although he now seems to concede that 'perhaps [it] goes just a bit above [the bottom of the oval]'.¹⁴ Once again he refers the reader to the photograph (Plate I, 2) to decide for himself, but (a) to repeat,¹⁵ this letter space is so worn—and not just at the top—that, not only can we have no idea whether the vertical re-appeared above the oval, but there must remain doubt as to the overall shape of the letter; (b) in line 3 how do we decide what is 'noise' and what is a genuine trace? Indeed, some have 'seen' a phi to the right of the top of Chambers' alleged phi, an impossible position,

⁷ I thought I had made myself clear; I apologize for any obscurity in my original presentation.

⁸ Chambers, 1993, 171.

⁹ Chambers, *op. cit.*, 172.

¹⁰ Henry, 1992, 144–5.

¹¹ My colleague Prof. Gordon Lister, a geologist with particular expertise in the area of Greek marbles, commented to me in a letter of 9 May 1989: 'I can imagine that the zone of microcracking, viewed from behind, would be a little like looking at a neon sign with conical glasses on. The image would have a certain degree of ambiguity.'

¹² Chambers, 1993, 172.

¹³ Chambers, 1990, 44.

¹⁴ Chambers, 1993, 172.

¹⁵ Cf. Henry, 1992, 144.

of course. But why are these marks to be disregarded as 'noise' and not the other similar marks/traces to the left? And (c) that Chambers' alleged qoppa-like phi is unique in Attic epigraphy may indeed not be a critical and overriding objection, but it is certainly not unimportant. The uniqueness of the shape is unlikely to bolster confidence in the reading; rather it engenders niggling doubt.

II. MEASUREMENTS

When we come to what Chambers regards as the supporting evidence of measurements of groups of letters, it appears that he and I still interpret the same evidence differently. As he says, the reader will have to decide. To help in this decision I make the following brief comments:

(i) Although Chambers claims that the lack of perfect vertical alignment in the stoichedon pattern (to which I had drawn attention) is 'unimportant',¹⁶ it surely goes without saying that vagaries in vertical alignment must of necessity create irregularities of *horizontal* spacing, which is indeed the crucial factor involved here.

(ii) If the groups *IXΣE* and *ENIA* (both in line 14) do not, *for whatever reason*, conform to the norms established by Chambers for other similar groups of four letters, the assumption cannot be made that such anomalies did not occur elsewhere on the lost portion of the text, nor can we place overmuch faith in statistics impressively calculated in centimetres to the third decimal place on a stone so badly deteriorated that it is often difficult, if not impossible, to be precisely sure where one letter stroke begins and another ends.

(iii) Similarly there is little force in dismissing the evidence of the combination *BEIA* (line 14) simply by refusing to embrace a group which yet again shows an anomaly viz. the left leg of alpha sliding down close to the iota.¹⁷

(iv) In my earlier critique¹⁸ I pointed out *inter alia*, that 'the widest of Chambers' narrow group viz. *μελ* in line 9, with a mean of 4.28 . . . is only infinitesimally smaller than the narrowest of Chambers' broad group viz. *ενον* in line 15, with a mean of 4.294.' This point is ignored by Chambers, but, I believe, warrants repetition.

What then the value of arguments based on spatial measurements? My grudging admission that a sequence of four letters with initial beta might on average occupy more space than an equivalent sequence with initial iota is hardly unduly cautious. It is the plain truth, nothing more nor less. *Caveat lector!*

III. CONCLUSIONS

Chambers does make the valid point that, no matter when the alliance between Athens and Egesta was concluded, an explanation for Thucydides' silence in 6.6.2 is demanded, and he asks for mine. My reply would have to be that I do not know the answer. If pressed, I should have to say that the Egestan envoys were much more likely to refer to an alliance concluded as recently as 418/17 than to one concluded some 40 years earlier (and perhaps renewed more than once in the interim).

But likelihood in the realm of speculation is inadequate to decide this issue. All we have is the stone and what we can now glean from it, whether by the keenness of natural eyesight or with the aid of modern technology. In my opinion, the arguments

¹⁶ Chambers, 1993, 172.

¹⁷ Lest the reader should grow weary over such details, Chambers, 1993, 173, relegates this unwelcome anomaly to a footnote (n. 11).

¹⁸ Henry, 1992, 141.

presented on the basis of comparative measurements are less than compelling and the computer-enhanced photographs are still open to interpretation.

Thus we really are back to where we were. Those who wish to read *Ἀντιφών* will do so; others will refuse. We still lack hard, irrefutable evidence.

I assess the present state of play as 40–30 in favour of the Habronists, and eagerly await the next service to see if the Antiphonists can claw their way back to deuce.

Monash University

ALAN HENRY

ARISTOPHANES, *LYSISTRATA* 231

οὐ στήσσομαι λέαινα' ἐπὶ τυροκνήστιδος.

In his admirable commentary, Jeffrey Henderson notes the significance of posture and of physical setting. He does not remark that the statue of Leaina near to which *Lysistrata* and *Kalonike* are standing on the Akropolis was intimately tied to the obscure story of the later years in the Athenian tyranny. With minor variations of detail or colour the story was that Leaina, a *hetaira* beloved of Harmodios or Aristogeiton, had been tortured by Hippias after the murder of Hipparchos but, brave girl, had preferred to die than say yes, or indeed say anything. She bit out her tongue.¹ The Athenians set up a bronze lioness, the work of Amphikrates, to commemorate her martyrdom.²

It is towards this crouching figure that *Lysistrata* raises her hand as she asks her sorority to swear 'I shall not squat like a lioness ἐπὶ τυρ . . .'. On what would the audience have expected that particular lioness to squat? On a cheese-grater? Hardly. On a tyrant, surely, or even more precisely, on a tyrant-slayer. An able actor would have had no trouble with a minor clash of stress or tone. A very alert auditor might have picked up an earlier suggestion of sex and politics at vv. 59/60—*ἰππικῇ*. But even the dumbest would be alive to an issue that had been tickling his fancy and his fears for nearly four years now.

Thucydides' petulant outburst at 6.53 owes much to his arrogance and something, no doubt, to his family tradition³ but the fact of popular panic was real enough and behind it lay two anxieties that were always lurking in Athenian minds, tyranny and Sparta; to give body to the former there was Alkibiades who, like another Olympic victor in the past, might have been thought to be 'growing his hair long with a view to tyranny'.⁴ By spring 411 the panic had subsided, *Lysistrata* is a confident play, but there was talk of Alkibiades' return, of being 'democrats with a difference', and the Spartans were at Dekeleia. Sensitivity was there to be rekindled.

¹ It is strange that the learned Pausanias (i 23.2–3) should have to rely on Athenian gossip for the story, which was certainly 'in print' for Cicero (*de Gloria*, fr. 12) and flourished thereafter on both sides of the periegete (Pliny, *N.H.* 7.87 and 34.72; Plut. *De Garrul.* 8, certainly before; then, Polyainos 8.45; Athenaios 569f; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* I 20; Euseb. (Jerome) *s.a.* 512). Pliny hints at the source—'lyrae cantu'.

² Amphikrates is, to me, otherwise unknown. For cheese-graters (and lionesses) see P. Jacobsthal, *Ath. Mitt.* 37 (1932), 1–7.

³ Sad that it is still necessary to repeat that through the son of Melesias and Kimon and Kimon's wife, Thucydides belonged to the Athenian right; that his infatuation with Perikles did not lead him to appreciate the implications of Periklean policies. Was Thuc. old enough to understand [. . .] κλες' affirmation of rights for the tyrannicides in *IG* I³ 131?

⁴ Hdt. 5.71. Kylon does not seem to have figured in all the brouhaha of 414–11.