

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.