72   Jon Solomon

mally either dissimilation, as in *$\ast\dot{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}o\varsigma$ > $\dot{\alpha}\varrho\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}o\varsigma$,* or, alternatively, the existence of one *l* in the root leads to the choice of suffixes in *r* instead of *l,* as in $\epsilon\dot{v}\chi\omega\lambda\acute{\eta}$ beside $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\omega\varrho\acute{\eta}$, or $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\vartheta\lambda o\nu$ beside $\ddot{o}\lambda\epsilon\vartheta\varrho o\varsigma$.[14]) Clearly this form is no scribal error. Wilamowitz[15]) suggested that it is merely a joke, Mr White marrying Miss Red (i.e. Pyrrha). I see no way to exclude this outright, in the absence of Epicharmus' full text; but would not **$\ast\ast\Lambda\epsilon v\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ have made the witticism sufficiently clear?

(ii) Hesychius has an entry $\Delta\epsilon v\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\iota\cdot$ *o*$\dot{\iota}$ $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau v\varrho o\iota$. The satyrs are nowhere else Deukalion's sons. We now know that Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* made them the great-great-grandsons of his wife Pyrrha and Zeus, but this relationship is surely too indirect for it to be evident that this gloss alludes to their descent from him, as is supposed by M. L. West.[16]) On the other hand, why satyrs should be called 'sons of sweetness' or 'of must' scarcely needs explanation; and since the form $\delta\epsilon\tilde{v}\kappa o\varsigma$ is so rare, a self-conscious pun on 'must' by a comedian seems improbable.

Sophoclean Clusters of Dual Personal Pronouns

By JON SOLOMON, Tucson (Arizona)

Sophocles does not frequently employ the dual personal pronoun in the "Theban" tragedies. His use of the dual in general throughout these three plays – in nouns, adjectives, and verbs – is well understood and discussed in previous scholarly work.[1]) But his use of the dual is,

---

[14]) M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du Mycénien et du grec ancien,* Paris 1972, 151.

[15]) Ap. G. Kaibel, *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* I, Berlin 1899, 112. See further K. Meuli, in P.-W. *RE* XII (1925) 2211 f., s. v. Leukaria and Leukarion.

[16]) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women.* Oxford 1985, 59 n. 64. The relevant passage is fr. 9 a. 19 M.-W., with the comments of the first editors P. J. Parsons, P. J. Sijpesteijn and K. A. Worp in *Papyri, Greek and Egyptian, in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner,* London 1981, 14.

[1]) E. g. Bernard M. Knox, *The Heroic Temper; Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1964) 79–80 with 179, who cites also *El.* 977–85. See also the important work on the dual femine forms by Guy L. Cooper, "In

in fact, one of the more effective, if limited, methods which Sophocles skillfully employs to portray the particular difficulties with which the Labdacid dynasty from the time of Laius to the death of Antigone found itself inextricably bound. A reading of his poetry will make it evident that Sophocles only rarely inserted the personal pronoun forms σφώ and σφῷν into his dialogue and preserved these valuable monosyllabic words for poignant phrases in emotional passages. In treating these pronouns with such frugality and care he clusters them into two concentrated passages in two of the three Theban plays – the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Oedipus at Colonus*; he does not employ the same technique in the *Antigone* nor in the others (or fragments).[2])

In the *Oedipus Tyrannus* the dual personal pronouns are clustered between lines 1486 and 1511 where either σφώ or σφῷν can be found four times (in twenty-five lines).[3]) This passage, in which

Defense of the Special Dual Feminine Forms of the Article and Pronouns in Attic Greek," *TAPA* 103 (1972) 97–125.

Verses such as these from Ismene's rhesis in *Ant.* 55–57:

τρίτον δ' ἀδελφὼ δύο μίαν καθ' ἡμέραν
αὐτοκτονοῦντε, τὼ ταλαιπώρω μόρον
κοινὸν κατειργάσαντ' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοιν χεροῖν.

are precise and vivid because of the employment of the dual. The combination of the dual with αὐτο- and κοινὸν solidifies the unifying aspect of this double murder (suicide).

[2]) In the *Antigone,* where Creon and the chorus discuss the fate of Antigone and Ismene, Sophocles writes ἄμφω ... (770) and τώ ... (769); cf. Cooper (*supra,* n. 1) 115–19. In fact, σφῷν appears only at *El.* 1367 (Electra and Orestes), *Aj.* 1265 (Agamemnon and Teucer), and *Phil.* 627 (Philoctetes and Neoptolemus). While Sophocles does not cluster dual personal pronouns elsewhere, he does reserve σφε for a series of four significant uses in the only four examples of that word found in the *Antigone*; I have written a paper on this matter soon to be submitted for publication (see below pp. 80–87).

[3]) The *Oedipus Tyrannus* contains only two previous examples of the word before this cluster at lines 1486–1511. σφῷν first occurs at line 581 where Creon prepares to deliver his lengthy rhesis about the merits of his present political (non-)position and his lack of desire or ambition for the kingship. The reason for the use of the pronoun here is clear enough, for Creon compares his degree of power and influence in the city to Oedipus' and Jocasta's degrees of power and influence; Sophocles employment of the dual pronoun here is utterly (and enviously) precise. Similarly, in the *amoibaion* at line 668 the chorus (in an iambic-dochmiac passage; line 668 is iambic trimeter syncopated catalectic) in the *amoibaion* uses σφῷν without any apparent special emphasis, although the word could refer effectively (if unconsciously on the chorus' part) to the ills of Oedipus and Jocasta.

Jon Solomon

Oedipus embraces and talks to his children for the first time since
his blinding and for the last time, essentially completes the tragedy.
Oedipus has already sung the *kommos* (1307-1366), reasoned with
himself, pleaded with Creon for exile (1368-1458), and accounted
for his suffering and selfinflicted wounds.

The most challenging aspect of his multiple *anagnoriseis* now sur-
faces-his progeny. More intolerable than his convicted patricide,
more painful than the banishment for which he pleads, his confron-
tation with his children, particularly his daughters, forces Oedipus to
"see" the physical representation of his ill fortune (which he hates)
and the emotional product of his previous good fortune (whom he
loves). Before the shepherd confirmed the truth about Oedipus' ori-
gins, Oedipus was no doubt already well aware that he was in all
likelihood the person who killed Laius and that he was not the child
of Polybus and Merope. The quintessential fact which Oedipus had
to elicit from the unwilling shepherd,[4] or what he expected least of
all to find out from the shepherd, was the truth of Apollo's prophe-
cy-that he was Jocasta's child.

In fact, before the blind and self-destructive Oedipus returns to
the stage at line 1307 we had heard little in regard to this third
aspect of his familial catastrophe. It is, ironically, perhaps the far-
thest thing from his mind; he had pitiably made his boast (lines
1062-3, 1070, 1076-7) that he could bear to learn of his slavish ori-
gins, and he feared most the death of his father and the oracle of
Apollo. But in the *kommos* and in the ensuing passages it is now
Oedipus' unspeakable birth, incestuous marriage, and worse than
bastard offspring, not the murder of his father or his sacrilege, that
define his agony. This final scene is consequently the most challeng-
ing to Oedipus, for he must face and he must feel a parental concern
for his daughters (whom he has just learned to be his sisters). Who
will care for them? What kind of life will they have? How will they
find husbands? (ll. 1489-1502) It is in such an emotional and famil-
ial context as this the otherwise insignificant dual second person per-
sonal pronouns assume their significance.

---

[4] "Unwilling" not only because of the destruction to be caused for Oedipus,
but also because it was the shepherd's fault. Lines 1157 and 1349f. suggest his
blame, and it renders the interrogation of the shepherd somewhat ironic that the
man who should have put Oedipus to death years ago is now about to destroy
him a second time. Moreover, at lines 1349f. Oedipus wishes the shepherd dead
(ὄλοιθ' ὅστις ὃς μ' ἀπ' ἀγρίας πέδας / νομάδ' ἐπιποδίας ἔλαβ' ἀπό τε φόνου /
ἔρυτο κἀνέσωσεν, οὐ- / δὲν ἐς χάριν πράσσων.).

When Oedipus for the first time mentions his daughters (1462) Sophocles immediately begins to use the dual voice, even if there were two sons for whom he had in the preceding lines used the less specific plural (1459-61).[5]) In addition although Oedipus had felt no revulsion in calling his sons "παῖδες" (1459), he at intervals finds himself reluctant to address his daughters as "τέκνα" or the like. Pitying and prophesying their future Oedipus initially refers to them as "ταῖν δ' ἀθλίαιν οἰκτραῖν τε παρθένοιν ἐμαῖν (1462); and when he subsequently asks Creon to allow a visitation with the girls (146 f.), he refers to them as σφας (1470), a noncommittal term which, like παρθένοιν, avoids specifying their abnormal relationship but which designates this relationship as something very special. This special relationship has no name; cf. σφε in *Ant.* 44. It hovers along a distasteful spectrum of "maidens," "sisters," "daughters," "children," and a resultant noncommittal "them." Sophocles uses a similarly noncommittal term, ἐκγόνοιν, the next time (1474) he refers to them.[6]) All of these terms designate his daughters in the third person; Oedipus had not yet confronted his "children."

When Oedipus does in fact address his children (near the beginning of his lengthy rhesis [1480-1514]), he has no initial difficulty in finding a term for them. Instinct and habit compel him to summon them ironically, pitiably, as "τέκνα" (1480) and Sophocles then developes the irony further in the next line's emphatically and painfully explicit ὡς τὰς ἀδελφὰς τάσδε τάς ἐμὰς χέρας (1481). Again in the closing lines of his beckoning he returns to the term τέκνα (1484) and parallels this normal usage with ὑμῖν (1482, 1484).

Oedipus now embarks upon the second part of his rhesis in which he, now filled with emotion - σφὼ δακρύω (1486) - begins to bemoan his daughters' bleak future (τὰ λοιπὰ πικροῦ βίου). Immediately, Sophocles has his protagonist twice employ the dual personal pronoun σφὼ (1486 and 1488), and this σφὼ vividly contradicts the previous τέκνα ... ὑμῖν. Oedipus' natural inclination would have him consider his girls simply as his daughters; it is these daughters (τέκνα) from whom he has just sought solace or pity in lines 1480-85. Now, however, Oedipus must consider his daughters as marriageable

---

[5]) παίδων δὲ τῶν μὲν ἀρσένων μή μοι, Κρέον,
προσθῆ μέριμναν· ἄνδρες εἰσίν, ὥστε μὴ
σπάνιν ποτὲ σχεῖν, ἔνθ' ἂν ὦσι, τοῦ βίου·

[6]) Other Sophoclean passages confirm the unfatherly relationship suggested by the use of ἐκγόνοιν· *Ant.* 842, *O. T.* 172, and *O. C.* 588.

76   Jon Solomon

girls, and in this function he finds it extremely difficult to label them as
"normal" daughters. Indeed, they are not normal, and Oedipus recon-
ciles himself to calling them that bitterly appropriate σφώ.

Our poet would be disappointingly un-Sophoclean, however, if he
excessively glutted the passage with this second person dual pronoun
and never allowed his previously proud protagonist to fight off the
gloom and call his daughters another ironic "τέκνα" at least once
more (1493). Perhaps the return to τέκνα here is symbolic of Oedi-
pus' hope; there may be, he seems to wish, someone (τίς) who will
accept the reproaches and marry his "daughters." But the reality of
the situation forces him back to σφῷν at 1495: τίς οὗτος ἔσται, τίς
παραρρίψει, τέκνα, / τοιαῦτ' ὀνείδη λαμβάνειν, ἃ τοῖς ἐμοῖς / γονεῦ-
σιν ἔσται σφῷν θ' ὁμοῦ δηλήματα;⁷)

Oedipus turns to Creon and contrasts the dual with which he has
referred to his two daughters with another dual (νὼ ... ὣ 'φυτεύσα-
μεν, / ὀλώλαμεν δύ' ὄντε) which refers to their two parents
(1504-1505). Pleading for their future, he asks Creon to protect
them against poverty and spinsterhood (1505-1506) – whatever the
precise meanings of 1505 f. – and to pity them (1508). In both pleas
he returns to the noncommittal σφε ... σφας.⁸) Oedipus turns for the
last time to his daughters and once again uses the dual σφῷν ...
εἰχέτην (1511) in juxtaposition with one final τέκνα; such a juxtapo-
sition exhibits Oedipus' love for his daughters as well as his pessi-
mistic confusion for their prospects for happiness.

In a literary genre in which characters are often labeled in peri-
phrastic trimeters (e.g. *Ant.* 1) and to which a variety of pronouns
(in three numbers) are available, such a monosyllabic pronoun as
σφῷν or such simple words as ὑμεῖς or τέκνα, can, by contrast alone,

---

⁷) The σφῷν is textually secure, be it genitive or dative, even if the surround-
ing words are not; see the summary of conjectures and interpretations in J.C.
Kamerbeek *The Oedipus Tyrannus*, vol IV (1967) of *The Plays of Sophocles*
(Leiden 1959-1967) 267.

The ensuing ὑμῶν is not spoken by Oedipus but by an imaginary tormentor. It
would be inappropriate and virtually impossible for these people to refer to Oedipus'
daughters as "σφῷν." They do not have the "special" relationship with the girls
which Oedipus has. It is symbolic only of Oedipus' misery, pessimism, and love
for his daughters that he refers to them alternately as σφώ or ὑμεῖς (τέκνα).
Consequently, when Oedipus again uses τέκνα ... ὑμᾶς in 1501-1502, it is in
utter despair. No one will marry them; they will not experience the joys of moth-
erhood, and the reason is obvious: They are his children (τέκνα).

⁸) Cf. the detachment implied in the use of the nondescript νιν at *O. T.* 1174
and 1176.

produce a great effect; by intermingling these words, tossing them about at one moment as if each one described precisely Oedipus' female progeny and then in the next moment as if no word at all were appropriate Sophocles accurately portrayed Oedipus' oscillating concerns and confused familial relationships.

In the *Oedipus at Colonus* Sophocles employs the dual personal pronouns somewhat less sparingly, yet once again we find the poet preserving these words for clustered usages in significant locations.[9]) The first two instances at lines 342 and 344 demonstrate how emphatic Sophoclean usage of σφώ and σφῷν can be. Ismene has recently reached Oedipus and Antigone at Colonus, and her arrival instigates an Oedipal tirade against his two worthless sons as well as fitting praise for his two dutiful daughters. This tirade begins with the famous Herodotean passage (2.35) in which the sloth and selfishness of Polyneices and Eteocles are compared to the domestic lack of industry of Egyptian men. Sophocles strongly contrasts Oedipus' sons and Oedipus' daughters, and the word with which he establishes this strong contrast is σφῷν: (342-45) σφῷν δ', ὦ τέκν', οὓς μὲν εἰκὸς ἦν πονεῖν τάδε, / κατ' οἶκον οἰκουροῦσιν ὥστε παρθένοι, / σφὼ δ' ἀντ' ἐκείνων [v.l. ἐκείνοιν] τἀμὰ δυστήνου κακὰ / ὑπερπονεῖτον. The initial position of σφῷν and σφώ, the temporary grammatical uncertainty of σφῷν, the repetition of σφῷν and σφώ, and the word order in the rest of the sentence all render the contrast extremely effective. Because so much of the development of the *Oedipus at Colonus* derives from the opposition of trustworthy and untrustworthy supplications and promises to Oedipus, Sophocles must establish the discrepancy between the two familial factions forcefully and accurately. He accomplishes this in this passage in large part through skillful manipulation of his dual pronouns.[10])

---

[9]) Fourteen times in the *Oedipus at Colonus*, six times in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. As four of the examples of the pronouns in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* were clustered in lines 1486-1511, so eight of the examples in the *Oedipus at Colonus* are clustered in lines 1375-1444 with the "prelude" at line 1257: there is a brief "cluster" of two more at lines 342 and 344. Similarly, as two of the examples in *Oedipus Tyrannus* were unclustered, so are those at O. C. 497, 1111, 1543, and 1740.

[10]) Sophocles' employment of the dual in this passage is neither clear nor textually secure. Judging from O. T. 1459-62 one might expect Sophocles to have referred to Eteocles and Polyneices in the plural (O. T. 1460: ἄνδρες εἰσίν) and to Antigone and Ismene in the dual (O. T. 1462: ταῖν δ' ἀθλίαιν οἰκτραῖν τε καρθένοιν ἐμαῖν). In this passage Ismene initially refers to Oedipus and Antigone in the dual (O. C. 329: θιγγάνω δυοῖν ὁμοῦ); cf. O. T. 581 in which Creon refers to

78   Jon Solomon

The great cluster of dual personal pronouns in the *Oedipus at
Colonus* begins surely by line 1375 and perhaps earlier at 1257 with
the entrance of Polyneices. In this hateful confrontation between
Oedipus and Polyneices σφώ and σφῷν are used eight times in one
scene, seven times within just 69 lines (1375-1444). These pronouns
when emitted from the mouth of Polyneices always refer to his
beloved two sisters, and from the mouth of Oedipus they always
refer to his two hated sons. Oedipus cannot use the pronoun until he
begins referring not to Polyneices alone, of course, but to both sons.
Such a reference occurs in the second part of Oedipus' rhesis begin-
ning at line 1348, where, after reviling Polyneices (1354: ὦ κάκιστε),

---

Oedipus and Iocasta in the dual and discussed *supra*. n.6. Following the hemi-
stichs assigned to Oedipus and Ismene (11. 335f.) Oedipus, again as expected,
refers to his two sons in the plural (335: οἱ δ' αὐθόμαιμοι ποῦ νεανίαι πονεῖν;).
Once he launches into his Herodotean tirade, however, his two sons are now
referred to in the dual (337: ὦ παντ' ἐκείνω ... κατεικασθέντε). Since these lines
will effectively contrast the two sons (ἐκείνω) and the two daughters (σφῷν ...
σφώ), one finds the double use of the dual here less satisfying than the contrast-
ing use at *O. T.* 1459-62. In addition, in the very sentence in which Sophocles
introduces Ismene and Antigone as σφῷν ... σφώ, he apparently now refers to
Polyneices and Eteocles here in the plural (ἀντ 'ἐκείνων).
   According to Pearson's apparatus, only Vat(icanus 287) reads ἐκείνοιν; its
scribe apparently attempted, as I have, to bring some order to the dual and plural
references to Oedipus' daughters and sons. If the preceding Herodotean passage
had not referred to the two sons in the dual, I would not hesitate to read ἐκείνων
here in line 344, substantiating this reading by the *Oedipus Tyrannus* parallel
cited earlier. But despite the generally simple transition between plural and dual
which the Greek language allowed, ἐκείνοιν might be preferred here; Sophocles
may have been flirting with another flurry of duals just as he had at *Ant.* 55-57.
Ultimately, since Sophocles clearly uses ὦ ... ἐκείνω ... κατεικασθέντε in the pre-
ceding Herodotean passage, the equation of the two sons with the plural and the
two daughters with the dual cannot be considered to be ubiquitous. Lastly, if
Sophocles' original text had been consistent in its use of the dual here for the
two sons, he might well have written in line 335 τὼ δ 'αὐθομαίμω ποῦ νεανία
πονεῖν; the corruption of the original ω(ο) into οι or of α into αι would be sim-
ple to explain, and perhaps a later scribe then adjusted the article and noun/
adjective to the plural. A similar corruption of ἐκείνοι in line 337 would also be
easily explained paleographically, but a parallel κατεικασθέντες, which could
have easily been corrupted because of the omission of sigma or of a terminal
abbreviation, would be metrically deficient. Despite the inconsistency in the
dual-plural categorization of the daughters and sons in the *Oedipus at Colonus*, it
nonetheless must be remembered that at lines 343, 344, 497, 111, 1257, 1407,
1411, 1435, 1444 (*bis*), and 1740-at all but three usages of the word in the
play - σφώ and σφῷν refer only to the two daughters. If Sophocles uses the dual
flexibly in general, he uses the dual personal pronouns in a consistent manner.

he then threatens both sons together. He curses them; may they die by each other's hand, and both times Oedipus invokes this curse he employs a dual personal pronoun (1375 and 1392).[11]) In direct contrast Polyneices employs the same pronoun exclusively as a term of endearment to his sisters. As soon as he appears on stage Polyneices addresses his sisters and asks for their pity; Sophocles helps to establish Polyneices' endearing and pathetic tone by putting into his mouth the words παῖδες ... σφῷν (1255-57). Polyneices' supplications to his sisters persist after Oedipus invokes his curse on him and his brother (σφῷν in lines 1375 and 1392); now he requires even more pity and, more specifically, proper burial. Four times he asks for burial, and four times he refers to his sisters in these requests as σφῷν (1407, 1411, 1435, and 1444). The clustering of dual personal pronouns in this scene leads us to a clearer insight into what the poet is trying to accomplish here. The indisputable clustering of dual personal pronouns and the apparent contradictory emotional connotations in its usage by Oedipus and Polyneices seem to imply an ironic and paradoxical parallelism between these two Labdacids. Polyneices is not entirely without justification in his plea for mercy from his father. He apologizes for what he had done to Oedipus in the past (1264-6), he promises him honor and retribution for these wrongs (1342), and he begs for forgiveness (1267-9). Consequently, it is not impossible that we are to feel some sympathy for Polyneices, especially since Sophocles seems to dwell on Polyneices' pitiable and admirable quest for at least proper burial; prepared to die, thoroughly cursed with his father's hatred, Polyneices reveals an admirable courage in his resolve.[12]) It is because of this cautious sympathy we feel for Polyneices that we can see the parallel between him and his father. Both are exiles, and both are in their own ways doomed; and while Sophocles may show this parallelism between two characters in a variety of ways, here the parallelism is revealed quite clearly *via* the paradoxically parallel use of the dual personal pronoun by the two characters. The parallelism is paradoxical since Oedipus' use of

---

[11]) See T. G. Rosenmeyer, "The Wrath of Oedipus," *Phoenix* 6 (1952) 92-112; on lines 1383-4 here see P. E. Easterling, "Oedipus the Polyneices," *PCPhS* 13 (1967) 1-13.

[12]) C. Whitman, *Sophocles; A Study of Heroic Humanism* (Cambridge, Mass 1951) 210-11, who cites Gennaro Perrotta, *Sofocle* (Messina 1935) 606. Polyneices himself sees this parallel and attempts to exploit it, e.g. lines 1334-7. See also A. J. Podlecki, "Reciprocity in *Prometheus Bound*," *GRBS* 10 (1969) 287-92.

80   Jon Solomon

the word σφῷν is hateful, Polyneices' endearing, and since Oedipus
consistently refers to his sons as σφῷν, Polyneices to his sisters.

With great effect Sophocles gives Antigone one opportunity to
employ the same dual personal pronoun: (1424–25) ὁρᾷς τὰ τοῦδ'
οὖν ὡς ἐς ὀρθὸν ἐκφέρεις / μαντεύμαθ', ὅς σφῷν θάνατον ἐξ ἀμφοῖν
θροεῖ; Here Antigone serves as a buffer between the two conflicting
members of her family. She maintains a respectful and sisterly love
for her brother(s) and pleads with Polyneices to save himself. In
her fear for her brothers' safety she refers to them as σφῷν, and
how much more sympathy must we now feel for siblings who care
for each other, and how much irony must we now perceive in Oedi-
pus' referring to these same two young men with the same word but
with an entirely different attitude?[13])

A Pronoun of Distance: σφε in *Antigone*

By Jon Solomon, Tucson (Arizona)

Those who analyze Sophocles' poetry have eloquently and convin-
cingly detailed how the poet employs interwoven and neologistic
compounds that at once provide dignity, irony, or verbal majesty to a
given scene.[1]) In this paper I hope to introduce a different but com-
plementary perspective, that is, how Sophocles treats words of lesser
importance, for instance the third person personal pronoun σφε. I
chose this particular anaphoric pronoun since Sophocles only occa-
sionally uses it (four times in this play, two dozen times in all the
extant plays, nine of which are found in the *Trachiniae*) and had a

---

[13]) The sympathetic use of the dual personal pronoun is used later by Oedi-
pus at line 1543 (ἐγὼ γὰρ ἡγεμὼν / σφῷν αὖ πέφασμαι καινός, ὥσπερ σφὼ
πατρί.), and then by the chorus at line 1740 (τὰ σφῷν τὸ μὴ πίτνειν κακῶς.). In
both examples the word refers again to the two daughters of Oedipus.

[1]) See, for example, F.R.Earp, *The Style os Sophocles* (Cambridge 1944)
57–93; Hugh Parry. *The Lyric Poems of Greek Tragedy* (Toronto and Sarasota
1978) 53–61; and Dorothy M. Clay, *A Formal Analysis of the Vocabulary of Aesch-
lylus, Sophocles, and Euripides* (Diss., Minnesota 1957) *passim*, but especially
441–5. On Sophocles' syntactical skills, see also I.E.Azelius, *De assimilatione syn-
tactica apud Sophoclem* (Uppsala 1897).