

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

SOPHOCLES
ANTIGONE

EDITED BY MARK GRIFFITH

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

GENERAL EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

Regius Professor Emeritus of Greek, University of Cambridge

PHILIP HARDIE

Corpus Christi Professor of Latin, University of Oxford

RICHARD HUNTER

Regius Professor of Greek, University of Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

Kennedy Professor Emeritus of Latin, University of Cambridge

SOPHOCLES
ANTIGONE

EDITED BY

MARK GRIFFITH

*Professor of Classics and Theatre Arts,
University of California at Berkeley*



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521337014

© Cambridge University Press 1999

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1999
18th printing 2016

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Sophocles.

[Sophocles. Antigone]

Antigone / Sophocles; edited by Mark Griffith

p. cm. – (Cambridge Greek and Latin classics)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0 521 33056 4 (hardback) – ISBN 0 521 33701 4 (paperback)

I. Antigone (Greek mythology) – Drama. I. Griffith, Mark.

II. Title. III. Series

PA4413.A7 1999

882'.01-dc21 98-35827 CIP

ISBN 978-0-521-33701-4 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>Preface</i> | page vii |
| <i>Abbreviations</i> | xi |
| <i>A note on metrical symbols and abbreviations</i> | xii |
| Introduction | |
| 1. <i>Sophokles and Athens</i> | 1 |
| 2. <i>The story of Antigone</i> | 4 |
| 3. <i>Structure, dramatic technique, style</i> | 12 |
| 4. <i>The production</i> | 21 |
| 5. <i>The meaning of the play</i> | 25 |
| (a) <i>Aesthetics</i> | 26 |
| (b) <i>Lessons</i> | 28 |
| (c) <i>Characters</i> | 34 |
| (d) <i>Ethics</i> | 38 |
| (e) <i>Contradictions</i> | 43 |
| (f) <i>Politics</i> | 54 |
| (g) <i>Fantasies</i> | 58 |
| 6. <i>The transmission of the text</i> | 66 |
| A note on the text and critical apparatus | 69 |
| ANTIGONE | 71 |
| Commentary | 119 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 356 |
| <i>Indexes</i> | 363 |

PREFACE

Since the late eighteenth century, *Antigone* has been one of the most widely read, translated, performed, discussed, adapted, and admired of all classical Greek texts. Sophokles' play has captured the imagination of writers as diverse as Friedrich Hölderlin, Jean Cocteau, Jean Anouilh, Berthold Brecht, Rolf Hochhuth, Heinrich Böll, and Athol Fugard, and of composers such as Felix Mendelssohn, Camille Saint-Saëns, Arthur Honegger, Mikos Theodorakis, and Carl Orff; and it has attracted the critical attention of philosophers and theorists as influential as G. W. F. Hegel, Søren Kierkegaard, Martin Heidegger, Georg Lukács, and Jacques Lacan. (On these, and other aspects of the history of the play's reception and interpretation, see Steiner 1984.) With its challenging exploration of conflicts between family and state, divine and human law, male authority and female resistance, *Antigone* continues to strike responsive chords in all kinds of audiences and readers, and to be assigned as a core text in courses, not only on Greek drama, but also on political theory, gender studies, and moral philosophy, in universities and colleges all over the world.

It is all the more daunting a task, therefore, to produce a new edition of the play, for its readers may be coming to it with many different kinds of questions and expectations, and with correspondingly different preferences as to the *kinds* of help it should provide. Of course, my first responsibility is to assist all readers – especially those less familiar with the language and style of Sophoklean tragedy – in figuring out how the Greek is put together, word by word and phrase by phrase; and to this end I have done my best to provide the necessary textual, lexical, grammatical, syntactical, and metrical assistance, and to supplement this with further references to the standard commentaries and scholarly aids (esp.

LSJ, Smyth, Goodwin's *GMT*, and Denniston's *GP*; and for metrical matters, Dale 1968 and West 1982. Given the nature of this series, I have favoured works in English, where possible). But almost equally basic and indispensable to the commentator's job, I take it, is the explanation of stylistic, rhetorical, theatrical, and structural aspects of the play; and, at the next level, the reader is also entitled to expect information about the social, ethical, political, religious, and literary context, and (as far as possible) the mental and psychological make-up of its Athenian audience – by which point philology has merged into hermeneutics, and the critical floodgates are wide open.

In interpreting the play, I have tried to keep two unattainable yet desirable goals constantly in view: on the one hand, to transport myself and my readers as completely as possible into the mind-sets of the original audience in the Theatre of Dionysos; and on the other, to explore the fullest range of meanings that this text can yield to us now. As audiences vary and change, so do meanings multiply and change with them. A work as dense and complex as Sophokles' *Antigone* invites many different responses and critical judgements, and I have tried to include a good number of the more fruitful and significant of these – while also explaining why others seem textually and contextually less legitimate or plausible. Likewise, I have tried to cite a fair selection of the best modern scholarship on the play, both to indicate where critical opinion diverges and to suggest helpful sites of more extensive discussion. But of course this selection represents only a tiny fraction of what is available (and still growing); and I cannot pretend to have covered it adequately. I hope those whose work I may seem to have neglected will forgive me; I could not read, let alone cite, everything.

I am happy to acknowledge my debt to previous commentators on the play, especially R. F. P. Brunck, L. Campbell, G. Müller, J. C. Kamerbeek, A. Brown, and above all R. C.

Jebb; also to S. Radt for his editions of the fragments of Aeschylus and Sophokles (= *TrGF* vols. 3 and 4). I am fortunate too, in establishing my text and *apparatus criticus*, to have been able to draw on the expert work of A. C. Pearson, A. Dain, A. Colonna, R. D. Dawe, and H. Lloyd-Jones & N. G. Wilson: but I have preferred to print my own version rather than follow any one of them exactly throughout.

The Introduction is intended to be accessible to Greekless readers, as well as to those planning to sift and struggle through the play in the original. After much agonizing, I abandoned my early resolve to keep this Introduction short and to let the text and the Commentary speak for themselves, line by line and scene by scene. Instead, I decided – rightly or wrongly – that, given the enormous scholarly literature on *Antigone*, and the vigorous debates that continue to rage around it, it would be irresponsible of me to stand back and refrain from larger-scale interpretive comment of my own. So in §5 of the Introduction I engage with a number of different approaches to the play, and try briefly to outline the chief merits, shortcomings, and implications of each. Doubtless some of these approaches will appeal more than others to any particular reader; but I hope none turns out to be completely unappealing and useless to all. In any case, this section of the Introduction can easily be skipped (in part, or whole) by those who want to concentrate on reading the play through with an open mind.

It has taken me much longer than planned to complete this edition. I am grateful to many colleagues, friends, and students for help of various kinds along the way: especially to my undergraduate students at Berkeley, to Ruby Blondell (and her students at the University of Washington), Judith Butler, Martin Cropp (and his students at Calgary), Michael Ewans, Leslie Kurke, André Lardinois, Rodney Merrill, Seth Schein (and his students at Davis), Deborah Steiner, and

Victoria Wohl, for their corrections and constructive criticisms; to Yasmin Syed, Paul Psinos, and Susan Moore for expert editorial assistance; to Pauline Hire, for her sure-handed guidance throughout the process of publication, and her tactful applications of spur and curb; to Alan Elliott for getting me launched on the reading and interpretation of Greek tragedy, almost forty years ago; and, as always, to the wise and patient General Editors of this series, Pat Easterling and Ted Kenney, to whose advice, I know, I should have paid more constant attention. The faults that remain (including diffuseness, vacillation, and a tendency to fall between several critical stools at once – to say nothing of outright mistakes) are my own: ἔμ' αὐτόγνωτος ὤλεσ' ὀργά.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|--------------|---|
| CHCL | P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, eds., <i>Cambridge history of classical literature</i> , vol. 1 (Cambridge 1985) |
| Ellendt | F. Ellendt, <i>Lexicon Sophocleum</i> (Leipzig 1872) |
| FGrHist | F. Jacoby, ed., <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin 1923) |
| FJ&W | H. Friis Johansen and E. W. Whittle, eds., <i>Aeschylus The Suppliants</i> (3 vols., Carlsburg 1980) |
| Gildersleeve | B. L. Gildersleeve, <i>Syntax of classical Greek</i> (New York n.d.; repr. 1980) |
| GMT | W. W. Goodwin, <i>Greek moods and tenses</i> (New York 1890) |
| GP | J. D. Denniston, <i>The Greek particles</i> (2nd ed., Oxford 1954) |
| K-G | R. Kühner and B. Gerth, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre</i> (Hanover, 1898–1904) |
| LIMC | <i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> (8 vols., Zurich 1981–97) |
| LJ&W | H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, eds., <i>Sophocles</i> (Oxford 1990, corr. 1992: OCT) |
| LJ&W 1990 | H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, <i>Sophoclea</i> (Oxford) |
| LSJ | H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. Stuart Jones, <i>A Greek–English lexicon</i> (Oxford, 1940) with <i>Revised Supplement</i> , ed. P. G. Glare (Oxford 1996) |
| PCG | R. Kassel and C. Austin, eds., <i>Poetae comici Graeci</i> (Berlin 1984–) |
| PMG | <i>Poetae melici Graeci</i> , ed. D. L. Page (Oxford 1959) |
| RE | <i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> |
| S-Inwood | see Sourvinou-Inwood in <i>Bibliography</i> |
| Smyth | H. Weir Smyth, <i>Greek grammar</i> (rev. G. M. Messing, Cambridge, MA, 1956) |
| TrGF | B. Snell, R. Kannicht and S. L. Radt, eds., <i>Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> (Göttingen 1971–) |
| West | M. L. West, ed., <i>Iambi et elegi Graeci</i> (Oxford 1989–92) |
| W-Ingram | see Winnington-Ingram in <i>Bibliography</i> |

A NOTE ON METRICAL SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| — | a long (heavy) syllable |
| ∪ | a short (light) syllable |
| × | anceps (a position which may be occupied by a syllable of either quantity) |
| ∪∪ | a resolution (two short syllables taking the place of a long) |
| ≡ | a contraction (a long syllable taking the place of two shorts) |
| ∩ | <i>brevis in longo</i> (a short syllable treated as if long) |
| ∪, ∩, etc. | the upper symbol refers to the strophe, the lower to the antistrophe |
| // | evidence of major pause ("period end") |
| d | —∪∪— |
| D | —∪∪—∪∪— |
| D ₂ | —∪∪—∪∪—∪∪— |
| e | —∪— |
| E | —∪—×—∪— |
| ba. | ∪— — (bacchiac metron) |
| cr. | —∪— (cretic metron) |
| ia. | ×—∪— (iambic metron) |
| sp. | — — (spondee) |
| choriambic dim(eter) | ××××—∪∪— |

For further discussion of terminology, see West 1982, especially pp. xi–xii.

INTRODUCTION

I. SOPHOKLES AND ATHENS

Sophokles was born *c.* 495 BCE, into a wealthy family from the Attic deme of Kolonos.¹ In addition to being the most successful tragedian of his time, he was active in public life (*hellēnotamias* in 443–2; *stratēgos* in 441–40 with Perikles, and perhaps again later in the 420s with Nikias; and *proboulos* during the emergencies of 412–11). There is also a tradition that, when the cult of Asklepios was introduced into Athens in 420, S. provided an altar and home for the god in his own house until an official public shrine could be built, thus earning himself the posthumous cult title Δεξίων ('Receiver of the god').² Various other sources (not necessarily reliable) report that he was a 'good-humoured' man,³ who travelled widely, had a strong bisexual appetite, enjoyed the musical and erotic activities of the symposium, and was on good terms with such intellectual luminaries as Ion of Chios and Herodotos of Halikarnassos.

S.'s career as a playwright was long and prolific (over 120 plays), stretching from his first production in 468 until at least 409 (*Ph.*). He died in 405 (a few months after Euripides), and *OC* was produced posthumously in 401. Of the seven plays that survive entire, *Ph.* and *OC* are the only ones for which we have 'didaskalic' information fixing their dates;⁴ but there are good stylistic reasons for regarding *Ajax* and *Trachiniai* as relatively early (between 468 and 435), and *Elektra* as late (between 420 and 410). *OT* is commonly placed in the 420s, though the evidence is thin.⁵ *Ant.* is assigned to 442 or 441 on

¹ For full testimonia to S.'s life and career, see Radt, *TrGF* vol. IV, 11–107; also M. R. Lefkowitz, *Lives of the Greek poets* (London 1981) 75–87, *CHCL* I 764–5, Ehrenberg 1954, Buxton 1995: 3–5.

² *Et. Magn.* 256.6 *s.v.* Δεξίων = *TrGF* vol. IV, 169; cf. 167–73a. For a sceptical view of this tradition, see A. Connolly, *JHS* 118 (1998) 1–21.

³ Aristoph. *Frogs* 82 εὐκόλος.

⁴ The *Didaskaliai* were lists of dates and titles of performances in the annual dramatic competitions, first compiled by Aristotle, and subsequently used by Alexandrian and later scholars.

⁵ On the dating of these plays, see Lesky 1972: 187–91, Schwinge 1962, B. M. W. Knox, *AJP* 78 (1956) 133–47, W-Ingram 1980: 341–3, and Easterling's Introd. to *S. Tr.* (pp. 19–23).

fairly solid grounds, for one of the three *hypotheses* ('summaries', or 'introductions') contained in our MSS of the play states (*hypoth.* 1.13–14), 'They say that S. was awarded the *stratēgia* in Samos after his success with the production of *Antigone*.' The Samian expedition took place in 441–40;⁶ and, whether or not S.'s election in fact owed anything to the popularity of *Ant.*, this explanation would hardly have been advanced unless the play's production was dated just a year or two earlier. Such a date in any case squares well with several structural and stylistic features of the play,⁷ and with the additional statement (*hypoth.* 1.15) that *Ant.* 'is counted 32nd' (i.e., fairly early) among S.'s 120 plays.

Athens in the late 440s was a city of unprecedented prosperity, power, and innovation, both political and intellectual. The democratic system, first introduced in 508, and progressively modified during the subsequent decades, was by now firmly entrenched: sovereign authority lay with the popular Assembly and lawcourts, and public offices were rotated annually by election and/or lottery. Although aristocrats continued to dominate the political arena, with the 'best' men (i.e. the wealthy and well-born) leading armies and fleets on campaigns, proposing and arguing policies in the Assembly, and holding the key elective offices – above all, in the person of Perikles the Alkmaionid, who had begun his long period of ascendancy that was to continue until his death in 429 – none the less the prevailing ideology, as reflected in the language, attitudes, and assumptions of public debate, was by now vehemently democratic, emphasizing loyalty to the laws of the *polis* rather than selfish family ambitions, the freedom of all citizens to vote and speak their minds, and the accountability of all public officials for their actions and decisions.⁸ 'Noble' families or individuals often found their own

⁶ It may not have been concluded until a couple of years later: see R. G. Lewis, *GRBS* 29 (1988) 35–50 (arguing for 438 as the date of *Ant.*).

⁷ In particular, the technique of 3-actor dialogue (376–581), more integrated and 'advanced' than that of *Aj.* or *Tr.*, but less so than *OT* 512–648, 1110–85, and *El.*, *Ph.* 865–1080, and *OC* (Schwinge 1962: 73–5, 79–93, K. Listmann, *Die Technik des Dreigesprächs in der gr. Tragödie*, diss. Giessen 1910); also the absence of astrophic choral lyric (found only in S.'s late plays), and the absence of *antilabē* (splitting of ia. trimeters between two speakers, common in S.'s later plays, less so in *Aj.* and *Tr.*). See n. 5 above, n. 48 below.

⁸ Sinclair 1988, Hansen 1991, Ober 1989: 293–339; cf. 162–210, 639–80, 1326–53nn.

interests, alliances, and foreign connections running counter to the policies of the democratic state; and popular attitudes towards them tended to combine admiration with resentment, gratitude with suspicion.⁹ In the midst of this continuing struggle between the different segments and interests within the population, the possibility of *stasis*, in the form of an oligarchic counter-revolution, or even of a tyrant's coup, was never far from people's minds or politicians' tongues.¹⁰ The same political leader who was hailed one week as defender of the people and saviour of the city, might the next be hounded into disgrace or exile as a would-be tyrant or traitor (cf. 370 ὑπίπολις, ἄπολις, 1155–71). Thus the gulf that is unfailingly maintained on the tragic stage, between the noble families whose disastrous story is being enacted, and the sundry messengers, guards, attendants, and choruses who observe and respond to them, reflects, not only the imaginary and long-superseded conditions of heroic bronze-age myth, but also (in exaggerated and distorted form) the social realities of contemporary Athens.¹¹

Tensions of other kinds too permeated Athenian culture, in this period of rapid change and unprecedented diversity. Within one and the same community could be found, on the one hand, a small but prominent number of well-educated – and often sceptical and unconventional – teachers, performers, artists, and writers (ethnographers, scientists, historians, sophists, playwrights) who were raising questions about the gods, the cosmos, the origins of civilization and morality, and the nature and purpose of myth and fiction;¹² on the other, thousands (esp. the rural poor, who still probably comprised a majority of the Athenian population) who adhered staunchly to traditional religious belief and cult practice, continued to take Homer, Hesiod and the old myths pretty much at face value, and

⁹ Sinclair 1988: 14–23, 188–96, Ober 1989: 192–247, 279–92, Maitland 1992, G. Herman, *Ritualized friendship and the Greek city* (Cambridge 1987).

¹⁰ Cf. 295–303, 670–111n., Knox 1957: 53–106. The Athenian campaign against Samos on which S. served as *stratēgos* was in fact an operation designed to restore democratic, pro-Athenian rule in that island, after an attempted secession by oligarchs on the island.

¹¹ See further Vernant & Vidal-Naquet 1981: 29–48, 237–47, Rohdich 1980, Easterling 1984, Seaford 1994, Griffith 1995; and below, pp. 54–8.

¹² Knox 1957: 107–58, Long 1968: 7–9, Guthrie 1971: 14–26, 55–134, G. B. Kerferd, *The sophistic movement* (Cambridge 1981), Goldhill 1986: 222–43, Rose 1992: 266–78.

viewed with intense suspicion or contempt those new-fangled intellectual currents.

This was the context, then, in which the annual dramatic competitions took place in the Theatre of Dionysos. The festival of which they formed a part lasted several days,¹³ and was attended by hundreds of non-Athenian visitors in addition to thousands of residents of Attika itself. They were treated to spectacular processions and displays of Athenian wealth and power, as well as to the numerous dithyrambs, tragedies, satyr-plays, and comedies. The expenses of each production were borne by an individual *chorēgos* (one of the wealthier citizens, to whom the city assigned such *liturgies* as a kind of taxation).¹⁴ Both playwright and *chorēgos* stood to win considerable prestige from a victory in the dramatic competition, which represented the cultural pinnacle of the Athenian year.

The plays were thus both public ceremonies organized by the city for the benefit of the population at large, and performances designed by members of the city's elite to win themselves individual distinction through the demonstration of liberality, taste and skill. Given such a range of purposes and festival spirits, we may imagine that S. could count on his audience's coming to the political, moral, and religious issues that are raised in his play from a wide range of prior assumptions, beliefs, and expectations.

2. THE STORY OF *ANTIGONE*

The Theban saga of the Labdakids, of Laios and Iokaste, Oidipous and his sons, the Seven against Thebes, and the Sons of the Seven (*Epigonoi*), was one of the best known and most frequently handled of all in Greek literary and iconographic tradition.¹⁵ Although, like any

¹³ For a full account of the proceedings see Pickard-Cambridge 1988: 57–101, Goldhill 1990, Csapo & Slater 1995: 103–21, 139–65.

¹⁴ By the fourth century, the three actors were paid by the city; but it is possible that in the mid-fifth century the *chorēgos* paid them; see Pickard-Cambridge 1988: 87–90, 93–6.

¹⁵ E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder* (Leipzig 1891), Robert 1915, A. L. Edmunds, *HSCP* 85 (1981) 221–38, H. Petersmann, *WS* 12 (1978) 67–96, Mas-tronarde 1994: 17–30, *LIMC s.vv.* 'Eteokles', 'Ismene', 'Kapaneus', 'Oedipus', 'Septem', Zimmermann 1993.

myth, it was known in countless different, often contradictory, versions, it is possible to sketch at least the broad outlines of the story presupposed by S. as being already familiar to his Athenian audience.

Oidipous unknowingly kills his father, Laios (son of Labdakos), and marries his mother, Iokaste (daughter of Menoikeus and sister of Kreon).¹⁶ Upon discovery of the truth, Iokaste commits suicide;¹⁷ Oidipous blinds himself, and eventually dies too, after either wandering in exile, or moping around Thebes for several years.¹⁸ At some point, Oidipous curses his two sons, Eteokles and Polyneikes, who end up quarrelling over the kingdom. Their attempt at a compromise is soon violated by one or both of them:¹⁹ Pol., who has married Argeia, daughter of the Argive king Adrastos, then leads an Argive army against Thebes, to claim the throne for himself. In a battle at the seven gates, Eteokles' Thebans defeat Pol. and his six Argive champions (including the impious Kapaneus, cf. 110–16, 127–33nn.); and the two brothers kill each other, in accordance with their father's curse. A young son of Kreon also dies before or during the battle, as a kind of sacrificial victim guaranteeing safety to Thebes.²⁰ In the next phase (the point at which S.'s *Antigone* begins), with Laios'

¹⁶ In epic, Oidipous' mother's name is given as Epikaste, or Euryganeia, or Euryanassa. In *Ant.* she is not named; cf. 53–4, 911.

¹⁷ Not so in E. *Pho.*, perhaps a Euripidean innovation: see Mastronarde 1994: 25–6 (and cf. 53–4n.).

¹⁸ From *Ant.* 49–54, 900–3, we get the impression that he died in Thebes (cf. 53–4n.). The motif of Oidipous' self-blinding (*Ant.* 51–2) is first found at A. *Th.* 782–5 (though the reading is disputed); but it was probably older (Mastronarde 1994: 22–3).

¹⁹ In E. *Pho.*, the arrangement was that the brothers would alternate as ruler of Thebes; but in an earlier version Eteokles was to rule while Pol. took most of the ancestral possessions (including the necklace of Harmonia, cf. 130n.) and went to live in Argos (cf. Mastronarde 1994: 26–8). Blame for the breakdown of the agreement is variously assigned: in *Ant.*, Kreon blames Pol. for attacking Thebes (198–202, 280–9, 514–20), and he is not contradicted (cf. 111n.).

²⁰ The son's name varies: either Menoikeus or Megareus (cf. 1302–3n., E. *Pho.* 930–1018, and Mastronarde 1994: 28–30). For Haimon's role in the epic *Oidipodeia*, see below p. 9. Kreon, a descendant of one of the original 'Sown Men' (Σπαρτοί) of Thebes, is normally represented in tragedy as Iokaste's brother; it is not known what role he may have had in earlier versions. (His name means 'Ruler'.)

direct male heirs all dead, Kreon takes over as ruler of Thebes. He at first refuses to allow Adrastos and the Argives to recover their dead for burial, but is eventually persuaded or compelled (in most versions, through the intervention of Theseus and an Athenian army) to back down and hand them over.²¹ If the story is continued further, the Sons of the Seven (*Epigonoï*) eventually return to capture Thebes and destroy the city.

Of the pre-Sophoklean literary versions of this saga, the most influential were the epic cycle of *Thebais*, *Oidipodeia*, and *Epigonoï*, ascribed to 'Homer' or 'Arktinos', and rivalling the Trojan cycle in popularity. But various segments of the saga were treated by many other poets too, whose work survives to us only in fragments (as in the cases of Hesiod, Stesichoros, and Ion), or not at all,²² and in due course numerous fifth-century tragedies were also based on this material. Of these, two celebrated tetralogies by Aischylos, the first (from c. 475 BCE?) containing *Nemea*, *Argeioi*, *Eleusinioi*, and *Epigonoï*.²³ the second (from 467) *Laios*, *Oidipous*, *Seven against Thebes*, and (satyric) *Sphinx*, certainly loomed large in the awareness of S. and his Athenian audience.²⁴ It is uncertain whether A. on either occasion presented a version specifically involving denial of burial to Polyneikes: probably not.²⁵ It is true that, in the case of *The Seven against Thebes*,

²¹ In A. *Eleusinioi*, Theseus and Adrastos persuade Kreon to grant burial (*TrGF* III 175 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 29.4); but according to E. *Suppliants*, Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, Isokrates' *Panegyrikos*, etc., the Athenians defeat Kreon and the Thebans in battle (a popular *topos* of Athenian jingoism; cf. T. C. Burgess, *Epideictic literature* (Chicago 1902) 146–50). It is not known if the burial motif occurred in texts earlier than the fifth century; see Zimmermann 1993: 59–77.

²² The scanty remains of the epic *Thebais* can be found in A. Bernabé, ed., *Poetae epici Graeci* I (Leipzig 1988) 17–32 and M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988) 21–7. Other important pretragic texts: Hesiod frs. 192–3 M–W; Stesichoros PLille 76a–c = M. Davies, *PMGF* 222(b); Pindar, *O.* 2.21ff., *N.* 9.18–19, *O.* 6.15ff., Ion, *PMG* 740 (see p. 10 below). For visual representations, see Robert 1915, *LIMC* (above, n. 15).

²³ The order and content of these four plays are far from certain; see S. Radt in *TrGF* III s.vv., Zimmermann 1993: 81–7, T. Gantz, *AJP* 101 (1980) 158–9.

²⁴ H. C. Baldry, *G&R* 3 (1956) 24–37, Else 1976, Davidson 1983.

²⁵ A verse quoted by Didymos from the *Eleusinioi* refers to a singular 'corpse' (fr. 53a Radt $\nu\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\varsigma$, cf. 409–12n.); if this refers to Pol., and if we fol-

our MSS contain a final scene in which a herald announces over the corpses of the two brothers that 'the Councillors of the people' (1006 δῆμου προβούλοις) have forbidden burial for Pol.; whereupon 'Antigone' asserts that she will disobey the edict and bury him, and the play ends with the Chorus of Theban women dividing into two groups, one going off to lament Eteokles, the other to join Ant. in burying Pol. However, most modern scholars have concluded that this scene was not composed by A. at all, but added onto his play after S.'s *Ant.* was already established as the classic treatment.²⁶ It is probable that the announcement of the arriving characters 'Antigone' and 'Ismene' at A. *Th.* 861–74 is likewise an interpolation, and that neither sister appeared in A.'s original play.²⁷ In that case, like E. *Pho.* (and E.'s lost *Antigone*),²⁸ and like S.'s own *OT* and *OC* (and lost *Epigonoï* and *Eriphyle*),²⁹ this scene is of interest for us here only as evidence for the 'reception' of our play, not for pre-Sophoklean treatments of the myth.

Even apart from this final scene, however, *Seven against Thebes* clearly exercised a strong influence on S.,³⁰ esp. in the representation of the Argive attack (100–61), of the catastrophes piling up over the family of Laios (49–57, 582–625, 857–71), and of the divine anger that may lie behind them. Yet we should beware of dwelling too

low M. Schmidt in reading *Argeia* (= Pol.'s wife, daughter of Adrastos) rather than *Argeioi* or *Argeiai* as the title of the accompanying play, then his career throughout the trilogy appears rather prominent. But there is not much to go on here, and the rest of our evidence for the play focuses on the collective Argive dead, as in E. *Suppliants* (cf. 1080–3n.); cf. Zimmermann 1993: 81–7.

²⁶ On the authenticity of this scene, see (*pro*) H. Lloyd-Jones, *CQ* 9 (1959) 80–115, P. S. Mellon, *The ending of A.'s Seven* (Ann Arbor 1974), and (*contra*) E. Fraenkel, *MH* 21 (1964) 58–64, R. D. Dawe, *CQ* 17 (1967) 16–28; further refs. in Zimmermann 1993: 99–111.

²⁷ The lines assigned to them in the *kommos* (961–74) could be sung by a divided chorus. There is no mention elsewhere in the play of any sisters.

²⁸ Zimmermann 1993: 161–88; the play was probably composed late in E.'s career.

²⁹ *TrGF* III F185–90, F201a–h.

³⁰ Else 1976, Davidson 1983, Garner 1990: 80–1. We know from other sources that *Seven* was one of Aisch.'s most popular and influential plays in the fifth century (Ar. *Frogs* 1021, A. Wartelle, *Histoire du texte d'Eschyle dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1971) 71–6).

insistently on possible allusions to those few texts that happen to survive to us, when so much else is lost that may have been equally familiar and significant.³¹

In any case, in composing *Ant.* S. appears to have made substantial innovations of his own to both action and characters, to the point that in some respects the myth is virtually reinvented: (i) the issue of the Argive dead is suppressed,³² with the focus shifting instead onto the burial of Pol. and (ii) the condemnation and suicide of Ant.; (iii) Kreon's son is betrothed to Ant.; (iv) Kreon's wife is introduced into the story; (v) Ismene is made into a significant factor, as companion and foil to Ant.; (vi) the gods are assigned a crucial and distinctive role. Each of these innovations brings with it significant dramatic consequences.

(i) Instead of a dispute between Thebes and Athens (and/or Argos) over the return of enemy soldiers' bodies, the conflict between Kreon and Ant. over the proper treatment of Pol.'s corpse is internal to Thebes, and to the royal family (since Kreon is Pol.'s uncle). Thus another chapter is added to the miseries of this blighted house, and the rights and wrongs of Kreon's conduct become much muddier (see below, pp. 28–34).

(ii) The main opponent of Kreon's edict is now Pol.'s sister (who is thus structurally equivalent to Adrastus and/or Theseus in the traditional myth). So, while the final outcome (Kreon's humiliation) remains the same, the dynamics of the confrontation are transformed, as he is challenged, not by a warrior-king backed by an army, but by his own young niece, then his son, and finally a blind prophet. Gender, youthful desire, parental authority, and the mysterious will of hidden gods are thus made into key issues, while the lonely immure-

³¹ So, for example, the version of Pherekydes of Athens (*FGrHist* III F95, probably a generation earlier than S.'s *Ant.*), has a very different story-line: the two incestuous sons of O. and Iokaste (here named Phrastor and Laonytos) are killed; only later does O. marry Euryganeia, who bears Ant., Ismene, Pol., and Eteokles; Ismene is killed by Tydeus 'at a fountain' (and presumably the sons kill one another too, along with the Seven); then O. takes a third wife, Astymedousa. See further Zimmermann 1993: 89–96, and p. 10 below for the version of Ion of Chios.

³² It may perhaps surface briefly at *Ant.* 1080–3 (see n., and cf. 9–10n.).

ment and death of Ant. add further layers of pathos and lead directly to Kreon's personal ruin.

(iii) In the epic *Oidipodeia*, Haimon, who is described as κάλλιστόν τε καὶ ἰμεροέστατον ἄλλων | παῖδα φίλον Κρείοντος ἀμύμονος ('finer and lovelier than all others, the dear son of noble Kreon') becomes a victim of the Sphinx at an early stage in the story (fr. 2 = schol. E. *Pho.* 1760, cf. Apollod. 3.5.8), and Kreon's other son dies during the battle against the Seven Argives (cf. 1302–3n.). In S. *Ant.*, we do not hear about any children of Kreon until shortly before Haimon's arrival, when Ismene mentions his impending marriage to Ant. (568);³³ then he is greeted as the 'youngest' and 'last' of Kreon's children (626; cf. 1302–3n.), and he provides the crucial link between the fates of Ant. and Kreon, for it is his passionate rage and suicide that deal his father the most crushing blow of all.

(iv) Kreon's wife, Eurydike, like his son, is not mentioned until it is time for her to appear on stage (1180–1256n.), and she has probably been invented for this play. Her role is entirely that of victim, as she arrives only to learn of her son's death, and immediately departs to commit suicide herself, thus capping Kreon's series of calamities.

(v) In the extant remains of the Theban epics, small interest seems to be shown in Oidipous' daughters;³⁴ and although an 'Ismene' shows up occasionally in various versions of the saga before *Ant.* (sometimes in contexts quite unconnected to Oidipous' family),³⁵

³³ Perhaps the tradition of Ismene's fatal love affair (below, n. 35) suggested this theme to S. In E. *Pho.*, this new tradition of betrothal between Ant. and Haimon is maintained (*Pho.* 757–60, 944–6), and a younger brother, Menoikeus, is added who can die for Thebes (Mastronarde 1994: 28–9). In E.'s (lost) *Antigone*, Haimon and Ant. marry and even have a son of their own, Maion (*hypoth.* S. *Ant.* 1.6–8).

³⁴ Zimmermann 1993: 59–68.

³⁵ The name proclaims her indigenous significance: in addition to the River Ismenos (104n.), Thebes boasted a hill, a village, and a cult title of Apollo of this name. See E. Bethe, *RE* IX 2 (1916) 2135–6 s.v. 'Ismene', Zimmermann 1993: 68–70, I. Krauskopf, *LIMC* V 1 (1990) 796–9. (It is possible that a rough breathing, Ἴσμη-, was preferred in fifth-century Attic: see Mastronarde 1994 on E. *Pho.* 101.) According to the seventh-century elegist Mimnermos (fr. 21 West), 'Ismene was intimate (προσομιλοῦσαν) with Theoklymenos, and was killed by [the Argive champion] Tydeus on the command of Athena.'

there are only minimal traces of 'Antigone'.³⁶ One possible precedent to S.'s version of the two devoted sisters may have existed in a dithyramb by Ion of Chios (a contemporary and friend of S.), in which 'both Ismene and Ant. were burnt to death in the temple of Hera, by Eteokles' son Laomadas' (presumably because the sisters had shown support for Pol.).³⁷ But the inclusion of this timid and 'normal' sister to serve as a foil to the abnormally bold and intransigent heroine – and to some degree as a channel for the audience's own responses (61–2, 98–9, 526–81nn.) – is likely to have been S.'s own idea.

(vi) Distinctively Sophoklean too, and obviously crucial, is the part played by the gods, an aspect of the drama in which any playwright usually enjoys much latitude. In S.'s play, the theme of divine anger at the refusal of burial to Pol. and at the unnatural 'burying' alive of Ant., looms insistently throughout the final scenes, esp. in the words of Teiresias; and, given the prophet's enormous authority and the 'objective' evidence of the failed sacrifices and polluted altars (99–1022, 1080–6), together with the repeated references to the gods' concern by Ant. and the Chorus earlier in the play (77, 450–70, 519–21, 542, 838–70, 891–4, 921–8; 278–9, 368–75, 582–625), we must regard this divine intervention as a dramatic 'fact', i.e. as an integral part of the causal chain leading to the denouement.³⁸

³⁶ Ant.'s function in *OC* as guide to the blind Oidipous in his wandering exile may or may not have had an Archaic precedent; cf. Zimmermann 1993: 190, 196–7. Pausanias (second century CE) mentions a local Theban legend in which Ant. dragged the body of Pol. and placed it on the funeral pyre of Eteokles (9.25.2, cf. 9.18.3); but this, like Apollodoros' account (3.7.1) that 'Ant. secretly stole the corpse of Pol. and buried it; and after being caught by Kreon, she was buried alive in the grave', is probably derived from S.'s play (though Petersmann argues that these reflect pre-Sophoklean traditions). Ant.'s name, but nothing more, is found in Pherekydes (see above, n. 31). As a name, 'Ἀντιγόνη' ('In return for birth', or 'Instead of a parent' or 'Instead of procreation?') is rare (though the masculine 'Ἀντιγόνοσ' becomes popular in the Hellenistic period); it was presumably invented to fit her mythical role.

³⁷ Salloustios, quoted in *hypoth.* 2.2–4 (= Ion, *PMG* 740). Perhaps Kreon's tendency in *Ant.* to treat the sisters as a like-minded pair may reflect this, or an earlier, tradition (488–9n., Zimmermann 1993: 94–5, 118).

³⁸ That is not to say that every account of the gods' attitude or Zeus's law (e.g. Ant.'s at 450–70, or Kreon's at 282–9, 514–22, or the Chorus' at 278–9,

There are of course many other areas in which S. must have followed his own creative imagination in shaping the 'plot' (μῦθος) or 'action' (πρᾶξις) or 'arrangement of the events' (σύστασις τῶν πραγμάτων),³⁹ without having to concern himself unduly with previous versions. The inclusion of Teiresias (who is almost a fixture in the Theban saga), and of such minor characters as a Guard, and a Messenger,⁴⁰ is in some respects highly conventional; yet in each case S. has made distinctive and effective use of them (223–331, 315–31, 327–31, 988–1114, 1064–90, 1192–1243nn.).

An especially crucial choice for the playwright, in determining mood, dynamics, and point(s) of view, is that of the identity and character of the Chorus.⁴¹ In this case, by making them elderly Theban citizens, who are by gender, age, status, and experience much closer to Kreon than to Ant., S. has isolated his heroine to an unusual degree,⁴² and has also provided a subtly distorting filter or lens for the audience's reception of the stage action. For, while the Elders to some degree resemble the majority of the theatre audience (adult male citizens, watching the action unfold ...), and their attempts to explore and explain the action soar at times to dazzling sublimity of lyric description and speculation, none the less, as the play proceeds, we quickly come to recognize the limitations and misapprehensions in their vision and understanding (211–14, 278–9, 332–75, 582–625nn.). The uncertainties and indeterminacy that this realization brings are, it can be said, essential components in the 'story' as S. presents it, and will keep us thinking and wondering

594–614) is guaranteed as being perfectly 'correct' and identical to the view that S. holds or wishes us to hold. See further pp. 46–8 below. (On the question, whether the gods should be thought to have performed, or assisted at, the 'first burial' of Pol., see 278–9n.)

³⁹ For Aristotle's use of these terms in the *Poetics*, and their relation to modern narratological theories of 'plot,' see E. Downing, *CA* 3 (1984) 164–78.

⁴⁰ Our MSS present us with two different Messengers; but only one is required (1278–1316n.).

⁴¹ On S.'s choruses in general, see Kirkwood 1958: 181–214, Burton 1980, Gardiner 1987, Scott 1996: 1–7, 27–30; on *Ant.* in particular, see esp. Coleman 1972, Segal 1964 and 1981: 152–7, 197–200, W-Ingram 1980: 91–116, Ditmars 1992.

⁴² In the other six extant plays of S., the chorus is of the same gender as the main suffering hero(ine); the same is usually true in E.

throughout about what to believe and what to doubt, where to place our sympathies, what to expect next, and how to explain it after it happens. And, since the Chorus' role becomes increasingly prominent, and even decisive, in the final scenes, our assessment of their character and capabilities proves to be crucial to the overall interpretation of the play.⁴³

3. STRUCTURE, DRAMATIC TECHNIQUE, STYLE

The basic structure of a Greek tragedy is one of actors' dialogue scenes alternating with choral songs.⁴⁴ (Our extant tragedies normally contain four or five full-scale choral songs; *Ant.* has six.) Within this simple overall structure, many variations are possible, so that no two tragedies follow exactly the same pattern. So, for example, the choral songs can vary greatly in number of responding ('strophic') pairs⁴⁵ and in metrical (= also choreographical) character. Likewise,

⁴³ See 1091–1114, 1257–1353, 1326–53nn., and below, pp. 55–8. Yet some critics have argued that the Chorus of *Ant.* is largely irrelevant to the interpretation of the play; e.g., B. Alexanderson, *Eranos* 66 (1966) 85–105, Vickers 1974, Heath 1987.

⁴⁴ For discussion of this basic structure, see K. Aichele, in Jens 1971: 48–58, Taplin 1977: 49–60. However, a more technical terminology has long been conventional (based largely on Aristotle, *Poetics* ch. 12): *prologos* = the part of the play preceding the entry of the chorus, usually two scenes (sometimes three, rarely one, as *Ant.* 1–99); *parodos* = 'entrance-song' of the chorus; *stasimon* = strophic choral song other than the *parodos*; *epeisodion* ('episode') = the part between one choral song and the next; *exodos* = the scene(s) following the last *stasimon*. For those who prefer these terms, I have included them along with the 'Scene/Song' headings. During the fourth century the structure of five Acts (μέρη, 'parts') divided by four choral interludes became standard, whence it persisted (via Horace, *Art of Poetry* 189–90) into Senecan, Elizabethan and Neo-Classical drama.

⁴⁵ In employing a series of such strophic pairs, with changing metrical components (aa bb cc, etc.), rather than repeated 'triadic' structure (aab, aab . . .) or recurrent stanzas of the same type (aaa . . .), the choral lyrics of Attic drama are distinctively different from all other Greek choral poetry (as they are also in admitting only the faintest tinge of Doric dialect, i.e. in the sporadic use of α for η). Triadic structure is occasionally employed in tragedy, as the final element in a series of antistrophic stanzas: so *Ant.* 801–82 (876–82 = epode, see n. on *Metre*). In the later fifth century, astrophic choral lyrics become increasingly common (esp. in E.); but there are none in *Ant.*

dialogue scenes usually switch back and forth between *rhēsis* (extended speech by individual actors, e.g. *Ant.* 162–210; or pairs of actors in an *agōn*, as at 450–96, 639–723), *stichomythia* (line-for-line conversation, or occasionally two-line *distichomythia*, as at 78–87, 536–47), and irregular, less stylized, dialogue between two or three speakers (e.g. 237–48, 441–9, 758–80, 1091–1114).⁴⁶ Thus, even within the highly economical and stylized formal conventions, the pace and dynamics can be subtly and powerfully modulated.⁴⁷

Although lyric is primarily the province of the Chorus, spoken iambic trimeters that of the actors, there are many opportunities for cross-over,⁴⁸ even apart from the convention whereby the *koryphaios* ('head-man' of the Chorus) regularly speaks trimeters in dialogue scenes with actors. As a bridge between full lyric and full iambic dialogue, and also to announce the arrival or departure of individual characters, recitative anapaests from the chorus (probably chanted, not sung) are regularly employed (155–62, 376–83, 526–30, 626–30, 1257–60nn.);⁴⁹ and at 939–43 a short dialogue in anapaests occurs, as the action, which has been 'frozen' during *Ant.*'s final *rhēsis* (891–928n.), picks up speed again and *Ant.* is led off for execution (929–43n.). Two of the emotional highpoints of the play occur in passages of lyric *amoibaion* ('exchange') between actor and Chorus: the first is *Ant.*'s wrenching *kommos* (quasi-ritual lament) at 801–82, with the Chorus at first responding to her lyric complaints with anapaests (802–38), then, as their distress increases, joining in with their own lyrics (853–5 = 872–5n.; cf. *A. Ag.* 1072–1177, 1406–1576; *E. Hipp.*

⁴⁶ All the dialogue in *Ant.* takes place in iambic trimeters; no use is made of trochaic tetrameters, which S. (like E.) employs more in his later plays.

⁴⁷ It is disappointing therefore to find these dynamics frequently ignored in translations and stage productions of Greek tragedy, with the whole script reduced to a formless monotone.

⁴⁸ This is increasingly so as the fifth century proceeds. *Ant.* however does not contain any short exclamatory lyrics from an actor, or extended monody, as do (e.g.) *El.*, *Ph.*, and *OC*; an indication of relatively early date (see n. 7, above).

⁴⁹ For an analysis of the contexts and functions for which anapaests are used in tragedy, see S. G. Brown, in J. H. D'Arms & J. W. Eadie, eds., *Ancient and modern: essays . . . G. F. Else* (Ann Arbor 1977) 45–77, who points out that no other play employs anapaests quite so regularly as *Ant.* to announce the arrival of characters; see too Scott 1996: 34–5.

811–884); the second is Kreon's *kommos* (1261–1346), in which the Chorus continue to use iambic trimeters throughout, in a calmer counterpoint to his lyric laments.

Analysed in these purely formal terms, the basic structure of *Ant.* is as follows:

Opening Scene (*prologos*) 1–99

dialogue-scene, Ant. & Ismene.

First Choral Song (*parodos*) 100–61 (ἄκτις ἀελίου ...)

two antistrophic pairs of stanzas, alternating with anapaests.

Second Scene (First *epeisodion*) 162–331

(i) dialogue: Kreon & Chorus (162–222 (inc. *rhēsis* 162–210));

(ii) dialogue: Guard & Kreon (223–331 (inc. messenger-*rhēsis*, 249–77)).

Second Choral Song (First *stasimon*) 332–75 (πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ ...)

two antistrophic pairs of stanzas.

Third Scene (Second *epeisodion*) 376–581

(i) dialogue: Guard, Kreon, Ant. (376–445 (inc. messenger-*rhēsis*, 407–40));

(ii) dialogue: Kreon & Ant. (446–525 (*agōn* 450–96; *stichomythia*, 508–25));

(iii) Choral anapaests, announcing Ismene's arrival (526–30);

(iv) dialogue: Ismene, Ant., Kreon (531–81 (*stichomythia* 537–76)).

Third Choral Song (Second *stasimon*) 582–625 (εὐδαίμονες οἷσι κακῶν ...)

two antistrophic pairs of stanzas.

Fourth Scene (Third *epeisodion*) 626–780

(i) Choral anapaests, announcing Haimon's arrival (626–30);

(ii) dialogue: Kreon, Haimon, Chorus (*agōn* 639–723; *stichomythia* 726–57).

Fourth Choral Song (Third *stasimon*) 781–801 (Ἔρωσ ἀνίκατε μάχαν ...)

one antistrophic pair of stanzas.

Fifth Scene (Fourth *epeisodion*) 802–943

(i) Choral anapaests, announcing Ant.'s entrance (802–5);

(ii) *amoibaion-kommos*: Ant. & Chorus (806–82)

(Ant. = two antistr. pairs + epode; choral responses = first anap., then lyrics)

(iii) dialogue: Kreon & Ant. (883–928);

(iv) anapaestic dialogue: Chorus, Kreon, Ant. (929–43).

Fifth Choral Song (Fourth *stasimon*) 944–87 (ἔτλα καὶ Δανάας...)

two antistrophic pairs of stanzas.

Sixth Scene (Fifth *epeisodion*) 988–1114

(i) dialogue: Teiresias & Kreon (988–1090 (*agōn*, *stichomythia*, *rhēsis*));

(ii) dialogue: Kreon & Chorus (1091–1114).

Sixth Choral Song (Fifth *stasimon*) 1115–54 (πολυώνυμε, Καδμείας ἄγαλμα...)

two antistrophic pairs of stanzas.

Seventh & Final Scene (*exodos*) 1155–1353

(i) dialogue: Messenger & Chorus (1155–1256; & Eurydike 1183–91)

(messenger-*rhēsis* 1192–1243)

(ii) Choral anapaests, announcing Kreon's entrance (1257–60);

(iii) *amoibaion-kommos*: Kreon, Chorus, Messenger (1260–1353);

(iv) Chorus' anapaestic processional (1347–53).

It may sometimes be helpful to think of Attic drama, like Homeric epic, as being composed out of 'type scenes,' whose 'grammar' and dynamics demand proper recognition and appreciation by an experienced audience. The formalities of greeting and silence, arrival and departure, question and answer, insult and threat, would be second nature to both playwright and audience; and the technical artistry of each messenger-narrative and argument-*stichomythia*, each imagistic choral song and confrontational *agōn*, is a significant component of the sum of dramatic effects upon which the play's success depends.⁵⁰ That is to say, this play, like all of S.'s, owes as

⁵⁰ See in particular J. Duchemin, *L'agon dans la tragédie grecque* (Paris 1945), Jens 1971, J. Keller, *Struktur und dramatische Funktion des Botenberichtes bei Aischylos und Sophokles* (diss. Tübingen 1959), L. Di Gregorio, *Le scene d'annuncio nella tragedia greca* (Milan 1967), Taplin 1977, Hamilton 1978, Mastrorarde 1979, Bain 1981, M. Kaimio, *Physical contact in Greek tragedy* (Helsinki 1988), Heath 1987: 124–64.

much to the brilliance of its individual scenes as to the cohesion and dramatic economy of its whole plot-structure.⁵¹

Ant. is highly concentrated, both temporally and in terms of theme and causation. The opening scene and first Song present the battle and the death of the brothers as having occurred the previous day (1–99n.); and somehow, during the span of the play (i.e. apparently just a few hours)⁵² the edict is published, one brother is buried with full honours, the other twice ‘buried’ by *Ant.*, *Ant.* is captured, *Pol.*’s body rots and befouls the animals and altars for miles around, *Ant.* is entombed, and commits suicide. Then, as *Kreon* at last realizes what he has done, and what needs to be undone, he rushes off, shouting out orders, while the Chorus launch into a hymn of hope – all for nothing, for *Kreon* arrives at the tomb just as *Haimon* finds his fiancée dead, and has to witness his son’s suicide with his own eyes. The unnatural speed and neatness of this sequence of events, though obvious when analysed thus at leisure, works unobtrusively and effectively in the theatre: for it does not depend on improbable coincidences or arbitrary interventions, but merely the removal of (or disregard for) ‘dead’ time and cluttering details.⁵³ *Ant.* may not compare with *OT* or *E. Hippolytos* for the ostentatious precision of its ironies and steel-trap construction (partly because it contains fewer explicit predictions within the play), but its dramatic economy is none the less masterful and compelling.⁵⁴

The play is constructed so as to build towards three climactic confrontations: the first between *Kreon* and *Ant.* (441–525), the second

⁵¹ The notion that *S.* was only interested in the former, and routinely sacrificed consistency of characterization and plot in order to provide exciting individual scenes (e.g., Wilamowitz 1917, Waldock 1951), finds few supporters these days. See also below, pp. 34–8. On the aesthetic satisfaction provided by the play’s formal organization, see below, pp. 26–8, and pp. 58–66.

⁵² Cf. Aristot. *Poetics* 5 1449b12–15, Taplin 1977: 290–4.

⁵³ Alfred Hitchcock once remarked that ‘Art is life with the dull bits left out’; cf. Aristot. *Poet.* 9 1451a36–b11.

⁵⁴ The ironies and mechanical precision of the plot are more pronounced in Anouilh’s version, as his Chorus remarks: ‘The spring is wound up tight. It will uncoil of itself. That is what is so convenient in tragedy. The least little turn of the wrist will do the job. Anything will set it going . . . Tragedy is clean, it is restful, it is flawless . . . nothing is in doubt and everyone’s destiny is known’ (Anouilh 1944/1958: 23).

between Kreon and Haimon (631–765), and the third between Kreon and Teiresias (988–1090). These three scenes, each containing a furious stichomythic exchange (508–25, 726–65, 1048–63 with nn.), represent the peaks of dramatic conflict, the points at which the tensions are stretched tightest and the stage ‘action’ and bodily energy display themselves most forcefully to the eyes and ears of the audience. The first two of these confrontations result in impasse and hardened resolve on both sides, but the third brings about the play’s sudden reversal of direction, as Kreon acknowledges his mistakes and rushes off to try to repair the damage (1091–1114). In the two *kommoi*, by contrast (806–82, 1257–1353), the action is slowed down almost to a standstill, as the fuller resources and registers of lyric are employed to explore the emotional abyss into which the two main characters are plunged; and a similar effect is achieved in Ant.’s final *rh̄sis* (891–928). Building up and accelerating towards the moments of climax and reversal, and serving to set the scene for the tableaux of misery and self-reflection represented in the *kommoi*, are the four long ‘messenger-speeches’,⁵⁵ in which the decisive off-stage events are presented. All four are narrative *tours de force*, packed with vivid description, skilfully paced, and subtly coloured by the perspectives of the particular speaker: the self-concerned Guard (223–331, 249–77, 407–40nn.), the numinously raging prophet (988–1114n.), and the shocked, empathetic servant (1192–1243n.).

In the choral Songs, the Elders’ reflective lyrics provide contrasts in perspective and tone from the passages of confrontation and pathos that precede them. It is not so much that the tension is relaxed (for the Chorus are still for the most part anxious and uncertain — except when they are indulging for a moment their more naïve hopes for salvation, 100–61, 1115–54nn.); rather, because the Elders are less involved in the personal animosities of the preceding scene than the main characters, they are permitted (in part, just by reason of their conventional choral ‘melic voice’) to view the issues and possibilities with greater distance and speculative licence. Several of the odes of *Ant.* are based on traditional song-types that bring with

⁵⁵ Although only 1192–1243 is delivered by a ‘Messenger’, the two narratives by the Guard (249–77, 407–40) and Teiresias’ description at 998–1032 may be regarded as belonging to this sub-genre; see nn. *ad locc.*

them their own generic requirements of form and expression, notably those of prayer and hymns of thanks (100–61, 781–800, 1115–52nn.). In other cases, they are more free-wheeling and speculative, tied less tightly to any particular formula (332–75, 582–625nn.), or boldly allusive and elliptical in choice of mythical examples (944–87n.).

In general, S.'s lyric manner is not quite as boldly metaphorical and colourful as A.'s, nor as syntactically bizarre (though on occasion, e.g., 365–75, 594–603, 966–76, it can become quite convoluted). Yet the Songs of *Ant.* contrive to be constantly off-centre and unsettling, multi-layered and open-ended – much more so than E.'s, for example.⁵⁶ If it is characteristic of lyric poetry in general to be dense and ambiguous, these odes must be counted among the most opaque – as well as the most adventurous – in all of Greek tragedy. Indeed, so rich and suggestive are they in their language, and so far-ranging and abstract in their subject matter, that it is often difficult to extract from them a particular opinion or definite interpretation.⁵⁷ Sometimes two distinct layers of signification present themselves, with one 'surface' meaning that is clearly primary (i.e. what the Chorus 'mean' to say), while a secondary level of signification suggests ironically, or subversively, something further that we are undoubtedly expected to notice, though the Chorus do not 'intend' it (332–75, 781–800nn.). In other cases, it may be a mistake to single out any one interpretation as 'primary,' and we might do better to recognize the multiplicity of significations as itself constituting the 'meaning' of the passage in question (582–625, 944–87nn.).

Within the dialogue, too, the Elders perform an important role, as voices of stodgy and conventional civic normality: their consistent, if sometimes half-hearted (211–14, 504–5, 872–4nn.) expressions of support of Kreon, and strong disapproval tinged with pity for Ant.

⁵⁶ On the style of S.'s choral lyrics, see H. Parry, *The lyric poems of Greek tragedy* (Toronto 1978) 53–6, 119–25, Segal 1964, Coleman 1972, W-Ingram 1980: 91–116; also W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart 1934), esp. 53–131, 186–96.

⁵⁷ See esp. Segal 1964, Coleman 1972, Easterling 1978, W-Ingram 1980: 91–116, Nussbaum 1986: 68–78, Oudemans & Lardinois 1987: 118–59. The metrical character of their lyrics, however, is unusually homogeneous (Ditmars 1992, Scott 1996: 28; and see nn. on *Metre*).

and Haimon (471–2, 801–5, 875; 627–30, 766–7nn.), help to direct and articulate the audience's own ambivalent responses, or sometimes to crystallize them into sharper disagreement and ironical questioning. In general, it may be said that this Chorus is remarkable for its combination of obtuseness and insight, its ability to miss the nearest target completely – and thereby score a bull's-eye on another target they are not even aiming at;⁵⁸ and much in our interpretation of the play may hinge on our response to their shifting point of view and our assessment of their value as commentators and assistants to the action.⁵⁹

As for the verbal and rhetorical 'style' (λέξις, διάθεσις) of the play: this is discussed constantly in the commentary, and it would be futile to try to describe it in detail here. But a few generalities may be helpful.⁶⁰ The formal 'literary dialect' (*Kunstsprache*) of tragic dialogue drew widely, esp. from epic, the iambic tradition, and contemporary Ionic–Attic prose, and thus provided a distinctive amalgam of styles, at once highly artificial and yet capable of quick, almost conversational, directness.⁶¹ Of the three extant tragedians, S.'s language is the most flexible and richly varied. At times his trimeters approach

⁵⁸ They 'speak profoundly but thoughtlessly . . . They say everything in one way or another that has to be said about *Ant.* . . . but they never understand anything of what they say. . . They thus allow S. to be always invisible while being always present', Benardete 1975: 166–7.

⁵⁹ Thus on the one hand, e.g. Coleman 1972 finds the choral odes full of 'helpless bewilderment and dark despair . . .', and 'the closing eulogy of τὸ φρονεῖν hollow and meaningless' (27), while others read the chorus ironically throughout, as perpetually misunderstanding the true state of affairs (e.g., Benardete 1975, Müller *passim*, and *Hermes* 89 (1961) 398–422), or as being too afraid of Kreon ever to say what they really think (211–14, 504–5, 872–4nn.). On the other hand, e.g., Rohdich 1980 sees the Chorus as representing the increasingly reassuring voice of the citizens, recovering the *polis* from the excesses of its leaders. See further below, pp. 56–8.

⁶⁰ See further esp. Campbell 1879: 1 1–107, Bruhn 1899, Earp 1944, Goheen 1951, Long 1968, Webster 1969: 143–62, Lesky 1972: 187–91, Kitzinger 1976, Moorhouse 1982, Coray 1993, Foley 1996, and W. B. Stanford's ed. of *S. Ajax*.

⁶¹ In this respect Greek tragedy could be said to lie midway between the extreme fluctuations of Elizabethan English tragedy (Marlowe, Shakespeare, Webster) – which even contains passages of the 'lowest' prose – and the sustained elevation of Racine and Corneille.

the 'elevation' of A.'s, with long, sonorous compounds and elaborate word-plays and images (e.g. 1-6, 49-57, 1064-90 with n.); but elsewhere his characters' language is plainer, the manner simpler (e.g. 69-77, 327-31, 1108-14). Such variations, together with modifications in rhetorical strategy and manner, can contribute substantially to the characterization of individual speakers, and to the pacing and mood of particular scenes. Thus the sisters' disagreement in the opening scene is cast into sharper relief by the contrast between Ismene's measured periods and ornate diction, and Ant.'s simpler language and more staccato speech patterns, full of future assertions and imperatives (49-68, 59-60, 69-77, 69-70nn.). Likewise, Kreon's rigid and controlling temperament is represented throughout by the harsh imagery of his language,⁶² by his constant use of γνῶμαι, and by his disrespectful habit of referring to people in the third person even when they are present (473-96, 561-2, 726-7, 883-90, 931-6) or, when he does address them directly, of doing so in a crudely imperious manner (441-2, 531-5); whereas Ant.'s language is more particular, personal, and direct.⁶³

One further feature remains to be discussed: tragic 'irony'. It was in fact precisely to describe Sophoklean style and technique that this term was first coined and analysed by a modern critic.⁶⁴ Every play of S. contains numerous phrases, and even whole scenes or songs, whose full significance to the theatre audience may be sharply at variance with what the speakers have in mind. The dialogue scenes of *Ant.* present relatively few instances of this, as compared with, e.g., *OT* or *Tr.*, where the *doubles entendres* and misapprehensions come thick and fast, because the main characters of this play are for the most part unusually *aware* of what they are doing and what the consequences are likely to be. (In this respect, the play may be compared with, e.g., S. *OC*, or A. *Prom.*, or E. *Med.*) So too, the only sig-

⁶² Goheen 1951: 14-35, Kitzinger 1976: 157-64; see below (on characterization), pp. 34-8.

⁶³ E. Wolf, *Sentenz und Reflexion bei S.* (Leipzig 1910) 48-53, 126-31, Kitzinger 1976: 143-64, Foley 1996. See further below, pp. 41-2, on the vocabulary of 'knowing' and 'thinking'; also pp. 36-8.

⁶⁴ C. Thirlwall, *On the irony of Sophocles* (*Philol. Mus.* 2, London 1833); G. G. Sedgewick, *Of irony* (Toronto 1948) 18-23, D. C. Muecke, *The compass of irony* (London 1969). See too Kirkwood 1958: 247-87.

nificant prophecy within the play (Teiresias') is already starting to come true even as it is delivered, and thus provides little opportunity for ironic misunderstanding. But, in addition to the multi-layered choral Songs, the play does contain its share of small-scale misinterpretations and unwitting utterances (e.g., concerning the perpetrator of the mysterious burial: 'which *man* dared to do this...?' 248; cf. 221–2n.), chiefly from Kreon and the Chorus. One effect of these recurrent 'tragic ironies' is, as always, to point out the limits of human (or these humans') understanding; another is to instil in the audience the sense of a larger, and inescapable, pattern of events, sharply – even cruelly – at variance with that envisioned by the doomed protagonist and his half-aware advisers, and yet in its own way predictable, and aesthetically (even, for some perhaps, morally or religiously) satisfying.⁶⁵

4. THE PRODUCTION

The first performance of *Ant.* took place one morning in the Theatre of Dionysos, on the south slope of the Acropolis, as part of the Great Dionysia.⁶⁶ The audience in their banked rows of seats look down on a circular (or perhaps rectangular or trapezoidal) dance-floor (ὄρχήστρα),⁶⁷ and behind it a wooden structure (σκηνή), which serves in this play, as in many, to represent the 'house' or royal palace, which is the home of all the main characters in *Ant.*, since Ant. and Ismene are wards of their uncle Kreon (cf. 18–19, 531–5). The large

⁶⁵ 'By virtue of dramatic irony ... the mind of the spectator moves easily forward and backward. It gives him that sense of control which ... is the peculiar pleasure of the stage' (Sedgewick (previous n.) 55; cf. Reinhardt 1979: 73 'the irony of the divine ... [by which] the attitude of the man in power is mocked and his limitations revealed', 91–3 'the irony of.. "too late"'); also Jones 1962: 166–77.

⁶⁶ Pickard-Cambridge 1988, Taplin 1977: 1–60, 434–51. We do not know the titles of the other two tragedies and satyr-play which accompanied that performance; but they must have dealt with quite different subjects, since *OC* is known to belong to a different year, *OT* did not win first prize, and the list of titles of S.'s plays does not contain any other 'Theban' dramas.

⁶⁷ For arguments in favour of a rectangular or trapezoidal *orchestra* at this date, see E. Pohlmann, *Studien zur Bühnendichtung und zum Theaterbau der Antike* (Frankfurt 1995; *contra*, Wiles 1997: 44–52).

central door of this building dominates the stage (18–19, 1183–91nn.), marking the boundary between visible and hidden, public and private space, and thus, to a large degree, between male and female spheres of activity and consciousness (18–19, 1183–91nn.).⁶⁸ The male characters all arrive by the side-entrances (εἴσοδοι), one of which may be imagined as leading to the city-streets, the other to the gates and plain beyond; and they usually depart by these too.⁶⁹ By contrast, the female characters mostly enter and depart by the house-door. The exception is Ant., who boldly heads off alone down one εἴσοδος to bury her brother (80–1n.), and later reappears thence as a captive, a lone woman surrounded by soldiers (376–83n.). In the scene that follows, after bringing Ismene out to be interviewed as well, Kreon makes a point of shutting both the sisters up again indoors before their execution, ‘to be women, and not roaming around free’ (577–81). From this doorway Ant. begins her last journey (807, 878) to the ‘bridal suite’ of Death (813–16, 891–3 etc) – by way of the same path that is later taken in haste by Kreon and his attendants. In the final scenes the door becomes our focus again, as Eurydike first overhears (through the closed door) the Messenger’s news, and then comes out briefly to hear the details of Haimon’s death, only to disappear silently inside again, followed immediately by the anxious Messenger, who is thereby able to narrate the ‘indoors’ scene to us.

Anything that happens ‘off-stage’ (i.e. inside the palace, or in the city streets, or out on the plain and hillsides) has to be narrated to us – as it is in vivid detail by the Guard (twice), by Teiresias, and by the Messenger.⁷⁰ On-stage, we witness the successive confrontations of the characters, coming and going, as Kreon, head of both house-

⁶⁸ See Gould 1980, Easterling 1988, Zeitlin 1996: 341–74; and further J.-P. Vernant, ‘Hestia-Hermes’, in *Myth and thought in ancient Greece* (1965; Eng. tr. London 1983) 127–75, P. Bourdieu, ‘The Kabyle House, or the world reversed’, in *The logic of practice* (1980; Eng. tr. Stanford 1990) 271–83, D. Cohen, *Law, sexuality, and society* (Cambridge 1991), esp. pp. 70–97, 133–70.

⁶⁹ Some commentators have Haimon enter from the palace (e.g. Seale 1982: 96); but 688–700 suggest that he has come from elsewhere in the city.

⁷⁰ It is unclear whether Eurydike’s death indoors is presented by means of the *ekkuklēma*, in addition to the narration of the *kommos*: probably not (1293n.).

hold and city, attempts futilely to 'maintain straight order' by assigning everybody a place and keeping them there (162–210, 162–3, 661–80nn.). Only in the final scene, after Kreon's son is brought in from the distant tomb-prison, and his wife from the nearby bedroom, to form the final tableau, a corpse 'at each hand'⁷¹ (1298–1300, 1344–6), is everybody assembled and put in order. The conventional style of Classical Greek acting probably kept the speaking actors for the most part at some distance from one another, except for clearly marked moments of close contact.⁷² At the opening of *Ant.* the two sisters may well be in close contact, perhaps arm in arm (1–99n.); but thereafter the only physical contact indicated by the text (apart from Teiresias leaning on his young guide, 988–90, 1087) comes with the final tableau of Kreon and his dead son and wife.

S.'s original cast of performers was entirely male: fifteen chorus members, three speaking actors, and a number of silent 'extras'. Masks would immediately identify gender, age, and status of each character, and would facilitate quick changes from one character to another. The most likely distribution of parts would seem to be the following:

1. Kreon (much the longest role, including lyrics at 1257–1346);⁷³
2. Ant. (including lyrics at 806–82), Haimon, Teiresias and Eurydike;
3. Ismene, Guard, and Messenger.

The four opponents of Kreon would thus all be heard speaking with one voice, as it were (that of actor no. 2; cf. 626–30n.), while no. 3's

⁷¹ First he brings in the body of his son (perhaps carrying it himself; or else with attendants carrying it in a quasi-funerary procession; 1257–60n.); and then Eurydike's body is brought out, for Kreon and the audience to witness.

⁷² Taplin 1977: 28–39, Pickard-Cambridge 1988: 171–6, 246–57, Mastrorade 1979: 1–5, 19–34.

⁷³ Demosthenes (*De falsa leg.* 247) states that the part of Kreon was played by the τριταγωνιστής (Aischines); but he is referring to fourth-century productions, and he may be lying (Pickard-Cambridge 1988: 141). In any case, the significance of πρωταγωνιστής vs τριταγωνιστής is disputed. We do not know whether any of the actors whose names are associated with S. (Tlepolemos, Kleidemides, Polos: *TrGF* IV 142–8), or who are recorded as winning prizes during this period (Herakleides, Nikomachos, Saondas, Andron), performed in *Ant.* – nor whether S. himself did (see above, pp. 1–2).

characters present themselves (without song) as representatives of a more sober and mundane mentality.⁷⁴

One striking and distinctive characteristic of this play is the way in which 'characters emerge from the great lyrical utterances' (Seale 1982: 109), as if to exemplify – or repudiate – the imaginative explorations that we have just heard from the Chorus (esp. 376–83, 626–30, 1155–1256nn.). Distinctive too, is the fact that, whereas in most tragedies the actors all depart between scenes, leaving the Chorus alone to deliver their songs, in this play it appears that Kreon remains on stage for the 3rd and 5th Songs, and possibly for the 4th and Ant.'s *kommos* too.⁷⁵ If he does, his presence would confirm our sense that the Elders are inhibited from expressing (or even thinking) ideas that might run in opposition to the king's (781–800n.) – an inhibition that would persist throughout the powerful lament-scene in which, under Kreon's silent gaze, Ant. is led out through the *orchēstra* for execution (801–82n.): for, although the Chorus interact closely with her in the lyric structure, their words are critical and barely sympathetic, and Kreon soon reinserts himself into the dialogue (883–90; cf. 883–943, 937–43nn.). Later, once Kreon has realized his mistake, the Elders are quick to rally around him (1091–1114n.), and in the final scene they provide a calmer accompaniment to his lyric expressions of despair, as if they, rather than he, now preside over the stage, and over the management of the city (1326–53, 1347–53nn.).

The staging requires 'no props . . . no special effects. . . . The tragedy, in all its richness and diversity of theme is embodied in the idea of simple confrontation' (Seale 1982: 109). Here and there, the text indicates how these 'confrontations' should be handled: the Guard enters slowly and haltingly (223–32), but departs with alacrity; Ant. remains staring at the ground (in disdain? cf. 441n.) until she is ready to respond directly to Kreon; Ismene is described as being flushed and in tears when she is brought in at 526 (526–30n., cf. 491–4); Haimon enters looking dismayed and angry (626–30n.), and rushes

⁷⁴ See Ewans 1998, Pickard-Cambridge 1988: 132–44.

⁷⁵ Seale 1982, Bain 1981: 4 n. 1 (and others) have Kreon depart into the palace at 780, 943, and return unannounced after the Songs: but see further 780, 801–82, 988–90nn.

off in an even more frantic state (766–7); Kreon in turn hurries off (by the same route) to rescue Ant., in near-panic (1108–14); Eurydike's silent exit during the Messenger's speech is expressive of her desperate resolve (1244–56). But for the most part we must use our imaginations to envision what should be taking place before us – in full consciousness of the power that staging and acting technique have to dictate meaning to an audience, even where the words of the text may be less than transparent.⁷⁶

5. THE MEANING OF THE PLAY

*Delectāre, movēre, docēre?*⁷⁷ There are obviously many kinds of pleasure and benefit to be derived from Attic tragedy, many ways in which a play such as *Ant.* works on the minds and emotions of audiences and readers. It is unlikely that when S. sat down to write the play he had a clear idea of what it was going to 'mean', and even less likely that upon completion he could have explained its meaning to the satisfaction of a modern critic. The members of his original audience (which presumably included intellectuals such as Perikles, Sokrates, Aspasia, and Herodotos, as well as some thousands of semi-literate peasants and artisans) undoubtedly reacted in very disparate ways to particular scenes and to the play as a whole. Likewise, to modern readers the play will inevitably yield different meanings according to the context within which it is studied and the questions asked of it. None the less, in the belief that some approaches, and some conclusions, can be shown to be more fruitful, more adequate to the text, and more convincing than others, let us take some preliminary

⁷⁶ For example, we have no idea – but would love to know – whether Ant. and Haimon were played in S.'s first production as attractive, warm-blooded, idealistic teenagers, or as bratty, petulant trouble-makers. The text allows for either – or a combination of both (my own preference). Of course, I am also aware that at any point in performance a determined director or actor can override the plain meaning of S.'s text (and the interpretive notes of a commentary) with a gesture, a tone of voice – or a simple cut.

⁷⁷ *Entertainment, emotional stimulation* (or *persuasion*), *instruction* – these are the three chief goals for literature acknowledged by Classical critics (Cicero, *Orator* 21.69, Horace, *AP* 333–47, 391–407, etc.), and taken for granted by scholiastic commentators.

critical stabs at this remarkable work.⁷⁸ If in what follows *Antigone* may seem to switch back and forth between being a piece of moral or political philosophy, a religious rite, a sociological treatise, an imaginative poem, a stage drama, a political rally, a psychotherapy session, and more, I make no apology: (this) play can be, and should be, all of these things.

(a) *Aesthetics*

As Aristotle observes in the *Poetics*, much of the excitement and satisfaction provided by a tragic performance comes from the artful structuring of the plot (μῦθος); much, too, from the ornamented language (λέξις) and skilful vocal delivery (ὑπόκρισις), the metrical and musical rhythms and melodies (ἄρμονία, μέλος), and the visual dimensions of gesture, blocking, choreography, costume, and scenery (ὄψις, ὄρχησις, σκευοποιία, σκηνογραφία, κτλ.). Although Aristotle gives due weight also to the moral aspects of the action and characters, most of his discussion in the *Poetics* focuses on aesthetics and dramatic technique; and his comments about these are for the most part acute and illuminating.⁷⁹ Unfortunately, however, most of the aural and visual elements of the plays as originally performed are now irrecoverable, and we must necessarily be satisfied with the 'pleasures' provided by plot, characterization, language and (to a lesser degree) metre, since these are more adequately recorded in the surviving texts. But we must never forget how much we are missing.

In our sketch of the structure of *Ant.*, we noted how it is built, scene by scene, and song by song, through a series of climaxes that culminates in the revelation of Kreon's error and the announcement

⁷⁸ 'Fruitful' and 'convincing' – to whom? Let us say, to a majority of the 'competent readers' who have weighed the critical alternatives in the light of their own examination of the text. For a helpful definition of 'literary competence,' see J. Culler, *Structuralist poetics* (Ithaca 1975) 113-30; also Fish 1980, for the idea of an 'interpretive community'.

⁷⁹ For a helpful recent account of the multiple tragic pleasures identified by Aristotle, see A. O. Rorty, 'The psychology of Aristotelian tragedy', in Rorty, ed., *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics* (Princeton 1992) 1-22.

of the multiple deaths.⁸⁰ The overall pattern of events is highly satisfying in its economy and logic: for it is Kreon's own edict that destroys him, by bringing about the deaths of his own son and wife. In Aristotle's terms, this series of events is indeed both 'unexpected' (παρὰ τὴν δόξαν) and yet inevitable ('caused by one another', δι' ἄλληλα).⁸¹ A man of high standing and basically good intentions, through a serious but not implausible (and perhaps forgivable) mistake (ἄμαρτία),⁸² due partly to a kind of reprehensible but understandable ignorance, harms his own φίλοι and thereby falls from prosperity to misery. The point at which Kreon's fortunes are seen to begin their 'reversal' (περιπέτεια) is the precise moment at which he is brought to a 'recognition' (ἀναγνώρισις) of the true state of affairs (1064–1114, esp. 1095 ἔγνωκα καὺτός).⁸³ The demonstration of cause and effect, of 'the kind of thing that happens' in human affairs, the eliciting of 'pity and fear' at events befalling people 'like ourselves' who do not fully 'deserve' it, all of these are intriguing and emotionally captivating, whether or not they are ethically beneficial too.⁸⁴ The feelings of sympathy that flood through us as Ant. contemplates her entombment, and again as Eurydike and Kreon face the loss of their son; the thrill of excitement (tinged with horror and pity, or vindictive satisfaction?) provided by Teiresias' pronouncement of Kreon's sentence, and again by the narrative of

⁸⁰ Above, pp. 15–17.

⁸¹ *Poetics* 9 1452a3–4, an account that contains the germ of the modern notions of dramatic irony, paradox, and tragic inevitability; see above, pp. 20–1.

⁸² Aristotle stipulates that the fall should not come about simply through 'wickedness' (μοχθηρία); for ἄμαρτία in *Ant.*, cf. 743–4, 914, 926, 1023–32n., 1242–3n.

⁸³ It might be argued that Kreon comes to recognize, in effect, 'who' Pol. is, i.e. that he is not after all just an 'enemy' (522 ἐχθρός) but a φίλος: this would bring *Ant.* closer to the mainstream of Aristotle's favourite tragedies (*Poet.* 14 1453b10ff.). But the action of *Ant.* suggests that it is not merely failure to bury a *nephew/brother*, and premature burial of a *niece*, that is Kreon's 'mistake', but non-burial and improper burial of anyone at all.

⁸⁴ οἷα ἄν γένοιτο, *Poet.* 9 1451a 37; ὁμοίος, ἀνάξιος 13 1453a5–7, etc.; cf. *Rhet.* 2 8.1386a24. For discussion of tragedy's possible cognitive and ethical benefits, as envisaged by Aristotle, see S. Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics* (London 1986) 169–201; but cf. next n.

Haimon's death, as we recognize that everything is coming together as it must – these are the 'proper pleasures' of a well-made tragedy.

(b) *Lessons*

It was widely believed in ancient Greece, and is still widely believed today, that a good tragedy (or epic) teaches a lesson of some kind, through the representation of good and bad 'examples' (παράδειγματα, *exempla*) of human action and character, and through the exploration and revelation of ultimate truths about the world we live in. Although some modern critics have vigorously opposed this idea,⁸⁵ Greek drama is full of morally evaluative language, and seems constantly to invite its audience to think about the personal choices and confrontations of its main characters. In the modern era, hundreds of books and articles have discussed the degree to which Kreon, or Ant., or both, should be held responsible for the deaths of Ant., Haimon, and Eurydike, and what we should learn from their catastrophe. No consensus has emerged.⁸⁶

Many have found Kreon to be wholly at fault, his authority illegitimate, his edict impious and foolish, his behaviour and language intemperate and vindictive.⁸⁷ But to others he appears a well-intentioned ruler, sincerely committed to laudable political principles (162–210, 188–90, 639–80nn.) and civic piety (162–3, 199–201,

⁸⁵ For example, many of the 'New Critics'; or, from another angle, those who have focused chiefly on 'dramatic technique' (esp. Wilamowitz 1917, Waldock 1951), or on the purely emotional/aesthetic effects (e.g., W. Schade-waldt, *Hermes* 83 (1955) 129–71, Heath 1987: 1–89).

⁸⁶ For surveys of different opinions, see M. Flickinger, *Iowa Stud. Class. Philol.* 2 (1935), Hester 1971: 11–19, 48–54, Steiner 1984, Oudemans & Lardinois 1987: 107–17.

⁸⁷ Among those who see Kreon as wholly villainous and/or incorrigibly shortsighted, are Jebb, Reinhardt, Whitman, Müller, Benardete, and Vickers. On this view, Kreon does not even deserve the respect accorded to such towering but misguided Sophoklean heroes as Aias or Herakles: for, unlike them, once he is faced with proof of his error (1064–79), and direct threats to his own prosperity (1091–1114n.), he quickly backs down and crumbles. He thus becomes an object of contempt rather than sympathy ('puny', Whitman 1951: 91), and the play comes to be read as a simple morality-tale demonstrating the evils of petty tyranny and disregard for the gods.

280–314, 773–6, 777–80nn.), and reasonable enough to change his mind and rescind punishment – twice – when the error of his policies is pointed out by trustworthy advisers (766–80, 1091–1114nn.): he is guilty only of misjudging the gods' attitude to non-burial, and of intemperate reactions to what he sees as disloyal opponents.⁸⁸ Conversely, Ant. is seen by many as an inspirational defender of 'higher' truths – individual liberty, family loyalty, and religious duty – whose other-worldly independence and determination, in the face of a bullying male-chauvinist civic authority, are finally vindicated by Teiresias and by the gods' destruction of Kreon; while to others, it is Ant. (and to a lesser degree, Haimon) who herself brings about the catastrophe through her inflammatory words and disruptive behaviour, which alienates the sympathy both of the other characters and of the audience.⁸⁹ On this view, Ant.'s fate, like Haimon's, is largely self-inflicted; and Kreon suffers far beyond what his own mistakes deserve. I believe that neither of these extreme positions is tenable: the text shows beyond reasonable doubt that both Kreon and Ant. are at least partly (if not equally) responsible for the tragedy. But the fact that such a broad range of responses has been elicited by this text is itself significant; for the questions raised by the play are not simple, and we should not expect the answers to be so either.

One of the reasons for the lack of critical consensus lies in the issue of non-burial. Ancient Greek attitudes concerning the treatment of the corpses of public enemies were by no means clear-cut or consistent, and, although it becomes clear long before the end of the play that Kreon has acted wrongly in his treatment of Pol. and Ant., the audience would not be in a position to be sure of this when first his edict is announced. That is to say, Kreon might – or might not – be excused for thinking that his policy was justifiable and proper. Denial of normal burial, as a way of inflicting further revenge on a particularly hated enemy and his family, was an extreme and

⁸⁸ It is significant in this regard that Demosthenes (19.247) could quote Kreon's words at 175–90 as a model of civic leadership, with no trace of irony intended (162–210n.).

⁸⁹ W. M. Calder, *GRBS* 9 (1968) 389–407, S-Inwood 1990; cf. 31, 450–70, 469–70, 526–81, 875nn.

shocking measure, but not unheard-of or self-evidently inadmissible (26–36n.).⁹⁰ In particular, the recognized penalty for traitors and temple-robbers in fifth-century Athens was refusal of burial within the boundaries of the polis (*exorismos*);⁹¹ and criminals were sometimes executed by being thrown down a cliff into ‘the pit’ (*barathron*), where their corpses would presumably be left to rot.⁹² Bodies of the long-dead could also be dug up and ‘expelled,’ as a kind of posthumous exile. And of course in literature, threats to strip the corpses of slain warriors and leave them for the beasts and birds are common (though rarely carried out, as more generous sentiments usually prevail).⁹³

No issue could be better designed than this to engage an Athenian

⁹⁰ See W. Vischer, *RhM* 20 (1865) 445ff., Rosivach 1983, Parker 1983: 44–8. We may recall Nestor’s words at Hom. *Od.* 3.255–61, ‘You know what would have happened if red-haired Menelaos, returning from Troy, had caught Aigisthos alive in his house: they wouldn’t have heaped any burial mound for him, but the dogs and birds would have devoured him as he lay on the plain apart from the city, and none of the Achaian women would have lamented’, cf. S. *El.* 1487–90. In general, vengeance was highly prized by the Greeks, and exultation at the punishment and humiliation of an enemy was normal, though the ghastlier punishments (decapitation, impaling, and other kinds of mutilation and torture) were generally regarded in the fifth century as ‘barbaric’ and unGreek (cf. 308–9n., and e.g. A. *Eum.* 185–90 with Sommerstein’s nn., E. Hall, *Inventing the barbarian* (Oxford 1989) 158–9).

⁹¹ Thuc. 1.138.6, Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.22; also A. *Th.* 1014, E. *Pho.* 776, 1629–30. Relatives might in some cases take the body and bury it outside the borders; but the standard term for such criminals, ἄταφος (Plato, *Laws* 873c1, 960b2, etc.), implies that this was not normally expected.

⁹² Parker 1983: 47; occasionally the sea could be used to the same end. Closely analogous in some respects to the situation of *Ant.* is Lykourgos, *Against Leokr.* 121, where we are told the Athenians passed a ‘decree’ (ψηφισμα) ‘that if any [of those who had deserted to the Spartans in Dekeleia, during the Peloponnesian War] should be caught returning, anybody could arrest them and take them (ἀπαγαγεῖν, cf. 382n., 395, 438) to the authorities, who should hand them over to the executioner at the Pit (τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀρύγματος)’, i.e. the traitors were to be summarily executed without trial (cf. 35–6, 435nn.) and without likelihood of burial. For the constitutional status of the ‘edict’ (κήρυγμα) issued by the στρατηγός Kleon, see 7–8n.

⁹³ C. P. Segal, *The theme of the mutilation of the corpse* (*Mnem. Suppl.* 17, 1971), Rosivach 1983. On the echoes in *Ant.* of Achilles’ treatment of Hektor’s corpse in the *Iliad* (gods’ disapproval, unspoilt corpse, Priam’s lone attempt, etc.), see Linforth 1961: 189–95.

audience in absorbing moral questions about revenge and the humiliation of enemies, the authority of the state to interfere with family obligations and rites, and the relations between human and divine 'law' – questions of central and immediate significance to the democracy that show up repeatedly in the literature of the fifth century.⁹⁴ So, while S.'s prime purpose in composing *Ant.* may not have been specifically to determine the precise rights and wrongs of denying burial rites (esp. since the play ends up leaving many of the key issues up in the air),⁹⁵ this highly problematic issue provided an ideal springboard, or framework, on which to construct a powerful tragic plot. Some critics have argued that it is Kreon's stipulation, not only that no burial or lamentation of any kind shall be permitted within Theban territory, but that the corpse must be 'left alone' (ἐἶναι, 29, 205) for the dogs and birds – i.e. that it may not even be removed for burial *outside* the borders – that sets the measure one fatal degree beyond the bounds of political legitimacy and religious propriety (26–36n.). Perhaps so; one can certainly surmise that if Kreon had just assigned minimal burial rites for Pol., inside or outside the borders, catastrophe would have been avoided. But this fine distinction is never in fact made in the play – and in the end Pol. is given an honorific local funeral like Eteokles' (1101, 1199–1204). In sum, it does not seem to have been S.'s purpose to provide a systematic

⁹⁴ A. *Eleusinioi* and *Hektoros Lutra*, S. *Ajax*, E. *Suppl.* all involve the defeat of an attempt to refuse burial to an enemy. The apparent intensification of interest in this issue at this period may reflect a development of moral and political scruples from the Archaic period into the fifth century (Rosivach 1983, Ostwald 1986, esp. 137–61). But it may also be the product of (a) generic and (b) class variables: (a) in 'real life', hated enemies' corpses were in fact mistreated on occasion: but in 'high literature,' attempts at such mistreatment are usually presented as reprehensible; (b) the 'low' and 'ugly' (αἰσχροί), esp. slaves and common criminals, could be tortured, impaled, exposed, thrown into pits, etc., without arousing much outcry; but a noble body was inviolate (cf. 517). (Thus it appears that domestic revenge in the *Odyssey* admits abuses that are frowned upon in the *Iliad*.) In our play, Pol. may be a traitor; but he is a member of the royal family, and has a royal sister, so the gods are offended: cf. Teiresias' words at 1018.

⁹⁵ In particular, it is never made finally clear whether the principle that Kreon violates is non-burial *per se*, or non-burial of a member of his own family (Pol. being his nephew); nor whether Pol.'s (presumed) status as a traitor makes a significant difference: cf. 508–25 with nn., and see n. 120 below.

analysis of, and solution to, these issues: instead, he has composed a tragedy.⁹⁶

As Kreon's edict is announced, the original audience would probably react at first with mixed expectations (26–36n.); for Kreon defends it with language heavily charged with religious and political assurances (166–210, 199–201, 283–9, 304–6, 518–25nn.):⁹⁷ Pol. has proved himself an enemy to his own *polis* and its gods, so only fellow-traitors could wish to honour him with burial. Yet in rejecting his measure Ant. employs equally compelling language of her own (48, 72–98, 450–60, 502–4, 511–23, 921–8nn.), language that is ultimately vindicated by the prophet (998–1114, 1068–76nn.).⁹⁸ Does this subsequent vindication require us to revise our initial (equivocal) response to Kreon's decree, and decide unequivocally in favour of Ant.? Was she right all along, and Kreon simply wrong? Perhaps so – and yet, even as the action reaches its denouement, and the gods reveal their absolute disapproval of Kreon's policy, it remains unclear to what degree Ant. personally has been justified (1068–71, 1172–5, 1226–36nn.): nothing is said by Teiresias or anyone else to indicate that the gods approved of her actions; and it is debatable whether in fact she helped to correct the situation in any way.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ We may compare Shakespeare's exploitation in *Hamlet* of the moral ambivalence surrounding revenge, and the uncertainties (Catholic vs Protestant) about the existence and status of ghosts; cf. E. Prosser, *Hamlet and revenge* (Stanford 1967), esp. 97–142.

⁹⁷ Furthermore, the edict is described by several characters as being, not just Kreon's, but 'of the citizens' (79, 907 πολιτῶν, cf. 35–6, 59–60nn.) and 'the law' (59–60, 452). Kreon's constitutional position is in fact left rather vague throughout (7–8n.), as commonly happens in Attic tragedy, straddling as it does the socio-political worlds of the Bronze Age ('heroic') past and fifth-century (democratic) Athens; cf. Vernant & Vidal-Naquet 1981: 237–47, Rohdich 1980, P. E. Easterling, 'Constructing the heroic', in C. Pelling, ed., *Greek tragedy and the historian* (Oxford 1997) 21–37, Seaford 1994. As it turns out, the constitutionality of the edict is not made an issue in the play, though the character of Kreon's style of leadership most certainly is.

⁹⁸ But it is significant that her rhetoric, as well as being personally antagonistic (69–70, 450, 469–70nn.), is heavily negative: she is more concerned to reject than to affirm (450–70n., 538–9, 905–7). Thus it is not easy to pinpoint the positive principles that she is defending, beyond absolute devotion to parents and brother, and respect for the dead and the gods below (cf. n. 120 below).

⁹⁹ Brown 1987: 7–10, S–Inwood 1990.

That Kreon's edict was wrong is made blindingly clear by mid-play. But it is clear too that the catastrophe is brought about, not just by his mistake, but by a particular combination of circumstances and decisions (by Ant. and Haimon, as well as Kreon himself) which raise further moral questions of considerable complexity. In Kreon's case, not only does he offend against the sacred laws of family and the underworld gods, but his increasingly 'tyrannical' conduct (esp. his identification of the 'city' with himself; his obsession with his own authority; his harsh and high-handed threats; his unreasonable suspicion of others) contributes directly to his downfall – though opinions may differ as to whether these traits are to be detected right from the start (162–210, 211–14nn.) or become apparent only in the scene with the Guard (280–314n.), or later still (473ff.?: or 631–780, or even 1033–63).¹⁰⁰ As for Ant., whether or not her extraordinary (even faintly incestuous?, cf. 73, 523, 898–9) devotion to her brother and parents is to be interpreted as evidence of an inherited taint which may itself be a 'cause' of the continuing disasters (471–2, 594–603, 900–3nn.), she clearly contributes, through her unreasonable, impatient, and intransigent behaviour, to the catastrophe that finally wipes out her family, as is repeatedly pointed out by both the Chorus and Ismene.¹⁰¹

Thus the moral issues, of right and wrong, responsibility and blame, remain open to analysis and debate, both during the progress of the play and after it is over. The sense of closure is strong, for the

¹⁰⁰ The 'tyrannical' qualities of Kreon are discussed by Bowra 1944: 72–8, Podlecki 1966 (with ref. to Hdt. 3.80–2), H. Funke, *Ant. und Abend.* 12 (1966) 29–50, C. Cerri, *QUCC* 39 (1982) 137–55, Blundell 1989: 123–6.

¹⁰¹ These seem to be two of the more 'reliable' witnesses from among the play's internal audiences (though pro-Ant. critics do not always agree on this); cf. 49–68, 98–9, 526–81; 100–61, 211–12, 278–9, 471–2, 770, 1091–1114, 1326–53nn. The (male) Elders are of course much more critical of Ant. than her sister is: and it is likely that many members of the Athenian audience would have shared their view; some might even have agreed with Kreon in regarding her, not merely as difficult and disruptive, but as a thoroughly 'bad woman', in her disobedience and rejection of marriage, and perhaps even in her usurpation of the male responsibility for burying Pol. (43, 903nn.): see S-Inwood 1989a, but also Foley 1996. A late twentieth-century audience is less likely to share Kreon's, Ismene's and the Chorus' disapproval of her 'unfeminine' resistance to male authority (61–3, 484–5, 525, 679–80).

play's action is indeed 'complete and whole' (Aristot. *Poet.* 7 1450b25, cf. 6 1449b25, 8 1450a31-5): but no less strong is our awareness that the conflicts fuelling this tragic catastrophe are incapable of easy resolution, and that the personal miscalculations and mischances that triggered it are of a kind all too likely to recur.

(c) *Characters*

If the play teaches a 'lesson', then, it is not that of a simple morality-play: neither Kreon nor Ant. is a villain, neither a saint. Should we see it instead as a tragedy of 'character'? Attic drama cannot be expected to offer the same depth and nuances of characterization as one finds in Ibsen or O'Neill, or even Shakespeare; and ancient Greek representations and interpretations of human behaviour and motivation will not always translate comfortably into twentieth-century terms. Yet the human figures presented on stage by S. none the less achieve a degree of coherence, distinctiveness, and immediacy that encourages us to begin to regard them, and respond to them, as if they were actual persons, whose dilemmas and sufferings command our sympathy and identification.¹⁰²

The action of *Ant.* results from the clash between two dogmatic and inflexible individuals. If either Kreon or Ant. were less rigid, more capable of compromise, catastrophe could be averted. But compromise is foreign to their natures, and much of the power and attraction of the play comes from the sheer force and inevitability of their collision.¹⁰³ But as the climax builds, we come to realize how radically different the two characters are: Ant. alone maintains to

¹⁰² For discussion of the different possible definitions and functions of 'character' in drama, see J. Gould, *PCPS* 24 (1978) 43-67, Easterling 1977, Blundell 1989: 16-25, and Goldhill and Easterling in Pelling 1990. On the processes whereby we come to piece together whole 'characters' from the visual and verbal clues supplied by a playwright, see Beckerman 1970: 130-67, 210-21, Elam 1980: 110-17, 131-4.

¹⁰³ Kreon and Ant. are 'daimonically linked' (Reinhardt 1979: 65); cf. Benardete 1975: 1 158, 'One wonders whether Ant. does not need Creon in order to be what she is.' There are hints of a long-standing antagonism between the two characters, cf. 7-8, 31-2, 192-206, 469-70, 561-2nn.

the bitter end those 'heroic' qualities of stubbornness, outspokenness, and courage for which S.'s hero(ine)s are renowned,¹⁰⁴ while Kreon's resolve crumbles, and he tries, belatedly and futilely, to make amends for his mistakes and avert catastrophe. This contrast of personalities and principles (primarily between Ant. and Kreon, but also between her and the mild and cautious Ismene, the practical-minded Guard, and the short-sighted Elders) fuels the play's series of confrontations, and to some critics the transcendent sense of commitment and other-worldliness of the heroine represents S.'s loftiest vision for humanity, an inspiring alternative to the mundane limitations of civic life.¹⁰⁵

Yet it is Kreon, not Ant., who has the largest role and most lines to speak, and it is his downfall that commands our attention in the final scenes.¹⁰⁶ He is presented as a well-meaning, unexceptional man, fatally corrupted and ruined by the exigencies of power. Repeatedly, after enunciating a more or less laudable set of general principles, he fails to live up to them in the face of public challenges to his masculine and parental authority: but it is not entirely clear in the end whether it is the principles themselves, or Kreon's self-contradictory conduct, that has been exposed as morally deficient. His language and attitudes display a curiously banal combination of brutality and pettiness (of a kind familiar to us from twentieth-century totalitarian leaders); and although he precipitates divine wrath on a large scale, he does not strike us as a tragic 'overreacher', but almost an 'everyman'. For readers who prefer their tragic heroes grand and larger-than-life, this ordinariness, so far from bringing him closer and making him 'one of us', seems only to make him

¹⁰⁴ See esp. Knox 1964: 1-59; also Bradley 1905, on Shakespearean heroes.

¹⁰⁵ E.g., Jebb, Whitman 1951, Reinhardt 1979, Lesky 1972: 140-2, Benardete 1975; cf. too J. A. Moore, *Sophocles and Arete* (Harvard 1938). This tendency to idealize the passionate and uncompromising vision of one isolated, doomed character (Achilles, Dido, Hamlet, Captain Ahab, James Dean . . .) is characteristic of the post-Romantic humanistic tradition at large: for the ideological implications of this tendency, see Rohdich 1980: 22, Dollimore 1989: 53-6, 153-81.

¹⁰⁶ It takes special pleading to make the case (e.g., Reinhardt 1979: 93, Knox 1964: 115-16) that the presence of Ant. is felt throughout the closing scenes despite the text's complete silence about her.

more repulsive. But the drama is more compelling, and the ending more pitiful, if we recognize his good intentions, his sincere commitment to what he takes to be best for his city and family, and his eventual willingness to learn – even if it comes too late.

For many years, the ‘problem’, whether Ant. or Kreon should count as ‘the tragic hero’, and whether or not the unity of the play is compromised by the prominence of two main characters rather than one, was the subject of constant debate.¹⁰⁷ But more recently, as the focus has shifted onto the action and the social dimensions of the play, rather than the characters, this pseudo-problem has evaporated: for it is obvious that the key events of the drama depend precisely on the interaction and interdependence of both figures (as, e.g., in E. *Hipp.*, A. *Ag.*, or S. *Tr.* and *Phil.*). Without one, there could be no tragedy for the other.¹⁰⁸

The contrast between these two characters, rooted as it is in differences of gender, age, and political standing,¹⁰⁹ is fully represented in their respective diction and speech-patterns. Kreon habitually starts out and ends his speeches with generalizations, and relies heavily on analogies and abstractions, often in the form of simile, metaphor, or γνῶμη. His use of harsh metaphors drawn from coinage and metal-working, from military organization and warfare, from the commanding and steering of a ship, and from the breaking and yoking of animals, lends an especially rigid and domineering tone to his utterances; and his constant reliance on γνῶμαι seems to reflect a desire to define and maintain his world in the most stable and unvarying (‘universal’) terms possible.¹¹⁰ Ant.’s language is more

¹⁰⁷ For discussion of the ‘diptych’ structure of *Ant.* (and of *Aj.* and *Tr.* too), see Waldo 1951, Webster 1969: 102–25.

¹⁰⁸ This shift of focus owes much to Jones 1962. But for sympathetic discussion of Sophoklean characterization, see, e.g., H. Diller, *WS* 69 (1956) 70–85, *Ant. und Abendl.* 6 (1957) 157–69, G. H. Gellie, *Sophocles: a reading* (Melbourne 1972), Kitzinger 1976.

¹⁰⁹ Perhaps parentage too: Ant. is accused of being just like her father (471–2, cf. 875; see Johnson 1997).

¹¹⁰ Goheen 1951, Foley 1996: 59–60. Kitzinger 1976: 143–57 points out that Kreon is ‘a man who grasps at conventional language and opinion to maintain an unacceptable and idiosyncratic position . . .’; ‘generalizations often

concrete and particular, and she tends to assert more baldly what she feels – indeed ‘knows’ – to be the self-evident, experiential truth (69–77n.; cf. 472, 480, 686n.), with heavy use of negative particles and sarcastic barbs to express her rejection of the views of others (4–6n., 69–70, 450–70n., 538–9, 925–8; 31, 469–70nn.).¹¹¹ The two of them are contrasted in turn with the other, less intransigent, more ‘normal’ members of the community: Ismene’s balanced and reasonable presentation of alternatives throws Ant.’s tunnel vision into sharp relief (49–68n.); the Guard’s self-protective verbal smoke-screens amount almost to a parody of Kreon’s own autocratic mannerisms, as his down-to-earth concerns and opinions are couched in incongruously high-flown, even pseudo-philosophical language, in a comic commentary on the serious business of tragedy (223–36 with nn., 316–21, 327–31, 388–400, 437–40nn.); Haimon’s youthful temper is shown straining to maintain proper filial respect despite his growing rage and frustration (626–780, 683–723nn.); and even the Elders are tellingly characterized as simultaneously timid and critical, obtuse and insightful, doubtful but loyal, limited as they are by their conventional assumptions and their deference to Kreon’s authority.

Distinctively drawn though each of these figures is, we should acknowledge none the less that their internal psychological states and personalities, i.e. their true ‘characters’ as such behind their dramatic masks, remain largely unformulated by the text, and thus beyond our consideration.¹¹² Rather, we may say that Ant. and Kreon embody and articulate the most typical and generalized *characteristics* of their precisely defined social roles – Ant. as the devoted sister and

divert irrational reactions on Kreon’s part into rational language’. For the different terms used by Ant. and Kreon for ‘knowledge’ and ‘learning,’ see below, p. 42. For Kreon’s imagery, see esp. 162–3, 477–8, 674–5nn.

¹¹¹ See further Kitzinger 1976: 75–85, 175–80.

¹¹² The text does raise some interesting possibilities, however, about which we are at liberty to speculate: are Ant.’s (or Ismene’s) personality and motivations shaped by (consciousness of) incestuous origin (cf. Loraux 1986, Johnson 1997)? Or by resentment of her uncle’s new authority? What do the Chorus really feel about Ant. and Haimon, and about their king? What are Ant.’s feelings for Haimon? What goes through Kreon’s head when he encounters Haimon at the tomb (1226–30)? etc. Out of such questions, like Anouilh, we may construct our own new dramas.

unmarried daughter,¹¹³ Kreon as the stern soldier-ruler and father,¹¹⁴ each of them fiercely determined to resist any threat to the integrity of these roles. This is not to say that they are not convincing, even memorable, dramatic 'characters'; rather, that we are not encouraged by the text to ponder the inner workings of their minds. The meaning of the play lies for the most part elsewhere.

(d) *Ethics*

Amidst the political innovations and intellectual debates of the fifth century, increasingly insistent and systematic attention came to be paid to questions of law, custom, and behaviour, and to the proper definition and application of traditional terms of moral evaluation. What does it mean to be δίκαιος, χρηστός, σώφρων, σοφός, or ἀγαθός in a democratic *polis*? What is the relationship between moral goodness and political success, between human achievement and divine approval? Along with the Sophists and Sokrates, the tragedians clearly belong among the precursors of Plato and Aristotle in the realm of moral philosophy, as their reworkings of the old myths explore the shifting conceptions and applications of familiar ethical terms.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ She is παῖς at 378, 423, 472, 561, 654, 693, 949; νεᾶνις at 783–4; κόρη at 395, 769, 889, 1100, 1204; νύμφη at 568, 628, 633, 796–7 (cf. 654, 761); παρθένος at 1237: cf. Loraux 1986: 172, Segal 1981: 179–83. Kreon, however, likes to refer to her as γυνή (649, 651, 678, 680, 740, 746, 756), an easier term to use pejoratively. For her sisterly attributes, see 1, 523, 904–15nn., and below, pp. 52–4.

¹¹⁴ He is στρατηγός on first mention (8); then usually (except to Ant. herself) ἄναξ, βασιλεύς, or τύραννος (7–8n.) In the scenes involving Haimon, πατήρ occurs with insistent regularity (635, 640, 644, 683, 701, 703, 704, 742, 755, 1176, 1177, 1225, 1234).

¹¹⁵ Some well-known examples: δίκη in A.'s *Oresteia*, σωφροσύνη in E. Hipp., σοφία in E. *Ba*. In none of these cases does a straightforward definition emerge (any more than in an aporetic Sokratic dialogue), but we are led to recognize the complexity, or indeterminacy, of the concepts in question, as well as the ways in which highly-charged evaluative language can be more or less legitimately deployed. For explicitly ethical–philosophical treatments of Greek tragedy, see esp. A. H. Adkins, *Merit and responsibility* (Oxford 1960), Long 1968, Nussbaum 1986, Blundell 1989, B. Williams, *Shame and necessity* (Berkeley 1993). On *Ant.* in particular, see also Dalfen 1977, Hester 1971 (and *WS* 14 (1980) 5–8), Oudemans & Lardinois 1987, Foley 1996.

In *Ant.*, we can identify three clusters of terms that receive particularly intensive scrutiny: those denoting (i) 'piety', 'reverence', 'due observance', (ii) 'family' and 'friends', and (iii) 'understanding', 'good sense', 'planning', 'intelligence'.¹¹⁶

(i) Terms for 'piety', 'reverence' (εὐσέβεια, σέβειν, κτλ.) recur throughout the play in a wide variety of usages and contexts. The semantic field of σεβ- covers primarily the honouring of the gods, but extends also to respect for parents and the dead, and to various other more or less clearly defined obligations.¹¹⁷ Given this broad range of application, one set of σεβ- obligations could easily come into collision with others (514-21); and the degree and mode of 'devotion' that is expected may be disputed (626-780, 639-80, 683-7nn.): one person's 'reverence' may even be another's 'impiety' (74, 923-4n.). Kreon demands 'reverence' for the gods and cults of the city, for legitimate political authority (165-9, 199-201, 280-314, 508-25, 730, 744-5, 780nn.), and for his status as father (632-4, 639-80nn.); and he takes care to design a form of execution for his niece that will (he claims) allow him and his city to remain 'pure' (773-6n., 889 ἄγνοι). For her part, Ant. insists on the absolute requirement to honour, not only parents, but all one's closest kin, in death as in life (74, 502-5, 511, 943, etc.), and she claims that her actions, though labelled 'criminal' and 'impious' by others (74, 300-1, 514, 924; cf. 853-6), are in fact gloriously holy and pious (72 καλόν, 74 ὄσια, 97 καλῶς, 99 ὀρθῶς, 502 εὐκλεέστερον, 511 σέβειν, 521 εὐαγῆ, 943; cf. 695 εὐκλεεστάτων).¹¹⁸ Ismene recognizes the propriety of both kinds of claim (98-9), as do the Chorus, at least

¹¹⁶ Other terms that come under discussion include: κέρδος (221-2, 461-4, 1031-2, 1035-9nn.); ὀρθός (162-3n.); τέχνη and μηχανή (365-7n., 332-75); νόμος and νόμισμα (59-60, 295-6, 451-2, 453-5nn.).

¹¹⁷ Dover 1974: 246-54, 273-8.

¹¹⁸ 'Although the two characters use the same words when they speak and develop their pros and cons, the content of their speeches does not result in an antithetical relationship. Rather, the opposition is between two *realms*: word for word, and meaning for meaning, they *separate* from each other. . . . What [Kreon] calls "dishonour" is holy to his opponent; what he calls "pious" is not so to her, and the same with "friend" and "foe" and "good" and "bad" (514ff)', Reinhardt 1979: 77-8; cf. Goheen 1951, Dalfen 1977.

intermittently (213, 278–9, 365–75, 872–5, 872). After Teiresias' warnings, Kreon at last recognizes the obvious: 'It's best to end one's life preserving the established customs' (νόμους, 1113–14), and the play ends with the Chorus' trite endorsement of conventional attitudes, 'One mustn't be irreverent (ἀσεπτεῖν) towards the gods!' (1349–50 with n.). While this ending confirms that Kreon is indeed being punished for his impiety, as Ant. had demanded (cf. 921–8, 925–8nn.), it falls short of rewarding her for the 'piety' to which she laid claim in her final words on stage (940–3 *λεύσσετε ... οἷα πάσχω τὴν εὐσεβίαν σεβίσασσα*). Her piety did not save her from death, nor her family from extinction (599–603);¹¹⁹ and several difficult questions that have been raised about the proper 'reverence' due to the dead have still not been fully answered.¹²⁰ The paradoxes persist.

(ii) 'Benefit your friends (φίλοι) and harm your enemies!' Few Greeks before Plato would question this basic principle, which lies at the heart of Archaic and Classical morality and social relations.¹²¹ But how do we know who our true φίλοι are, and how can we ensure that they will remain so? Furthermore, given the wide semantic field occupied by φίλος – covering 'family member', 'loved one', 'friend', 'ally', even 'one's own' (limbs, etc.), and extending even further with the usage of φιλέω, φιλότης, φιλία, κτλ.¹²² – contradictions con-

¹¹⁹ A few modern scholars have focused on the status of Pol.'s (or Ant.'s) soul in Hades, and the prospects of psychic consciousness and reward down there. But this concern finds small support in the text, and seems anachronistic.

¹²⁰ For example: *does* one 'dishonour' a patriot in showing respect to a traitorous enemy (514–6)? *Do* 'good and bad' men deserve equal honour in death (520)? *Do* the dead continue to hate their enemies even in the underworld (515, 521–2; cf. 508–25n.)?

¹²¹ Archilochos fr. 23.14–15 West, Theognis 337–40, Solon fr. 1.5–6 West, etc., Blundell 1989: 26–59. The Guard provides a practical, 'low' perspective on all this (437–40): it is painful to harm one's φίλοι, but ultimately the most precious φίλος is – oneself.

¹²² Benveniste 1966: 335–53, F. Dirlmeier, *Φίλος und Φιλία im vorhellenistischen Griechentum* (Munich 1931), Blundell 1989: 39–49. For ἐχθρός/ἐχθαίρω, κτλ., the range is more limited, since these always denote positive hostility and dislike; cf. 9–10n.

stantly arise, as members of the same family or political group (= φίλοι, by definition) become 'hateful/hostile' to one another as a result of their behaviour.¹²³ Such contradictions are explored in detail in this play (cf. 182–90, 511–25, with nn.). For Ant., a φίλος is naturally and unalterably 'one's own' (9–10, 511–25, 522–3, 904–15nn.), and therefore always deserving of 'love' (73, 523, 898–9nn.) and 'honour'.¹²⁴ By contrast, Kreon proposes an unorthodox definition of φιλία that is none the less in some respects quite familiar from Athenian political debate (162–210, 508–25): natural 'ties' (family and other prior personal connections) should count for nothing, and we should 'select' (188 θείμην, 190 ποιούμεθα, 191 νόμοισι) our φίλοι and ἐχθροί/πολέμιοι purely on the basis of their conduct towards our community. This disagreement cuts to the heart of Athenian political life (see below, pp. 48–50); but, so far from directly confronting the philosophical problem – what criteria to invoke when φιλία places conflicting demands upon a person – neither Ant. nor Kreon acknowledges the legitimacy of the other's claims at all: for Kreon, the traitorous Pol. has simply ceased to *be* φίλος to his uncle or sisters (208–10, 516–22nn.), whereas Ant. never responds to the charge that Pol. was a traitor to his city, and argues instead that Eteokles' enmity has been superseded by death (508–25, 521nn.). Characteristically, Ismene again shows some sympathy for each side (e.g. 79, 98–9) – and although she is consequently condemned by both, her mixed feelings may be shared by many members of the audience.

(iii) Throughout the play, emphasis is constantly being placed on the need for intelligence and good sense (φρονεῖν, γνώμη, εὐβουλία, νοῦς, μανθάνειν), and characters repeatedly accuse one another of

¹²³ Blundell 1989: 50–9; on φιλία in *Ant.*, Knox 1964: 80–8, Goldhill 1986: 79–83, 88–106.

¹²⁴ Cf. the many αὐτ- words she uses in this connection (1, 863–5nn.; also 511, 513, 900, 915nn., and 48, 696, and further Loraux 1986). But despite Ant.'s claim to be 'born to share in φιλία' (523), she does not demonstrate an especially 'loving nature', in the modern sense of those words: she is on the contrary quite cold and dismissive towards everyone except the dead, and threatens to 'hate' Ismene if she will not co-operate with her (86, 93); cf. 523n. and Nussbaum 1986: 64–5.

'foolishness' (ἀβουλία, δυσβουλία, μωρία, κτλ.) or outright 'madness' (492, 653, 765). The Chorus sing of mankind's extraordinary intelligence and ingenuity, so powerful for good or ill (332-75n.), and of the human propensity to lapse into that special kind of delusion (ἄτη, 4, 17, 582-625nn.), wherein evil is mistaken for good, injustice for justice (615-25, cf. 791-2, and 323). We should hardly expect a neat definition of 'true wisdom' to emerge: tragedy thrives on mental mistakes and contingent misunderstandings, which are represented as being typical and ineradicable, indeed intrinsic to social existence. We may, however, learn something about the possibilities and limitations of human understanding from tracing the differing mentalities and rhetorical strategies exemplified by the usage of these terms. In particular, we can trace an implicit struggle for validation between the calculating 'intelligence', 'counsel', and 'thought' (γνώμη, φρονεῖν, μανθάνειν, βούλευμα, νοῦς), recommended by Kreon and the other (male) characters, as against Ant.'s intuitive 'knowledge' and 'certainty' (especially ἐπίστασθαι, εἰδέσθαι);¹²⁵ and among the male characters, we may contrast Kreon's emphasis on 'calculation' and rigid 'straightness' with Haimon's and Teiresias' recommendations of 'learning' and 'bending'.¹²⁶

By the end of the play, after Kreon's ignorance and overconfident obstinacy have been starkly laid bare and punished, the Chorus sum up with the pat assertion, τὸ φρονεῖν εὐδαιμονίας πρῶτον ὑπάρχει. But we have received small reassurance as to the capacity of human intelligence to calculate and escape calamity in the future. Smaller minds – the Guard's, Ismene's, the Elders' – may succeed in avoiding personal disaster: but none of them has proved capable of fore-

¹²⁵ Foley 1996: 57-9, 64-8 suggests that Ant.'s language presents a distinctly 'feminine' mentality, reflective of the different contexts for moral choice experienced by women; cf. C. Gilligan, *In a different voice* (Harvard 1982). But in other respects Ant. is obviously a more 'masculine' and assertive character than her sister, and her language and actions appear shockingly 'hybridic' and 'manly' to Kreon and the Chorus (480-5; 471-2, 875, etc.). See further below, pp. 51-4.

¹²⁶ For male γνώμη, see 175-7, 188, 330, 389, 635, 640, 719; for φρονεῖν, 207, 477-9, 510 (and 557!), etc. (and cf. Ismene at 49); also οἶδα (316, 477-8n.); on Kreon's ὀρθο- words, cf. 162-3n. For Ant., ἐπίσταμαι ('be sure', 'know how to', 471-2, 480; cf. Haimon at 686) and οἶδα (2, 18, 33, 89, 447-8, 460, 521) are characteristic. See Coray 1993, esp. 58-80, Nussbaum 1986: 51-82, Foley 1996: 57-9, 64-8, C. Knapp, *AJP* 37 (1916) 300-16, and above pp. 36-7.

seeing or averting the troubles that afflict the larger community. Rather, it has been the impetuous and one-dimensional 'tempers' of Ant. and Haimon (ὄργή, 766–7, 875; cf. 471–2, 929–30) that have combined to provoke the eventual resolution, in combination with Teiresias' supernatural insight into hidden 'signs' (σημεῖα, 998n.; cf. 993 φρενός, 996 φρόνει). Perhaps some comfort may be derived from the idea, repeated at intervals throughout the play, that human beings must be 'flexible' (e.g., 710–23, 1023–8) and willing to 'learn'. But it would not be unreasonable to conclude instead from the fates of Kreon, Ant., Haimon, and Eurydike that the internal and external forces that drive us all are too unruly and unpredictable to be mastered or evaded by merely human 'good sense'.¹²⁷

(e) *Contradictions*

One function of drama (as of other forms of mythical, artistic, and religious expression) appears to be the opportunity it provides of articulating and confronting (in more or less disguised forms) some of society's deepest-seated tensions and conflicts, and perhaps mitigating or defusing them to some degree through the mechanisms of ritual, play, and communal celebration, a process that can be both disturbing and yet strangely satisfying. It is not so much that a particular artistic representation is likely to propose a permanent solution to such divisions and conflicts (e.g., between male and female, master and slave, family and state); rather that the very process of working through the conflict, and 'resolving' it in dramatic terms, may make it more manageable and enduring, or at least more intelligible, in the future.¹²⁸

In the case of Athenian tragedy, we may recognize a characteristic

¹²⁷ Nussbaum 1986: 80 suggests that we have learned (primarily from the examples and language of Haimon and Teiresias) to be 'flexibly responsive to the world'; but others see the 'wisdom' acquired as being of a more mysterious and paradoxical kind (Benardete 1975, Reinhardt 1979, Oudemans & Lardinois 1987).

¹²⁸ See esp. Turner 1969, and cf. Lada 1993. The Structuralist approach to myth and ritual derived from Claude Lévi-Strauss, Victor Turner, and others, with its predilection for these and other polar binary oppositions, has been applied to Greek tragedy with particular success: e.g. Vernant & Vidal-Naquet 1981, Segal 1981.

dynamic by which a set of social issues is simultaneously problematized and neutralized or foreclosed: troublesome and even radical questions about the status quo are brought to the surface, but the outcome of the play appears to eliminate, or at least to limit, the possibility of social change, and thus reinforces the sense that this status quo is unalterable and necessary (and therefore even 'right?'). This dynamic is especially pronounced in S.'s plays, and, together with their extraordinarily tight construction and sense of closure, is largely responsible for S.'s reputation for 'pessimism'.¹²⁹ Yet, even in S.'s plays, the dramatic resolution tends to be presented in such an open-ended and ambiguous fashion that different readers and audience members may draw quite different conclusions about the social and moral implications of the play: even as some of them resign themselves (sadly, or complacently) to the inescapability of fate, and perhaps to the concomitant dignity of human suffering, others may indignantly recall the elements of resistance and contradiction within the play that point to, or demand, a better alternative.¹³⁰ Thus, for example, if we read resolutely enough against the grain of S.'s dramatic text, and insist that all the injustices which we see from our modern perspective were intended so to be seen, as part of S.'s covert critique of his society, we can conclude that 'S. leads us to ask not merely whether a polity so unjustly structured can survive but whether it deserves to',¹³¹ whereas it might be preferable to insist only that S.'s text *allows* us to see these injustices (even as it also works to disguise and gloss over some of them), and thus probes certain fault-lines in the Athenian polity without coming close to

¹²⁹ E.g., J. C. Opstelten *Sophocles and Greek pessimism* (Amsterdam 1952), Whitman 1951, Reinhardt 1979. By contrast, critics usually find A.'s plays more 'optimistic' and progressive, E.'s more subversive and radically disruptive.

¹³⁰ Even within the same reader/spectator, two successive experiences of the 'same' text/dramatic performance may result in quite different responses. In general, see Dollimore's analysis of 'subversion' vs 'containment' as a critical strategy (1989: xvi-xxxii); and cf. Rose 1992: 27-42, building on N. Holland, *The dynamics of literary response* (New York 1968) and F. Jameson, *Marxism and form* (Princeton 1971). See too Griffith 1995: 107-24.

¹³¹ W. J. and A. M. Lane, in J. P. Euben, ed., *Greek tragedy and political theory* (Berkeley 1986) 182. (A similar, but more subtle, reading is offered by Benardete 1975.)

suggesting the need for radical social change, let alone any programme for effecting it. At the opposite extreme, it has been concluded that the very purpose of S.'s drama (or Shakespeare's) is to bring us to a state of aesthetic equilibrium, ever oscillating between co-existing but incompatible alternatives as we contemplate 'man's awkward position, divided and ambiguous, in a hard and ruthless world';¹³² or that the experience of *Ant.* leads us to appreciate the value of moral complexity and conflict for their own sakes.¹³³ Both these responses may bring their own aesthetic and moral satisfactions; yet the stronger our sense of 'equilibrium' and aesthetic 'richness', the easier it may be for us to cease interrogating the text for new possibilities and to settle into a complacent resignation to the inevitable.

In any case, *Ant.*'s baffling open-endedness may be said to add to, rather than detract from, the universality and power of its appeal, allowing as it does for the multiplicity of statuses and viewpoints of the play's ancient and modern audiences – even as it explains to some degree the abundance of scholarly disagreement over its 'correct' interpretation. There may indeed be several 'correct' interpretations of *Ant.*, and there seems little to be gained, and much to be lost, by insisting that one is better than all others. The play of opposites provides its own challenges, and its own rewards.¹³⁴

¹³² Oudemans & Lardinois 1987: 28.

¹³³ So Nussbaum 1986: 75–80, emphasizing the 'richness' of experience provided by the totality of S.'s play, as opposed to the pat consistency and over-simplification sought by *Ant.* and *Kreon*.

¹³⁴ Does this mean that we are all licensed to find whatever meanings we wish in this, or any, work of literature? Not exactly. We may look, we may think we have found its meaning – but then we are obliged to examine the alternatives, expose our view to criticism, take account of the original conditions of production and performance, before concluding that our own interpretation is justifiable or 'valid' in anything more than a partial or solipsistic sense; see Culler 1975, Fish 1980 (above, n. 78). In the end, of course, it is up to us, as readers, audiences, actors, directors, critics, and teachers, to what degree, and to what social ends, we may choose to focus on these oppositions and fault-lines – or any other particular elements – in a text. But we need to be aware, and explicit, about what we are doing thereby and why; see R. Williams' 'Afterword' to J. Dollimore & A. Sinfield, eds., *Political Shakespeare* (London 1985) 281–9.

(i) *Human/divine*

In one of the most famous speeches of Western literature, Ant. invokes the 'unwritten and unfaltering laws of the gods' (453-7) as her basis for disobeying the mortal Kreon's edict. Earlier, the Chorus, after singing of the wonderful achievements of 'ultra-clever man' (347 περιφραδῆς ἀνὴρ), warn that this man and his city are 'high' (ὑψίπολις) only so long as he 'reveres the justice of the gods' (369-70). So, after Teiresias explains to Kreon that the gods both below and above the ground are offended by his non-burial of Pol. and premature 'burial' of Ant. (1068-76), we may concur with the Chorus' final assessment, 'We must not be impious (ἄσεπτεῖν) towards the gods' (1349-50), and with Kreon's verdict, 'The blame for this will always belong to nobody else but me' (1317-18). The general principle, that divine law overrules human, has thus been reaffirmed, and this 'religious' lesson has been taken by many to be S.'s main concern in the play: Kreon's presumption is crushed, and the traditional rules of family-based cult are thereby reinforced.¹³⁵ This lesson is not entirely comforting, however: for even if the contemplation of the numinous mystery of the divine carries with it a kind of fascination that is enhanced by such glorious poetry as is contained in the 2nd, 3rd, and 6th Songs of *Ant.*, and by our recognition of the 'fullness of Ant.'s death' and of the 'all-embracing world with which Ant.'s figure is linked',¹³⁶ we may well be disturbed by the gods' apparent disregard for Ant. herself, even after she articulates her support for their 'laws' and accepts a lonely death in defence of them; dismayed too by the suffering and deaths of the innocent Haimon and Eurydike. The gods (as often) appear more concerned with punishment than with reward or comfort.

Furthermore, tempting though many critics have found it thus to identify Kreon squarely with the secular, Ant. with the divine, and to

¹³⁵ Ant.'s expressions of moral and religious certainty have even suggested to some critics a special kind of spiritual enlightenment or direct apprehension of the divine, such that her death has been described in terms reminiscent of Christian martyrdom (e.g., Jebb xxv-xxxv, cf. Reinhardt 1979: *passim*; *contra*, Brown 1987: 7-10). On this score, discussion has surrounded Ant.'s expressions of dismay and uncertainty (loss of 'faith?'), as she contemplates death and the gods' failure to intervene; but see 921-8n.

¹³⁶ Reinhardt 1979: 93, 80; and cf. n. 65 above.

read the play as a straightforward vindication of traditional religious belief, the issues are not quite so simple. It is true that Kreon sneers at Ant.'s claims to have divinity on her side (514–16, 575–81, 777–80nn.), indignantly rejects the Chorus' suggestion that the gods might be responsible for the mysterious nocturnal burial of Pol.'s body (280–9), and accuses the venerable prophet of corruption and greed (1033–63). But Kreon himself appeals repeatedly to Zeus and the gods of his city (184, 304–5; cf. 162–3, 198–203; and 758), and does eventually heed the prophet's warnings and attempt to make amends (991–7, 1095–7). And while his scornful and hyperbolic language at times betrays gross insensitivity, bordering on blasphemy (see esp. 485–90, 889, 1039–44nn.), he does not challenge or insult the gods directly, like S.'s Aias or E.'s Hippolytos, Pentheus, or Polymestor.¹³⁷ There is historical evidence that during the mid-fifth century the Athenian *demos* began to intervene in new ways to regulate the activities of traditional family-based cults;¹³⁸ and we may regard Kreon and Ant. as representing two different kinds of religious observance, civic vs familial, or 'new' vs 'old' – even to some degree 'upper' vs 'lower' gods.¹³⁹ In so far as the play contains a clear religious 'message', it clearly validates the claims of the old familial cults: Kreon was wrong. But we should not look to press such a neat religious (or religious/secular) dichotomy too far: neither of the two main characters is entirely consistent in word and practice – and neither takes account of those other divine, but anarchical, powers

¹³⁷ Kreon's edict is not motivated at first by antagonism to Pol.'s family and its rites (which after all are his own), but by concern for the political security of the city: he suspects conspirators, not his niece.

¹³⁸ E.g. the Praxiergidai decree at Eleusis (*IG* XIII 105.35); see further Ostwald 1986: 138–61. These issues tend in modern discussions to spill over (anachronistically) into analysis in terms of 'state' vs 'church', or 'state' vs 'individual conscience'; see below, pp. 48–50.

¹³⁹ 'Ant. is not interested in heaven. As Creon ... remarks, it is the law of Hades that she feels bound to fulfil (777) ... She mentions Zeus only twice ... (2–6, 450) ...; [by contrast] Hades 519, 542, (811, 911); Pherssephassa 894; the gods 77, 454–5, 459–60, 921, 922, 925; the gods below 451, 938; the dead below 25, 74–5, (89), 521, 560', MacKay 1962: 167. Such an opposition is familiar, e.g., from A.'s *Eum.*, where it is likewise reinforced by an opposition of gender; cf. G. Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens* (3rd ed., London 1961), Zeitlin 1996: 87–119.

whose energy obliterates these neat distinctions and sweeps all before them, Eros and Dionysos (153–4, 1115–54nn.).¹⁴⁰

(ii) *Polis/oikos*

Conflict between family obligations and the demands of the larger community, between *φιλία* and *τὸ κοινόν*, pervades every civilized society. This conflict was especially acute and clearly defined in fifth-century Athens, and nowhere more so than in this play. Kreon, as στρατηγός (7–8n.) and leader of his city, insists on the need for citizens and rulers alike to disregard kinship and personal favouritism and to set the highest value on discipline and ‘obedience to authority’ (*πειθαρχία*, 661–80); and his nephew Pol. is consequently to be treated as nothing more than an enemy of the state. Ant., however, in maintaining the overriding obligations of *φιλία* (9–10, 69–77, 508–25n.), cannot cease to regard Pol. as ‘her own’, whatever his public actions.¹⁴¹

Yet here too the issue is far from cut and dried. For all Kreon’s political (and specifically democratic-sounding) language,¹⁴² he shows increasingly, in his confrontations with both Ant. and Haimon, that he is more concerned about his own personal authority, as a man and a father, than about his citizens’ opinions (473–85, 726–69, etc.; and cf. 670–1n.). Indeed, he displays not only disrespect for family obligations, but also political incompetence in his insensitivity and mistrust of his fellow-citizens; and he ends up not only destroying his own family, but also jeopardizing the whole community of Thebes, by tainting its public altars and its relations with other cities (1015–22, 1080–3). Conversely, Ant. is by no means unconcerned about her

¹⁴⁰ On Eros and Dionysos, see W-Ingram 1980: 92–116, Segal 1981: 197–206, Nussbaum 1986: 82, Seaford 1994; and below pp. 58–66.

¹⁴¹ Since the *oikos/polis* opposition overlaps to some degree with that between nature (*φύσις*) and culture (*νόμος*), we may also take note here of the play’s insistence on Ant.’s *natural* and hereditary characteristics and obligations (1, 37–8, 471–2, 523, 866nn.; also 683–6n.), as opposed to Kreon’s emphasis on *cultural* choices, ‘making straight’, ‘keeping order’, and selectively ‘establishing’ his social connections (188 *θείμην*, 190 *ποιούμεθα*; cf. 162–3, 639–80, 670–1nn., and 680 *καλοίμεθ’ ἕν*). See above, pp. 40–1, and Segal 1981: 152–86.

¹⁴² His assertions are reminiscent of Perikles’ (Thuc. 2.38–46, 60), and later quoted approvingly by Demosthenes 19.247; see 162–210, 188–90nn.

public reputation among the citizens (84-7, 839-52, 937-43). Public and private, political and familial, cannot be wholly separated in the case of royalty: so, while the play certainly asserts the inviolable claims of kinship and points up the oppressive potential of civic authority in the wrong hands, it does so in such a way as to remind us of the inherent dangers posed to the stability of the *polis* by its leading dynastic families.¹⁴³ If 'family' is the solution, it is also the problem.

One of the most influential general theories of tragedy is that of G. W. F. Hegel, which is based directly on his reading of this play in terms of *oikos/polis* opposition.¹⁴⁴ Hegel asserts that both Kreon and Ant. are right in principle, but that each of their conflicting principles is of only limited validity, whereas each of them insists on its absolute claims: the tragic conflict destroys the two individuals, but results in the emergence of an ethically 'higher' and more inclusive plane of consciousness.¹⁴⁵ This reading has much to be said for it (provided we do not require both characters to be *entirely* or *equally* right in every respect), and lies behind many subsequent theories concerning the centrality of *conflict* to the idea of tragedy.¹⁴⁶ The biggest problem with it lies perhaps in its idea of a final 'synthesis' or elevated level of awareness (which is directly linked to Hegel's insistently evolutionist and progressive view of history); for, although the ending of *Ant.* does provide reassurances of a less troubled future, and of lessons that have been 'learned' by the survivors, neither the Chorus nor Kreon comes close to articulating a world-view that synthesizes the insights gained through the course of the tragedy, and it must remain questionable how much of this the members of the audience are able to achieve for themselves.¹⁴⁷

Closely related to this *oikos/polis* dichotomy is the issue of kinship

¹⁴³ See further Maitland 1992, Griffith 1995, and pp. 54-8 below.

¹⁴⁴ See A. & H. Paolucci, eds., *Hegel on tragedy* (New York 1962) 62-74 (from *The philosophy of fine art*), Steiner 1984: 19-42, Hester 1971.

¹⁴⁵ In insisting that Ant. and Kreon are both 'right' in principle, Hegel does not rule out the possibility of either or both being at fault in the personal (behavioural) shortcomings that heighten the conflict instead of seeking to resolve it.

¹⁴⁶ Gellrich 1988. By contrast, Aristotle has little appetite for 'conflict'.

¹⁴⁷ See 1326-53, 1343-6, 1347-53nn., and above, pp. 43-5.

and exogamy. If one of the primary functions of myth is to provide aetiologies and justifications of familiar social rules, rituals, and taboos, then the Theban saga was especially rich in examples of violations of the rules concerning endogamy/exogamy, and concerning the relative claims of birth-family vs marriage-family.¹⁴⁸ In *Ant.*, the cursed families of Laios and Menoikeus are shown transgressing these norms yet again, with the next generation consequently failing to achieve proper 'passage' from childhood to adulthood and marriage: Oidipous' two sons die at each other's hands, one unmarried, the other exploiting a foreign marriage to forge a military alliance and attack his homeland; of the two daughters, neither is married, and *Ant.* rejects the prospect of husband and children, while demonstrating peculiar devotion to brother and kin. At the opposite extreme, Kreon's son unites with his intended bride against his father, whom he even attempts to kill (648–60, 740–9, 1231–4). The result: obliteration of the whole extended family, as a 'lesson <to the rest of Thebes/Athens> in old age' (1353), according to the logic of myth.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ For the particular characteristics of the 'Thebes' myth in Athenian tragedy, see esp. Zeitlin 1986, Seaford 1994: 213–20.

¹⁴⁹ The Theban saga is often narrated so as to emphasize the theme of sacrificing one family, or a single man (= *Opfertod*), to save the whole city, whether that family must be Laios' (as in *A. Th.*), or that of one of the 'Sown Men' (as in *E. Pho.*; cf. Pentheus in *E. Ba.*); see R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1983) 16–54, Zeitlin 1986. Such a story-pattern fits *OT* much better than *Ant.*: but in our play it is not far-fetched to see Kreon in this role of 'ritual substitute', with *Ant.* an innocent victim wastefully sacrificed along with him; or we might regard the whole 'extended family' (Kreon's and Oidipous' together) as the tainted element that must be eradicated for social health to be restored to Thebes. This taint is repeatedly mentioned or implied, both surrounding *Ant.*'s own direct ancestry (2–6, 49–57, 594–603, 857–71), and in connection with Kreon's actions within the play (1015, 1066–76, 1311, 1322–5, 1339). Although little is said in the text about any purification or communal relief resulting from the royal deaths, the burial of *Pol.* does remove the aura of pollution (1199–1205 with nn.), and the growing sense of co-operation between Kreon and the Chorus (and, intrinsically, between Chorus and theatre audience) may be felt to promise some further degree of reassurance and continuity; see 1347–53nn., and pp. 54–8 below. For further discussion of the *pharmakos* theory in relation to stage tragedy, see esp. N. Frye, *Anatomy of criticism* (Princeton 1957) 147–50, 206–23, Turner 1969, R. Girard, *Violence and the sacred* (1972; Eng. tr. Baltimore 1977), W. Burkert, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 87–121, Seaford 1994: 310–18; and for Greek ritual practice, see J. Bremmer, *HSCP* 87 (1983) 299–320.

(iii) *Male/female*

Gender lies at the root of the problems of *Ant.* Throughout the play, the status and proper roles of women, the possibilities of female autonomy and subjectivity, and the limitations of traditional views of male authority and discipline, are repeatedly brought up as key issues; and in the figure of the young heroine, who refuses to be cowed by male authority, takes action against an unacceptable political order, speaks out on behalf of divinely sanctioned moral laws, and embraces a terrifying death rather than abandon her principles, S. has created one of the most impressive female figures ever to walk the stage. As we have seen, modern critical responses to *Ant.* as a character have varied widely, and we possess few clues about the reception of the play by its original audience.¹⁵⁰ None the less, as we hear Kreon shrilly – and erroneously – berating his nieces and son, and insisting on the need for men always to ‘be master’ of women (e.g., 482–5, 531–5, 677–80, 740–50), even the most misogynistic and paternalistic Athenian must have felt some qualms. Likewise, as *Ant.* and Ismene argue about what ‘women against men’ can achieve (61–2, 96–7), and the Chorus sing about the torments of mythical brides and mothers (944–87), it is impossible not to admire *Ant.*’s courage and achievement, and not to echo some at least of the praise expressed by Haimon (699 ‘Is she not worthy of golden honour?’), even though we may also sympathize with the more critical views of her presented by the Chorus or the Guard as detached male observers, or even those of Kreon himself.

For a Greek girl, the tokens of coming of age and social success were marriage and children: this was the prime object of her upbringing, and it was by this criterion that her reputation as a woman was established. So the day on which she was led by her father or guardian to the house of her new husband was likely to be the most significant moment of her life. Yet she was also expected to remain perpetually loyal and faithful to her natal family; and in this dual set of obligations, to father and to husband, she is constantly liable to

¹⁵⁰ It is not even known whether women attended the Theatre: see J. Henderson, *TAPA* 121 (1991) 133–47, S. Goldhill, in R. Osborne & S. Hornblower, eds., *Ritual, finance, politics* (Oxford 1994) 347–69. But there is no doubt that the majority of the original audience were male, and we may safely assume that if there was an imagined ‘ideal audience’ to which the plays were directed, it consisted of Athenian citizens; but see pp. 43–5 above.

conflicting demands from both sides. In Ant.'s view, in the shadow of civil war and continuing political crisis, the prospect of attachment to any group other than her father's/brother's family is tantamount to 'betrayal' (46), and she sees the only future awaiting her as reunion with her family beneath the earth (73-6 'I shall lie with him, united in love (φιλη . . . φίλου μέτα) . . . for ever . . .'; cf. 897-9). In a grim metaphor that comes to be repeated as a virtual refrain, she prepares for her 'marriage to Hades' (806-16, 893-4nn.), in the dark underground 'bridal chamber' that will also be her 'tomb'. Her death may carry a kind of 'nobility' and 'glory' (72, 502, 695, etc.; cf. 72n.); but we recognize it as a cruel curtailment and perversion of all the sexual and maternal desires that should be expected of a woman.¹⁵¹ The pathos of Ant.'s mixed despair and defiance, as she is led off to death, brings home unforgettably the sense of a young woman's terror and isolation at leaving her family home to take up residence in another man's house and bed – but in this case deprived of the compensating excitement of torches, music, and celebrating companions, and the prospect of a desired new status and future: 'Now he has laid hands on me and is taking me away – unmarried, unsung, receiving no share of marriage to anyone or raising of children, but all alone, bereft of those who care for me . . .' (916-19).¹⁵² And our final image of Ant. is of her dead white cheek spattered with blood from her bridegroom's embrace (1240-1), as her body provokes the final agonistic collision of the two men who seek to control her.

The figure of Ant. herself is gendered in curiously ambiguous and conflicted terms. On the one hand, her devotion to family and personal attention to her brother's funeral rites correspond to traditional 'feminine' priorities; and, as we saw, her language is differentiated from that of Kreon and the other male speakers by its diction and modes of argumentation.¹⁵³ Yet her self-assertive and independent

¹⁵¹ The curtailment is both external and internal to Ant.: her 'guardian' (*kurios*) is the very one who is 'leading' her to her deadly bridegroom; and she herself exercises her own subjective preference to the point of explicitly choosing brother and father over any prospective husband or children (904-14).

¹⁵² See further Seaford 1987, Rehm 1994: 59-71.

¹⁵³ See above, pp. 20, 36-7, and n. 125.

manner, her outspoken defiance of Kreon, and her sharp rejection of Ismene's conventionally 'feminine' mentality, together with her willingness to take action – and speak out – in the public sphere and in the name of the 'laws', mark her out as a highly unconventional and exceptional 'woman'.¹⁵⁴

The play thus raises deeply troubling questions about the status and expectations of women and about society's deep-seated gender conflicts. What does its outcome suggest by way of an answer? Through her words and actions, Ant. has publicly made her point, and has to some degree been vindicated and won glory (692–700): but she is dead, and she is largely neglected in the final scenes – no lament or honorific funeral for her is mentioned (1226–36, 1340–3nn.). She has given voice to the claims of kin and the cult of the dead, areas in which women were traditionally expected to be vocal and active; but in the end her voice has been replaced by that of Teiresias, speaking both for chthonic and 'upper' powers (1068–76), and also for 'the city' as a whole (992–4, 1015). Her 'unfeminine' venture into the male world of public action has destroyed her and others close to her. And even the burial of Pol., which she has twice attempted, is finally performed by Kreon and his men (1197–1204).

Eurydike is dead, too, the innocent victim of Kreon's mistakes; and although in her brief scene she is given a few lines that disturbingly draw attention to the recurrent miseries of her life as wife and mother (1191, 1301–5nn.), she is quickly silenced, for her role is primarily to be another vehicle for Kreon's punishment. In the closing scene, the focus is thus almost exclusively on Kreon and his sufferings. He may not have 'mastered' the women, as he intended, but he has survived them, and his political authority – shared now more

¹⁵⁴ Or, to put this another way: the contrasting patterns of behaviour and speech embodied in Ant., Ismene, and Eurydike – and within the single figure of Ant. herself – demonstrate the large (and often inconsistent) range of performativities contained within the category 'woman'. Ant. is hailed both as being 'of all women ... deserving of golden honour' (693–9) and as one who shamelessly attempts to assert herself as a 'man' in place of the king (484); conversely, Ismene can be said to be both a 'better' (more conventional) 'woman' and a less devoted (less single-minded) 'daughter' than her sister; see further M. Griffith, 'Antigone and her sisters', forthcoming in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds., *Making silence speak: women's voices in Greek literature and society* (Princeton 1999).

equally with the Elders – remains intact (1257–1353, 1347–53nn.). Only one female has survived – Ismene, who relapses into safe invisibility and silence well before the end of the play; and she is the one who has done the least to disrupt the prevailing male order, the one who spells out explicitly that women are ‘not to battle against men’ (62). It must be remarked, too, that during the course of the play the feminine solidarity of the two sisters has quickly been sacrificed by Ant. (and by S.?) in the name of absolute loyalty to brother and father: as a true ‘lover’ of her family (99, 523) she cannot ‘hate’ her brother or father, only her sister (86, 93–4; cf. 543, 549). And Ismene’s attempts to mend this breach repeatedly fail.¹⁵⁵

The choices for a female subject in this play are thus limited indeed: speak out, take action – and die in isolation; or keep your place indoors, in silence, in subjection, so that men may continue their misrule. How far are these choices felt to reflect the tragic peculiarities of the family of Oidipous and fictional Thebes, how far the norms of contemporary Athenian life? Did S.’s audience even notice the absence of Ismene, or the silence about Ant., in the closing scenes of the play?¹⁵⁶

(f) *Politics*

The action of *Ant.*, like that of most Attic tragedies, centres on an elite family, whose aspirations, achievements, and experiences reverberate mightily throughout their whole community.¹⁵⁷ The building

¹⁵⁵ See P. Phelan, *Mourning sex* (New York 1997) 13–16, reassessing Lacan’s claim (1992: 260–83) that Ant. ‘incarnates . . . the desire of death as such . . .’, which is in turn ‘linked to the desire of the mother’. See too Johnson 1997, and Katz 1994: 91–6, who argues that ‘the play describes a progression from an attempt to reconstitute a symbiotic unity with Ismene, through rejection of the living sister for the dead brother and the concomitant assumption of the maternal role, to a final and total collapse back into the dead past . . .’ (p. 95).

¹⁵⁶ We may compare the closing scenes of E. *Hipp.*, or the ending of Ar. *Lysistrata*, where the heroine is likewise removed so that the men can complete the reordering of Athens and Sparta. See further Wohl 1998; also Showalter 1985, Belsey 1985.

¹⁵⁷ That ‘community’ may be as large as humankind in general (c.g. in the cases of Prometheus in A. *Prom.*, or Herakles in S. *Tr.*); but usually it is a *polis* or an army.

that stands centre-stage, and provides the main focus of the play's action and the audience's attention, represents their palace, in front of which the Elders of the city are gathered, attending on the king's needs; the royal family passes in and out of the central door, and messengers come and go in their service. And, in accordance with tragic convention, although all the characters speak the same dialect and maintain more or less the same tragic dignity of diction and deportment,¹⁵⁸ a clear social distinction is maintained between those (named) characters of the elite and the (generally anonymous) minor figures, including the Chorus, who come either to attend to their needs, or to watch, advise, and sympathize with them – and who eventually will depart to other areas of the city to continue with their lives, chastened but relatively undamaged by the tragic denouement.

This distinction is reflected to a large degree in the relationship between the leading characters and the audience, who tend to be cast, both by the stage action and by the physical layout of the theatre, into a role similar to that of the Chorus, Messengers, or Guard. Although the spectators (ancient and modern) may be made up of several heterogeneous elements, and their 'gaze' and point of view may shift in unpredictable ways, from empathetic involvement with the first-hand experiences of the main characters, to the more distanced and deferential – and at times ironically slanted – views of the Chorus and other minor figures,¹⁵⁹ our relationship to the tragic 'elite' will normally comprise a complex mixture of admiration and disapproval, anxiety and dependency, as these central figures are presented to us alternately, or even simultaneously, as grand and superior objects of veneration, and as fatally error-prone and vulnerable misfits. Consequently, the audience may feel itself deeply involved in, and impressed by, the main characters' larger-than-life struggles, and yet ultimately grateful for its own relative distance and immunity from their risks, achievements, and sufferings, a combination of responses that appears to be characteristic of the tragic

¹⁵⁸ The Guard provides some slightly 'lower,' comic elements, in exception to this general rule; see 223–331, 388–400, 437–400n., Seidensticker 1982.

¹⁵⁹ By contrast, the 'gaze' of a modern cinema audience is relatively easy to track; see J. Ellis, *Visible fictions* (London 1982), K. Silverman 1983, Griffith 1995: 72–81, 1998: 36–42.

experience.¹⁶⁰ Without these elite figures, where would the tragedy be?

In the course of *Ant.*, the city is almost ruined by a collision of two high-handed aristocrats, the one parading expressions of democratic loyalty that quickly lapse into paranoid assertions of his own power, based on 'obedience to rule . . . right or wrong' (676, 667), the other outspokenly defying the city's edicts and officers in the name of 'unwritten laws' and the traditional claims of family blood-ties – a phenomenon all too familiar to fifth-century Athenians, as they recalled the chequered careers of their own Peisistratids, Alkmaionids, Kimonids, and other dynastic families.¹⁶¹ By the end of the play, the audience may derive some reassurance from the political developments that they have witnessed, whereby Kreon's authoritarianism, and the excessive pusillanimity and blindness of his advisers, have been replaced by a collaborative relationship between ruler and 'citizens', conducive to a more harmonious civic future (1091–1114, 1347–53nn.; cf. 1183 ἄστροι); and perhaps they may see in these developments some confirmation that their own democratic system can prevent such egregious misbehaviour among the elite.¹⁶² But, given the Elders' distinctively upper-class status (843, 940, 988), and the exclusion throughout from the stage of any truly 'democratic' presence or voices,¹⁶³ the restoration of political order that we witness taking place in the closing scenes amounts rather, it seems, to a form

¹⁶⁰ See Bradley 1905, Jauss 1974, Griffith 1995: 107–24; we may compare too the Chorus' and *Ant.*'s attitude to Niobe (823–38, with n.).

¹⁶¹ Further examples were close at hand, too: e.g., the kings of Sparta and Thessaly, or the tyrants of Samos and Syracuse; cf. Shakespeare's and Marlowe's *England*, with its anxieties about the monarchy and the social mobility of the new bourgeois.

¹⁶² See Rohdich 1980, J. Winkler in Winkler & Zeitlin 1990, Goldhill 1990, Rose 1992: 185–94, Seaford 1994. Yet Attic tragedy invariably concludes with the elite continuing legitimately in power, even if this or that disruptively dominant individual may have been removed or cut down to size; cf. Griffith 1995, 1998.

¹⁶³ The subdued voice of the majority of the Theban citizens, quoted vainly by Haimon and *Ant.* herself (690–700, 732–9; cf. 509), is never elevated to a position of authority, or even autonomy, and they never are allowed to speak for themselves – unless the low-life Guard be thought to be representative of the *dēmos* as a whole.

of aristocratic oligarchy. Furthermore, it has not been the ordinary citizens, nor any kind of democratic process, that opposed Thebes' tyrannically-inclined leader and rescued the city from disaster: it took the defiance of a princess and the rage of the leader's own love-struck son – together with the decisive intervention of the gods and their mysterious prophet.¹⁶⁴

For all their admiration of Ant.'s boldness and loyalty, and their respect for Kreon's (male, elite) status and political ideals (as initially expressed), few members of the audience are likely to identify wholeheartedly with either, as they plunge into their tragic collision. For the most part, their relationship to the stage action will mirror that of the internal audiences of the play (Chorus, Guard, Messengers). With all their limitations, the cautious, ineffectual, and complacent Elders represent a thoroughly 'normal' perspective, especially as the play nears its conclusion: 'Both of you have spoken well ...' (725), 'We are just human beings, mortal-born ...' (835), 'Power is not to be flouted ... Your own temper ruined you' (873-4), 'The great words of boasters are paid for with great blows' (1350-3), etc. We may even recognize our own reactions, albeit exaggerated and parodied, in the expressions of mixed sympathy and relief voiced by the Guard: 'It brought pleasure and pain at the same time: it's a pleasant relief to escape from trouble oneself, yet it's painful to bring others that we care about into trouble. But for me at any rate the most important thing is my own survival and well-being (σωτηρίας)' (436-40). For, though his moral stature (like his social status) may be somewhat lower than ours, his relationship to the tragic action closely parallels the audience's: he is an uncomfortable accomplice, quick to disassociate himself from the mistakes and sufferings of the key characters, yet willing to acknowledge concern for them, even partial responsibility for their troubles – provided that he is not himself directly endangered. And above all, he can be counted on to survive (400 'I have the right to be released from these troubles', cf. 445, and 315-31, 407-40nn.).

¹⁶⁴ And these mysterious 'gods' (as often in S.) appear to have small connection with the cults and processes of the *polis*: rather, they seem to belong to a primordial or ancestral realm that is oblivious to political process or civic cult (450-1, 582-93, 601-3, 1064-90nn., etc.).

We do not blame the Guard or the Elders for the catastrophe of *Ant*.¹⁶⁵ But they deserve no credit either for resolving the tragic conflict. They have done as little as they could, merely staying as far as possible out of the way, expressing sympathy and advice, and watching the action unfold in the hands – and on the heads – of their leaders. Attic (like Shakespearean) tragedy thus fosters in its mixed audience of commoners and aristocrats a dangerous, yet reassuring, interdependency between leaders and led;¹⁶⁶ and this play, even as it poses radical and unsettling questions about gender roles, political authority, class relations, and divine justice, contrives none the less to provide both an aesthetic and a social resolution that is as conservative and hierarchical as it is predictable. The whole process is strangely seductive and comforting, even for a democratic audience. We may be troubled, even outraged, by what we have witnessed on the stage: but in the end we are led by the text and by the action to *accept* it, to be *satisfied* with it, and (temporarily at least) to be *convinced*: this is how it must (have) be(en).¹⁶⁷

(g) *Fantasies*

Going to the theatre, or hearing a poem, or reading a book, draws us into a unique, fictional world that is constructed out of many elements: some actual or historical, others more or less imaginary and fantastic. The situations, characters, and viewpoints represented in a tragedy extend far beyond the personal experience of any one author,

¹⁶⁵ Nor do we blame Teiresias, who represents another (very different) strand in the audience's tangled skein of responses: the all-wise, yet socially disengaged prophet shares with us a unique grasp of what is about to happen, and why; and like us, he is by profession an observer and interpreter, not an agent. Thus, while he is not himself responsible for the tragic suffering of the main characters, he connives at it, and even approves of it and helps to enforce it as being dramatically necessary.

¹⁶⁶ See further Griffith 1995, 1998.

¹⁶⁷ It is this paralysing dynamic of 'Aristotelian' necessity and resignation that Brecht was determined to resist, with his principles of 'defamiliarization' and 'epic theatre'. Of course, resistance to the impulses towards acceptance and 'satisfaction' is not unthinkable, whether through 'reading against the grain' or 'negative hermeneutics' (or even heavy doses of 'irony'); see above pp. 43–5, and, e.g., Rose 1992: 1–42, Dollimore 1989: xvi–lxviii.

whose task it is to combine mythological, narratological, linguistic, and imagistic elements (selected both from tradition and from contemporary culture at large) with her/his own personal insights and memories, to create this particular dramatic world.¹⁶⁸ Conversely, the process of mentally *reassembling* and *re-creating* the play, through the act of reading or of watching it in performance, involves the audience both in responding conscientiously to the verbal and visual cues provided by the text and stage conventions, and also in opening up their own individual imaginations to the process of empathetic identification with the events and characters of the fiction.¹⁶⁹

Much of the pleasure (and some at least of the benefit) of drama derives from the cognitive and affective processes of piecing together the action and the human figures on stage, and in losing ourselves sufficiently in the illusion to be able to share the experiences of this or that dramatic character, as if it were happening to ourselves. Our 'consciousness' is thereby vicariously expanded. But there are likely to be other, subconscious, processes at work too. The audience's 'repertoire' of previous experiences and expectations will include, in addition to the common stock necessary to tune in to and decipher the linguistic and dramatic codes of a particular text,¹⁷⁰ innumerable subconscious desires, fantasies, and fears that may contribute powerfully to their engagement with the drama unfolding before them. There are indeed good reasons to suppose that one of the chief functions and appeals of fiction (as of art in general) is the exploitation and satisfaction of such fantasies, a process of which neither author nor audience may be fully aware.

While psychoanalytical criticism, like psychoanalysis itself, takes many forms, most versions focus especially on the repressed desires

¹⁶⁸ For helpful discussion of the semiotic codes by means of which relatively small fragments of stage dialogue and visual action are conventionally organized to suggest a whole 'world' populated by real 'characters', see Beckerman 1970, Elam 1980: 98–134.

¹⁶⁹ Iser 1978, Jauss 1974; cf. Lada 1993, Bennett 1997.

¹⁷⁰ Such a minimal common stock is what is entailed in 'literary competence' (above, n. 78). But beyond this minimum, there may be a fair degree of variation in the personal and cultural experiences of the different audience members, esp. in the twentieth century. On the respective 'repertoires' of author and reader, see Iser 1978: 68–85.

and anxieties that develop in every child, as it faces the demands of growing up and entering adult society: the need to separate from the mother, to individuate itself as an autonomous person whose desires will not always be met by an ever-present, ever-nurturing maternal body, and to define itself as a gendered, desiring subject in relation to the authority of the Father.¹⁷¹ According to orthodox Freudian theory, this 'Father', in the case of a boy-child, is a competitor for the love and body of the mother, in a competition that can only be won by the son when he renounces his mother's body, finds another female object of his affections, and becomes in turn a Father in his own right. In the case of a girl-child, the 'Father' is the chief agent (real or symbolic) of the patriarchal order that subjects her (as bride and mother) to a permanent role as object of male desire, sexual possession, and legal domination, a role that (allegedly) comes naturally to her in view of her 'lack' of male attributes.¹⁷²

Given the intensity of the anxieties that surround these relations,

¹⁷¹ The term 'Father' may be meant literally, or figuratively to symbolize patriarchal order, the Law, and even Language itself: see, e.g., Jacques Lacan, *Écrits* (1966; Eng. tr. New York 1977) 1-7, 146-78, 281-91.

¹⁷² Freudian models usually take for granted the essential difference between girls and boys, 'mothers' and 'fathers', whether these differences are taken to be natural or culturally constructed. Furthermore, most psychoanalytical theory (and practice) has bought heavily into the idea of the essential *normality* of patriarchy, and the naturalness of the restriction of female aspirations to those of marriage and child-bearing; this has made it all the easier for them to believe that the familial patterns and attitudes analysed by Freud and his followers, upon which the theories of 'self' and of gender norms are based, are universally true of all human beings, whatever familial and societal structures they may have grown up in. This seems to me unlikely; see, e.g., G. Rubin, 'The traffic in women', in R. Reiter, ed., *Toward an anthropology of women* (New York 1975) 175-210, T. De Lauretis, *Technologies of gender* (New York 1987). But there are enough points of similarity between ancient Athenian and modern Western family patterns for application of the same model to both to have some value. For orthodox Freudian readings of Greek culture and literature, see esp. Slater 1968, R. S. Caldwell, 'The psychoanalytic interpretation of Greek myth', in L. Edmunds, ed., *Approaches to Greek myth* (Baltimore 1990) 342-89, Green 1979. For helpful feminist modifications of Freudian psychoanalytical theory, with regard specifically to Greek tragedy, see esp. duBois 1988, N. S. Rabinowitz, *Anxiety veiled* (Princeton 1993), Wohl 1998.

and the instability of the gendered 'identity' that each author and audience-member is constantly (but surreptitiously) struggling to (re)construct and maintain, the appeal of dramatic and literary fiction is almost irresistible: for it gives its audience a safe and harmless opportunity to explore, or experiment with, a variety of 'subject positions', and encourages them to identify with characters and situations that in 'real life' they might never dare to imagine or confront.¹⁷³ Like a dream, or a game, the drama can thus 'play out' their fantasies in disguise, and may thereby provide a measure of vicarious psychological (re)integration and/or symbolic gratification.¹⁷⁴

From the opening moments of *Ant.*, we are drawn to identify with one or both of the young, unmarried sisters, a pair of perspectives that involves us immediately in a complex and unstable pattern of relations:¹⁷⁵ with the dead, tainted parents; with the uncle who acts *in loco parentis* and embodies the adult, male (social, sexual, and symbolic) order to which the sisters are expected to subordinate themselves (173-4, 207-10, 484-9, 639-80, etc.); with the ineffectual yet reassuringly conventional (almost grandfatherly) Chorus;¹⁷⁶ and subsequently with the breezy but irresponsible Guard; and even with

¹⁷³ For helpful discussions of 'identification' (especially around the issue of gender-construction and relation to the 'Father'), see J. Laplanche, *Life and death in psychoanalysis* (Baltimore 1976), K. Silverman, *Male subjectivity at the margins* (New York 1992), D. Fuss, *Identification papers* (New York 1992), J. P. Butler, *Bodies that matter* (New York 1993) 93-119, 187-222.

¹⁷⁴ This 'gratification' will normally include a sense of closure and of restored 'order' and control; also (in the case of comedy at least) the guarantee of a 'happy ending' (usually including the promise of material and sexual fulfilment); cf. Iser 1978: 39-50. But it is less easy to determine what kind of 'gratification' is provided by a tragedy such as *Ant.*, though much of this Introduction may be said to have been indirectly addressing this issue. See also Green 1979, Wohl 1998; and (for a less overtly psychoanalytic account) Zeitlin 1996.

¹⁷⁵ The instability, but also the strength, of the 'identification' by the (predominantly male) ancient audience with each of the two sisters must have been increased by the fact that both characters were played by male actors, a convention which, though familiar to audiences of that period, was none the less inherently unsettling and tension-creating; see Zeitlin 1996: 341-416.

¹⁷⁶ In the BBC-Princeton *Films for the Humanities* production, they wear dinner-jackets (tuxedos) throughout.

hot-headed young Haimon (whom Ant. ignores, but Ismene mentions warmly, almost longingly, 570–2; cf. 781–800).

Furthermore, as we have seen, the two sisters present powerfully contrastive models of feminine/filial behaviour. On the one hand, Ismene, as the (not unconflicted) embodiment of conformity and subservience to male authority, the state, and her legal guardian (despite 531–76), supports her sister and the prospect of her marriage (568–74, 572–6n.), and thus provides a model of well-integrated and ‘mature’ psycho-social attitudes – the consequence of which, it could be said, is her survival as part of the ‘order’ that is restored by play’s end, but also her relative lack of dramatic interest, and ultimately her silence and disappearance from the text.¹⁷⁷ By contrast, Ant. with her single-minded devotion to the memory of her irrecoverable ‘natural’ father (and, less so, mother: cf. 2–3n., 471–2 τὸ γέννημ’ ὤμὸν ἐξ ὤμοῦ πατρός, etc.) and to the body of her beloved brother (esp. 73–6, 898–9nn.), rejects her sister (77–99, 526–81nn.), challenges the authority of her κύριος (458–9, 469–70, 509, 942) and of the male order of ‘the citizens’ (907 βίαι πολιτῶν, cf. 937–43n.), and consigns herself to a childless ‘marriage’ in the recesses of the earth/mother that bore her (806–16, 842–7, 937–43nn., 1204–5), where she is to be reunited for ever with her father and brother(s).¹⁷⁸ She will never grow up and become a ‘woman’.¹⁷⁹ Her peculiar self-assertion, in opposition to the submissive conformity of Ismene, seems to raise the possibility of a true ‘subjectivity’ (selfhood, choice, agency; cf. 1, 523nn., and esp. 875 σὲ δ’ αὐτόγνωτος ὤλεσ’ ὀργά), as does her independent act – twice performed – of burying her brother on her

¹⁷⁷ The silencing of Ismene, and her removal to the status of mere spectator of the action (from outside the area of the *orchestra* and *skēnē*), implicitly confirms her identification with the rest of the ‘normal’, socially integrated and publicly silent, female members of Theban/Athenian society; cf. Showalter 1985, Belsey 1985.

¹⁷⁸ It remains unclear (and perhaps irrelevant) what she feels (and does) about Eteokles (cf. 898–9n.), since she has no familial duties to perform for him.

¹⁷⁹ S-Inwood 1990, cf. Foley 1996. In Anouilh’s play, this association between Ant.’s immaturity and her refusal to accept the political–symbolic order is more explicit: [Ant.] ‘I am not here to understand . . . I am here to say no to you and die.’ [Creon] ‘It is easy to say no . . .’ (Anouilh 1958: 37).

own initiative and with her own hands (900 αὐτόχειρ, cf. 43). Yet in her absolute self-negation (reflected even in her self-definition in terms of 'love' for her dead family: 523 συμφιλεῖν ἕφρου), and in her solitary death, she seems after all to confirm that the only acceptable place for such female subjectivity is – in Hades, where she can 'lie with' her family for ever (73–6, 891–9, 1204–5, 1240).¹⁸⁰

Choral fantasies of nymphs roaming joyously on the mountains with Dionysos (1128–36, 1150–2), or of a bride and groom exchanging longing glances (795–800), contrast with Ant.'s despairing contemplation of a solitary, virginal death, and in our final image of her, she is dangling lifeless and oblivious in the cave, the inert object of Haimon's passionate embraces (1236–41). Ant. receives no final resting-place in the play, no social reintegration, for she is the one victim entirely omitted from Kreon's final cortège. It is as if she remains forever in the cave.¹⁸¹ Her resistance to one symbolic/paternal order (Kreon's) has been absolute: but so has her reabsorption into another (her dead father's/Hades'), as she is handed over by her guardian to a subterranean husband, and condemned (like Kore-Persephone) to eternal childishness and childlessness.¹⁸²

Whereas both these sisters are figures requiring a large imaginative leap for a male spectator to achieve full identification, their uncle

¹⁸⁰ The repetition of κείσσομαι, κείται, κοιμήματα, κτλ. (73–6, 1240; 861–9; etc.), combines associations of sex, funeral, and dedicatory offering. For an analysis of the incestuous element in Ant.'s behaviour, cf. Seaford 1990: 213–14, Loraux 1986, Johnson 1997. In the end, however, it may be impossible and unnecessary to draw a sharp line between 'sexual' and 'non-sexual', 'normal' and 'incestuous' affections. Her feelings are extremely (abnormally) strong: but an Athenian audience would probably not find them pathological. (In Anouilh's version, both the erotic and the childish ('no') aspects of Ant.'s devotion to Pol. are made much more prominent.)

¹⁸¹ Contrast too the grimly negative images of Niobe (823–33), Kleopatra, and the Boreads (966–87), etc., all invoked as analogies to Ant. and confirming her ultimate sterility and exclusion.

¹⁸² See 810–16, 893–4, 1118–21nn., and Segal 1981: 200–6, Katz 1994: 92–5. Perhaps the fleeting image of her lying, bloodied, in the embrace of Haimon, provides a half-hearted, safely belated endorsement of her claims (as an assertive female subject) to sexual fulfilment and marriage (1240–1): like so many dangerously asocial hero(in)es, she can be allowed her full subjectivity only in the moment of her final removal from society.

is all too recognizable as 'one of us': a mature male citizen, father, husband, and wielder of full familial and political authority.¹⁸³ On first acquaintance, Kreon's values and aspirations strike us for the most part as quite commonplace and typical of Greek men (162–210n.). Even later, as we distance ourselves from his cruel and arrogant assertions, and come to welcome the proof that his treatment of Pol. and Ant. was wrong, we must shudder at the prospect of his confusion, shame, and loss of son, wife, and prestige. In so far as he resembles (many of) us, we recognize that his experience could be ours; and the music, gestures, and ritualistic language of the final dirge, with Kreon and the Chorus closely engaged in response to one another, inevitably strengthen that feeling of sympathy (1257–1353, 1326–53n.). His final cries (1325 'I who am no more than nothing...'; 1339 'useless man', μάταιον ἄνδρα), confirm that his earlier aspirations to absolute masculinity and authority were illusory: no 'man' should expect to rule over women, or sons, or citizens, to the degree that Kreon attempted. None the less, with his unruly ambitions duly curtailed, he will be allowed to continue to uphold the 'symbolic order' of Thebes (as will the spectators that of Athens), an order that will henceforth elicit (we are to assume) a more restrained and subdued exercise of paternal authority. For if there is anyone whose 'old age' stands to benefit from the 'lessons' of the play (1353 γῆραι . . . ἐδίδαξαν), it should be Kreon.

Thus Kreon's aspirations and point of view are not so much negated or superseded, as muted and trimmed. Certainly there is no other character in the play who presents a more complete or authoritative model of adult behaviour, through whom we can see an alternative fantasy fulfilled: not Ant., nor the Chorus, nor Teiresias – and certainly not Kreon's own son. In Haimon's relation to his father (and to the mother whom he never mentions), the conflicting demands of erotic desire and filial obedience are clear-cut, and in

¹⁸³ This privileging of the male spectator's imagination (as being 'ours') is intended only to reflect fifth-century Athenian norms; in a modern Western audience, as it reads the play or sees it performed by a cast of female and male actors, most women (and not a few men) will presumably tend to identify much more readily with one or both of the sisters than with their domineering uncle.

valuing ἔρως over φιλία and πειθαρχία, Haimon can be seen as asserting his claims as an independent adult (or adolescent) male subject, claims that we may find attractive and appealing, even as we must be troubled by the tone and content of his interactions with his father (626–780, 735, 762–5nn.).¹⁸⁴ The prize over which the two men compete is the person of Ant. herself (632–4, 746–56, 769, 890), and the terms of their quarrel are heavily coloured with sexual jealousy and ‘Oedipal’ conflict: Haimon indeed tries to kill his father in the ‘marriage-chamber’ of the cave (1231–4); and his death in his bride’s arms directly brings about that of his mother (her self-inflicted wound mirroring his, 1315–16n.). But his aspirations to sexual fulfilment, and to mature adulthood, are thwarted by the combination of his father’s repressiveness and his own – and Ant.’s – impetuosity, and when he does finally get to possess the body of his bride, the narrative of his marriage-in-death simultaneously satisfies, as it eternally defers, his and our desire (1220–5, 1234–41), as if to bring home to us the inaccessibility of such rewards outside the proper structures of parental and societal approval. Indeed, this conflict between father and son is ‘Oedipal’ not only in the narrow, familial sense (i.e. concerning access to the body of the mother/bride), but also in the larger sense, concerning the legitimate control of language and political authority, for Haimon insists that his opposition to his father is based on concern for him personally and for the *polis*, rather than on his own desires (626–780n., cf. 637–8, 701–2, 740–9n.), and Kreon explicitly equates paternal authority in the home with political order at large (658–60, 672–80). And in this struggle for authority, too, neither father nor son truly prevails, for, as a self-styled ‘non-entity’ (1325), without son or wife to ‘rule’ in his own house, Kreon can barely bring himself to contemplate either the present or the future at all (1328–32, 1343–4) and wants only to be taken ‘out of the way’ (ἐκποδών, 1321, 1339).

In the end, such mature voices of authority as we may identify in the closing scene of the play seem to proceed, not from Haimon or

¹⁸⁴ Likewise, the erotic excitement invoked by the Chorus (781–800) is interlaced with sobering reminders of Love’s damaging consequences (790–1 ‘He who has you is mad. You twist even just men’s minds, and make them unjust . . .’). See further Griffith 1988: 65–74.

Ant., nor even from Kreon, but from the previously ineffectual and impotent Elders (1091–1114, 1334–1353nn.), who to some degree, like most tragic Choruses, come to embody and articulate the audience's own sense of collective relief and renewed solidarity.¹⁸⁵ The mysterious lyric knowledge and archetypal insights that the Chorus (like Teiresias) can intermittently – and finally – muster, give them the power to be both outside and inside the action, and thus put them in the same frame of reference as ourselves; and it is they alone who succeed in giving verbal articulation, however groping and incomplete, to those anarchical yet liberating natural forces, Eros and Dionysos, forces that have somehow to be, if not harnessed or contained, at least channelled into the aesthetic symmetry and recuperative order of the tragic performance itself.¹⁸⁶

6. THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXT¹⁸⁷

S.'s text is not well preserved. Our oldest surviving manuscript of *Ant.* (Laurentianus 32.9 = L) was written *c.* 950 CE (i.e. some 1,400 years later than the first performance of the play), and the rest of our MSS date from the twelfth to the fifteenth century¹⁸⁸ (The first (Aldine) printed edition appeared in 1502.) It is not unlikely that S. himself made many changes to his text before, during, and after the period of rehearsal of his play for its first performance;¹⁸⁹ and we

¹⁸⁵ See above pp. 55–8; also Rohdich 1980, Griffith 1995: 108–24 (but cf. Gould 1996). Authority of a kind resides also with the blind, lone prophet, Teiresias, a figure exempt from normal social constraints and pleasures (no wife, no children, no regular political duties), and entitled to speak what he knows with no responsibility for the consequences; see n. 165, above.

¹⁸⁶ See F. Nietzsche, *The birth of tragedy* §§2–3, 7–9, Nussbaum 1986: 82. Henrichs 1990: 264–9 suggests a more directly salvationist function for Dionysos in *Ant.* (see 1115–54n.); contrast W-Ingram 1980: 91–116, Segal 1981: 190–206, Seaford 1994.

¹⁸⁷ See esp. A. Turyn, *Studies in the manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Sophocles* (Urbana 1952), Dawe 1973–8, LJ&W vi–xiv, xviii.

¹⁸⁸ A brother of L from about the same date also survives, but only as a faded and largely illegible palimpsest (Leiden BPG 60A = Λ).

¹⁸⁹ Or subsequent performance at the Rural Dionysia, or elsewhere (Pickard-Cambridge 1988: 40–56).

have no way of knowing what version(s) of the text may have been put into circulation by him or others during the fifth and early fourth century BCE.¹⁹⁰ In the mid-fourth century, official texts of A., S., and E. were assembled in Athens, from which actors were subsequently supposed not to depart in mounting new productions. Later, in the third century BCE, scholars in Alexandria assembled the best texts they could find of all major authors, to stock their new Library, and it is generally supposed that the MSS we possess are ultimately derived from these Alexandrian editions, which were also supplemented by copious commentaries during the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.

S.'s plays were not read or performed during the Hellenistic and Roman periods as much as E.'s or Menander's. However, S. continued to be one of the canonical authors, and school editions containing seven select plays eventually became standard; and at least one such edition survived the Middle Ages, to become the basis for our surviving MSS.¹⁹¹ The precise relations of those MSS to one another (and to other, lost MSS) are much disputed; but this much is agreed: (i) all the surviving MSS belong to a single family, even though different sub-groupings can be identified; (ii) no individual MS is so far superior to the others as to deserve special credit and credence;¹⁹² (iii) the MS tradition of S. during the late Mediaeval and early Renaissance periods was quite 'open', which is to say that copyists often copied from, or consulted, more than one exemplar; on occasion, even a late and unreliable MS can contain a good reading that may have been acquired from a good old source (though sometimes it may be the result of intelligent conjecture by the scribe or his 'corrector').

¹⁹⁰ See R. D. Dawe's introduction to his edition of *OT* (Cambridge 1982) 23-6.

¹⁹¹ In all, 150 or so MSS contain the 'Triad' (*Ajax*, *El.*, *OT*); about a dozen MSS are regarded as useful witnesses for *Ant.* by Dawe (Teubner), and by LJ&W (OCT) in their recent editions.

¹⁹² Brunck's edition (1786) mainly followed Parisinus gr. 2712 (A), of c. 1300 CE; Dindorf's edition (1832) favoured the tenth-century Laurentianus 32.9 (L), as did most subsequent editors, until Turyn and Dawe demonstrated the unsoundness of this prejudice.

Only two ancient papyri have been found containing small bits of *Ant.* (lines 242–6, 689–90): they add nothing useful.¹⁹³ Ancient authors and scholars (such as Demosthenes, Aristotle, Plutarch, Didymos, Athenaios, Eustathios, and Pollux) occasionally quote – not always accurately – from the play, and thus provide independent testimony for the lines in question (223, 241, 292, 318, 563, 628, 712–14, 742, 911, 1166–7: see *apparatus criticus* and nn.). But for the most part we must rely on the MSS, and when these appear all to be in error, we must seek to emend them, or acknowledge ignorance and print daggers.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹³ R. A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin literary papyri from Greco-Roman Egypt* (2nd ed., Ann Arbor 1967), nos. 1463, 1571. Pack no. 377 contains a comic parody of 712–14 (see n.).

¹⁹⁴ For a description of the symbols and editorial criteria used in the text and *apparatus criticus* of this edition, see p. 69.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT AND APPARATUS CRITICUS

In this edition, the *apparatus criticus* has been kept as short and simple as possible. No effort is made to record particular MS sources and affiliations: instead I use symbols (Φ , Ω) denoting a minority, majority, or unanimity of MSS. (There is one exception: those readings of the fourteenth-century 'Triclinian' family of MSS, which are likely to be emendations by Demetrius Triclinius himself, are designated by the symbol T.)

In noting variant readings, I have included only cases in which serious doubt exists as to what S. wrote, and I have excluded orthographical details that do not affect the meaning or metre.

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Ω | Reading of all or most MSS. |
| Φ | Reading of a minority of MSS. ¹ |
| scholiast | Reading (explicit or implicit) of one or more scholia. |

For fuller description and reporting of particular MSS and their affiliations, the reader should consult Lloyd-Jones & Wilson's OCT, Dawe's Teubner edition, and Dawe 1973–8.

¹ Φ may comprise half-a-dozen or more MSS, or just one or two, or no more than a $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, or *ante correctionem*, or *supra lineam* variant.

ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΗ

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ

ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΗ

ΙΣΜΗΝΗ

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΘΗΒΑΙΩΝ ΓΕΡΟΝΤΩΝ

ΚΡΕΩΝ

ΦΥΛΑΞ

ΑΙΜΩΝ

ΤΕΙΡΕΣΙΑΣ

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

ΕΥΡΥΔΙΚΗ

ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΗ

ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΗ

ὦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα,
ἄρ' οἶσθ' ὃ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίου κακῶν
ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῶιν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;
οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὔτ' ἀτήριον
οὔτ' αἰσχροὺς οὔτ' ἄτιμόν ἐσθ', ὁποῖον οὐ 5
τῶν σῶν τε κάμῶν οὐκ ὄπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν.
καὶ νῦν τί τοῦτ' αὖ φασι πανδήμῳ πόλει
κήρυγμα θεῖναι τὸν στρατηγὸν ἀρτίως;
ἔχεις τι κείσῃκουσας; ἢ σε λανθάνει
πρὸς τοὺς φίλους στείχοντα τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακά; 10

ΙΣΜΗΝΗ

ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδεὶς μῦθος, Ἀντιγόνη, φίλων
οὔθ' ἠδὺς οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸς ἴκετ', ἐξ ὅτου
δυοῖν ἀδελφοῖν ἐστερήθημεν δύο,
μιᾶι θανόντοιν ἡμέραι διπλῆι χερὶ·
ἐπεὶ δὲ φροῦδός ἐστιν Ἀργείων στρατός 15
ἐν νυκτὶ τῇ νῦν, οὐδὲν οἶδ' ὑπέρτερον,
οὔτ' εὐτυχοῦσα μᾶλλον οὔτ' ἀτωμένη.
Αν. ἦ ἴδη καλῶς, καὶ σ' ἐκτὸς αὐλείων πυλῶν
τοῦδ' οὔνεκ' ἐξέπεμπον, ὡς μόνη κλύοις.
Ισ. τί δ' ἔστι; δηλοῖς γάρ τι καλχαίνουσ' ἔπος. 20
Αν. οὐ γὰρ τάφου νῶιν τῷ κασιγνήτῳ Κρέων
τὸν μὲν προτίσας, τὸν δ' ἀτιμάσας ἔχει;
Ἔτεοκλέα μὲν, ὡς λέγουσι, σὺν δίκη
χρησθαι δικαίων τῷ νόμῳ κατὰ χθονὸς
ἔκρυψε, τοῖς ἔνερθεν ἔντιμον νεκροῖς· 25
τὸν δ' ἀθλίως θανόντα Πολυνεῖκους νέκυν

4 ἀτήριον Brunck: ἄτης ἄτερ Ω 14 θανόντοιν Blaydes: -όντων Ω
24 χρῆσθαι δικαίων τῷ νόμῳ Schütz: χρησθεὶς δικαίαι καὶ νόμῳ Ω

- ἀστοῖσί φασιν ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι τὸ μὴ
 ταφῶι καλύψαι μηδὲ κωκῦσαί τινα,
 ἔαν δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, οἰωνοῖς γλυκὺν
 θησαυρὸν εἰσορῶσι πρὸς χάριν βορᾶς. 30
 τοιαῦτά φασι τὸν ἀγαθὸν Κρέοντά σοι –
 κάμοι, λέγω γὰρ κάμῃ – κηρύξαντ' ἔχειν,
 καὶ δεῦρο νεῖσθαι ταῦτα τοῖσι μὴ εἰδόσιν
 σαφῆ προκηρύζοντα, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἄγειν
 οὐχ ὡς παρ' οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν τούτων τι δρᾷι
 φόνον προκεῖσθαι δημόλευστον ἐν πόλει.
 οὕτως ἔχει σοι ταῦτα, καὶ δείξεις τάχα
 εἴτ' εὐγενῆς πέφυκας εἴτ' ἐσθλῶν κακῆ.
- Ισ. τί δ', ὦ ταλαῖφρον, εἰ τάδ' ἐν τούτοις, ἐγὼ
 λύουσ' ἂν εἴθ' ἄπτουσα προσθείμην πλέον; 40
 Αν. εἰ ξυμπονήσεις καὶ ξυνεργάσῃ σκόπει.
- Ισ. ποῖόν τι κινδύνευμα; ποῦ γνώμης ποτ' εἶ;
 Αν. εἰ τὸν νεκρὸν ξὺν τῆϊδε κουφιεῖς χερί.
- Ισ. ἦ γὰρ νοεῖς θάπτειν σφ', ἀπόρρητον πόλει;
 Αν. τὸν γοῦν ἐμόν, καὶ τὸν σόν, ἦν σὺ μὴ θέλῃς,
 ἀδελφόν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ προδοῦσ' ἄλωσομαι. 45
 Ισ. ὦ σχετλία, Κρέοντος ἀντειρηκότος;
- Αν. ἀλλ' οὐδὲν αὐτῶι τῶν ἐμῶν μ' εἴργειν μέτα.
- Ισ. οἴμοι· φρόνησον, ὦ κασιγνήτη, πατήρ
 ὡς νῶιν ἀπεχθῆς δυσκλεῆς τ' ἀπώλετο, 50
 πρὸς αὐτοφώρων ἀμπλακημάτων διπλᾶς
 ὄψεις ἀράξας αὐτὸς αὐτουργῶι χερί·
 ἔπειτα μήτηρ καὶ γυνή, διπλοῦν ἔπος,
 πλεκταῖσιν ἀρτάναισι λωβᾶται βίον·
 τρίτον δ' ἀδελφῶ δύο μίαν καθ' ἡμέραν 55
 αὐτοκτονοῦντε τῶ ταλαιπώρω μόρον
 κοινὸν κατειργάσαντ' ἐπαλλήλοιν χεροῖν.
 νῦν δ' αὖ μόνᾳ δὴ νῶ λειλιμμένα σκόπτει

40 Porson: ἦ (or ἦ or καὶ or εἰ) θάπτουσα Ω: ἦ 'φάπτουσα Brunck 42
 ποῦ Φ: ποῖ Ω 46 line deleted by Didymos 48 μ' supplied by Brunck
 53 ἔπος Φ: πάθος Ω 58 δ' Φ: omitted by Ω

- ὄσωι κάκιστ' ὀλούμεθ', εἰ νόμου βίαι
 ψῆφον τυράννων ἢ κράτη παρέξιμεν. 60
 ἀλλ' ἐννοεῖν χρή τοῦτο μὲν γυναῖχ' ὅτι
 ἔφυνεν, ὡς πρὸς ἄνδρας οὐ μαχουμένα,
 ἔπειτα δ' οὔνεκ' ἀρχόμεσθ' ἐκ κρεισσόνων
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἀκούειν κᾶτι τῶνδ' ἀλγίονα.
 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν αἰτοῦσα τοὺς ὑπὸ χθονὸς 65
 ζύγγωνιαν ἴσχειν, ὡς βιάζομαι τάδε,
 τοῖς ἐν τέλει βεβῶσι πείσομαι· τὸ γὰρ
 περισσὰ πράσσειν οὐκ ἔχει νοῦν οὐδένα.
- Αν. οὔτ' ἂν κελεύσαιμ' οὔτ' ἂν, εἰ θέλοις ἔτι
 πράσσειν, ἐμοῦ γ' ἂν ἠδέως δρώϊης μέτα. 70
 ἀλλ' ἴσθ' ὅποια σοὶ δοκεῖ· κείνων δ' ἐγὼ
 θάψω· καλὸν μοι τοῦτο ποιούσηι θανεῖν.
 φίλη μετ' αὐτοῦ κείσομαι, φίλου μέτα,
 ὅσα πανουργήσασ', ἐπεὶ πλείων χρόνος
 ὄν δεῖ μ' ἀρέσκειν τοῖς κάτω τῶν ἐνθάδε. 75
 ἐκεῖ γὰρ αἰεὶ κείσομαι· σοὶ δ' εἰ δοκεῖ,
 τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔντιμ' ἀτιμάσασ' ἔχε.
- Ισ. ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἄτιμα ποιούμαι, τὸ δὲ
 βίαι πολιτῶν δρᾶν ἔφυν ἀμήχανος.
- Αν. σὺ μὲν τάδ' ἂν προύχοι', ἐγὼ δὲ δὴ τάφον
 χώσουσ' ἀδελφῶι φιλτάτῳ πορεύσομαι. 80
- Ισ. οἴμοι ταλαίνης, ὡς ὑπερδέδοικά σου.
- Αν. μὴ 'μοῦ προτάρβει· τὸν σὸν ἐξόρθου πότμον.
- Ισ. ἀλλ' οὖν προμηνύσηις γε τοῦτο μηδενὶ
 τοῦργον, κρυφῆι δὲ κεῖθε, σὺν δ' αὐτῶς ἐγὼ. 85
- Αν. οἴμοι, καταύδα· πολλὸν ἐχθίων ἔσηι
 σιγῶσ', ἐὰν μὴ πᾶσι κηρύξηις τάδε.
- Ισ. θερμὴν ἐπὶ ψυχροῖσι καρδίαν ἔχεις.
- Αν. ἀλλ' οἶδ' ἀρέσκουσ' οἷς μάλισθ' ἀδεῖν με χρή.
- Ισ. εἰ καὶ δυνήσηι γ'· ἀλλ' ἀμηχάνων ἐρᾶις. 90
- Αν. οὐκοῦν, ὅταν δὴ μὴ σθένω, πεπαύσομαι.

71 ὅποια Φ: ὅποια Ω 76 σοὶ Ω: σὺ Φ (and Elmsley) 83 μὴ 'μοῦ
 Schaefer: μὴ μου Ω πότμον Φ: βίον Ω

- Ισ. ἀρχὴν δὲ θηρᾶν οὐ πρέπει τὰμήχανα.
 Αν. εἰ ταῦτα λέξεις, ἐχθαρῆι μὲν ἐξ ἔμοῦ,
 ἐχθρὰ δὲ τῶι θανόντι προσκείσῃ δίκηι.
 ἀλλ' ἔα με καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἔμοῦ δυσβουλίαν 95
 παθεῖν τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο· πείσομαι γὰρ οὐ
 τοσοῦτον οὐδὲν ὥστε μὴ οὐ καλῶς θανεῖν.
 Ισ. ἀλλ', εἰ δοκεῖ σοι, στεῖχε· τοῦτο δ' ἴσθ', ὅτι
 ἄνους μὲν ἔρχῃ, τοῖς φίλοις δ' ὀρθῶς φίλη.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

- ἄκτις ἀελίου, τὸ κάλ- [στρ. α
 λιστον ἑπταπύλῳ φανέν 101
 Θήβαι τῶν προτέρων φάος,
 ἐφάνθης ποτ', ὦ χρυσέας
 ἀμέρας βλέφαρον, Διρκαί-
 ων ὑπὲρ ῥεέθρων μολοῦσα, 105
 τὸν λεύκασπιν Ἄργολικὸν
 φῶτα βάντα πανσαγίαί
 φυγάδα πρόδρομον ὄξυτέρῳ
 κινήσασα χαλινῶι,
 ὄν ἐφ' ἀμετέραι γαῖ Πολυνεΐκης 110
 ἄρθεις νεικέων ἐξ ἀμφιλόγων
 <ἦγαγε· κείνος δ'> ὄξεα κλάζων
 αἰετὸς εἰς γᾶν ὡς ὑπέρεπτα,
 λευκῆς χιόνος πτέρυγι στεγανὸς
 πολλῶν μεθ' ὄπλων 115
 ξύν θ' ἵπποκόμοις κορύθεσιν.
 στὰς δ' ὑπὲρ μελάθρων φονώ- [ἀντ. α
 σαισιν ἀμφιχανῶν κύκλωι

106 Ἄργολικὸν Blaydes, scholiast: Ἄργόθεν Ω 108 ὄξυτέρῳ Φ: ὄξυ-
 τῶρι Ω 110 Ω: ὄς ... Πολυνεΐκους Scaliger 112 ἦγαγε· κείνος δ'
 supplied by Nauck 113 εἰς γᾶν ὡς Ω: ὡς γᾶν Blaydes 117 φονώσαισιν
 Bothe: φονῶσιν Φ: φο(ι)νίασιν Ω

λόγχαις ἐπτάπυλον στόμα,
 ἔβα πρὶν ποθ' ἀμετέρων 120
 αἰμάτων γένυσιν πλησθῆ-
 ναί τε καὶ στεφάνωμα πύργων
 πευκάενθ' Ἥφαιστον ἐλείν.
 τοῖος ἀμφὶ νῶτ' ἐτάθη
 πάταγος Ἄρεος, ἀντιπάλου 125
 δυσχείρωμα δράκοντος.

Ζεὺς γὰρ μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους
 ὑπερεχθαίρει, καὶ σφας ἐσιδὼν
 πολλῶι ρεύματι προσνισσομένους
 χρυσοῦ καναχῆς ὑπεροπλίαις, 130
 παλτῶι ρίπτει πυρὶ βαλβίδων
 ἐπ' ἄκρων ἤδη
 νίκην ὀρμῶντ' ἀλαλάξαι.

ἀντιτύπαι δ' ἐπὶ γαῖ πέσε τανταλωθεῖς [στρ. β
 πυρφόρος ὃς τότε μαινομένοι ξὺν ὀρμαῖ 135
 βακχεύων ἐπέπνει
 ῥιπαῖς ἐχθίστων ἀνέμων.
 εἶχε δ' ἄλλαι τὰ μὲν,
 ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις ἐπενώ-
 μα στυφελίζων μέγας Ἄρ-
 ης δεξιόσειρος. 140

ἐπτά λοχαγοὶ γὰρ ἐφ' ἐπτά πύλαις
 ταχθέντες ἴσοι πρὸς ἴσους ἔλιπον
 Ζηνὶ τροπαίωι πάγχαλκα τέλη,
 πλήν τοῖν στυγεροῖν, ὦ πατρός ἐνός

122 τε T: omitted by Ω 125 ἀντιπάλου Φ: ἀντιπάλωι Ω 126 δρά-
 κοντος Φ: δράκοντι Ω 130 ὑπεροπλίαις Vauvilliers: ὑπεροπλίας Φ:
 ὑπεροπτι(ί)ας Ω 134 ἀντιτύπαι Porson: ἀντίτυπα Ω (-τυπος T)
 138-9 Erfurd: ἄλλαι τὰ μὲν ἄλλαι τὰ δ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις Φ: ἄλλα τὰδ' ἐπ'
 ἄλλους Ω 140 δεξιόσειρος Ω: δεξιόχειρος Φ

μητρός τε μιᾶς φύντε καθ' αὐτοῖν 145
 δικρατεῖς λόγχας στήσαντ' ἔχετον
 κοινοῦ θανάτου μέρος ἄμφω.

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἅ μεγαλώνυμος ἦλθε Νίκα [ἀντ. β
 τᾶι πολυαρμάτῳ ἀντιχαρεῖσα Θήβαι,
 ἐκ μὲν δὴ πολέμων 150
 τῶν νῦν θέσθαι λησμοσύναν·
 θεῶν δὲ ναοὺς χοροῖς
 παννυχίοις πάντας ἐπέλ-
 θωμεν, ὁ Θήβας δ' ἐλελί-
 χθων Βάκχιος ἄρχοι.

ἀλλ' ὄδε γὰρ δὴ βασιλεὺς χώρας, 155
 † Κρέων ὁ Μειοικέως (υυ-) νεοχμὸς †
 νεαραῖσι θεῶν ἐπὶ συντυχίαις
 χωρεῖ τίνα δὴ μῆτιν ἐρέσσω,
 ὅτι σύγκλητον τήνδε γερόντων
 προὔθετο λέσχην 160
 κοινῶι κηρύγματι πέμψας;

ΚΡΕΩΝ

ἄνδρες, τὰ μὲν δὴ πόλεος ἀσφαλῶς θεοὶ
 πολλῶι σάλῳι σείσαντες ὤρθωσαν πάλιν·
 ὑμᾶς δ' ἐγὼ πομποῖσιν ἐκ πάντων δίχα
 ἔστειλ' ἰκέσθαι, τοῦτο μὲν τὰ Λαῖου 165
 σέβοντας εἰδῶς εὐ θρόνων αἰεὶ κράτη,
 τοῦτ' αὐθις ἠνίκ' Οἰδίπους ὤρθου πόλιν,
 κάπει διώλετ' ἀμφὶ τοὺς κείνων ἔτι
 παῖδας μένοντας ἐμπέδοις φρονήμασιν.
 ὅτ' οὖν ἐκεῖνοι πρὸς διπλῆς μοίρας μίαν 170

151 θέσθαι Φ: θέσθε Ω 153 παννυχίοις Φ: παννύχοις Ω 154 ἐλελίχθων
 Φ: ἐλελίζων Ω Βάκχιος Bothe: Βακχεῖος Ω 156 Ω: <ταγὸς> supplied
 by Wolff 168 κείνων Ω: κείνου Φ

καθ' ἡμέραν ὦλοντο, παίσαντές τε καὶ
 πληγέντες αὐτόχειρι σὺν μιάσματι,
 ἐγὼ κράτη δὴ πάντα καὶ θρόνους ἔχω
 γένους κατ' ἀγχιστεῖα τῶν ὀλωλότων.
 ἀμήχανον δὲ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐκμαθεῖν 175
 ψυχὴν τε καὶ φρόνημα καὶ γνώμην, πρὶν ἂν
 ἀρχαῖς τε καὶ νόμοισιν ἐντριβῆς φανῆι.
 ἐμοὶ γὰρ ὅστις πᾶσαν εὐθύνων πόλιν
 μὴ τῶν ἀρίστων ἄπτεται βουλευμάτων,
 ἀλλ' ἐκ φόβου του γλώσσαν ἐγκλήσας ἔχει, 180
 κάκιστος εἶναι νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι δοκεῖ·
 καὶ μείζον' ὅστις ἀντὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ πάτρας
 φίλον νομίζει, τοῦτον οὐδαμοῦ λέγω.
 ἐγὼ γάρ, ἴστω Ζεὺς ὁ πάνθ' ὀρῶν ἀεὶ,
 οὔτ' ἂν σιωπήσαιοι τὴν ἄτην ὀρῶν 185
 στείχουσαν ἀστοῖς ἀντὶ τῆς σωτηρίας,
 οὔτ' ἂν φίλον ποτ' ἀνδρα δυσμενῆ χθονὸς
 θείμην ἐμαυτῶι, τοῦτο γιγνώσκων ὅτι
 ἦδ' ἐστὶν ἡ σώζουσα, καὶ ταύτης ἔπι
 πλέοντες ὀρθῆς τοὺς φίλους ποιούμεθα. 190
 τοιοῖσδ' ἐγὼ νόμοισι τήνδ' αὖξω πόλιν.
 καὶ νῦν ἀδελφὰ τῶνδε κηρύξας ἔχω
 ἀστοῖσι παίδων τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίου περὶ·
 Ἐτεοκλέα μὲν, ὃς πόλεως ὑπερμαχῶν
 ὄλωλε τῆσδε, πάντ' ἀριστεύσας δορί, 195
 τάφωι τε κρύψαι καὶ τὰ πάντ' ἐφαγνίσαι
 ἃ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἔρχεται κάτω νεκροῖς·
 τὸν δ' αὖ ξύναιμον τοῦδε, Πολυνείκην λέγω,
 ὃς γῆν πατρώϊαν καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς
 φυγὰς κατελθὼν ἠθέλησε μὲν πυρὶ 200
 πρῆσαι κατ' ἄκρας, ἠθέλησε δ' αἵματος
 κοινοῦ πάσασθαι, τοὺς δὲ δουλώσας ἄγειν,

187 χθονὸς Ω: πόλεως Φ 190 ὀρθῆς Ω: ὀρθῶς Φ 195 δορί Ω: χερί Φ
 196 ἐφαγνίσαι Φ: ἀφαγνίσαι Ω 201 πρῆσαι Ω: ἐπέσαι Musgrave

τοῦτον πόλει τῆιδ' ἐκκεκήρυκται τάφωι
 μήτε κτερίζειν μήτε κωκυῖσαι τινα,
 ἔἂν δ' ἄθαπτον καὶ πρὸς οἰωνῶν δέμας 205
 καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἔδεστον αἰκισθέν τ' ἰδεῖν.
 τοιόνδ' ἐμόν φρόνημα, κοῦποτ' ἔκ γ' ἐμοῦ
 τιμῆι προέξουσ' οἱ κακοὶ τῶν ἐνδίκων.
 ἀλλ' ὅστις εὔνους τῆιδε τῆι πόλει, θανῶν
 καὶ ζῶν ὁμοίως ἐξ ἐμοῦ τιμήσεται. 210

Χο. σοὶ ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει, παῖ Μενοικέως, ποεῖν
 τὸν τῆιδε δύσνον καὶ τὸν εὐμενῆ πόλει.
 νόμωι δὲ χρῆσθαι παντί πού γ' ἔνεστί σοι
 καὶ τῶν θανόντων χῶπόσοι ζῶμεν πέρι.
 Κρ. ὡς ἂν σκοποὶ νυν ἦτε τῶν εἰρημένων. 215
 Χο. νεωτέρωι τωι τοῦτο βαστάζειν πρόθεσ.
 Κρ. ἀλλ' εἴσ' ἔτοιμοι τοῦ νεκροῦ γ' ἐπίσκοποι.
 Χο. τί δῆτ' ἂν ἄλλο τοῦτ' ἐπεντέλλοις ἔτι;
 Κρ. τὸ μὴ ἴπιχωρεῖν τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν τάδε.
 Χο. οὐκ ἔστιν οὔτω μῶρος ὃς θανεῖν ἐρᾷ. 220
 Κρ. καὶ μὴν ὁ μισθός γ' οὔτος· ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἐλπίδων
 ἄνδρας τὸ κέρδος πολλάκις διώλεσεν.

ΦΥΛΑΞ

ἄναξ, ἐρῶ μὲν οὐχ ὅπως τάχους ὕπο
 δύσπνους ἰκάνω κοῦφον ἐξάρας πόδα·
 πολλὰς γὰρ ἔσχον φροντίδων ἐπιστάσεις, 225
 ὁδοῖς κυκλῶν ἐμαυτὸν εἰς ἀναστροφὴν·
 ψυχὴ γὰρ ηὔδα πολλὰ μοι μυθουμένη·
 “τάλας, τί χωρεῖς οἷ μολῶν δώσεις δίκην;”
 “τλήμων, μένεις αὔ; κεὶ τὰδ' εἴσεται Κρέων

203 ἐκκεκήρυκται Musgrave: ἐκκεκηρύχθαι Ω 208 τιμῆι Linwood: τιμῆν
 Ω 210 ἐξ Φ: ἔκ γ' Ω 211 ποιεῖν Φ: Κρέων Ω 212 καὶ Ω: κάς Din-
 dorf 213 ποῦ γ' Erfurd: πού τ' Ω: ποτ' Φ 215 ὡς ἂν Ω: ὡς οὔν
 Schneidewin 217 γ' Brunck: τ' Ω 218 ἄλλο Φ: ἄλλωι Ω 223
 τάχους Ω: σπουδῆς Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1415b20 225 ἔσχον Ω: εὔρον Φ
 229 μένεις Φ: μενεῖς Ω

- ἄλλου παρ' ἀνδρός, πῶς σὺ δῆτ' οὐκ ἀλγυνῆι;" 230
 τοιαῦθ' ἐλίσσω ἦνυτον σχολῆι βραδύς,
 χούτως ὁδὸς βραχεῖα γίγνεται μακρά.
 τέλος γε μέντοι δεῦρ' ἐνίκησεν μολεῖν
 σοί, κεῖ τὸ μηδὲν ἔξερῶ, φράσω δ' ὅμως.
 τῆς ἐλπίδος γὰρ ἔρχομαι δεδραγμένος 235
 τὸ μὴ παθεῖν ἂν ἄλλο πλὴν τὸ μόρσιμον.
- Κρ. τί δ' ἐστὶν ἀνθ' οὗ τήνδ' ἔχεις ἀθυμίαν;
 Φυ. φράσαι θέλω σοι πρῶτα τὰ μαυτοῦ· τὸ γὰρ
 πρᾶγμ' οὔτ' ἔδρασ' οὔτ' εἶδον ὅστις ἦν ὁ δρῶν,
 οὐδ' ἂν δικαίως ἐς κακὸν πέσοιμί τι. 240
- Κρ. εὖ γε στοχάζηι κάποφάργνυσαι κύκλωι
 τὸ πρᾶγμα· δηλοῖς δ' ὡς τι σημαίνων νέον.
 Φυ. τὰ δεινὰ γὰρ τοι προστίθησ' ὄκνον πολύν.
 Κρ. οὐκ οἶδ' ἐρεῖς ποτ', εἴτ' ἀπαλλαχθεὶς ἄπει;
 Φυ. καὶ δὴ λέγω σοι· τὸν νεκρὸν τις ἀρτίως 245
 θάψας βέβηκε καπὶ χρωτὶ διψίαν
 κόνιν παλύννας κάφαγιστεύσας ἅ χρῆ.
- Κρ. τί φῆς; τίς ἀνδρῶν ἦν ὁ τολμήσας τάδε;
 Φυ. οὐκ οἶδ'· ἐκεῖ γὰρ οὔτε του γενῆιδος ἦν
 πληγμ', οὐ δικέλλης ἐκβολή· στύφλος δὲ γῆ 250
 καὶ χέρσος, ἀρρώξ οὐδ' ἐπημαξευμένη
 τροχοῖσιν, ἀλλ' ἄσημος οὐργάτης τις ἦν.
 ὅπως δ' ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῖν ἡμεροσκόπος
 δείκνυσι, πᾶσι θαῦμα δυσχερὲς παρῆν·
 ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἠφάνιστο, τυμβήρης μὲν οὐ, 255
 λεπτή δ', ἄγος φεύγοντος ὡς, ἐπῆν κόνις.
 σημεῖα δ' οὔτε θηρὸς οὔτε του κυνῶν
 ἐλθόντος, οὐ σπάσαντος ἔξεφαίνετο.
 λόγοι δ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐρρόθουν κακοί,
 φύλαξ ἐλέγχων φύλακα, κἂν ἐγίγνετο 260
 πληγὴ τελευτῶσ', οὐδ' ὁ κωλύσων παρῆν.

231 Ω: σχολῆι ταχύς Φ: σπουδῆι βραδύς Seyffert 235 δεδραγμένος Φ:
 πεπραγ- οἱ πεπραγ- Ω 241 εὖ γε στοχάζηι Ω: τί φοιμαζῆι Aristotle,
Rhet. 1415b20 249 του Ω: που Φ 250 ἐκβολή Ω: ἐμβολή Φ

- εἷς γάρ τις ἦν ἕκαστος οὐξειργασμένος,
 κούδεις ἑναργής, ἀλλ' ἔφευγε μὴ εἰδέναι.
 ἦμεν δ' ἔτοιμοι καὶ μύδρους αἴρειν χεροῖν
 καὶ πῦρ διέρπειν, καὶ θεοὺς ὀρκωμοτεῖν 265
 τὸ μῆτε δρᾶσαι μῆτε τῶι ξυνειδέναι
 τὸ πρᾶγμα βουλευσάντι μῆτ' εἰργασμένῳ.
 τέλος δ', ὅτ' οὐδὲν ἦν ἐρευνῶσιν πλέον,
 λέγει τις εἷς ὁ πάντας ἐς πέδον κάρα
 νεῦσαι φόβῳ προὔτρεψεν· οὐ γὰρ εἶχομεν 270
 οὔτ' ἀντιφωνεῖν οὔθ' ὅπως δρῶντες καλῶς
 πράξαιμεν. ἦν δ' ὁ μῦθος ὡς ἀνοιστέον
 σοὶ τοῦργον εἶη τοῦτο κούχῃ κρυπτέον.
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἐνίκᾳ, κάμῃ τὸν δυσδαίμονα
 πάλος καθαιρεῖ τοῦτο τάγαθὸν λαβεῖν. 275
 πάρειμι δ' ἄκων οὐχ ἑκοῦσιν, οἶδ' ὅτι·
 στέργει γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἄγγελον κακῶν ἐπῶν.
- Χο. ἄναξ, ἐμοὶ τοι μὴ τι καὶ θεήλατον
 τοῦργον τόδ' ἢ ξύννοια βουλεύει πάλαι.
- Κρ. παῦσαι, πρὶν ὀργῆς καὶ με μεστῶσαι λέγων, 280
 μὴ φευρεθῆῃς ἄνους τε καὶ γέρων ἄμα.
 λέγεις γὰρ οὐκ ἀνεκτά, δαίμονας λέγων
 πρόνοιαν ἴσχειν τοῦδε τοῦ νεκροῦ πέρι.
 πότερον ὑπερτιμῶντες ὡς εὐεργέτην 285
 ἔκρυπτον αὐτόν, ὅστις ἀμφικίονας
 ναοὺς πυρώσων ἦλθε κἀναθήματα,
 καὶ γῆν ἐκείνων καὶ νόμους διασκεδῶν;
 ἦ τοὺς κακοὺς τιμῶντας εἰσορᾷς θεοὺς;
 οὐκ ἔστιν· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ πάλαι πόλεως
 ἄνδρες μόλις φέροντες ἐρρόθουν ἐμοί, 290
 κρυφῆι κάρα σείοντες, οὐδ' ὑπὸ ζυγῶι
 λόφον δικαίως εἶχον, ὡς στέργειν ἐμέ.
 ἐκ τῶνδε τούτους ἐξεπίσταμαι καλῶς

263 μὴ Erfurdt: τὸ μὴ Ω 264 αἴρειν Ω: ἔχειν Φ 269 ὁ Nauck: ὅς Ω
 292 Ω: νῶτον εὐλόφως εἶχον Eustathios (on Homer, *Od.* 5.285)

- παρηγμένους μισθοῖσιν εἰργάσθαι τάδε.
 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν οἶον ἄργυρος 295
 κακὸν νόμισμ' ἔβλαστε. τοῦτο καὶ πόλεις
 πορθεῖ, τόδ' ἄνδρας ἐξανίστησιν δόμων·
 τόδ' ἐκδιδάσκει καὶ παραλλάσσει φρένας
 χρηστάς πρὸς αἰσχροῦ πράγμαθ' ἴστασθαι βροτῶν.
 πανουργίας δ' ἔδειξεν ἀνθρώποις ἔχειν 300
 καὶ παντὸς ἔργου δυσσέβειαν εἰδέναι.
 ὅσοι δὲ μισθαρνοῦντες ἦνυσαν τάδε,
 χρόνῳ ποτ' ἐξέπραξαν ὡς δοῦναι δίκην.
 ἀλλ', εἶπερ ἴσχει Ζεὺς ἔτ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ σέβας,
 εὖ τοῦτ' ἐπίστασ', ὄρκιος δέ σοι λέγω, 305
 εἰ μὴ τὸν αὐτόχειρα τοῦδε τοῦ τάφου
 εὐρόντες ἐκφανεῖτ' ἐς ὀφθαλμούς ἐμούς,
 οὐχ ὑμῖν Ἄιδης μῦθος ἀρκέσει, πρὶν ἂν
 ζῶντες κρεμαστοὶ τήνδε δηλώσηθ' ὕβριν,
 ἴν' εἰδότες τὸ κέρδος ἔνθεν οἰστέον 310
 τὸ λοιπὸν ἀρπάζητε, καὶ μάθηθ' ὅτι
 οὐκ ἐξ ἅπαντος δεῖ τὸ κερδαίνειν φιλεῖν.
 ἐκ τῶν γὰρ αἰσχροῶν λημμάτων τοὺς πλείονας
 ἀτωμένους ἴδοις ἂν ἢ σεσωμένους.
- Φυ. εἰπεῖν τι δώσεις, ἢ στραφεῖς οὕτως ἴω; 315
 Κρ. οὐκ οἴσθα καὶ νῦν ὡς ἀνιαρῶς λέγεις;
 Φυ. ἐν τοῖσιν ὦσιν ἢ 'πὶ τῇ ψυχῇ δάκνηι;
 Κρ. τί δὲ ῥυθμίζεις τὴν ἐμὴν λύπην ὅπου;
 Φυ. ὁ δρῶν σ' ἀνιᾶι τὰς φρένας, τὰ δ' ὦτ' ἐγώ.
 Κρ. οἴμ', ὡς λάλημα δῆλον ἐκπεφυκὸς εἶ. 320
 Φυ. οὐκουν τό γ' ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας ποτέ.
 Κρ. καὶ ταῦτ' ἐπ' ἀργύρῳ γε τὴν ψυχὴν προδοῦς.
 Φυ. φεῦ·
 ἧ δεινόν, ὦ δοκῆι γε, καὶ ψευδῆ δοκεῖν.

299 βροτῶν Ω: βροτους (sic) Φ 315 τι Ω: δὲ Φ 318 τί δὲ Φ, Plutarch, *Moralia* 590c: τί δαι Ω 320 λάλημα Ω: ἄλημα scholiast δῆλον Ω: δεινόν Burges 321 τό γ' Reiske: τόδ' Ω 323 ὦι δοκεῖ Φ: ἦν δοκῆι Ω

Κρ. κόμψευέ νυν τήν δόξαν· εἰ δὲ ταῦτα μὴ
 φανεῖτέ μοι τοὺς δρῶντας, ἔξερεῖθ' ὅτι 325
 τὰ δειλὰ κέρδη πημονὰς ἐργάζεται.

Φυ. ἀλλ' εὐρεθείη μὲν μάλιστ'· ἐὰν δέ τοι
 ληφθῆι τε καὶ μή, τοῦτο γὰρ τύχη κρινεῖ,
 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ὄψῃ σὺ δεῦρ' ἐλθόντα με.
 καὶ νῦν γὰρ ἐκτὸς ἐλπίδος γνώμης τ' ἐμῆς 330
 σωθεῖς ὀφείλω τοῖς θεοῖς πολλήν χάριν.

Χο. πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κούδ' ἐν ἀν- [στρ. α
 θρώπου δεινότερον πέλει·
 τοῦτο καὶ πολιοῦ πέραν
 πόντου χειμερίωι νότῳ 335
 χωρεῖ, περιβρυχίοισιν
 περῶν ὑπ' οἴδμασιν, θεῶν
 τε τὰν ὑπερτάταν, Γᾶν
 ἄφθιτον, ἀκαμάταν ἀποτρύεται,
 ἴλλομένων ἀρότρων ἔτος εἰς ἔτος, 340
 ἵππείωι γένοι πολεύων.

κουφονόων τε φύλον ὀρ- [ἀντ. α
 νίθων ἀμφιβαλῶν ἄγει
 καὶ θηρῶν ἀγρίων ἔθνη
 πόντου τ' εἰναλίαν φύσιν 345
 σπείραισι δικτυοκλώστοις
 περιφραδῆς ἀνήρ· κρατεῖ
 δὲ μηχαναῖς ἀγραύλου
 θηρὸς ὄρεσσιβάτα, λασιαύχενά θ'
 ἵππον ὑπαγάγετ' ἀμφίλοφον ζυγὸν 350
 οὔρειόν τ' ἀκμήτα ταῦρον.

341 πολεύων Φ: -εῦον Ω 343 ἄγει Ω: ἀγρεῖ Nauck (ἀγρεύει schol.)
 351 ὑπαγάγετ' Griffith: ἄξεται Ω: ἔξετ' or ἔξεται Φ: ὀχμάζεται Schöne
 352 ἀκμήτα Φ: ἀδμήτα Ω

καὶ φθέγμα καὶ ἀνεμόεν [στρ. β
 φρόνημα καὶ ἀστυνόμους 355
 ὀργὰς ἐδιδάξατο, καὶ δυσαύλων
 πάγων ὑπαίθρεια καὶ
 δύσομβρα φεύγειν βέλη,
 παντοπόρος· ἄπορος ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἔρχεται 360
 τὸ μέλλον· Ἄϊδα μόνον
 φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται,
 νόσων δ' ἀμηχάνων φυγὰς
 ξυμπέφρασται.

σοφόν τι τὸ μηχανόεν [ἀντ. β
 τέχνας ὑπὲρ ἐλπίδ' ἔχων 366
 τοτὲ μὲν κακόν, ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἐσθλὸν ἔρπει.
 νόμους γεραίρων χθονὸς
 θεῶν τ' ἔνορκον δίκαν
 ὑψίπολις· ἄπολις ὅτωι τὸ μὴ καλὸν 370
 ξύνεστι τόλμας χάριν.
 μήτ' ἐμοὶ παρέστιος
 γένοιτο μήτ' ἴσον φρονῶν
 ὅς τάδ' ἔρδει. 375

ἔς δαιμόνιον τέρας ἀμφινοῶ
 τόδε· πῶς εἰδῶς ἀντιλογήσω
 τήνδ' οὐκ εἶναι παῖδ' Ἀντιγόνην;
 ᾧ δύστηνος καὶ δυστήνου
 πατρὸς Οἰδιπόδα, 380
 τί ποτ'; οὐ δὴ που σέ γ' ἀπιστοῦσαν
 τοῖς βασιλείοισιν ἄγουσι νόμοις
 καὶ ἐν ἀφροσύνηι καθελόντες;

357 ὑπαίθρεια Böckh: αἶθρια Ω 367 τοτὲ Φ: ποτὲ Ω 368 γεραίρων
 Reiske: παρείρων Ω: περαίνων Pflugk 375 ἔρδει Ω: ἔρδοι Φ 382
 βασιλείοισιν T: βασιλείοις Ω ἄγουσι Ω: ἀπάγουσι Böckh: ἀνάγουσι
 Wieseler

- Φυ. ἦ δ' ἔστ' ἐκείνη τοῦργον ἢ ἔχειργασμένη·
 τήνδ' εἴλομεν θάπτουσαν. ἀλλὰ ποῦ Κρέων; 385
- Χο. ὄδ' ἐκ δόμων ἄφορρος ἐς δέον περᾶι.
- Κρ. τί δ' ἔστι; ποῖαι ξύμμετρος προὔβην τύχηι;
- Φυ. ἄναξ, βροτοῖσιν οὐδέν ἔστ' ἀπώμοτον·
 ψεύδει γὰρ ἢ ἴπινοια τήν γνώμην· ἐπεὶ
 σχολῆι ποθ' ἦξιν δεῦρ' ἄν ἐξηύχουν ἐγώ 390
 ταῖς σαῖς ἀπειλαῖς, αἷς ἐχειμάσθην τότε.
 ἀλλ', ἢ γὰρ ἐκτὸς καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδας χαρὰ
 ἔοικεν ἄλλῃ μῆκος οὐδὲν ἠδονῆι,
 ἦκω, δι' ὄρκων καίπερ ὦν ἀπώμοτος,
 κόρην ἄγων τήνδ', ἢ καθιρέθη τάφον 395
 κοσμοῦσα. κλῆρος ἐνθάδ' οὐκ ἐπάλλετο,
 ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἐμὸν θοῦρμαιον, οὐκ ἄλλου, τόδε.
 καὶ νῦν, ἄναξ, τήνδ' αὐτός, ὡς θέλεις, λαβῶν
 καὶ κρῖνε κάξέλεγχ'· ἐγὼ δ' ἐλεύθερος
 δίκαιός εἰμι τῶνδ' ἀπηλλάχθαι κακῶν. 400
- Κρ. ἄγεις δὲ τήνδε τῶι τρόπῳι πόθεν λαβῶν;
- Φυ. αὐτὴ τὸν ἄνδρ' ἔθαπτε· πάντ' ἐπίστασαι.
- Κρ. ἦ καὶ ξυνίης καὶ λέγεις ὀρθῶς ἃ φῆς;
- Φυ. ταύτην γ' ἰδὼν θάπτουσαν ὄν σὺ τὸν νεκρὸν
 ἀπεῖπας. ἄρ' ἔνδηλα καὶ σαφῆ λέγω; 405
- Κρ. καὶ πῶς ὀρᾶται, κἀπίληπτος ἠιρέθη;
- Φυ. τοιοῦτον ἦν τὸ πρᾶγμ'· ὅπως γὰρ ἦκομεν
 πρὸς σοῦ τὰ δεῖν' ἐκεῖν' ἐπηπειλημένοι,
 πᾶσαν κόνιν σήραντες ἢ κατεῖχε τὸν
 νέκυν, μυδῶν τε σῶμα γυμνώσαντες εὔ, 410
 καθήμεθ' ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων ὑπήνεμοι,
 ὄσμῃν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μὴ βάλῃ πεφευγότες,
 ἐγερτὶ κινῶν ἄνδρ' ἀνήρ ἐπιρρόθοις

385 εἴλομεν Ω: εἴδομεν Φ 386 δέον Ω: μέσον Φ 387 Φ: ποῖα ...
 προὔβη τύχη Ω 392 ἐκτὸς Ω: εὐκτὸς Bothe 395 καθιρέθη anon.:
 καθευρέθη Ω 396 κλῆρος Ω: κλῆρος δ' Φ 406 ἠιρέθη Φ, scholiast:
 ηὔρέθη Ω

- κακοῖσιν, εἴ τις τοῦδ' ἀφειδήσοι πόνου.
 χρόνον τάδ' ἦν τοσοῦτον, ἔστ' ἐν αἰθέρι 415
 μέσῳ κατέστη λαμπρὸς ἡλίου κύκλος
 καὶ καῦμ' ἔθαλπε· καὶ τότε' ἐξαίφνης χθονὸς
 τυφῶς αἰείρας σκηπτόν, οὐράνιον ἄχος,
 πῖμπλησι πεδίον, πᾶσαν αἰκίζων φόβη
 ὕλης πεδιάδος, ἐν δ' ἔμεστῶθι μέγας 420
 αἰθήρ· μύσαντες δ' εἶχομεν θείαν νόσον.
 καὶ τοῦδ' ἀπαλλαγέντος ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῶι,
 ἢ παῖς ὄραται, κἀνακωκύνει πικρᾶς
 ὄρνιθος ὄξυν φθόγγον ὥς, ὅταν κενῆς
 εὐνῆς νεοσσῶν ὄρφανὸν βλέψηι λέχος· 425
 οὕτω δὲ χαῦτη, ψιλὸν ὥς ὄραϊ νέκυν,
 γόοισιν ἐξώιμωξεν, ἐκ δ' ἀράς κακὰς
 ἦρᾶτο τοῖσι τοῦργον ἐξειργασμένοις.
 καὶ χερσὶν εὐθύς διψίαν φέρει κόνιν,
 ἔκ τ' εὐκροτήτου χαλκείας ἄρδην πρόχου 430
 χοαῖσι τρισπόνδοισι τὸν νέκυν στέφει.
 χῆμεῖς ἰδόντες ἰέμεσθα, σὺν δέ νιν
 θηρώμεθ' εὐθύς οὐδὲν ἐκπεπληγμένην,
 καὶ τὰς τε πρόσθεν τὰς τε νῦν ἠλέγχομεν
 πράξεις· ἄπαρνος δ' οὐδενὸς καθίστατο, 435
 ἅμ' ἠδέως ἔμοιγε κάλγεινῶς ἅμα·
 τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐκ κακῶν πεφευγέναι
 ἦδιστον, ἐς κακὸν δὲ τοὺς φίλους ἄγειν
 ἀλγεινόν. ἀλλὰ πάντα ταῦθ' ἦσσω λαβεῖν
 ἔμοι πέφυκε τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας. 440
- Κρ. σὲ δὴ, σὲ τὴν νεύουσαν ἐς πέδον κᾶρα,
 φῆς, ἢ καταρνηῖ μὴ δεδρακέναι τάδε;
 Αν. καὶ φημί δρᾶσαι κοῦκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι τὸ μῆ.
 Κρ. σὺ μὲν κομίζοις ἂν σεαυτὸν ἦι θέλεις
 ἔξω βαρείας αἰτίας ἐλεύθερον· 445

423 πικρᾶς Ω: πικρά Dawe: πικρῶς Bothe

439 Φ: ταῦτα πάνθ' Ω: πάντα τᾶλλ' Blaydes

436 ἅμ' Dindorf: ἀλλ' Ω

444 ἦι Ω: οἶ Φ

- σὺ δ' εἶπέ μοι μὴ μῆκος, ἀλλὰ συντόμως,
 ἠΐδησθα κηρυχθέντα μὴ πράσσειν τάδε;
- Αν. ἦϊδη· τί δ' οὐκ ἔμελλον; ἔμφανῆ γάρ ἦν.
- Κρ. καὶ δῆτ' ἐτόλμας τούσδ' ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους;
- Αν. οὐ γάρ τί μοι Ζεὺς ἦν ὁ κηρύξας τάδε, 450
 οὐδ' ἡ ξύνοικος τῶν κάτω θεῶν Δίκη
 τοιούσδ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ὤρισεν νόμους·
 οὐδὲ σθένειν τοσοῦτον ὠϊόμην τὰ σὰ
 κηρύγμαθ' ὥστ' ἄγραπτα κάσφαλῆ θεῶν
 νόμιμα δύνασθαι θνητὸν ὄνθ' ὑπερδραμεῖν. 455
 οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κάχθές, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ποτε
 ζῆι ταῦτα, κοῦδεις οἶδεν ἐξ ὄτου ἴφανε.
 τούτων ἐγὼ οὐκ ἔμελλον, ἀνδρὸς οὐδενὸς
 φρόνημα δείσασ', ἐν θεοῖσι τὴν δίκην
 δώσειν· θανουμένη γὰρ ἐξήϊδη – τί δ' οὐ; – 460
 κεῖ μὴ σὺ προυκήρυξας. εἰ δὲ τοῦ χρόνου
 πρόσθεν θανοῦμαι, κέρδος αὐτ' ἐγὼ λέγω.
 ὅστις γὰρ ἐν πολλοῖσιν ὡς ἐγὼ κακοῖς
 ζῆι, πῶς ὄδ' οὐχὶ κατθανῶν κέρδος φέρει;
 οὕτως ἔμοιγε τοῦδε τοῦ μόρου τυχεῖν 465
 παρ' οὐδὲν ἄλγος· ἀλλ' ἂν, εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς
 μητρὸς θανόντ' ἄθαπτον ἠνσχόμην νέκυν,
 κείνοις ἂν ἤλγουν· τοῖσδε δ' οὐκ ἀλγύνομαι.
 σοὶ δ' εἰ δοκῶ νῦν μῶρα δρώσα τυγχάνειν,
 σχεδὸν τι μῶρῳι μωρίαν ὀφλισκάνω. 470
- Χο. δηλοῖ τὸ γέννημ' ὦμον ἐξ ὦμοῦ πατρὸς
 τῆς παιδός· εἴκειν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται κακοῖς.
- Κρ. ἀλλ' ἴσθι τοι τὰ σκλήρ' ἄγαν φρονήματα
 πίπτειν μάλιστα, καὶ τὸν ἐγκρατέστατον
 σίδηρον ὀπτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς περισκελῆ 475

446 συντόμως Φ: σύντομον Φ: σύντομα Ω 447 ἠΐδησθα Cobet: ἠΐδεις τὰ
 Ω 448 ἠΐδη Brunck: ἠΐδεις Ω ἔμφανῆ Ω: ἐκφανῆ Φ 449 νόμους
 Ω: ὄρους Φ 452 τοιούσδ' Valckenaer: οἱ τούσδ' ... ὤρισαν Ω 455
 θνητὸν Ω: θνητά γ' Bruhn 462 αὐτ' Φ: αὐτ' Ω 467 Φ: ἠνεσχ- ορ
 ηίσχ- ορ ἠνεσχόμην νέκυν Ω 471 δηλοῖ Ω: δῆλον Nauck

- θραυσθέντα καὶ ῥαγέντα πλεῖστ' ἄν εἰσίδοις.
 σμικρῶι χαλινῶι δ' οἶδα τοὺς θυμουμένους
 ἵππους καταρτυθέντας· οὐ γὰρ ἐκπέλει
 φρονεῖν μέγ' ὅστις δοῦλός ἐστι τῶν πέλας.
 αὕτη δ' ὑβρίζειν μὲν τότ' ἐξηπίστατο, 480
 νόμους ὑπερβαίνουσα τοὺς προκειμένους·
 ὕβρις δ', ἐπεὶ δέδρακεν, ἦδε δευτέρα,
 τούτοις ἐπαυχεῖν καὶ δεδρακυῖαν γελαῖν.
 ἦ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἀνὴρ, αὕτη δ' ἀνὴρ,
 εἰ ταῦτ' ἀνατεῖ τῆιδε κείσεται κράτη. 485
 ἀλλ' εἴτ' ἀδελφῆς εἴθ' ὀμαιμονεστέρα
 τοῦ παντὸς ἡμῖν Ζηνὸς ἐρκείου κυρεῖ,
 αὐτὴ τε χῆ ξύναιμος οὐκ ἀλύξετον
 μόρου κακίστου· καὶ γὰρ οὖν κείνην ἴσον
 ἐπαιτιῶμαι τοῦδε βουλευσαι τάφου. 490
 καὶ νιν καλεῖτ'· ἔσω γὰρ εἶδον ἀρτίως
 λυσσῶσαν αὐτὴν οὐδ' ἐπήβολον φρενῶν·
 φιλεῖ δ' ὁ θυμὸς πρόσθεν ἠιρῆσθαι κλοπεύς
 τῶν μηδὲν ὀρθῶς ἐν σκότῳι τεχνωμένων.
 μισῶ γε μέντοι χῶταν ἐν κακοῖσί τις 495
 ἄλους ἔπειτα τοῦτο καλλύνειν θέληι.
- Αν. θέλεις τι μεῖζον ἢ κατακτεῖναι μ' ἑλών;
 Κρ. ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδέν· τοῦτ' ἔχων ἅπαντ' ἔχω.
 Αν. τί δῆτα μέλλεις; ὡς ἐμοὶ τῶν σῶν λόγῳι
 ἀρεστὸν οὐδέν, μηδ' ἀρεσθείη ποτέ, 500
 οὔτῳ δὲ καὶ σοὶ τᾶμ' ἀφανδάνοντ' ἔφυ.
 καίτοι πόθεν κλέος γ' ἄν εὐκλεέστερον
 κατέσχον ἢ τὸν αὐτάδελφον ἐν τάφῳι
 τιθείσα; τούτοις τοῦτο πᾶσιν ἀνδάνειν
 λέγοιτ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ γλῶσσαν ἐγκλήιοι φόβος. 505
 ἀλλ' ἢ τυραννὶς πολλὰ τ' ἄλλ' εὐδαιμονεῖ
 κᾶξεστιν αὐτῆι δρᾶν λέγειν θ' ἄ βούλεται.

485 ἀνατεῖ Ω: ἀνατί Φ 486 ὀμαιμονεστέρα Φ: ὀμαιμονεστέρας Ω
 505 ἐγκλήιοι Schaefer: ἐγκλήσοι or -εἰσοι Ω

- Κρ. σὺ τοῦτο μούνη τῶνδε Καδμείων ὄραϊς.
 Αν. ὀρώσι χοῦτοι· σοὶ δ' ὑπίλλουσι στόμα.
 Κρ. σὺ δ' οὐκ ἐπαιδῆι, τῶνδε χωρὶς εἰ φρονεῖς; 510
 Αν. οὐδὲν γὰρ αἰσχρὸν τοὺς ὁμοσπλάγχχνους σέβειν.
 Κρ. οὐκουν ὄμαιμος χῶ καταντίον θανῶν;
 Αν. ὄμαιμος ἐκ μιᾶς τε καὶ ταύτου πατρός.
 Κρ. πῶς δῆτ' ἐκείνωι δυσσεβῆ τιμαῖς χάριν;
 Αν. οὐ μαρτυρήσει ταῦθ' ὁ κατθανῶν νέκυς. 515
 Κρ. εἴ τοί σφε τιμαῖς ἐξ ἴσου τῶι δυσσεβεῖ.
 Αν. οὐ γάρ τι δοῦλος, ἀλλ' ἀδελφὸς ὦλετο.
 Κρ. πορθῶν δὲ τήνδε γῆν· ὁ δ' ἀντιστάς ὕπερ.
 Αν. ὅμως ὃ γ' Ἄιδης τοὺς νόμους τούτους ποθεῖ.
 Κρ. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ χρηστὸς τῶι κακῶι λαχεῖν ἴσος. 520
 Αν. τίς οἶδεν εἰ κάτω ἔστιν εὐαγῆ τάδε;
 Κρ. οὔτοι ποθ' οὐχθρός, οὐδ' ὅταν θάνηι, φίλος.
 Αν. οὔτοι συνέχθην ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν.
 Κρ. κάτω νυν ἔλθοῦσ', εἰ φιλητέον, φίλει
 κείνους· ἐμοῦ δὲ ζῶντος οὐκ ἄρξει γυνή. 525
- Χο. καὶ μὴν πρὸ πυλῶν ἦδ' Ἰσμήνη
 φιλάδελφα κάτω δάκρυ' εἰβομένη·
 νεφέλη δ' ὀφρύων ὕπερ αἱματόεν
 ῥέθος αἰσχύνει,
 τέγγουσ' εὐῶπα παρειάν. 530
- Κρ. σὺ δ', ἦ κατ' οἴκους ὡς ἔχιδν' ὑφειμένη
 λήθουσά μ' ἐξέπινες, οὐδ' ἐμάνθανον
 τρέφων δύ' ἄτα κάπαναστάσεις θρόνων,
 φέρ' εἰπὲ δὴ μοι, καὶ σὺ τοῦδε τοῦ τάφου
 φήσεις μετασχεῖν, ἦ ἔσομῃ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι; 535
- Ισ. δέδρακα τοῦργον, εἴπερ ἦδ' ὁμορροθεῖ,
 καὶ ξυμμετίσχω καὶ φέρω τῆς αἰτίας.

518 δὲ Φ: γε Ω 519 τούτους Ω: ἴσους Φ 520 λαχεῖν Ω: λαβεῖν Φ
 ἴσος Φ: ἴσον Ω 521 κάτω ἔστιν Ω: κάτωθεν Φ 527 Τ: δάκρυ λειβο-
 μένη Ω 533 ἄτα Ω: ἄτας Φ

- Αν. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔάσει τοῦτό γ' ἡ δίκη σ', ἐπεὶ
οὔτ' ἠθέλησας οὔτ' ἐγὼ 'κοινωσάμην.
- Ισ. ἀλλ' ἐν κακοῖς τοῖς σοῖσιν οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι
ξυμπλουν ἑμαυτὴν τοῦ πάθους ποιουμένη. 540
- Αν. ὦν τοῦργον Ἄιδης χοὶ κάτω ξυνίστορες·
λόγοις δ' ἐγὼ φιλοῦσαν οὐ στέργω φίλην.
- Ισ. μήτοι, κασιγνήτη, μ' ἀτιμάσης τὸ μὴ οὐ
θανεῖν τε σὺν σοὶ τὸν θανόντα θ' ἀγνίσαι. 545
- Αν. μὴ μοι θάνης σὺ κοινά, μηδ' ἄ μὴ 'θίγες
ποιοῦ σεαυτῆς. ἀρκέσω θνήσκουσ' ἐγώ.
- Ισ. καὶ τίς βίος μοι σοῦ λελειμμένη φίλος;
- Αν. Κρέοντ' ἐρώτα· τοῦδε γὰρ σὺ κηδεμών.
- Ισ. τί ταῦτ' ἀνιᾶις μ' οὐδὲν ὠφελουμένη; 550
- Αν. ἀλγοῦσα μὲν δῆτ', εἰ γελῶ γ', ἐν σοὶ γελῶ.
- Ισ. τί δῆτ' ἂν ἀλλὰ νῦν σ' ἔτ' ὠφελοῖμ' ἐγώ;
- Αν. σῶσον σεαυτήν. οὐ φθονῶ σ' ὑπεκφυγεῖν.
- Ισ. οἴμοι τάλαινα, κάμπλάκω τοῦ σοῦ μόρου;
- Αν. σὺ μὲν γὰρ εἴλου ζῆν, ἐγὼ δὲ κατθανεῖν. 555
- Ισ. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀρρήτοις γε τοῖς ἑμοῖς λόγοις.
- Αν. καλῶς σὺ μὲν τοῖς, τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ 'δόκουν φρονεῖν.
- Ισ. καὶ μὴν ἴση νῶιν ἔστιν ἡ 'ξαμαρτία.
- Αν. θάρσει· σὺ μὲν ζῆις, ἡ δ' ἐμὴ ψυχὴ πάλαι
τέθνηκεν, ὥστε τοῖς θανοῦσιν ὠφελεῖν. 560
- Κρ. τῶ παῖδέ φημι τῶδε τὴν μὲν ἀρτίως
ἄνουν πεφάνθαι, τὴν δ' ἄφ' οὔ τὰ πρῶτ' ἔφου.
- Ισ. οὐ γὰρ ποτ', ὦναξ, οὐδ' ὅς ἂν βλάσθη μένει
νοῦς τοῖς κακῶς πράσσουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐξίσταται.
- Κρ. σοὶ γοῦν, ὄθ' εἴλου σὺν κακοῖς πράσσειν κακά. 565
- Ισ. τί γὰρ μόνη μοι τῆσδ' ἄτερ βιώσιμον;
- Κρ. ἀλλ' ἦδε μὲν σοι μὴ λέγ' ὡς ἄρ' ἔστ' ἔτι.
- Ισ. ἀλλὰ κτενεῖς νυμφεῖα τοῦ σαυτοῦ τέκνου;

548 Ω: τίς βίου ... πόθος Φ 551 γελῶ γ' Heath: γελῶτ' or γέλωτ' Ω
563 Ω: ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ Plutarch, *Mor.* 460E, *Life of Phoc.* I 565 κακοῖς Φ:
κακῆι Ω 567 μὲν σοι Ω: μέντοι Φ ὡς ἄρ' Semitelos: οὐ γὰρ Ω

- Κρ. ἄρώσιμοι γὰρ χᾶτέρων εἰσὶν γύαι.
 Ισ. οὐχ ὡς γ' ἐκείνῳι τῆιδέ τ' ἦν ἤρμοσμένα. 570
 Κρ. κακὰς ἐγὼ γυναικᾶς υἰέσι στυγῶ.
 Ισ. ὦ φίλταθ' Αἴμον, ὡς σ' ἀτιμάζει πατήρ.
 Κρ. ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς καὶ σὺ καὶ τὸ σὸν λέχος.
 Ισ. ἦ γὰρ στερήσεις τῆσδε τὸν σαυτοῦ γόνον;
 Κρ. Ἄιδης ὁ παύσων τούσδε τοὺς γάμους ἔφυ. 575
 Ισ. δεδογμέν', ὡς ἔοικε, τήνδε κατθανεῖν.
 Κρ. καὶ σοί γε κάμοί. μὴ τριβὰς ἔτ', ἀλλὰ νιν
 κομίζετ' εἴσω, δμῶες· ἐκ δὲ τοῦδε χρῆ
 γυναικᾶς εἶναι τάσδε μηδ' ἀνειμένας.
 φεύγουσι γὰρ τοὶ χοῖ θρασεῖς, ὅταν πέλας 580
 ἦδη τὸν Ἄιδην εἰσορῶσι τοῦ βίου.
- Χο. εὐδαίμονες οἴσι κακῶν ἄγευστος αἰών· [στρ. α
 οἷς γὰρ ἂν σεισθῆι θεόθεν δόμος, ἅτας
 οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει γενεᾶς ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἔρπον· 585
 ὅμοιον ὥστε πόντιον
 οἶδμα δυσπνόοις ὅταν
 Θρήσησιν ἔρεβος ὕφαλον ἐπιδράμη πνοαῖς,
 κυλίνδει βυσσόθεν 590
 κελαινὰν θῖνα, καὶ δυσάνεμοι
 στόνῳι βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλῆγες ἄκται.
- ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν οἴκων ὄρῳμαι [ἀντ. α
 πῆματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πῆμασι πίπτοντ', 595
 οὐδ' ἀπαλλάσσει γενεὰν γένος, ἀλλ' ἐρείπει
 θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν.
 νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὄπερ

572, 574 assigned to Ismene by Ω: 572 to Ant., 574 to Chorus by Aldine ed., Böckh Αἴμον Φ: Αἴμων Ω 573 γε Ω: με Φ 575 ἔφυ Ω: ἐμοί Φ 576 assigned to Ismene by Φ: to Chorus by Ω 586 ὅμοιον Ω: deleted by Seidler πόντιον Schneidewin: ποντίας Elmsley: ποντίας (or -αις) ἄλός Ω 591 δυσάνεμοι Hartung: δυσάνεμον Ω: δυσανέμωι Jacobs 595 φθιτῶν Hermann: φθιμένων Ω 599 ὄπερ Φ: ὕπερ Ω

ρίζας ἐτέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις, 600
 κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία
 θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων ἀμαῖ κόνις,
 λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς.

τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀν- [στρ. β
 δρῶν ὑπερβασία κατὰσχοι; 605
 τὰν οὐθ' ὕπνος αἰρεῖ ποθ' ὁ †παντογήρωσ†
 οὔτ' ἐτέων ἄκματοι
 μῆνες, ἀγήρωσ δὲ χρόνῳ δυνάστας
 κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου
 μαρμαρόεσσαν αἴγλαν. 610
 τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον
 καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει
 νόμος ὄδ'· φοῦδὲν ἔρπει
 θνατῶν βιότῳ πάμπολις† ἐκτὸς ἄτας.

ἀ γάρ δὴ πολὺπλαγκτος ἐλ- [ἀντ. β
 πὶς πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνησις ἀνδρῶν, 616
 πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονῶν ἐρώτων·
 εἰδότει δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει,
 πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῶι πόδα τις προσαύσηι.
 σοφίαι γὰρ ἔκ του 620
 κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται
 τὸ κακὸν δοκεῖν ποτ' ἐσθλὸν
 τῶιδ' ἔμμεν ὅτῳ φρένας
 θεὸς ἄγει πρὸς ἄταν,
 πράσσει δ' ὀλίγιστον χρόνον ἐκτὸς ἄτας. 625

600 ἐτέτατο Brunck: τέτατο Ω: ὁ τέτατο Hermann 602 κόνις Ω: κοπίς Jortin 604 δύνασιν Φ: δύναμιν Ω 605 ὑπερβασία Ω: ὑπερβασίαι Φ 606 παντογήρωσ οἱ πανταγήρωσ Ω: παντοθήρας Bamberger 607 ἐτέων ἄκματοι Schneidewin: ἀκάματοι θεῶν Ω 608 ἀγήρωσ Φ: ἀγήρωι Ω 614 πάμπολις Ω: πάμπολύ γ' Heath 619 προσαύσηι Φ: προ(σ)ψαύσηι Ω: προσάρηι Φ 625 ὀλίγιστον Bergk: ὀλιγοστόν Ω

ὄδε μὴν Αἰμῶν, παίδων τῶν σῶν
 νέατον γέννημ'· ἄρ' ἀχνύμενος
 τῆς μελλογάμου
 τάλιδος ἦκει μόρον Ἀντιγόνης,
 ἀπάτης λεχέων ὑπεραλγῶν;

630

Κρ. τάχ' εἰσόμεσθα μαντέων ὑπέρτερον.
 ὦ παῖ, τελείαν ψῆφον ἄρα μὴ κλυῶν
 τῆς μελλονύμφου πατρὶ λυσσαίνων πάρει;
 ἦ σοὶ μὲν ἡμεῖς πανταχῆι δρῶντες φίλοι;

ΑΙΜΩΝ

πάτερ, σός εἰμι· καὶ σύ μοι γνώμας ἔχων
 χρηστὰς ἀπορθοῖς, αἷς ἔγωγ' ἐφέψομαι·
 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἀξιώσεται γάμος
 μείζων φέρεσθαι σοῦ καλῶς ἡγουμένου.

635

Κρ. οὕτω γάρ, ὦ παῖ, χρὴ διὰ στέρνων ἔχειν,
 γνώμης πατρώιας πάντ' ὀπισθεν ἐστάναι.
 τούτου γὰρ οὐνεκ' ἄνδρες εὐχονται γονὰς
 κατηκόους φύσαντες ἐν δόμοις ἔχειν,
 ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀνταμύνωνται κακοῖς,
 καὶ τὸν φίλον τιμῶσιν ἐξ ἴσου πατρί.

640

ὅστις δ' ἀνωφέλητα φιτεύει τέκνα,
 τί τόνδ' ἂν εἴποις ἄλλο πλὴν αὐτῷ πόνους
 φῦσαι, πολὺν δὲ τοῖσιν ἐχθροῖσιν γέλων;
 μὴ νῦν ποτ', ὦ παῖ, τὰς φρένας γ' ὑφ' ἡδονῆς
 γυναικὸς οὐνεκ' ἐκβάλης, εἰδὼς ὅτι
 ψυχρὸν παραγκάλισμα τοῦτο γίγνεται,
 γυνὴ κακὴ ξύνευνος ἐν δόμοις. τί γὰρ
 γένοιτ' ἂν ἔλκος μείζων ἢ φίλος κακός;
 ἀλλὰ πτύσας ὡσεὶ τε δυσμενῆ μέθες

645

650

628 Livineius: τῆς μελλογάμου νύμφης Ω: omitted by Φ (and Pollux 3.45) 632 κλυῶν West: κλύων Ω 633 λυσσαίνων Ω: θυμαίων Φ
 635 μοι Ω: μου Φ: με Blaydes 636 ἀπορθοῖς, αἷς Ω: ἀπόρθου, ταῖς Griffith
 637 ἀξιώσεται Musgrave: ἀξίως (or -ος) ἔσται Ω 645 φιτεύει Livineius:
 φυτεύει Ω: προσφύει Φ 648 γ' ΤΦ: omitted by Ω

τὴν παῖδ' ἐν Ἴδου τήνδε νυμφεύειν τινί.
 ἔπει γὰρ αὐτὴν εἶλον ἐμφανῶς ἐγὼ 655
 πόλεως ἀπιστήσασαν ἐκ πάσης μόνην,
 ψευδῆ γ' ἔμαυτὸν οὐ καταστήσω πόλει,
 ἀλλὰ κτενῶ. πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐφυμνείτω Δία
 ξύναιμον· εἰ γὰρ δὴ τά γ' ἐγγενῆ φύσει
 ἄκοσμα θρέψω, κάρτα τοὺς ἕξω γένους. 660
 ἐν τοῖς γὰρ οἰκείοισιν ὅστις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ
 χρηστός, φανεῖται κὰν πόλει δίκαιος ὦν.
 καὶ τοῦτον ἂν τὸν ἄνδρα θαρσοίην ἐγὼ [668]
 καλῶς μὲν ἄρχειν, εὖ δ' ἂν ἄρχεσθαι θέλειν, [669]
 δορός τ' ἂν ἐν χειμῶνι προστεταγμένον [670] 665
 μένειν δίκαιον κἀγαθὸν παραστάτην. [671]
 ὅστις δ' ὑπερβὰς ἢ νόμους βιάζεται [663]
 ἢ τοῦπιτάσσειν τοῖς κρατύνουσιν νοεῖ, [664]
 οὐκ ἔστ' ἐπαίνου τοῦτον ἐξ ἑμοῦ τυχεῖν. [665]
 ἀλλ' ὄν πόλις στήσειε, τοῦδε χρῆ κλύειν [666] 670
 καὶ σμικρὰ καὶ δίκαια καὶ τάναντία. [667]
 ἀναρχίας δὲ μεῖζον οὐκ ἔστιν κακόν·
 αὕτη πόλεις ὄλλυσιν, ἥδ' ἀναστάτους
 οἴκους τίθησιν, ἥδε συμμάχου δορός
 τροπὰς καταρρήγνυσι· τῶν δ' ὀρθουμένων 675
 σώζει τὰ πολλὰ σώμαθ' ἢ πειθαρχία.
 οὔτως ἀμυντέ' ἐστὶ τοῖς κοσμουμένοις,
 κοῦτοι γυναικὸς οὐδαμῶς ἥσσητέα.
 κρεῖσσον γὰρ, εἴπερ δεῖ, πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐκπεσεῖν,
 κούκ ἂν γυναικῶν ἥσσονες καλοίμεθ' ἂν. 680

Χο. ἡμῖν μὲν, εἰ μὴ τῶι χρόνῳ κεκλέμμεθα,
 λέγειν φρονούντως ὦν λέγεις δοκεῖς πέρι.

655 εἶλον Ω: εἶδον Φ 659 τά γ' Erfurd: τά τ' Ω: τάδ' Φ 663-6
 [= 668-71 in Ω] transposed here by Seidler 668 [664] κρατύνουσιν νοεῖ
 Φ: κρατοῦσιν ἐννοεῖ Ω 670-671 [666-667] deleted by Dawe 671
 [667] σμικρὰ Ω: πικρὰ van Eldik 672 δὲ Φ (and Stobaeus 4.7.12): γὰρ Ω
 673 πόλεις Φ: πόλεις τ' (or πόλις τ') Ω ἥδ' Ω: ἥδ' Φ 674 συμμάχου
 Reiske: συμμάχη or σύν μάχη Ω 678 γυναικὸς Ω: γυναικῶν Φ

- Αι. πάτερ, θεοὶ φύουσιν ἀνθρώποις φρένας,
 πάντων ὅσ' ἐστὶ κτημάτων ὑπέρτατον,
 ἐγὼ δ' ὅπως σὺ μὴ λέγεις ὀρθῶς τάδε 685
 οὔτ' ἂν δυναίμην μῆτ' ἐπισταίμην λέγειν·
 γένοιτο μεντᾶν χᾶτέραι καλῶς ἔχον.
 σοῦ δ' οὖν πέφυκα πάντα προσκοπεῖν ὅσα
 λέγει τις ἢ πράσσει τις ἢ ψέγειν ἔχει.
 τὸ γὰρ σὸν ὄμμα δεινὸν ἀνδρὶ δημότῃ 690
 λόγοις τοιούτοις οἷς σὺ μὴ τέρψηι κλύων.
 ἐμοὶ δ' ἀκούειν ἔσθ' ὑπὸ σκότου τάδε,
 τὴν παῖδα ταύτην οἷ' ὀδύρεται πόλις,
 πασῶν γυναικῶν ὡς ἀναξιώτατη
 κάκιστ' ἀπ' ἔργων εὐκλεεστάτων φθίνει· 695
 ἦτις τὸν αὐτῆς αὐτάδελφον ἐν φοναῖς
 πεπτῶτ' ἄθραπτον μῆθ' ὑπ' ὠμηστῶν κυνῶν
 εἶασ' ὀλέσθαι μῆθ' ὑπ' οἰωνῶν τινος·
 οὐχ ἦδε χρυσῆς ἄξία τιμῆς λαχεῖν;
 τοιάδ' ἐρεμνὴ σίγ' ἐπέρχεται φάτις. 700
 ἐμοὶ δὲ σοῦ πράσσοντος εὐτυχῶς, πάτερ,
 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κτῆμα τιμιώτερον.
 τί γὰρ πατρὸς θάλλοντος εὐκλείας τέκνοις
 ἄγαλμα μεῖζον, ἢ τί πρὸς παίδων πατρί;
 μή νυν ἐν ἦθος μοῦνον ἐν σαυτῶι φόρει, 705
 ὡς φῆς σὺ, κούδεν ἄλλο, τοῦτ' ὀρθῶς ἔχειν·
 ὅστις γὰρ αὐτὸς ἢ φρονεῖν μόνος δοκεῖ,
 ἢ γλῶσσαν, ἦν οὐκ ἄλλος, ἢ ψυχὴν ἔχειν,
 οὔτοι διαπτυχθέντες ὦφθησαν κενοί.
 ἀλλ' ἀνδρα, κεῖ τις ἦι σοφός, τὸ μανθάνειν 710
 πόλλ' αἰσχρὸν οὐδὲν καὶ τὸ μὴ τείνειν ἄγαν.
 ὀραῖς παρὰ ρείθροισι χειμάρροις ὅσα
 δένδρων ὑπέικει, κλῶνας ὡς ἐκσώζεται,

687 κᾶτέραι Φ: κᾶτέρωι or -ρωσ Ω 688 σοῦ Φ: σοὶ Ω: σὺ Φ (σὺ δ' οὐ πέφυκας Φ) 690–1 Dindorf proposed lacuna after 690 700 ἐπέρχεται Ω: ὑπέρχεται Herwerden 703 εὐκλείας Ω: εὐκλείαι Johnson 706 ὡς Ω: ὁ Blaydes 710 κεῖ Ω: κῆν Φ

- τὰ δ' ἀντιτείνοντ' αὐτόπρεμν' ἀπόλλυται.
 αὐτως δὲ ναὸς ὅστις ἐγκρατῆ πόδα
 715 τείνας ὑπέικει μηδέν, ὑπτίοις κάτω
 στρέψας τὸ λοιπὸν σέλμασιν ναυτίλλεται.
 ἄλλ' εἶκε θυμοῦ καὶ μετástασιν δίδου.
 γνώμη γὰρ εἴ τις κάπ' ἐμοῦ νεωτέρου
 πρόσεστι, φῆμ' ἔγωγε πρεσβεύειν πολὺ
 720 φῦναι τὸν ἄνδρα πάντ' ἐπιστήμης πλέων·
 εἰ δ' οὔν, φιλεῖ γὰρ τοῦτο μὴ ταύτηι ῥέπειν,
 καὶ τῶν λεγόντων εὔκαλὸν τὸ μανθάνειν.
- Χο. ἄναξ, σέ τ' εἰκός, εἴ τι καίριον λέγει,
 μαθεῖν, σέ τ' αὖ τοῦδ'· εὔγὰρ εἴρηται διπλῆι.
 725 Κρ. οἱ τηλικοῖδε καὶ διδασζόμεσθα δὴ
 φρονεῖν πρὸς ἄνδρὸς τηλικούδε τὴν φύσιν;
- Αι. μηδέν γ' ὁ μὴ δίκαιον· εἰ δ' ἐγὼ νέος,
 οὐ τὸν χρόνον χρὴ μάλλον ἢ τάργα σκοπεῖν.
- Κρ. ἔργον γὰρ ἔστι τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας σέβειν;
 730 Αι. οὐδ' ἂν κελεύσαιμ' εὐσεβεῖν ἐς τοὺς κακοῦς.
- Κρ. οὐχ ἦδε γὰρ τοιαῖδ' ἐπέιληπται νόσωι;
 Αι. οὐ φησι Θήβης τῆσδ' ὁμόπτολις λεῶς.
- Κρ. πόλις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀμὲ χρὴ τάσσειν ἐρεῖ;
 Αι. ὀραῖς τόδ' ὡς εἴρηκας ὡς ἄγαν νέος;
 735 Κρ. ἄλλωι γὰρ ἢ μοι χρὴ με τῆσδ' ἄρχειν χθονός;
- Αι. πόλις γὰρ οὐκ ἔσθ' ἦτις ἄνδρὸς ἔσθ' ἑνός.
- Κρ. οὐ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἢ πόλις νομίζεται;
 Αι. καλῶς ἐρήμης γ' ἂν σὺ γῆς ἄρχοις μόνος.
- Κρ. ὄδ', ὡς ἔοικε, τῆι γυναικὶ συμμαχεῖ.
 740 Αι. εἴπερ γυνὴ σὺ· σοῦ γὰρ οὔν προκῆδομαι.
- Κρ. ὦ παγκάκιστε, διὰ δίκης ἰὼν πατρί;

715 αὐτως (sic) Ω: οὕτως Φ ὅστις Ω: εἴ τις Φ ἐγκρατῆ Ω: ἐγκρατῆς
 or -εἴ Φ 718 θυμοῦ Φ: θυμῶι Ω 721 τὸν Ω: τιν' Blydes 725
 διπλῆι Hermann: διπλᾶι or -ἄς Ω: -ἄ Jebb 727 πρὸς Ω: ὑπ' or παρ' Φ
 728 γ' ὁ Tournier: τὸ Ω: ὁ Φ 731 οὐδ' ἂν Ω: οὐ τᾶν Schneidewin 736
 με Dobree: γε Ω: omitted by Φ 742 παγκάκιστε Ω: παῖ κάκιστε Plu-
 tarch, *Moralia* 483b

- Αι. οὐ γὰρ δίκαιά σ' ἔξαμαρτάνονθ' ὀρώ.
 Κρ. ἄμαρτάνω γὰρ τὰς ἐμὰς ἀρχὰς σέβων;
 Αι. οὐ γὰρ σέβεις, τιμάς γε τὰς θεῶν πατῶν. 745
 Κρ. ὦ μιαρὸν ἦθος καὶ γυναικὸς ὕστερον.
 Αι. οὐ τὰν ἔλοις ἦσσω γε τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἐμέ.
 Κρ. ὁ γοῦν λόγος σοι πᾶς ὑπὲρ κείνης ὄδε.
 Αι. καὶ σοῦ γε κάμου, καὶ θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων.
 Κρ. ταύτην ποτ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὡς ἔτι ζῶσαν γαμεῖς. 750
 Αι. ἦδ' οὖν θανεῖται καὶ θανοῦσ' ὀλεῖ τινα.
 Κρ. ἦ κάπαπειλῶν ὦδ' ἐπεξέρχῃ θρασύς;
 Αι. τίς δ' ἔστ' ἀπειλὴ πρὸς κενὰς γνώμας λέγειν;
 Κρ. κλαίων φρενώσεις, ὧν φρενῶν αὐτὸς κενός.
 Αι. εἰ μὴ πατὴρ ἦσθ', εἶπον ἂν σ' οὐκ εὖ φρονεῖν. 755
 Κρ. γυναικὸς ὧν δούλευμα, μὴ κώτιλλέ με.
 Αι. βούληι λέγειν τι καὶ λέγων μηδὲν κλύειν;
 Κρ. ἄληθες; ἀλλ' οὐ, τόνδ' Ὀλυμπον, ἴσθ' ὅτι,
 χαίρων ἔτι ψόγοισι δεινάσεις ἐμέ.
 ἄγετε τὸ μῖσος, ὡς κατ' ὄμματ' αὐτίκα 760
 παρόντι θνήσκῃ πλησία τῶι νυμφίωι.
 Αι. οὐ δῆτ' ἔμοιγε, τοῦτο μὴ δόξηις ποτέ,
 οὗθ' ἦδ' ὀλεῖται πλησία, σύ τ' οὐδαμὰ
 τοῦμὸν προσόψῃ κρᾶτ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀρῶν,
 ὡς τοῖς θέλουσι τῶν φίλων μαίνηι συνών. 765
 Χο. ἀνὴρ, ἄναξ, βέβηκεν ἐξ ὀργῆς ταχύς·
 νοῦς δ' ἐστὶ τηλικούτος ἀλγῆσας βαρύς.
 Κρ. δράτω, φρονεῖτω μεῖζον ἢ κατ' ἄνδρ' ἰών·
 τὰ δ' οὖν κόρα τὰδ' οὐκ ἀπαλλάξει μόρου.
 Χο. ἄμφω γὰρ αὐτὰ καὶ κατακτεῖναι νοεῖς; 770
 Κρ. οὐ τήν γε μὴ θιγοῦσαν· εὖ γὰρ οὖν λέγεις.
 Χο. μόρωι δὲ ποίωι καὶ σφε βουλεύῃ κτανεῖν;
 Κρ. ἄγων ἐρῆμος ἔνθ' ἂν ἦι βροτῶν στίβος

747 οὐ τὰν Erfurd: οὐκ ἂν γ' Φ: οὐκ ἂν Ω 748 σοι Ω: σοῦ Φ 759 ἔτι
 Dobree: ἐπὶ Ω 763 οὐδαμὰ Ω: οὐδαμῶς or -οῦ Φ 769 τὰ ... τὰδ'
 Ω: τῶ ... τῶδ' Dindorf

κρύψω πετρώδει ζῶσαν ἐν κατώρυχι,
 φορβῆς τοσοῦτον ὡς ἄγος μόνον προθεῖς, 775
 ὅπως μίασμα πᾶσ' ὑπεκφύγη πόλις.
 κάκει τὸν Ἄιδην, ὃν μόνον σέβει θεῶν,
 αἴτουμένη που τεύξεται τὸ μὴ θανεῖν,
 ἢ γνῶσεται γοῦν ἀλλὰ τηνικαῦθ' ὅτι
 πόνος περισσός ἐστι τᾶν Ἄιδου σέβειν. 780

Χο. Ἔρωσ ἀνίκατε μάχαν, [στρ. α
 Ἔρωσ, ὃς ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις,
 ὃς ἐν μαλακαῖς παρειαιῖς
 νεάνιδος ἐννυχεύεις,
 φοιτᾶις δ' ὑπερπόντιος ἐν τ' 785
 ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαῖς·
 καὶ σ' οὔτ' ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὐδεὶς
 οὔθ' ἀμερίων σέ γ' ἀν-
 θρώπων, ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμνηεν. 790

σὺ καὶ δικαίων ἀδίκους [ἀντ. α
 φρένας παρασπᾶις ἐπὶ λώβαι·
 σὺ καὶ τόδε νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν
 ξύναιμον ἔχεις ταραξᾶς·
 νικᾶι δ' ἐναργῆς βλεφάρων 795
 ἴμερος εὐλέκτρου
 νύμφας, τῶν μεγάλων †πάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς†
 θεσμῶν· ἄμαχος γὰρ ἐμ-
 παίζει θεὸς Ἀφροδίτα. 800

νῦν δ' ἤδη ἴγῳ καὐτὸς θεσμῶν
 ἔξω φέρομαι τὰδ' ὀρῶν, ἴσχειν δ'
 οὐκέτι πηγᾶς δύναμαι δακρῦων,
 τὸν παγκοίτην ὄθ' ὀρῶ θάλαμον
 τήνδ' Ἀντιγόνην ἀνύτουσαν. 805

775 Ω: ὅσον ἄγος φεύγειν Blaydes, Hartung 782 κτήμασι Ω: κτήνεσι
 Brunck 789 σέ γ' Blaydes: ἐπ' Ω 797 Ω: παρβασιαισιν Griffith
 799 ἐμπαίζει Ω: ἐμπαίει Livineius

- Αν. ὀρᾶτέ μ', ὦ γᾶς πατρίας πολῖται, [στρ. α
 τὰν νεάταν ὁδὸν
 στείχουσαν, νέατον δὲ φέγ-
 γος λεύσσοσαν ἀελίου,
 κοῦποτ' αὔθις· ἀλλά μ' ὁ παγ- 810
 κοίτας Ἄιδας ζῶσαν ἄγει
 τὰν Ἀχέροντος
 ἄκταν, οὔθ' ὕμεναίων
 ἔγκληρον, οὔτ' ἐπὶ νυμ-
 φείοις πῶ μέ τις ὕμνος ὕ- 815
 μνησεν, ἀλλ' Ἀχέροντι νυμφεύσω.
- Χο. οὐκοῦν κλεινὴ καὶ ἔπαινον ἔχουσ'
 ἐς τόδ' ἀπέρχηι κεῦθος νεκύων;
 οὔτε φθινάσιν πληγεῖσα νόσοις
 οὔτε ξιφέων ἐπίχειρα λαχοῦσ' 820
 ἀλλ' αὐτόνομος ζῶσα μόνη δὴ
 θνητῶν Ἀίδην καταβήσηι.
- Αν. ἤκουσα δὴ λυγροτάταν ὀλέσθαι [ἀντ. α
 τὰν Φρυγίαν ξέναν
 Ταντάλου Σιπύλῳι πρὸς ἄ- 825
 κρῶι, τὰν κισσὸς ὡς ἀτενῆς
 πετραία βλάστα δάμασεν,
 καὶ νιν ὄμβροι τακομέναν,
 ὡς φάτις ἀνδρῶν,
 χιών τ' οὐδαμὰ λείπει, 830
 τέγγει δ' ὑπ' ὄφρῦσι παγ-
 κλαύτοις δειράδας· ἄι με δαί-
 μων ὁμοιοτάταν κατευνάζει.

814 ἐπὶ νυμφείοις Bergk: ἐπινύμφειος Dindorf: ἐπὶ νυμφίδιος Ω 817
 οὐκοῦν Ω: οὐκουν Denniston 828 ὄμβροι Musgrave: ὄμβρωι Ω: ὄμβρος
 Φ 831 τέγγει Ω: τέγκει οἱ τάκει Φ δ' Φ: τ' Ω 832 παγκλαύτοις
 Φ: παγκλαύστοις Ω: παγκλαύτους Φ

Χο. ἀλλὰ θεός τοι καὶ θεογεννής,
 ἡμεῖς δὲ βροτοὶ καὶ θνητογενεῖς. 835
 καίτοι φθιμένην μέγα κάκοῦσαι
 τοῖς ἰσοθέοις σύγκληρα λαχεῖν
 ζῶσαν καὶ ἔπειτα θανοῦσαν.

Αν. οἴμοι γελῶμαι. τί με, πρὸς θεῶν πατρῶιων, [στρ. β
 οὐκ οἰχομέναν ὑβρί- 840
 ζεις, ἀλλ' ἐπίφαντον;
 ὦ πόλις, ὦ πόλεως
 πολυκτῆμονες ἄνδρες·
 ἰὼ Διρκαῖαι κρήναι Θή-
 βας τ' εὐαρμάτου ἄλσος, ἔμ- 845
 πας ξυμάρτυρας ὕμ' ἐπικτῶμαι,
 οἷα φίλων ἄκλαυτος, οἷοις νόμοις
 πρὸς ἔργμα τυμβόχωστον ἔρ-
 χομαι τάφου ποταίνιου·
 ἰὼ δύστανος, βροτοῖς 850
 οὔτε νεκρὸς νεκροῖσιν
 μέτοικος, οὐ ζῶσιν, οὐ θανοῦσιν.

Χο. προβᾶσ' ἐπ' ἔσχατον θράσους
 ὑψηλὸν ἐς Δίκας βᾶθρον
 προσέπεσες, ὦ τέκνον, ποδί. 855
 πατρῶιον δ' ἐκτίνεις τιν' ἄθλον.

Αν. ἔψαυσας ἀλγεινοτάτας ἔμοι μερίμνας, [ἀντ. β
 πατρὸς τριπόλιστον οἴ-
 κτον τοῦ τε πρόπαντος 860

836 μέγα κάκοῦσαι Seyffert: μέγ' ἀκοῦσαι Ω 837 σύγκληρα Schaefer:
 ἔγκληρα Ω 838 Ω: line omitted by Φ 840 οἰχομέναν Martin: ὀλ(λ)ο-
 μέναν (οἱ ὄλλυ-) Ω 848 ἔργμα Ω: ἔρμα Φ 850 Böckh: ἰὼ δύστανος,
 οὔτ' ἐν βροτοῖς Ω 855 ποδί Bruhn: ποδοῖν Schneidewin: πολύν Φ: πολύ
 Ω 859 οἴκτον Ω: οἶτον Φ

- ἄμετέρου πότμου
 κλεινοῖς Λαβδακίδαισιν.
 ἰὼ ματρῶναι λέκτρων ἄ-
 ται κοιμήματά τ' αὐτογέν-
 νητ' ἐμῶι πατρὶ δυσμόρου ματρός· 865
 οἷων ἐγὼ ποθ' ἄ ταλαίφρων ἔφυν·
 πρὸς οὖς ἀραῖος ἄγαμος ἄδ'
 ἐγὼ μέτοικος ἔρχομαι.
 ἰὼ δυσπότημων κασί-
 γνητε γάμων κυρήσας, 870
 θανῶν ἔτ' οὔσαν κατήναρές με.
- Χο. σέβειν μὲν εὐσέβειά τις,
 κράτος δ', ὅττωι κράτος μέλει,
 παραβατὸν οὐδαμᾶι πέλει,
 σὲ δ' αὐτόγνωτος ὦλεσ' ὀργά. 875
- Αν. ἄκλαυτος, ἄφιλος, ἀνυμέναι- 876
 ος ἄ ταλαίφρων ἄγομαι [ἔπ.
 τὰν ἐποίμαν ὀδόν.
 οὐκέτι μοι τόδε λαμπάδος ἱερὸν
 ὄμμα θέμις ὄραῖν ταλαίνοι· 880
 τὸν δ' ἐμὸν πότμον ἀδάκρυτον
 οὐδεὶς φίλων στενάζει.
- Κρ. ἄρ' ἴστ' αἰοιδὰς καὶ γόους πρὸ τοῦ θανεῖν
 ὡς οὐδ' ἂν εἷς παύσαιτ' ἂν, εἰ χρεῖη λέγειν;
 οὐκ ἄξεθ' ὡς τάχιστα; καὶ κατηρεφεῖ 885
 τύμβωι περιπτύξαντες, ὡς εἶρηκ' ἐγὼ,
 ἄφετε μόνην ἐρῆμον, εἴτε χρῆι θανεῖν
 εἴτ' ἐν τοιαύτῃ ζῶσα τυμβεύειν στέγηι.

865 δυσμόρου Ω: δυσμόρωι Φ 877 ἄ ταλαίφρων Erfurd (ἀταλ- Φ):
 ταλαίφρων Ω 878 τὰν Ω: τάνδ' Φ 884 χρεῖη Dawes: χρεῖ' ἢ Ω
 λέγειν Ω: λέγων Vauvilliers: χέων Blaydes 887 ἄφετε Φ: ἀφεῖτε or ἀφῆτε
 Ω: ἄπιτε Φ χρῆι Dindorf: χρῆ Ω 888 τυμβεύειν Ω: τυμβεύσει
 (or -εὔει) Φ

- ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἄγνοοι τοῦπὶ τήνδε τήν κόρην·
 μετοικίας δ' οὖν τῆς ἄνω στερήσεται. 890
- Αν. ὦ τύμβος, ὦ νυμφεῖον, ὦ κατασκαφῆς
 οἴκησις αἰείφουρος, οἷ πορεύομαι
 πρὸς τοὺς ἑμαυτῆς, ὦν ἀριθμὸν ἐν νεκροῖς
 πλεῖστον δέδεκται Φερσέφασσ' ὀλωλότων·
 ὦν λιοισθία ἄγω καὶ κάκιστα δὴ μακρῶν 895
 κάτειμι, πρὶν μοι μοῖραν ἐξήκειν βίου.
 ἔλθοῦσα μέντοι κάρτ' ἐν ἐλπίσιν τρέφω
 φίλη μὲν ἦξεν πατρί, προσφιλῆς δὲ σοί,
 μήτηρ, φίλη δὲ σοί, κασίγνητον κάρα.
 ἐπεὶ θανόντας αὐτόχειρ ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ 900
 ἔλουσα κάκωσμησα κάπιτυμβίους
 χοὰς ἔδωκα· νῦν δέ, Πολύνεικες, τὸ σὸν
 δέμας περιστέλλουσα τοιάδ' ἄρνημαι.
 καίτοι σ' ἐγὼ ἄτιμησα τοῖς φρονοῦσιν εὖ·
 οὐ γάρ ποτ' οὔτ' ἂν εἰ τέκνων μήτηρ ἔφην 905
 οὔτ' εἰ πόσις μοι κατθανῶν ἐτήκετο,
 βίαί πολιτῶν τόνδ' ἂν ἠιρόμην πόνον.
 τίνος νόμου δὴ ταῦτα πρὸς χάριν λέγω;
 πόσις μὲν ἂν μοι κατθανόντος ἄλλος ἦν,
 καὶ παῖς ἀπ' ἄλλου φωτός, εἰ τοῦδ' ἤμπλακον· 910
 μητρὸς δ' ἐν Ἄιδου καὶ πατρὸς κεκευθότιον
 οὐκ ἔστ' ἀδελφὸς ὅστις ἂν βλάστοι ποτέ.
 τοιῶνδε μέντοι σ' ἐκπροτιμήσασ' ἐγὼ
 νόμωι, Κρέοντι ταῦτ' ἔδοξ' ἀμαρτάνειν
 καὶ δεινὰ τολμᾶν, ὦ κασίγνητον κάρα. 915
 καὶ νῦν ἄγει με διὰ χερῶν οὔτω λαβῶν
 ἄλεκτρον, ἀνυμέναιον, οὔτε του γάμου
 μέρος λαχοῦσαν οὔτε παιδείου τροφῆς,
 ἀλλ' ὦδ' ἐρήμος πρὸς φίλων ἢ δύσμορος
 ζῶσ' ἐς θανόντων ἔρχομαι κατασκαφάς· 920

894 Φερσέφασσ' Φ: Περσεφασσ' Ω 904-20 deleted by Lehrs
 911 κεκευθότιον Ω: βεβηκότων Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1417a32

ποίαν παρεξελθοῦσα δαιμόνων δίκην;
 τί χρή με τήν δύστηνον ἐς θεοὺς ἔτι
 βλέπειν; τίν' αὐδᾶν ξυμμάχων; ἐπεὶ γε δὴ
 τήν δυσσέβειαν εὐσεβοῦσ' ἔκτησάμην.
 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν οὖν τάδ' ἐστὶν ἐν θεοῖς καλὰ, 925
 παθόντες ἂν ξυγγνοῖμεν ἡμαρτηκότες·
 εἰ δ' οἶδ' ἄμαρτάνουσι, μὴ πλείω κακὰ
 πάθοιεν ἢ καὶ δρῶσιν ἐκδίκως ἐμέ.

Χο. ἔτι τῶν αὐτῶν ἀνέμων αὐταὶ
 ψυχῆς ῥίπαὶ τήνδε γ' ἔχουσιν. 930

Κρ. τοιγὰρ τούτων τοῖσιν ἄγουσιν
 κλαύμαθ' ὑπάρξει βραδυτήτος ὑπερ.

Αν. οἴμοι, θανάτου τοῦτ' ἐγγυτάτω
 τοῦπος ἀφίκται.

Κρ. θαρσεῖν οὐδὲν παραμυθοῦμαι
 μὴ οὐ τάδε ταύτη κατακυροῦσθαι. 935

Αν. ὦ γῆς Θήβης ἄστου πατρῶιον
 καὶ θεοὶ προγενεῖς,
 ἄγομαι δὴ ἔγὼ κοῦκέτι μέλλω.
 λεύσσετε, Θήβης οἱ κοιρανίδαι,
 τήν βασιλειδῶν μούνην λοιπήν, 940
 οἷα πρὸς οἶων ἀνδρῶν πάσχω,
 τήν εὐσεβίαν σεβίσασα.

Χο. ἔτλα καὶ Δανάας οὐράνιον φῶς [στρ. α
 ἀλλάξαι δέμας ἐν χαλκοδέτοις 945
 αὐλαῖς· κρυπτομένα δ' ἐν
 τυμβήρει θαλάμῳ κατεζεύχθη·
 καίτοι καὶ γενεαὶ τίμιος, ὦ παῖ παῖ,
 καὶ Ζηνὸς ταμειέεσκε γονὰς χρυσορύτους. 950

929 αὐταὶ Erfurdt: αὐταὶ Ω 933-4 assigned to Ant. by Ω: to Chorus by
 Lehrs 935-6 assigned to Kreon by Ω: to Chorus by Böckh (and scho-
 liast) 941 βασιλειδῶν G. Wolff: βασιλείαν Φ: βασιλίδα Ω 949 καὶ
 supplied by Hermann

ἄλλ' ἄ μοιριδία τις δύνασις δεινά.
 οὔτ' ἄν νιν ὄλβος οὔτ' Ἄρης,
 οὐ πύργος, οὐχ ἀλίκτυποι
 κελαιναὶ νᾶες ἐκφύγοιεν.

ζεύχθη δ' ὀξύχολος παῖς ὁ Δρύαντος [ἀντ. α
 Ἰδωνῶν βασιλεύς, κερτομίοις 956
 ὀργαῖς ἐκ Διονύσου
 πετρῶδει κατάφαρκτος ἐν δεσμῶι.
 οὔτω τᾶς μανίας δεινὸν ἀποστάζει
 ἀνθηρόν τε μένος. κείνος ἐπέγνω μανίας 960
 ψαύων τὸν θεὸν ἐν κερτομίοις γλώσσαις.
 παύεσκε μὲν γὰρ ἐνθέους
 γυναῖκας εὐίον τε πῦρ,
 φιλαύλους τ' ἠρέθιζε Μούσας. 965

παρὰ δὲ Κυανέων †πελαγέων πετρῶν† διδύμας [στρ. β
 ἄλως
 ἄκται Βοσπόριαι †ἦδ' ὁ Θρηικῶν†
 Σαλμυδησός, ἴν' ἀγχίπολις Ἄ- 970
 ρης δισσοῖσι Φινείδαις
 εἶδεν ἀρατὸν ἔλκος
 τυφλωθὲν ἐξ ἀγρίας δάμαρτος
 ἄλαδὸν ἀλαστόροισιν ὀμμάτων κύκλοις
 ἀραχθέντων ὑφ' αἵματηραῖς 975
 χεῖρεσσι καὶ κερκίδων ἀκμαῖσιν.

κατὰ δὲ τακόμενοι μέλεοι μελέαν πάθαν [ἀντ. β
 κλαῖον, ματρὸς ἔχοντες ἀνύμφευτον γονάν· 980

952 ὄλβος Scaliger: ὄμβρος Ω 955 ὀξύχολος Scaliger: ὀξυχόλωσ Ω
 966-9 Ω: κυανέοις Φ πελαγέων (or -ίων) Ω: πελάγεσι Φ: πελάγει Jebb:
 σπιλάδων Wieseler (-οιν Pearson) πετρῶν Ω: πέτραις Φ: deleted by
 Brunck ἄλως Ω: ἄλως τ' Φ 970 ἀγχίπολις Φ: ἀγχίπολις Ω 975
 ἀραχθέντων Seidler: ἀραχθὲν ἐγγέων Ω 980 Ω: πατρὸς Φ ἀνύμφευ-
 τον Ω: ἀνύμφεου Meineke

ἄ δὲ σπέρμα μὲν ἀρχαιογόνων
 † ἄντας † Ἐρεχθειδᾶν,
 τηλεπόροις δ' ἐν ἄντροις
 τράφη θυέλλησιν ἐν πατρώιαις
 Βορέας ἄμιππος ὀρθόποδος ὑπὲρ πάγου 985
 θεῶν παῖς· ἀλλὰ κάπ' ἐκείναι
 Μοῖραι μακραίωνες ἔσχον, ὦ παῖ.

ΤΕΙΡΕΣΙΑΣ

Θήβης ἄνακτες, ἤκομεν κοινήν ὁδὸν
 δὺ' ἐξ ἐνὸς βλέποντε· τοῖς τυφλοῖσι γὰρ
 αὕτη κέλευθος ἐκ προηγητοῦ πέλει. 990
 Κρ. τί δ' ἔστιν, ὦ γεραιὲ Τειρεσία, νέον;
 Τε. ἐγὼ διδάξω, καὶ σὺ τῶι μάντει πιθοῦ.
 Κρ. οὐκ οὐκ ἄρα γέ σῆς ἀπεστάτου φρενός.
 Τε. τοιγὰρ δι' ὀρθῆς τήνδ' ἐναυκλήρεις πόλιν.
 Κρ. ἔχω πεπονθῶς μαρτυρεῖν ὀνήσιμα. 995
 Τε. φρόνει βεβῶς αὖ νῦν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ τύχης.
 Κρ. τί δ' ἔστιν; ὡς ἐγὼ τὸ σὸν φρίσσω στόμα.
 Τε. γνώσῃ, τέχνης σημεῖα τῆς ἐμῆς κλυών.
 ἐς γὰρ παλαιὸν θᾶκον ὀρνιθοσκόπον
 ἴζων, ἴν' ἦν μοι παντὸς οἰωνοῦ λιμήν, 1000
 ἀγνώτ' ἀκούω φθόγγον ὀρνίθων, κακῶι
 κλάζοντας οἴστρωι καὶ βεβαρβαρωμένωι·
 καὶ σπῶντας ἐν χηλαῖσιν ἀλλήλους φοναῖς
 ἔγνων· πτερῶν γὰρ ῥοῖβδος οὐκ ἄσημος ἦν.
 εὐθύς δὲ δείσας ἐμπύρων ἐγευόμην 1005
 βωμοῖσι παμφλέκτοισιν· ἐκ δὲ θυμάτων
 Ἥφαιστος οὐκ ἔλαμπεν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σποδῶι
 μυδῶσα κηκίς μηρίων ἐτήκετο
 κᾶτυφε κἀνέπτυε, καὶ μετάρσιοι
 χολαὶ διεσπείροντο, καὶ καταρρυεῖς 1010

982 ἄντας Ω: αὔχας Dindorf: ἐξαύχας Griffith
 ποντες Ω 994 Valckenaer: τήνδε ναυκληρεῖς Ω

989 βλέποντε Φ: βλέ-

μηροὶ καλυπτῆς ἐξέκειντο πιμελῆς.
 τοιαῦτα παιδὸς τοῦδ' ἐμάνθανον πάρα
 φθίνοντ' ἀσῆμων ὀργίων μαντεύματα.
 ἔμοι γὰρ οὗτος ἡγεμῶν, ἄλλοις δ' ἐγώ.
 καὶ ταῦτα τῆς σῆς ἐκ φρενὸς νοσεῖ πόλις. 1015
 βωμοὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐσχάροι τε παντελεῖς
 πληρεῖς ὑπ' οἰωνῶν τε καὶ κυνῶν βορᾶς
 τοῦ δυσμόρου πεπτῶτος Οἰδίπου γόνου.
 καῖτ' οὐ δέχονται θυστάδας λιτὰς ἔτι
 θεοὶ παρ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲ μηρίων φλόγα, 1020
 οὐδ' ὄρνις εὐσήμους ἀπορροιβδεῖ βοάς,
 ἀνδροφθόρου βεβρώτες αἵματος λίπος.
 ταῦτ' οὖν, τέκνον, φρόνησον. ἀνθρώποισι γὰρ
 τοῖς πᾶσι κοινόν ἐστι τούξαμαρτάνειν·
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀμάρτηι, κείνος οὐκέτ' ἔστ' ἀνήρ 1025
 ἄβουλος οὐδ' ἀνολβος, ὅστις ἐς κακὸν
 πεσὼν ἀκεῖται μηδ' ἀκίνητος πέλει.
 αὐθαδία τοι σκαιότητ' ὀφλισκάνει.
 ἀλλ' εἶκε τῶι θανόντι, μηδ' ὀλωλότα
 κέντει· τίς ἀλκὴ τὸν θανόντ' ἐπικτανεῖν; 1030
 εὔ σοι φρονήσας εὔ λέγω· τὸ μανθάνειν δ'
 ἦδιστον εὔ λέγοντος, εἰ κέρδος λέγοι.
 Κρ. ᾧ πρέσβυ, πάντες ὥστε τοξόται σκοποῦ
 τοξεύετ' ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε, κούδὲ μαντικῆς
 ἄπρακτος ὑμῖν εἶμι· τῶν δ' ὑπαὶ γένους 1035
 ἐξημπόλημαι κάκπεφόρτισμαι πάλαι.
 κερδαίνεται, ἐμπολάτε τάπο Σάρδεων
 ἤλεκτρον, εἰ βούλεσθε, καὶ τὸν Ἰνδικὸν
 χρυσόν· τάφωι δ' ἐκείνον οὐχὶ κρύψετε,
 οὐδ' εἰ θέλουσ' οἱ Ζηνὸς αἰετοὶ βορὰν 1040
 φέρειν νιν ἀρπάζοντες ἐς Διὸς θρόνους·

1022 βεβρώτες Ω: βεβρώτος Φ λίπος Ω: λίβος Blomfield 1027 ἀκίνη-
 τος Ω: ἀνίητος or ἀίνητος Φ: ἀνίατος Blaydes 1032 λέγοι Ω: φέροι or
 φέρι Φ 1035 τῶν δ' Ω: τῶν Φ 1037 τάπο Blaydes: τὰ πρὸ Φ: τὸν
 πρὸς Ω 1040 οὐδ' εἰ Ω: οὐ δὴ Φ

οὐδ' ὡς μίασμα τοῦτο μὴ τρέσας ἐγὼ
 θάπτειν παρήσω κείνον· εὖ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅτι
 θεοὺς μιάινειν οὔτις ἀνθρώπων σθένει.
 πίπτουσι δ', ὧ γεραιῆ Τειρεσία, βροτῶν 1045
 χοῖ πολλὰ δεινοὶ πτώματ' αἴσχυρ', ὅταν λόγους
 αἰσχροὺς καλῶς λέγωσι τοῦ κέρδους χάριν.

Τε. φεῦ.

ἄρ' οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τις, ἄρα φράζεται –

Κρ. τί χρῆμα; ποῖον τοῦτο πάγκοινων λέγεις;

Τε. ὅσῳ κράτιστον κτημάτων εὐβουλία; 1050

Κρ. ὅσῳ περ, οἶμαι, μὴ φρονεῖν πλείστη βλάβη.

Τε. ταύτης σὺ μέντοι τῆς νόσου πλήρης ἔφυς.

Κρ. οὐ βούλομαι τὸν μάντιν ἀντειπεῖν κακῶς.

Τε. καὶ μὴν λέγεις, ψευδῆ με θεσπίζειν λέγων.

Κρ. τὸ μαντικὸν γὰρ πᾶν φιλάργυρον γένος. 1055

Τε. τὸ δ' ἐκ τυράννων αἰσχροκέρδειαν φιλεῖ.

Κρ. ἄρ' οἶσθα ταγοὺς ὄντας ἀν λέγηις λέγων;

Τε. οἶδ'. ἐξ ἐμοῦ γὰρ τήνδ' ἔχεις σώσας πόλιν.

Κρ. σοφὸς σὺ μάντις, ἀλλὰ τὰδικεῖν φιλῶν.

Τε. ὄρσεις με τὰκίνητα διὰ φρενῶν φράσαι. 1060

Κρ. κίνει, μόνον δὲ μὴ ἔπι κέρδεσιν λέγων.

Τε. οὔτω γὰρ ἤδη καὶ δοκῶ τὸ σὸν μέρος;

Κρ. ὡς μὴ ἔμπολήσῃς ἴσθι τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα.

Τε. ἀλλ' εὖ γέ τοι κάτισθι μὴ πολλοὺς ἔτι
 τρόχους ἀμιλλητηῆρας ἡλίου τελῶν, 1065

ἐν οἷσι τῶν σῶν αὐτὸς ἐκ σπλάγχνων ἕνα

νέκυν νεκρῶν ἀμοιβὸν ἀντιδοὺς ἔσθι,

ἀνθ' ὧν ἔχεις μὲν τῶν ἄνω βαλῶν κάτω,

ψυχὴν τ' ἀτίμως ἐν τάφῳ κατώικισας,

ἔχεις δὲ τῶν κάτωθεν ἐνθάδ' αὖ θεῶν 1070

ἄμοιρον, ἀκτέριστον, ἀνόσιον νέκυν.

1056 ἐκ Ω: αὖ Hartung 1057 Ω: ἄ or ἄν λέγεις Φ: οὐς ψέγεις Kapsome-
 nos, Wecklein 1065 τρόχους Erfurd: τροχούς Ω ἡλίου τελῶν Ω:
 ἡλιον τελεῖν Winkelmann 1069 τ' Ω: γ' Dawe: deleted by Bothe
 κατώικισας Ω: κατοικίσας Φ

- ὧν οὔτε σοὶ μέτεστιν οὔτε τοῖς ἄνω
 θεοῖσιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ σοῦ βιάζονται τάδε.
 τούτων σε λωβητῆρες ὑστεροφθόροι
 λοχῶσιν Ἄιδου καὶ θεῶν Ἑρινύες, 1075
 ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς τοῖσδε ληφθῆναι κακοῖς.
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἄθρησον εἰ κατηγυρωμένος
 λέγω· φανεῖ γὰρ οὐ μακροῦ χρόνου τριβῆ
 ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν σοῖς δόμοις κωκύματα.
 ἔχθραι δὲ πᾶσαι συνταράσσονται πόλεις 1080
 ὄσων σπαράγματ' ἢ κύνες καθήγνισαν
 ἢ θῆρες ἢ τις πτηνὸς οἰωνός, φέρων
 ἀνόσιον ὁσμήν ἐστιοῦχον ἐς πόλιν.
 τοιαῦτά σοι, λυπεῖς γάρ, ὥστε τοξότης
 ἀφήκα θυμῶι καρδίας τοξεύματα 1085
 βέβαια, τῶν σὺ θάλλπος οὐχ ὑπεκδραμηῖ.
 ὦ παῖ, σὺ δ' ἡμᾶς ἄπαγε πρὸς δόμους, ἴνα
 τὸν θυμὸν οὔτος ἐς νεωτέρους ἀφῆι,
 καὶ γινῶι τρέφειν τὴν γλῶσσαν ἡσυχαιτέραν
 τὸν νοῦν τ' ἀμείνω τῶν φρενῶν ὧν νῦν φέρει. 1090
- Χο. ἀνὴρ, ἄναξ, βέβηκε δεινὰ θεσπίσας.
 ἐπιστάμεσθα δ', ἐξ ὄτου λευκὴν ἐγὼ
 τήνδ' ἐκ μελαίνης ἀμφιβάλλομαι τρίχα,
 μή πῶ ποτ' αὐτὸν ψεῦδος ἐς πόλιν λακεῖν.
- Κρ. ἔγνωκα καὐτὸς καὶ ταράσσομαι φρένας· 1095
 τό τ' εἰκαθεῖν γὰρ δεινόν, ἀντιστάντα δὲ
 Ἄτηι πατάξαι θυμὸν ἐν δεινῶι πάρα.
- Χο. εὐβουλίαν δεῖ, παῖ Μενοικέως, λαβεῖν.
 Κρ. τί δῆτα χρὴ δρᾶν; φράζε· πείσομαι δ' ἐγώ.
 Χο. ἐλθὼν κόρην μὲν ἐκ κατώρυχος στέγης 1100
 ἄνες, κτίσον δὲ τῶι προκειμένῳ τάφον.

1080–3 deleted by A. Jacob 1080 ἔχθραι Reiske: ἐχθραὶ Ω 1081 ὄσων
 Ω: ὄσαις Frederking καθήγνισαν Ω: καθήγνισαν Φ 1083 πόλιν Ω:
 πόλον Nauck 1084 σοι Φ: σου Ω 1090 ὧν Brunck: ἢ Ω 1094
 λακεῖν Ω: λαβεῖν Φ 1096 δὲ Ω: τε Φ 1098 εὐβουλίαν IJ&W: -ίας Ω
 λαβεῖν Ω: λαχεῖν Φ: Κρέον or Κρέων Φ

- Κρ. καὶ ταῦτ' ἐπαινεῖς καὶ δοκεῖ παρεικαθεῖν;
 Χο. ὅσον γ', ἄναξ, τάχιστα· συντέμνουσι γὰρ
 θεῶν ποδώκεις τοὺς κακόφρονας Βλάβαι.
- Κρ. οἴμοι· μόλις μὲν, καρδίας δ' ἐξίσταμαι 1105
 τὸ δρᾶν· ἀνάγκη δ' οὐχὶ δυσμαχητέον.
- Χο. δρᾶ νυν τάδ' ἐλθὼν μῆδ' ἐπ' ἄλλοισιν τρέπε.
- Κρ. ὦδ' ὡς ἔχω στείχοιμ' ἄν· ἴτ' ἴτ' ὀπάονες,
 οἳ τ' ὄντες οἳ τ' ἀπόντες, ἀξίνας χεροῖν
 ὀρμᾶσθ' ἐλόντες εἰς ἐπόψιον τόπον. 1110
 ἐγὼ δ', ἐπειδὴ δόξα τῆιδ' ἐπεστράφη,
 αὐτός τ' ἔδησα καὶ παρῶν ἐκλύσομαι.
 δέδοικα γὰρ μὴ τοὺς καθεστῶτας νόμους
 ἄριστον ἢ σώιζοντα τὸν βίον τελεῖν.
- Χο. πολυώνυμε, Καδμείας ἄγαλμα νύμφας [στρ. α
 καὶ Διὸς βαρυβρεμέτα 1117
 γένος, κλυτὰν ὃς ἀμφέπει
 Ἰταλίαν, μέδεις δὲ
 παγκοίνοις Ἐλευσινίας 1120
 Δημοῦς ἐν κόλποις, ὦ Βακχεῦ,
 Βακχᾶν ματρόπολιν Θήβαν
 ναιετῶν παρ' ὕγροῖς
 Ἰσμηνοῦ ρεῖθροις, ἀγρίου τ'
 ἐπὶ σποραῖ δράκοντος. 1125
- σὲ δ' ὑπὲρ διλόφου πέτρας στέροψ ὄπωπε [ἀντ. α
 λιγνύς, ἔνθα Κωρύκκιαι
 στείχουσι Νύμφαι Βακχίδες
 Κασταλίας τε νᾶμα. 1130

1102 δοκεῖ Rauchenstein: δοκεῖς Ω 1105 καρδίας Φ: καρδία Ω: καρδίαν
 Φ 1107 τρέπε Ω: τρέπου Φ 1108 ἴτ' ἴτ' T: ἴτ' Ω: οἳ τ' Φ 1116
 Hermann: νύμφας ἄγαλμα Ω 1120 παγκοίνοις Ω: παγκοίνους or -ου
 Φ 1121 ὦ Ω: omitted by T 1123 ναιετῶν Dindorf: ναίων Ω ὕγροῖς
 Hartung: ὕγρον Ω: ὕγρων T 1124 ρεῖθροις Hartung: ρέεθρον Ω:
 ρέεθρων T 1129 Meineke: Νύμφαι στείχουσι Ω

καί σε Νυσαίων ὀρέων
 κισσήρεις ὄχθαι χλωρά τ' ἄ-
 κτὰ πολυστάφυλος πέμπει
 ἀμβρότων ἐπέων
 εὐαζόντων Θηβαίας
 ἐπισκοποῦντ' ἀγυιάς. 1135

τὰν ἐκ πασᾶν τιμᾶις [στρ. β
 ὑπερτάταν πόλεων
 ματρὶ σὺν κεραυνίαι·
 καὶ νῦν, ὡς βιαίας ἔχεται 1140
 πάνδαμος πόλις ἐπὶ νόσου,
 μολεῖν καθαρσίωι ποδὶ Παρνασίαν
 ὑπὲρ κλειτὺν ἢ στονόεντα πορθμόν. 1145

ἰὼ πῦρ πνειόντων [ἀντ. β
 χοράγ' ἄστρον, νυχίων
 φθεγμάτων ἐπίσκοπε,
 παῖ Διὸς γένεθλον, προφάνηθ',
 ὦναξ, σαῖς ἅμα περιπόλοις 1150
 Θυίαισιν, αἶ σε μαινόμεναι πάννυχοι
 χορεύουσι τὸν ταμίαν Ἰακχον.

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

Κάδμου πάροικοι καὶ δόμων Ἄμφιονος, 1155
 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅποιον στάντ' ἄν ἀνθρώπου βίον
 οὔτ' αἰνέσαιμ' ἄν οὔτε μεμψαίμην ποτέ.
 τύχη γὰρ ὀρθοῖ καὶ τύχη καταρρέπει
 τὸν εὐτυχοῦντα τὸν τε δυστυχοῦντ' αἰεί.
 καὶ μάντις οὐδεὶς τῶν καθεστῶτων βροτοῖς. 1160

1134 ἀμβρότων Ω: ἀβρότων Φ ἐπέων Ω: ἐπετῶν Hartung (-ᾶν Pallis)
 1141 ἐπὶ Ω: ὑπὸ Musgrave 1146 πνειόντων Brunck: πνεόντων Ω 1147
 νυχίων Φ: καὶ νυχίων Ω 1149 παῖ Διὸς Ω: παῖ Ζηνοῦς Bothe: Ζηνοῦς
 Schubert 1150 προφάνηθ' ὦναξ, σαῖς Bergk: προφάνηθι Ναξίαις Ω
 1151 Θυίαισιν Böckh: Θυίαισιν Ω: Θυίαισιν Holford-Strevens

Κρέων γὰρ ἦν ζηλωτός, ὡς ἐμοί, ποτέ,
 σώσας μὲν ἐχθρῶν τήνδε Καδμείαν χθόνα,
 λαβὼν τε χώρας παντελῆ μοναρχίαν
 ἠΐθυνε, θάλλων εὐγενεῖ τέκνων σποραῖ.
 καὶ νῦν ἀφεῖται πάντα. καὶ γὰρ ἡδοναὶ 1165
 ὅταν προδῶσιν ἀνδρός, οὐ τίθημ' ἐγὼ
 ζῆν τοῦτον, ἀλλ' ἔμψυχον ἠγοῦμαι νεκρόν.
 πλούτει τε γὰρ κατ' οἶκον, εἰ βούληι, μέγα,
 καὶ ζῆ τύραννον σχῆμ' ἔχων, ἐὰν δ' ἀπῆι
 τούτων τὸ χαίρειν, τᾶλλ' ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιάς 1170
 οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην ἀνδρὶ πρὸς τὴν ἡδονήν.

Χο. τί δ' αὖ τόδ' ἄχθος βασιλέων ἤκεις φέρων;

Αγ. τεθναῖσιν· οἱ δὲ ζῶντες αἴτιοι θανεῖν.

Χο. καὶ τίς φονεύει; τίς δ' ὁ κείμενος; λέγε.

Αγ. Αἴμων ὄλωλεν· αὐτόχειρ δ' αἰμάσσεται. 1175

Χο. πότερα πατρῷας, ἢ πρὸς οἰκείας χερός;

Αγ. αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ, πατρὶ μηνίσας φόνου.

Χο. ᾧ μάντι, τοῦπος ὡς ἄρ' ὀρθὸν ἦνυσας.

Αγ. ὡς ᾧδ' ἐχόντων τᾶλλα βουλευεῖν πάρα.

Χο. καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ τάλαιναν Εὐρυδίκην ὁμοῦ 1180
 δάμαρτα τὴν Κρέοντος· ἐκ δὲ δωμάτων
 ἦτοι κλυοῦσα παιδὸς ἢ τύχηι πάρα.

ΕΥΡΥΔΙΚΗ

ᾧ πάντες ἀστοί, τῶν λόγων ἐπισηθόμην
 πρὸς ἔξοδον στείχουσα, Παλλάδος θεᾶς
 ὅπως ἰκοίμην εὐγμάτων προσήγορος· 1185
 καὶ τυγχάνω τε κληῖθρ' ἀνασπαστοῦ πύλης
 χαλῶσα, καί με φθόγγος οἰκείου κακοῦ
 βάλλει δι' ὧτων· ὑπτία δὲ κλίνομαι

1165 καὶ γὰρ ἡδοναὶ Seyffert: τὰς γὰρ ἡδονὰς Ω 1166 ἀνδρός Ω: ἄνδρες
 Athenaios 280c, 547c: ἄνδρας Φ: ἄνδρα Eustathios 957.17 1167 line
 omitted by Ω: quoted by Athenaios, Eustathios 1182 πάρα Ω: περᾶι
 Brunck 1186 τε Ω: γε Φ: δὲ Φ

δείσασα πρὸς δμωαῖσι κάποπλήσσομαι.
 ἀλλ' ὅστις ἦν ὁ μῦθος αὖθις εἶπατε· 1190
 κακῶν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειρος οὔσ' ἀκούσομαι.
 Αγ. ἐγώ, φίλη δέσποινα, καὶ παρῶν ἐρῶ,
 κούδὲν παρήσω τῆς ἀληθείας ἔπος.
 τί γάρ σε μαλθάσσοιμ' ἄν ὦν ἐς ὕστερον
 ψευῆσαι φανούμεθ'; ὀρθὸν ἀλήθει' αἶε. 1195
 ἐγὼ δὲ σῶι ποδαγὸς ἐσπόμεν πόσει
 πεδίον ἐπ' ἄκρον, ἔνθ' ἔκειτο νηλεὲς
 κυνοσπάρακτον σῶμα Πολυνείκους ἔτι.
 καὶ τὸν μὲν, αἰτήσαντες ἐνοδίαν θεὸν
 Πλούτωνά τ' ὀργὰς εὐμενεῖς κατασχεθεῖν, 1200
 λούσαντες ἀγνὸν λουτρόν, ἐν νεοσπάσιν
 θαλλοῖς ὃ δὴ λῆλειπτο συγκατήθιομεν,
 καὶ τύμβον ὀρθόκρανον οἰκείας χθονὸς
 χώσαντες, αὖθις πρὸς λιθόστρωτον κόρης
 νυμφεῖον Ἄιδου κοῖλον εἰσεβαίνομεν. 1205
 φωνῆς δ' ἄπωθεν ὀρθίων κωκυμάτων
 κλύει τις ἀκτέριστον ἀμφὶ παστάδα,
 καὶ δεσπότηι Κρέοντι σημαίνει μολῶν·
 τῶι δ' ἀθλίας ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοῆς
 ἔρποντι μᾶλλον ἄσσον, οἰμῶξας δ' ἔπος 1210
 ἴησι δυσθρήνητον, “ὦ τάλας ἐγώ,
 ἄρ' εἰμὶ μάντις; ἄρα δυστυχεστάτην
 κέλευθον ἔρπω τῶν παρελθουσῶν ὁδῶν;
 παιδὸς με σαίνει φθόγγος. ἀλλά, πρόσπολοι,
 ἴτ' ἄσσον ὠκεῖς, καὶ παραστάντες τάφωι 1215
 ἀθρήσατ', ἀρμὸν χώματος λιθοσπαδῆ
 δύντες πρὸς αὐτὸ στόμιον, εἰ τὸν Αἴμονος
 φθόγγον συνίημ', ἧ θεοῖσι κλέπτομαι.”
 τοῖσδ' ἐξ ἀθύμου δεσπότου κελεύσμασιν

1189 κάποπλήσσομαι Ω: κάπιπλήσσομαι Φ 1196 ἐσπόμεν Ω: εἰπόμεν
 Φ 1208 μολῶν Ω: μαθῶν Φ 1216 ἀρμὸν Ω: ἀγμὸν Lloyd-Jones
 1219 τοῖσδ' Hermann: τάδ' Ω κελεύσμασι Ω: κελευσμάτων Burton

- ἤθροῦμεν· ἐν δὲ λοισθίῳ τυμβεύματι 1220
 τὴν μὲν κρεμαστὴν ἀύχενος κατείδομεν,
 βρόχῳ μιτώδει σινδόνας καθημμένην,
 τὸν δ' ἀμφὶ μέσση περιπετῆ προσκείμενον,
 εὐνῆς ἀποιμώζοντα τῆς κάτω φθορὰν
 καὶ πατρὸς ἔργα καὶ τὸ δύστηνον λέχος. 1225
 ὁ δ' ὡς ὄραϊ σφε, στυγνὸν οἰμῶξας ἔσω
 χωρεῖ πρὸς αὐτὸν κἀνακωκύσας καλεῖ·
 “ὦ τλήμον, οἶον ἔργον εἴργασαι· τίνα
 νοῦν ἔσχεις; ἐν τῷ συμφορᾶς διεφθάρης;
 ἔξελθε, τέκνον, ἰκέσιός σε λίσσομαι.” 1230
 τὸν δ' ἀγρίοις ὄσσοισι παπτήνας ὁ παῖς,
 πτύσας προσώπῳ κούδεν ἀντειπῶν, ξίφους
 ἔλκει διπλοῦς κνώδοντας, ἐκ δ' ὀρμωμένου
 πατρὸς φυγαῖσιν ἤμπλακ'· εἶθ' ὁ δύσμορος
 αὐτῷ χολωθεῖς, ὡσπερ εἶχ', ἐπενταθεῖς 1235
 ἤρεισε πλευραῖς μέσσον ἔγχος, ἐς δ' ὑγρὸν
 ἀγκῶν' ἔτ' ἔμφρων παρθένῳ προσπτύσεται.
 καὶ φυσιῶν ὀξεῖαν ἐκβάλλει ῥοὴν
 λευκῆι παρειᾷ φοινίου σταλάγματος.
 κεῖται δὲ νεκρὸς περὶ νεκρῶι, τὰ νυμφικὰ 1240
 τέλη λαχῶν δέιλαιος ἐν γ' Ἄιδου δόμοις,
 δείξας ἐν ἀνθρώποισι τὴν ἀβουλίαν
 ὅσῳ μέγιστον ἀνδρὶ πρόσκειται κακόν.
 Χο. τί τοῦτ' ἀν εἰκάσειας; ἡ γυνὴ πάλιν
 φρούδη, πρὶν εἰπεῖν ἔσθλὸν ἢ κακὸν λόγον. 1245
 Αγ. καὺτὸς τεθάμβηκ'· ἐλπίσιν δὲ βόσκομαι
 ἄχη τέκνου κλυοῦσαν ἐς πόλιν γόους

1222 μιτώδει Ω: μιτρώδει Φ 1225 λέχος Ω: λάχος Bergk 1227 αὐτὸν
 Ω: αὐτῶ or -οὺς Broadhead: αὐτὴν Ledbetter 1228 οἶον Φ: ποῖον Ω
 1236 ἐς Ω: ἐν Φ 1237 παρθένῳ Ω: παρθένον Φ 1238 καὶ φυσιῶν Ω:
 κάκφυσιῶν Blaydes ἐκβάλλει Ω: ἐμβάλλει Φ ῥοὴν Φ: πνοὴν Ω
 1241 ἐν γ' Heath: εἰν Φ: ἐν Ω 1244 πάλιν Ω: πάλαι Φ 1247 κλυοῦσαν
 (κλύουσαν) Ω: κλαίουσαν Φ γόους Ω: γόου Pearson: γόων Postgate:
 λόγους Φ

- οὐκ ἀξιώσῃν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ στέγῃς ἔσω
 δμωαῖς προθήσῃν πένθος οἰκεῖον στένειν·
 γνώμης γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειρος, ὥσθ' ἀμαρτάνειν. 1250
- Χο. οὐκ οἶδ'· ἐμοὶ δ' οὖν ἢ τ' ἄγαν σιγὴ βαρὺ
 δοκεῖ προσεῖναι χῆ μάρτην πολλὴ βοή.
 Αγ. ἀλλ' εἰσόμεσθα, μὴ τι καὶ κατάσχετον
 κρυφῆι καλύπτει καρδίαι θυμουμένηι,
 δόμους παραστείχοντες· εὖ γὰρ οὖν λέγεις. 1255
 καὶ τῆς ἄγαν γὰρ ἐστὶ που σιγῆς βάρους.
- Χο. καὶ μὴν ὄδ' ἄναξ αὐτὸς ἐφήκει
 μνημ' ἐπίσημον διὰ χειρὸς ἔχων,
 εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἄλλοτρίαν
 ἄτην, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀμαρτῶν. 1260
- Κρ. ἰώ, [στρ. α
 φρενῶν δυσφρόνων ἀμαρτήματα
 στερεὰ θανατόεντ',
 ὦ κτανόντας τε καὶ
 θανόντας βλέποντες ἐμφυλίους.
 ὦμοι ἐμῶν ἄνολβα βουλευμάτων. 1265
 ἰὼ παῖ, νέος νέωι ξὺν μόρωι,
 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ,
 ἔθανες, ἀπελύθης
 ἐμαῖς οὐδὲ σαῖσι δυσβουλίαις.
- Χο. οἴμ' ὡς ἔοικας ὀψὲ τὴν δίκην ἰδεῖν. 1270
- Κρ. οἴμοι, [στρ. β
 ἔχω μαθῶν δείλαιος· ἐν δ' ἐμῶι κάραι
 θεὸς τότε' ἄρα τότε με μέγα βάρους ἔχων
 ἔπαισεν, ἐν δ' ἔσεισεν ἀγρίαις ὁδοῖς,

1258 ἔχων Ω: ἄγων Φ 1270 ἰδεῖν Ω: ἔχειν Φ 1272 μαθῶν Ω: μαθεῖν Φ
 1273 Meineke: τότε μέγα βάρους μ' ἔχων Φ (μ' omitted by Ω)

οἴμοι λακπάτητον ἀντρέπων χαράν. 1275
 φεῦ φεῦ, ἰὼ πόνοι βροτῶν δύσπονοι.

Αγ. ὦ δέσποθ', ὡς ἔχων τε καὶ κεκτημένος,
 τὰ μὲν πρὸ χειρῶν τάδε φέρων, τὰ δ' ἐν δόμοις
 ἔοικας ἤκων καὶ τάχ' ὄψεσθαι κακά. 1280

Κρ. τί δ' ἔστιν αὖ κἀκίον ἐκ κακῶν ἔτι;
 Αγ. γυνὴ τέθνηκε, τοῦδε παμμήτωρ νεκροῦ,
 δύστηνος, ἄρτι νεοτόμοισι πλήγμασιν.

Κρ. ἰὼ, [ἀντ. α
 ἰὼ δυσκάθατος Ἄιδου λιμὴν,
 τί μ' ἄρα τί μ' ὀλέκεις; 1285
 ὦ κακάγγελτά μοι
 προπέμψας ἄχη, τίνα θροεῖς λόγον;
 αἰαῖ, ὀλωλότ' ἄνδρ' ἐπεξεργάσω.
 τί φῆς, παῖ, τίν' αὖ λέγεις μοι νέον,
 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ, 1290
 σφάγιον ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ
 γυναικεῖον ἀμφικεῖσθαι μόρον;

Αγ. ὄρᾶν πάρεστιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐν μυχοῖς ἔτι.

Κρ. οἴμοι, [ἀντ. β
 κακὸν τόδ' ἄλλο δεύτερον βλέπω τάλας. 1295
 τίς ἄρα, τίς με πότμος ἔτι περιμένει;
 ἔχω μὲν ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἀρτίως τέκνον,
 τάλας, τὰν δ' ἔναντα προσβλέπω νεκρόν.
 φεῦ φεῦ μᾶτερ ἀθλία, φεῦ τέκνον. 1300

1279 φέρων Ω: φέρειν Hartung: φέρεις Brunck 1280 ἤκων Brunck: ἤκειν
 Ω τάχ' Ω: τά γ' (or τά τ', or τάδ') Φ 1281 ἐκ Canter: ἦ Ω 1286
 ὦ Turnebus (cf. 1263): ἰὼ Ω 1289 παῖ Φ: ὦ παῖ Ω: deleted by Donald-
 son τίν' αὖ Enger: τίνα Ω νέον T: νέον λόγον Ω 1298 τὰν δ'
 Postgate: τήνδ' Φ: τάδ' Φ: τόνδ' or τόδ' Ω

- Αγ. †ή δ' ὀξύθηκτος ἦδε βωμία περίξ
 {x-u- x-u- x-u-}†
 λυεῖ κελαινὰ βλέφαρα, κωκύσσα μὲν
 τοῦ πρὶν θανόντος Μεγαρέως κενὸν λέχος,
 αὔθις δὲ τοῦδε, λοίσθιον δὲ σοὶ κακὰς
 πράξεις ἐφυμνήσσα τῶι παιδοκτόνῳ. 1305
- Κρ. αἰαῖ αἰαῖ, [στρ. γ
 ἀνέπταν φόβῳ. τί μ' οὐκ ἀνταίαν
 ἔπαισέν τις ἀμφιθήκτῳ ξίφει;
 δειλαῖος ἐγώ, αἰαῖ, 1310
 δειλαῖαι δὲ συγέκραμαι δῦαι.
- Αγ. ὡς αἰτίαν γε τῶνδε κάκείνων ἔχων
 πρὸς τῆς θανούσης τῆσδ' ἐπεσκήπτου μόρων.
 Κρ. ποίῳι δὲ κάπελυετ' ἐν φοναῖς τρόπῳι;
 Αγ. παῖσασ' ὑφ' ἧπαρ αὐτόχειρ αὐτήν, ὅπως 1315
 παιδὸς τόδ' ἦισθητ' ὀξυκώκυτον πάθος.
- Κρ. ὦμοι μοι, τάδ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἄλλον βροτῶν [στρ. δ
 ἐμᾶς ἀρμόσει ποτ' ἐξ αἰτίας.
 ἐγὼ γάρ σ', ἐγὼ σ' ἔκανον, ὦ μέλεος,
 ἐγὼ, φάμ' ἔτυμον. ἰὼ πρόσπολοι, 1320
 ἄγετέ μ' ὅτι τάχιστ', ἄγετέ μ' ἐκποδῶν,
 τὸν οὐκ ὄντα μᾶλλον ἢ μηδένα. 1325
- Χο. κέρδη παραινεῖς, εἴ τι κέρδος ἐν κακοῖς·
 βράχιστα γὰρ κράτιστα τὰν ποσὶν κακὰ.

1301 Ω: ἡ δ' ὀξυθήκτῳ βωμία περί ξίφει Arndt 1301-2 lacuna indicated by Brunck 1303 κενὸν λέχος Seyffert: κλεινὸν λέχος Ω: κλεινὸν λάχος Bothe 1307 ἀνταίαν Ω: καιρίαν Φ 1310 αἰαῖ Erfurdt: φεῦ φεῦ Ω 1313 μόρων Φ: μόρωι Ω 1314 κάπελυετ' Pearson: κάπελύσατ' Ω ἐν φοναῖς Ω: εἰς φονάς Φ 1318 ἐμᾶς Ω: ἐμᾶς γ' (or δ') Φ 1319 σ' ἔκανον Hermann: σ' omitted by Ω 1322 τάχιστ' Erfurdt: τάχος Ω

Κρ. ἴτω ἴτω, [ἀντ. γ
 φανήτω μόρων ὁ κάλλιστ' ἔχων
 ἔμοι τερμίαν ἄγων ἀμέραν 1330
 ὕπατος· ἴτω ἴτω,
 ὅπως μηκέτ' ἄμαρ ἄλλ' εἰσίδω.

Χο. μέλλοντα ταῦτα· τῶν προκειμένων τι χρῆ
 πράσσειν· μέλει γὰρ τῶνδ' ὅτοισι χρῆ μέλιν. 1335

Κρ. ἀλλ' ὦν ἐρῶ μέν, ταῦτα συγκατηυξάμην.

Χο. μή νυν προσεύχου μηδέν· ὡς πεπρωμένης
 οὐκ ἔστι θνητοῖς συμφορᾶς ἀπαλλαγὴ.

Κρ. ἄγοιτ' ἂν μάταιον ἄνδρ' ἐκποδῶν, [ἀντ. δ
 ὅς, ὦ παῖ, σέ τ' οὐχ ἐκὼν κατέκανον, 1340
 σέ τ' αὖ τάνδ', ὦμοι μέλεος, οὐδ' ἔχω
 πρὸς πότερον ἴδω, πᾶι κλιθῶ· πάντα γὰρ
 λέχρια τὰν χεροῖν, τὰ δ' ἐπὶ κρατὶ μοι 1345
 πότημος δυσκόμιστος εἰσήλατο.

Χο. πολλῶι τὸ φρονεῖν εὐδαιμονίας
 πρῶτον ὑπάρχει· χρῆ δὲ τὰ γ' ἐς θεοῦς
 μηδέν ἀσεπτεῖν· μεγάλοι δὲ λόγοι 1350
 μεγάλας πληγὰς τῶν ὑπεραύχων
 ἀποτείσαντες
 γήραι τὸ φρονεῖν ἐδίδαξαν.

1329 ἔχων Pallis: ἐμῶν Ω 1336 ἐρῶ μέν (οἱ ἐρῶμεν) Ω: ἐρῶ οἱ ἐρῶ νυν Φ
 1340 κατέκανον Schneider: κατέκτανον Ω: κατέκτα Τ 1341 σέ Hermann:
 ὅς σέ Ω αὖ τάνδ' Seidler: αὐτάν Ω 1343 Seidler: ὅπαι πρὸς πότερον
 Φ (πρότερον Ω) κλιθῶ Musgrave: καὶ θῶ Ω 1345 τὰν Brunck: τὰ δ'
 ἐν Ω: τὰ τ' ἐν Τ 1349 γ' Τ: τ' Ω

COMMENTARY

1-99 Opening Scene (*Prologos*)

Ant. and Ismene enter, and begin to discuss the events of the preceding day and night: the repulse of the Argive invaders, and their brothers' deaths. Ant. informs Ismene of their uncle's edict forbidding burial to Pol.'s corpse, and asks her to join in defying it. Ismene tries to dissuade her, but Ant. resolves to carry out the deed alone.

This first scene is set shortly before dawn. The battle is said to have taken place the previous day, the Argives' departure during the night (see 16, 100-3, 253 with nn.); Kreon's edict seems to have been issued from the battlefield (7-8, 33, 100-3nn.), and he is now on his way to make a public statement (33-4). But we need not expect exact temporal consistency (Introd. §3), esp. in an open-air production, where no lighting-effects are possible.

In the plays of A. and E., the opening scene usually takes the form of a monologue, announcing where the play is set and what has already happened: then the real action begins (see Stevens on *Andr.* 1-55). But S.'s plays generally open with a dialogue outlining both the main issues of the play and the personalities of the chief characters (H. W. Schmidt, in Jens 1971: 27-34). So, here, the two young sisters present an immediate contrast: Ant. single-minded and intransigent, Ismene more circumspect and conventional (cf. 1-10n.).

The scene passes through three phases. In the first (1-38), despite Ant.'s impatience and Ismene's anxiety, the two seem unified in outlook (1, 2-3, 37-48nn.); then (39-77) as Ismene recoils (49-68n.), Ant. begins to distance herself from her in favour of her brother; finally (78-99), despite Ismene's conciliatory efforts, Ant. bursts out in contemptuous hostility (86-7, 93ff). The mood thus grows progressively gloomier. The sisters enter together, but leave separately, and the family solidarity so strongly invoked by the opening lines gives way to fragmentation and isolation.

1-10 The two young women enter through the centre (= palace) door (18-19n.). Their costumes and hairstyles show at once that they are royal and unmarried, and in mourning; perhaps Ant.'s garb is the more conspicuously sombre.

Ant.'s first speech, like those of Oidipous in *OT* and *OC*, and Deianeira in *Tr.*, immediately establishes her situation and her character: above all, her devotion to kin and consciousness of her family's past (2-3, 7nn.); but also her combative nature, as her opening and closing questions (2 ἄρ' οἴσθ' ὃ τι . . . , 9 ἔχεις τι . . .) draw Ismene into taking one side or the other.

ἱ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον: appealing to her sister's identity of blood and interests, cf. *Tr.* 826, and Apollo at A. *Eum.* 89-90 σὺ δ', αὐτάδελφον αἶμα καὶ κοινοῦ πατρός, 'Ερμῆ . . . Though the αὐτο- prefix in S. sometimes has no more than a vaguely 'intensive or emphatic force' (Campbell 1879: 1.101.6), in this play it frequently 'speaks of the blood-tie as a place of incest, of parricide <and fratricide>, and of suicide' (Loraux 1986: 167); cf. 56 αὐτοκτονοῦντε with n., and 49-52n. Here Ant. means 'full-sister' (though e.g. at *Eum.* 89 Apollo is not full-brother to Hermes); but the expression, lacking feminine endings, may suggest also their 'common brother' (cf. 503, 696 αὐτάδελφον, 915 ὦ κασίγνητον κάρρα), and cf. 56-7 μόρον κοινόν, 147 κοινοῦ θανάτου, 201-2 αἵματος κοινοῦ, 546 κοινά. 'The pathetic emphasis of this first line gives the key-note of the drama. The origin which connects the sisters also isolates them' (Jebb).

Ἰσμήνης κάρρα: elevated (and untranslatable) tragic periphrasis, as at *OC* 321; cf. 899, 915, *OT* 40, 950, A. *Ag.* 905, etc. (and LSJ *s.v.* κεφαλή 1.2, Latin *caput*); also 944-5 Δανάας . . . δέμας, 764.

2-3 Lit. 'Do you know what, of the evils <stemming> from Oidipous, Zeus is not bringing to pass for us two who are <alone> still alive?' The syntax is rather confused, as ὅποιον redefines and amplifies ὃ τι (both of them objects of τελεῖ in indirect q.). Alternatively, we may suppose that οἴσθα ὃ τι οὐ τελεῖ; has been conflated with τί <ἔστιν> ὅποιον οὐ τελεῖ; (cf. 4-6). In either case, the sense is clear and emphatic ('every conceivable evil is descending on us'), and the syntactical informality is mitigated by the word-order, with Ζεὺς in striking *hyperbaton*.

Ζεὺς: here, perhaps, the name implies no more than a vague 'the powers that be'; contrast 127, 304, 450, 604-14nn.

τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν: the family's legacy of horrors, though not so insistently kept in our minds as in A. *Th.*, does surface intermittently; see 49-57, 594-603, 856-71, and *Intro.* §5(e)(ii).

ῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν: presumably dat. (of <dis>advantage, cf. 50),

though gen. absolute would be possible. The 'evils of Oidipous' have brought death to him, his wife, and his sons; and even the 'two surviving' daughters have not really escaped (cf. 4-8). This is the first in a dense cluster of duals (3, 13-14, 21, 50, 55-7, 58, 61-2.; and cf. 144-7, 170-2, 561-2, 769, and 488-9n.), describing natural but frustrated *pairings* - murderous brothers, disunited sisters, sister and dead brother, dying bride and groom; cf. *OC* 337-45, Knox 1964: 79-80, 67-9, W. Jäkel, *Gymn.* 68 (1961) 34-55.

4-6 Ant. explains (γάρ) the point of her rhetorical *q.* (ὁποῖον κτλ. picking up 2-3 κακῶν ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῶιν . . .). The insistent torrent of negatives (seven in three lines, cf. 450-60) and list of rhyming neuter adjectives (4n.) hammer home the completeness of the family's public and private miseries, building up to the one that most concerns Ant. now (ἄτιμον, cf. 22 ἀτιμάσας, 25 ἔντιμον with n.). For the enjambment of 5-6, cf. 27n.

4 ἀτήριον: this (Brunck's) emendation is far from certain; but ἄτης ἄτερ of the MSS would mean 'free from ruin', the opposite of what is needed here (as the ancient critic Didymos already noted). The regular adj. derived from ἀάω/ἀτάομαι/ἄτη is ἀτηρός (A. *Ag.* 1484, *Eum.* 1007), but ἀτηρόν here would leave us a syllable short. ἀτήριος is not otherwise attested (it would normally imply an agent-noun *ἄτήρ); but S. is esp. fond of -ηριος adjectives, and cf. Homeric ἀπατήλιος vs ἀπατηλός, or e.g. E. *Andr.* 552. Alternatively, perhaps ἄτης γέμον (Hermann, cf. *OT* 4); or ἀτήσιμον, on the analogy of θανάσιμον, μόρσιμον (Dindorf; cf. Else 1976: 31, 102-4; but the formation would be irregular). ἄτη is a rich and evocative term, esp. in tragedy, suggesting both *outcome* ('delusion', 'ruin', 'misery'), and *cause* (often a mixture of human folly and supernatural sabotage: cf. 17n., 185, 864, 1096-7, 1260, and esp. 582-625n.); see further, Dodds 1951: 2-8, 37-41, R. D. Dawe, *HSCP* 72 (1968) 89-123, R. E. Doyle, *Ἄτη: its use and meaning* (New York 1984), Padel 1995: 166-87, 249-59. Along with the mention of Zeus and Oidipous in line 2, the term here increases the mood of anxiety in the face of events and powers utterly beyond the sisters' control.

6 τῶν . . . κακῶν: possessive gen., 'included among our troubles' (Smyth §1300), but echoing κακῶν (partitive gen.) in 2.

7-10 Ant. introduces the particular, new indignities up to which her generalization has been leading (2-6). The repeated questions

(again 21-2) might suggest that Ant. seeks information, or at least confirmation, from Ismene about what has happened; but 18-19, 21-32 show that Ant. already knows quite enough (more indeed than the city's Elders, cf. 159-62) and expects nothing new from her sister (cf. 18n., Intro. §5(c)).

7-8 καὶ νῦν τί τοῦτ' αὖ: the particular, present example, capping the preceding generalization about the past: 'Things were bad; now hear the latest . . .' (cf. 58 νῦν δ' αὖ). For τί αὖ ('what now?'), cf. 1172, 1281, *OC* 357, 1507.

φασί: cf. 23 ὡς λέγουσι, 27 φασιν, 31 φασί, and 9 εἰσήκουσας (also 447-8). A 'public proclamation to (or 'for') the whole citizen body' (πανδήμωι πόλει κήρυγμα, cf. 1141) is usually made by men to men, in the *ekklesia* or *agora* (or on the battlefield, cf. 1-10, 33nn.). Women would learn of it only at second hand (cf. 18-19, 31-2nn.).

κήρυγμα is a politically neutral term, applicable to democratic and autocratic 'proclamations' alike (cf. 27, 34, 161, 203-4, 447, 450, 454, with 453-5n.); and, although the edict here is clearly Kreon's, at 79, 907 it is spoken of as if it came from, or on behalf of, the citizens at large (cf. 44n.). Kreon's constitutional status in this play remains vague (cf. 670-1n.): in this, his first mention, he is styled στρατηγός (perhaps implying 'commander-in-chief', after Eteokles' death, cf. 1162-4n.). An Athenian *stratēgos* on campaign could issue a κήρυγμα on his own initiative (even one invoking the death penalty; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.15, Harrison 1971: 31-6). Ant. never calls Kreon 'king' (just 'Kreon', at 21, 31, 549); but everyone else does: βασιλεύς (155), ἄναξ (223, 278, 388, 563, 724, 766, 1091, 1103, 1257), τύραννος (60, 1056 - and cf. 506-7), ταγός (1057); and cf. 173 θρόνους, 1163 μοναρχίαν, 59-60, 65-7, 211-14nn. Kreon's relationship to the sisters is not mentioned until 173-4 (cf. 58n.), but Ant.'s intense animosity towards him is apparent at once (9-10, 31-2n., and cf. 453-5, 469-70, 484-5 with nn.).

9 ἔχεις τι 'Do you know anything?', cf. *Tr.* 318, *E. Or.* 1120.

9-10 'Do you not realize that our enemies' evils are approaching those we love?' The distinction between ἔχθροί (personal enemies) and πολέμιοι (political/military enemies) is not always observed in tragedy (e.g. 1080, 1162), and here the vagueness of στείχοντα . . . κακά, and of the 'poetic' plurals φίλους, ἐχθρῶν (cf. 565, 571, Moorhouse 1982: 4-10), together with the flexibility of the Greek genitive,

admits two possible interpretations: (i) 'the hated <Kreon>'s evil <plan> is threatening our beloved <Pol.>'; (ii) 'ills appropriate to <Argive> enemies (cf. 1080-3n.) are being applied to friends too (= Pol.)'. Ismene seems to respond to (ii) (11 φίλων, 15 Ἀργείων); but (i) must be the primary sense (see next n., and W-Ingram 1980: 135 n. 55).

φίλους . . . ἐχθρῶν: dispute over the proper definition and application of these terms forms a major theme of the play (Introd. §5(d)(ii)). Ant. already regards Kreon as ἐχθρός by reason of his mistreatment of Pol. (cf. 31-2n.; also 86, 93; contrast 523), whereas her brother, as her closest kin, can never be for her anything but φίλτατος (73-6, 81 with nn., 523-5), despite his hostile action against both brother and community (187, 212, 518, 522). Kreon's view of φιλία is radically different (187-8n., 511-25). Such uncompromising categorization of 'friends' and 'enemies' ('us vs them') is typical of Sophoklean 'hero(in)es' (cf. 632-4, Knox 1964: 28-34, 80-90, Blundell 1989: 115-30).

11 ἐμοὶ μέν: there is no answering δέ (cf. 65, 78, 1336), but a contrast is implied with unspecified 'others' (including Ant. herself), and the emphatic position of ἐμοί ('ethical' dative of interest) underlines this; cf. 18n.

Ἀντιγόνη: a word of this shape can fit into an ia. trim. only through 'irrational' resolution (in tragedy allowed only with proper names): cf. 991, 1045 Τειρεσία, 1180 Εὐρυδίκην, OC 1, 507, 1415, etc. At 377, 629, 805, Ant.'s name occurs in anapaests.

φίλων: objective genitive, '<no word> about our family or friends'. Ismene is unaware that Ant. was confining the term (10 φίλους) to just one brother (9-10n.).

12 ἐξ ὅτου 'from that <moment> when', 'ever since' (cf. 1092, and 15 ἐπει).

13-14 δυοῖν . . . δύο, | μιᾷ . . . διπλῆι: such wordplay is common with numbers (cf. 141-2), esp. with 'one' and 'two' (cf. 55-7 and 2-3n.).

θανόντων: the MSS have θανόντων, but although a plural verb or participle may follow a dual subject (55-7n., 170-1), this is very rare in the gen. or dative (Gildersleeve §§105-8, K-G 1 69-74).

διπλῆι χερσὶ 'by each others' hands', cf. 170 διπλῆς μοίρας and 2-3n.

15 ἐπει ‘ever since’ (temporal), cf. 12 ἐξ ὄτου.

Ἀργείων στρατός: to Ismene, Adrastos’ army are the obvious ‘enemies’ to whom Ant. must be referring (9–10n.).

16 νυκτὶ τῆι νῦν: either ‘last night’ (cf. 150–1 πολέμων τῶν νῦν, and *Aj.* 21 νυκτὸς τῆσδε, 209 νύξ ἦδε), or ‘this present night’: the sisters’ clandestine meeting seems to be taking place shortly before dawn (cf. 1–99n., and 33, 100–9, 253–4 with nn., and Bradshaw 1962: 203–4).

οὐδὲν οἶδ’ ὑπέρτερον ‘I know nothing further’ (cf. 631), answering 2 ἄρ’ οἶσθα, as 17 ἀτωμένη answers 4 ἀτήριον.

17 εὐτυχοῦσα . . . ἀτωμένη: conventional polar expression for ‘no news at all’, since there is no real prospect of ‘good news’. The construction after οἶδα shifts, as the participles (regular with verb of knowing) amplify οὐδὲν (cf. the proleptic ‘I know you who you are’). For the significance of ἀτωμένη, see 4n. ἀτάομαι recurs in literature (always present indic. or participle) only at 314, *Aj.* 269, 384, *E. Supp.* 182. (ἀάω, common in epic, is avoided in tragedy: only *A. fr.* 417, ?*S. fr.* 628.) But in legal texts (esp. the Code of Gortyn), ἄτη is commonly used of ‘damage’, ‘penalty’, and ἀτάόμενος = ‘the one fined’ or ‘convicted’.

18 ἦδη καλῶς ‘Just as I thought!’, suggesting impatience, perhaps even scorn (cf. 7–10n.).

18–19 ‘. . . and that is why I fetched you <here> outside the front gates’, the imperfect ἐξέπεμπον signifying what was in Ant.’s mind when she ‘started to escort’ Ismene outside.

αὐλείων πυλῶν: cf. *E. Hel.* 438. Classical Greek houses were set back from the street behind a central courtyard (αὐλή). The front door opening onto the street was the αὐλείος θύρα, the door(s) leading from the courtyard into the inner rooms the μέσσυλοι θύραι (cf. *E. Alk.* 549); see S. Walker, ‘Women and housing in classical Greece’, in Cameron & Kuhrt 1983: 81–91. πύλη for θύρα is common tragic ‘elevation’, as is the use of the plural. Freeborn young women were not supposed to venture outside without an escort (parent, friends, or slave attendant, cf. 578–9 with n., 1183–91n.; Gould 1980: 38–59, Easterling 1988: 22); hence there is nothing odd about Ismene’s being ‘unaware’ (9 λανθάνει) of what Kreon has been broadcasting.

20 δηλοῖς . . . καλχαίνουσι: lit. ‘you are obviously growing dark

over some piece of news'. (For the construction, cf. 242, 471.) *καλχαίνω* is a rare and striking word, derived from *κάλχη* = 'purple murex', virtually synonymous with *πορφύρα*. It seems to have been developed by analogy with Homeric *πορφύρω*, esp. the formula *πολλὰ δέ οἱ/μοι κραδίη πόρφυρε* ... ('His/my heart was seething-dark with many worries', e.g. *Il.* 21.551, *Od.* 4.427; cf. LSJ *s.v.*); cf. E. *Hkld.* 40 *ἐγὼ μὲν ἀμφὶ τοῖσδε καλχαίνων τέκνοις* (and 'Kalchas', the 'turbulent-dark' prophet). The image of 'dark' and 'heaving' physiological signs of emotion is prevalent among the medical writers as well as in poetry, esp. Aisch.; cf. A. *Cho.* 413 *σπλάγγνα μοι κελαινοῦσται πρὸς ἔπος* with Garvie's n., and FJ&W on A. *Supp.* 785, Padel 1992: 71–88.

21–2 Sense and emphasis are clear, thanks to the word-order, though the syntax is slightly unorthodox (*zeugma*). *τάφου* eventually turns out to be gen. of separation with *ἀτιμάσας* ('deprived him of burial'), cf. *OC* 49, A. *Prom.* 783, Smyth §1392ff.; but its emphatic initial position, outside the *μὲν* ... *δὲ* ... clauses, encourages us to take it also with *προτίσας*, as if = *προτιμάσας* ('considered [one of them] more worthy of burial').

οὐ γάρ ... :: colloquial and slightly scornful, virtually 'Don't you know that ...?' (*GP* 79), cf. *Ph.* 249–50.

ῶϊν: genitive, 'of the two of us'; cf. 2–3n.

κασιγνήτω: accusative, governed by *προτίσας/ἀτιμάσας ἔχει*, in 'whole and part' construction with *τὸν μὲν* ... *τὸν δέ*; cf. 561. Less idiomatic, though logical, would be the genitive ('one of them ... the other').

προτίσας ... *ἀτιμάσας ἔχει*: aor. participle + *ἔχω* = periphrastic perfect, esp. favoured by S. and Hdt. (28 times in S.; 24 times in E., only once in A.; see Dawe on *OT* 577, Aerts 1965: esp. 130–40). Sometimes there is little difference in meaning between this and the straight perfect (Gildersleeve §295); but sometimes there may be a resultative force, as here (and again at 32, 77, 180, 192 – all in the mouths of Ant. or Kreon; also 791–4, 1068 applied to Kreon, and cf. 1272), suggesting a sense of intransigence, of *taking a stand* ('He has made his announcement, and he's sticking to it!').

23–30 *Ἐτεοκλέα μὲν* ... *τὸν δὲ* ... *νέκυν κτλ.*: the parallelism is marked by indignant contrast and crescendo. In the *μὲν*-clause, Eteokles' bare name occupies less than half a line, and he is disposed

of in a tidy, three-line period. But in the δέ-clause, ‘Pol.’s corpse, wretchedly killed’ takes up a full trimeter; and the construction of the next two lines becomes more complicated (the acc. νέκυν is not parallel to Ἐτεοκλέα, and only with 28 τινα do the infinitives fall into place). The five lines devoted to Pol. are increasingly unsettled, with piled-up epithets, resolutions (26 Πολυνείκους, 29 ἄταφον, 31 ἀγαθόν), enjambments (27–8, 29–30), and harsh alliteration (τ/θ, κ/χ).

23 ὡς λέγουσι: cf. 7–8n., 27 φασι. The phrase implies that Ant. did not herself witness the burial of Eteokles – perhaps because she was less concerned about him than about Pol. (cf. 899–903 with nn.)? In real life, of course, an honorific funeral would take several days.

23–4 σὺν δίκῃ | χρῆσθαι δικαίων τῷ νόμῳ ‘thinking it right to make right use of custom’; for δικαίων, cf. *OT* 575, *OC* 1350, 1642, etc. This is Schütz’s emendation (by no means certain) of the transmitted text (σὺν δίκῃ χρησθεὶς δικαίαι καὶ νόμῳ), which contains three major defects: (i) χρησθεὶς (passive) would make sense only if equivalent to χρησάμενος (middle), an unparalleled usage; (ii) there is anyway no dative object for a transitive χρησθεὶς, only the acc. Ἐτεοκλέα; (iii) the phrase σὺν δίκῃ δικαίαι is intolerably feeble. Alternatively, we might (with Müller and Jebb) start from the scholiast’s comment (δικαίαι κρίσει χρησάμενος) and read σὺν δίκης χρῆσει δικαίαι καὶ νόμου (‘with due observance of right and custom’, Jebb): but χρῆσις is not found in tragedy (only *Pind. N.* 1.30, *O.* 11.2), whereas νόμῳ/δίκῃ χρῆσθαι is an established idiom (cf. *Antiphon Or.* 5.87, *E. IA* 316), and σὺν δίκῃ occurs thrice elsewhere in *S.* Whatever reading we adopt, it is clear that Ant. is describing the burial of Eteokles as ‘right’ and in accordance with ‘law’ or ‘custom’.

25 ἔντιμον: predicative, ‘so that he is honoured’, with ethic dative τοῖς νεκροῖς (‘in the eyes of the dead’). This could be taken to reflect concern about exclusion and ‘disenfranchisement’ from the Underworld (cf. 22 ἀτιμάσας, and 4–6n.), like *Hom. Il.* 23.71–3 ‘Bury me ... For now the souls ... are keeping me at a distance and not allowing me yet to join them across the river.’ But the term may refer more vaguely to the posthumous ‘status’ of the two brothers (as e.g. at *A. Eum.* 95–6 ὑφ’ ὑμῶν ὧδ’ ἀπτητιμασμένη | ἄλλοισιν ἐν νεκροῖσιν, *Cho.* 483–5). Personal and family honour are more at issue

here (cf. 572 ἀτιμάζει) than correctness of religious observance, though the two are closely related.

26–36 Kreon's edict forbids anyone to bury or lament Pol.: his corpse must be exposed to the animals and birds (cf. Hom. *Od.* 3.254–61, S. *El.* 1487–8, A. *Th.* 1014) – a new twist to the well-known Theban myth (Parker 1983: 45–8, *Introd.* §2). Such treatment, though shocking, would not be completely alien to Athenian sensibilities: indeed, the law stipulated that traitors should be refused burial within the territory of Attika; and though in some cases the dead man's family might take the body outside the borders for burial, this does not seem usually to have happened, and the term used to refer to such criminals was ἄταφοι. Possibly in this case Kreon's refusal to allow burial or lamentation of *any kind* (i.e. implicitly, even outside the borders, 29 ἐᾶν) makes a significant difference; but no mention of such a distinction is expressed in the play. So at this point (as at 198–210) it would be hard for an audience to be sure of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of this policy; see further Rosivach 1983, *Introd.* §5(b).

27 ἀστοῖσι = πολίταις. Kreon's edict is directed at political factions within the city, real or suspected, not at Pol.'s own family; see 31–2n., 36, 79, 289–94.

ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι: as at 203, the primary sense must be, 'it has been publicly (ἐκ-) proclaimed'; but the usual sense of ἐκκηρύσσω, 'banish by proclamation', may make itself felt too (cf. *OC* 430, Lysias 12.95): Pol.'s corpse is to be 'excluded' from the land of the dead (25n.; cf. 7–8, 451–2nn.).

τὸ μὴ | . . . καλύψαι: such enjambment is distinctive of S.; cf. 5–6, 67–8n. With μὴ + infin. after a verb of hindering, the article is optional (Smyth §2744.3; cf. 78, 443, 544–5n.).

28 κωκῦσαι: a traditional feature of mourning throughout the ancient and modern Mediterranean is the shrill 'wailing', esp. of the women (Alexiou 1974); cf. 423, 1079, 1206, 1227, 1316.

29 ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον: almost formulaic, cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.386 ἄκλαυτος ἄθαπτος, *Od.* 11.72, E. *Hek.* 30.

29–30 Lit. 'a sweet store <of food> for birds gazing <at it> with a view to delight of (= in) feeding' (cf. [E.] *Pho.* 1634). At 205–6, 697–8, 1017–18, 'dogs' are mentioned too, as is traditional (Hom. *Il.* 1.5–6, S. *Ph.* 1146–57, etc.). θησαυρός occurs in many sacral and

metaphorical expressions, but the image here is unusually vivid and macabre. βορᾶς is best taken both with θησαυρόν and with πρὸς χάριν (objective gen., see LSJ *s.v.* χάρις IV, IJ&W 1990: 116). πρὸς χάριν suggests also ‘at will’, ‘as they please’ (LSJ *s.v.* VI.2.b), for which cf. esp. *Ph.* 1156 κορέσαι στόμα πρὸς χάριν ἑμᾶς σαρκός (‘to glut your mouth(s) at will on my flesh’, addressed to birds and beasts). For the ‘stare’ of hungry animals or exultant enemies, cf. 205–6n.

31 τὸν ἀγαθὸν Κρέοντα: heavily sarcastic, ‘our noble Kreon’, cf. 275 τοῦτο τὸ ἀγαθὸν with n., *Ph.* 873 οἱ ἀγαθοὶ στρατηλάται, *OT* 385 with Dawe’s n. (also 562 with n.).

31–2 σοὶ – | κάμοι, λέγω γὰρ κάμέ: probably σοὶ is best unaccented, an ethic dative (‘you know’, cf. 37), since Kreon did not direct his edict specifically at Ismene (cf. 27 ἀστοῖσι with n.); but once uttered, σοὶ is enough to trigger κάμοι and a trimeter-long expansion on Ant.’s feelings. (In effect: ‘That’s Kreon’s announcement for you – and for me! Yes, he has actually made such an announcement to *me*.’) Thus what was presented by Kreon as a public proclamation, has been taken by Ant. as a personal affront (cf. 59–60, 450–70n.). Jebb regards such an implicit sequence of thought as ‘hardly possible’, and reads σοὶ (accented); but this throws unexpected emphasis on Kreon’s concern with the sisters, and leaves the explanatory λέγω γὰρ κάμέ without much point, unless (with Campbell) we interpret as ‘I count myself too <among those affected by the decree>’ (cf. A. *Prom.* 973, *Cho.* 989, LSJ *s.v.* λέγω II).

κηρύξαντ’ ἔχειν: cf. 21–2n.

33 δεῦρο νεῖσθαι: i.e. to the palace, and perhaps to the city-centre as a whole, if the edict was first pronounced on the battlefield (7–8n.). νέομαι is common in Homer and Pindar, but rare in tragedy (only here and E. *Alk.* 737, *El.* 723).

τοῖσι μὴ εἰδόσιν: synizesis, cf. 95, 97, 263, 535; also 156n.

34–5 ἄγειν | οὐχ ὡς παρ’ οὐδέν ‘he is not treating the matter as of no importance’, cf. 466 and *El.* 1327, *OT* 983, LSJ *s.v.* παρά c.1.8.

35–6 ὃς ἂν ... δρᾶι | ... προκείσθαι ‘anyone who does any of the aforementioned (τούτων = 31 τοιαῦτα), <for him> public death by stoning is prescribed’, with ellipse of τούτῳ, as often in such constructions (e.g. 214, 478–9). προκείσθαι is the technical term for laws, cf. 481, *OT* 865, LSJ *s.v.* I.4, and next n.

φόνον ... δημόλευστον: execution by public stoning was very

rare in Classical Athens, though not infrequently threatened in tragedy (e.g., *A. Th.* 199 λειστηῖρα δήμου ... μόρον, *Ag.* 1616 with Fraenkel's n.; *S. Aj.* 254 λιθόλευστον Ἄρη, *OC* 435): it was felt to be especially appropriate for traitors (Parker 1983: 194–6, Rosivach, *CA* 6 (1987) 232–48). Like a modern-day firing squad, stoning spreads the responsibility around: nobody ever knows which stone (or bullet) is the fatal one. But the idea is not mentioned again, and Kreon eventually chooses a different death for Ant. (773–6n.). The impersonal construction, the reference to the whole community (ἐν πόλει), and the semi-technical προκεῖσθαι, all suggest the wording of an actual edict (7–8n.). On the other hand, φόνον is an ugly word, usually signifying 'bloody murder' or 'slaughter', rather than 'judicial execution' (but cf. *OT* 100–1 φόνωι φόνον πάλιν λύοντας).

37–48 The tempo quickens, as the sisters engage more closely in stichomythia, with Ismene questioning and fearful, Ant. assertively practical; but Ismene soon breaks off in dismay. As often in stichomythia, lines are closely interwoven by rhetoric and syntax, while the moods of the two interlocutors are contrasted; cf. 726–65, 1048–63nn., *Introd.* pp. 19–20, 36–8.

37–8 σοι: ethic dat. (cf. 31–2n.). 'There you are: that's how things stand', cf. *El.* 761, 938.

ἔσθλων κακή 'worthless <daughter> of noble <parents>', gen. of origin after πέφυκας, cf. 866 οἶων ... ἔφυν, 379–80, 486–7, 823–5, *Aj.* 763 (also 471–2 below). Ant.'s speech ends on a challenging note (cf. 9–10, with echo of 10 ἐχθρῶν κακά).

39 ταλαίφρον 'wretched', 'long-suffering' (as at 866), with perhaps a hint too of 'reckless' (cf. 82 ταλαίνης, *El.* 388, *A. Th.* 262, and 47 ὦ σχετλία, 56 τῷ ταλαιπώρῳ, 1228 ὦ τλήμον).

εἰ τὰδ' ἐν τούτοις 'if that is where things stand' (cf. 37, 722, 936).

39–40 λύουσα ... εἶθ' ἄπτουσα: a quasi-proverbial 'polar' expression for 'whatever I may try to do' (cf. 334–41, 442–3, 446, 670–1, 785–6, 819–22, 951–4, 1109, 1192–3, 1244–5nn., Bundy 1961: 24–5). Lit. 'What more could I contribute by trying to loosen or tighten' (sc. 'the tangled knot of circumstance?'; or possibly 'the string of this ill-tuned lyre?', cf. *Hom. Od.* 21.408). The metaphor is common, cf. *Aj.* 1317 εἰ μὴ ξυνάψων ἀλλὰ συλλύσων πάρει, *E. Hipp.* 67 κάθαμμα λόγου λύειν (and 1112 with n.). The (conative) present participles carry conditional force ('if I were to try to loosen ...').

Again Ismene acknowledges her own powerlessness (ἐγώ, cf. 11 ἐμοί, 16–17.) Some interpret τί ... ἄν ... προσθείμην πλέον; as ‘what benefit would I do *myself*?’, but this hardly suits Ismene’s character. Porson’s emendation of the absurd ἢ θάπτουσα in the MSS seems certain; for the omission of the first εἴτε before λύουσα, cf. *Tr.* 236, *OT* 517, *GP* 507–8.

41 Here, and in 43, Ant.’s syntax is ambiguous and compact. Both εἰ-clauses could depend on σκόπει in indirect q. (‘Consider if you will help ...’; cf. 58); or we could take them instead as parallel to the participles of 39–40, i.e. as alternative protases for προσθείμην ἄν, now expressed in the bolder (‘vivid’) indicative: ‘(you will contribute something) if you will join in the effort and the action. Think about it!’ For the ξυν- compounds, cf. 43, 523, and 85.

42 ποῖόν τι κινδύνευμα: internal (virtually cognate) acc. after the verbs of 41. As the scholiast remarks, ‘Note here the characterization (ἦθος) of Ismene, as she calls the “action” (ἔργον) a “risk” (κινδύνευμα)’; cf. 84–7n.

ποῦ γνώμης ποτ’ εἶ; lit. ‘wherever are you in thought?’, cf. *El.* 390. The variant ποῖ (‘Where in thought are you going?’, cf. *El.* 927) is less likely (see Müller).

43 κουφιεῖς ‘raise’, in preparation for burial; cf. *Aj.* 1410 πλευράς σὺν ἐμοί τάσδ’ ἐπικούφιζε. The usual expression is (νεκρὸν) ἀναίρεσθαι (LSJ *s.v.* β.3). While lamentation and preparation of the corpse were primarily women’s responsibilities, the actual burial was usually performed by men; cf. 245–8, 900–3n., Foley 1995: 133–7.

44 ‘What? Do you mean to bury him ...?’ ἢ γάρ signifies surprise (cf. 574, *GP* 284–5).

σφε can be sing. or plural, masc. or fem. Here = αὐτόν, as at 516, 1226; cf. 772.

ἀπόρρητον πόλει ‘<a thing that is> forbidden to the city’, neuter acc. in apposition to the previous sentence (Smyth §991). πόλει could instead be dat. of agent (‘by the city’), and this meaning may be half-intended (cf. 203–4n.), equating the ruler’s word with the city’s will (cf. 79, 907 βίαι πολιτῶν, and 7–8n., E. *Pho.* 1657). But 7, 27, 47, 60 point the other way. For the caesura, cf. 76–7n.

45–6 The two-line interruption of the one-line stichomythia is dramatically effective (see next n.), as Ant. asserts the principle on which she will stand throughout the play. The expression is para-

doxical, but unambiguous in sense: ‘I certainly intend to bury my brother – and I’ll bury yours too, if *you* aren’t prepared to!’ (as it were, ‘I’ll do *my* duty-to-a-brother, and yours too ...’). Other proposals have been made, to escape the strangeness of ‘my brother ... your brother’ referring to the same person: (i) ‘I’ll bury him, my brother and yours too, *even if* you refuse (to bury him)’; this involves either taking ἦν as = καὶ ἦν (Campbell), for which no adequate parallel is cited, or else emending (e.g.) to τὸν σὸν τε, κᾶν σὺ μὴ θέλῃς (Meineke); but in any case the emphasis on ‘my and your’ lacks point, and γοῦν is ignored. (ii) More pointed would be ‘I’ll certainly bury him-who-is-my-brother – and (who is) yours too, even if you don’t want (him to be)’, reading ἦν καὶ μὴ θέλῃς (Dawe). (iii) Rhetorically apt would be, ‘I’ll bury *my* brother at least, even if you don’t want to bury *yours*’, i.e. = καὶ ἦν σὺ μὴ τὸν σὸν θέλῃς (sc. θάπτειν) (Müller, cf. Radt, *Mnem.* 24 (1971) 293–5, 26 (1973) 131–6); but the word-order (*hyperbaton*) seems impossible (Dawe, *Mnem.* 26 (1973) 126–30, 137–9).

46 A scholium reports: ‘Didymos says [this line] has been pronounced spurious by the commentators.’ Without it, one-line stichomythia would be maintained; and it would be possible (though unusually abrupt) to understand 45 by itself, without express mention of ἀδελφόν (Dawe compares *OC* 830, *El.* 536; and cf. 48 τῶν ἐμῶν). But the two-line interruption has point (45–6n.; paralleled e.g. at 404–5, *OT* 366–7), and the expression of 46 is thoroughly Sophoclean: for οὐ γὰρ δὴ (with or without γε) in vehement rejection (six times in S., not in A., only twice in E.), cf. *OT* 576 οὐ γὰρ δὴ φονεύς ἀλώσομαι, *GP* 243; n.b. too *Aj.* 1267 χάρις διαρρεῖ καὶ προδοῦσ’ ἀλίσκεται. So the line should be retained (see further Jebb, *LJ&W* 1990: 116–17).

47 *σχετλία* again combines sympathy and reproach, cf. 39n.

48 ‘In no way (οὐδέν, adverbial) is it his business (μέτα = μέτεστι) to keep me from my own’ (τῶν ἐμῶν = gen. of separation, probably masc., referring to Pol.). Cf. 1072–3 (and *OT* 1448).

49–68 Ismene’s speech, despite its emotional beginning (οἶμοι), is a model of reasonable argument, carefully laid out (53 ἔπειτα, 55 τρίτον, 61 τοῦτο μὲν, 63 ἔπειτα δέ) in two- and three-line segments, most of them coinciding with line-beginning and end. The diction is ornate and stately, almost Aischylean in places (contrast 69–77n.;

also 58n.), as Ismene reminds Ant. first of their family's notorious past (49–57), then of their own isolation (58–64); and in conclusion (65–8) she defends her own course of (in)action, closing with a gnomic cap (67–8).

49 φρόνησον: keynote of Ismene's speech (cf. 58 σκόπει, 61 ἐννοεῖν, 68 ἔχει νοῦν; cf. too 95 δυσβουλίαν, 99 ἄνους), and of the play (1348–53, Introd. pp. 41–3). Where Ant. employed moral imperatives (9–10, 37–8, 46), Ismene appeals to good sense (cf. 1023–32n.).

49–52 A father's reputation is usually decisive for his daughters' future. This is expressed in νῶϊν (ethic dat.; cf. 3): what happened to Oidipous, as he 'fell to ruin and died' (ἀπώλετο = both; cf. 900) and thus came to be 'loathed and notorious', all happened 'for us'; cf. 701–4n.

πρὸς ... ἀμπλακημάτων 'as a result of ... crimes'. For πρὸς in this sense, cf. *OT* 1236 (τέθνηκε) πρὸς τίνος ποτ' αἰτίας; LSJ *s.v.* A.Π.2.

αὐτοφώρων ... αὐτὸς αὐτουργῶι χερί: cf. 1, 55–7nn., and αὐτόχειρ at 172, 306, 900, 1175, 1315. αὐτόφωρος usually means 'detected in the very (αὐτο-) act': but here 'self-detected', and perhaps also 'in an incestuous act' (cf. 1n., 863–5 αὐτογέννητα with n., Loraux 1986: 168–9). This is a family whose crimes and sufferings are peculiarly 'self-inflicted'.

ἀράξας: a violent word ('battering'), used again with reference to blinding at 975 and *OT* 1276.

53–4 ἔπειτα: not temporal (since Iokaste is presumably thought of as dying before Oidipous, as in the epic *Thebais* and in *OT*), but 'next' (i.e. 'second', cf. 55 τρίτον) in the list of calamities (*contra*, A. Brown, *CQ* 34 (1984) 280 n. 129). For Iokaste's suicide by hanging, cf. 1221–2.

55–7 δύο μίαν: cf. 13–14n.; and for the duals cf. 2–3n.

αὐτοκτονοῦντε: cf. 1 αὐτάδελφον, 49–52 with nn. In tragedy, αὐτο- in a compound signifying homicide may denote 'killing with one's own hand' or 'kin-killing', or both; cf. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1091, and e.g. *Aj.* 842, *E. Med.* 1254, *A. Th.* 681, 734; further Loraux 1986, Parker 1983: 350–1.

τῷ ταλαιπῶρω: cf. 39 ταλαῖφρον with n.

κατειργάσαντ': it is not unusual in tragedy for a plural verb to follow a 3rd p. dual subject (Smyth §955, cf. 13–14n.).

ἐπαλλήλοιον ‘directed at one another’ (unparalleled in this sense); cf. A. *Th.* 930 ἀλληλοφόνους χερσίν. For the caesura in 57, cf. 76–7n.

58 From the past (father, mother, brothers), Ismene turns to the immediate present, with a string of emphatic short words: ‘So now in turn, left quite alone, the pair of us . . .’

μόνα δῆ: for δῆ, cf. *Tr.* 1063, *GP* 205–6; also 895–6. As parentless, brotherless sisters, they now depend on their uncle, Kreon, as κύριος; cf. 7–8, 173–4nn.

59–60 νόμου βίαι ‘in violation of the law’, cf. 44 ἀπόρρητον πόλει, 79, 907 βίαι πολιτῶν, 449 ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους, 663 νόμους βιάζεται.

ψῆφον τυράννων ἢ κράτη: for ψῆφος used loosely of a ruler’s ‘decision’ (again 632), cf. *OT* 607 (also 8 στρατηγόν with n.). Ismene does not distinguish between νόμος, ψῆφος, κράτη; cf. 67, 78–9, and 7–8, 31–2, 211–14nn., and contrast *Ant.* at 31–2, 36, 452–5.

61–3 τοῦτο μὲν . . . ἔπειτα δ’: cf. 49–68n.

ὡς πρὸς ἄνδρας οὐ μαχουμένα: ὡς + participle suggests a belief (or, with the future, an expectation) on someone’s part (‘we’re not supposed to fight’), whether that ‘someone’ for Ismene is ‘Nature’ (cf. ἔφουμεν) or ‘most people’. Her insistence on female subservience would probably have struck most Athenians as quite proper, esp. since it is clothed in military (i.e. ‘masculine’) language (μαχουμένα, cf. 59 βίαι, 66 βιάζομαι): obviously women *should not* ‘battle’ against men, because they *cannot* (cf. Hesiod’s nightingale, *WD* 212–18). For the two-tiered system of subordination (within the family, females to males: within the city, citizens to rulers), cf. 639–80n, Griffith 1998.

63–4 οὐνεκ ‘that’ (= ὅτι, cf. 61).

ἐκ ‘by’ (LSJ *s.v.* III.5), cf. 293–4, 956–7; also 111, 180.

ἀκούειν ‘pay attention’, ‘obey’, a meaning commoner for κλύειν (666; but see LSJ *s.v.* ἀκούω II.3): probably epexegetic infin. of consequence without ὥστε (cf. 216n., 1076 with n.), ‘we are ruled . . . for obeying’ (= ‘so as to obey’); alternatively, ἀρχόμεσθα amounts to ‘we are compelled . . .’

ταῦτ’ . . . ἀλγίονα: internal acc. with ἀκούειν (cf. 66 τάδε, 666–7), ‘pay heed in these <things> and in even more painful <things> too’.

65–7 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν . . . πείσομαι ‘So I for my part . . . will obey.’ The period leads on to its predictable conclusion: πείσομαι, plus

reassuring *gnōmē* (67-8); cf. 49-68n. There is no answering δέ for μέν, though an implied contrast must be felt with 'you' (cf. 11n.). μέν and οὖν are not here working in combination: contrast 925-8.

τοὺς ὑπὸ χθονός: primarily the shade of Pol., but also perhaps the gods of the Underworld (cf. 75-7, 45¹, 777ff., 1070-1).

Ξύγγωνιαν: found only here = συγγνώμην.

τάδε: internal acc., cf. 1073 and 63-4n., 219.

τοῖς ἐν τέλει βεβῶσι 'the authorities', a vaguer and more palatable term than 'Kreon' or even a singular 'ruler' (cf. pl. τυράννων, 60; and 7-8n.). βεβῶσι, stylistically more elevated than οὔσι (cf. *El.* 1057, 1095) may also suggest a firmer 'stance' (cf. 22n.).

67-8 Enjambment marks the concluding *gnōmē*, as often in S. (cf. 61-2, 78-9, 98-9, 188-90, 311-12, 649-51, 651-2, 779-80, 1031-2, and Griffith on A. *Prom.* 43); for definite art. in this position, cf. 27, 78, 238-9, 409-10, 453, *OT* 231, *Ph.* 674, etc.

περισσά 'futile', 'excessive', cf. 780 (and Knox 1964).

69-77 Ant. scornfully rejects Ismene's position and asserts her own commitment to Pol. and to the dead. The half-disguised bitterness of 9-10, 31-2, 37-8, 45-6 now bursts out in short, enjambed sentences that contrast sharply with Ismene's measured, end-stopped periods (49-68n.). Likewise Ant.'s language is simpler, with a preponderance of shorter words (62 words in nine lines, whereas Ismene's first nine lines contain only 45), and employing insistent repetitions (71/76 δοκεῖ, 73 φίλη . . . φίλου, 73/76 κείσομαι; cf. 70/72 πράσσειν . . . δρώης . . . ποιούση) and asyndeta (72-3). Only twice does Ant. employ a long compound word, each time to coin a striking oxymoron (74 ὄσια πανουργήσασ' / 77 ἔντιμ' ἀτιμάσασ', with *homoioteleuton* between them). Cf. too 448n., *Introd.* §5(c).

69-70 'I will certainly not urge you; and in fact, if ever in the future you should be ready to perform the deed, you would not find me at all happy to share it with you' (cf. 536-47, with 538-9n.; and contrast 37-41). Context, and the emphatic ἐμοῦ γε . . . μέτα, show that ἡδέως here means 'pleasurably to me'; cf. Aristoph. *Clouds* 79 (and 436n.). Optative + ἄν is 'the combination most frequently used to indicate moral certainty; esp. common is the aor. opt. + ἄν to express total negation' (Gildersleeve §442; see too *GMT* §§236, 239), cf. 185-8, 240, 1108. For the (quite regular) repetition and position of ἄν (immediately after a negative, and after the emphatic word, here

έμοῦ) cf. 680, and see Gildersleeve §447, K–G I 245–7. For ἔτι = ‘in the future’, cf. *El.* 66, *Tr.* 257.

71 ‘Be as you think fit!’ (= τοιαύτη ὅποιαί . . . , with attraction); cf. *El.* 1024 ἄσκει τοιαύτη . . . μένειν, *Ph.* 1049, *E. Or.* 1680. Some MSS and editors take ἴσθι as from οἶδα, and read ὅποια (‘Think as you choose!’), cf. 301, *Ph.* 960, and Homeric ἦπια οἶδε, ἀθεμιστία εἰδῶς, κτλ. But in Attic this sense would normally be conveyed by φρονεῖν, as at 557, *El.* 1055–6 (cf. 49n.); in S., οἶδα usually connotes acquired, not innate, knowledge (cf. 300–1, Coray 1993: 1–36, esp. 24–5, *Introd.* §§5(c), 5(d)(iii)).

72 καλόν . . . θανεῖν: ‘explanatory’ asyndeton (cf. 86, 395–6). καλόν is the strongest term of moral approbation in the Greek vocabulary. Love, honour, duty, piety, all drive Ant. to prefer death to the ignominy of ‘betraying’ her brother (467): cf. 97, 557 καλῶς, 5 αἰσχρόν, ἄτιμον, 22 ἀτιμάσας, 25 ἔντιμον, 77, 514–16, 699; 502 κλέος, 695; 943; and 84–7, 495–6nn. Whereas Ismene ‘begs pardon of those below’ and ‘obeys those in power’ (65–7), Ant. subordinates all else to the dead and their enduring φιλοτιμία (cf. 25, 514–16, 542–6 with nn., 898–9).

73–6 An arresting statement of Ant.’s motivation. The unusual double repetition in 73 (for the simple *polyptoton*, φίλη μετὰ φίλου), emphasizes both the bond of φιλία (cf. 81 φιλτάτωι, 199n., and 897–9) and the physical closeness of the two bodies (cf. 1240).

ῥοια πανουργήσας: in Ant.’s view, her action is ‘pure’, but others will regard it as ‘criminal’; cf. 924n., *Introd.* §5(d)(i). πανουργος, -έω are ugly, ‘low’ terms (cf. 300–1n.).

74–5 ‘For the time during which (ὄν = acc. of duration) I must satisfy those below <is> longer than <the time for pleasing> those here’ (τῶν ἐνθάδε = ἢ τοῖς ἐνθάδε).

76–7 τὰ τῶν θεῶν: the first explicit mention of this theme (450–70n.); but cf. 65–6.

ἀτιμάσας ἔχε ‘keep them dishonoured’ (cf. 22 ἀτιμάσας ἔχει with n.). The ‘quasi-caesura’ (at mid-line, with elision) contributes, like the rhyme of -τιμ-, to the see-saw balance of the line; cf. 44, 57, 74, 79–80 (an unusually high rate) and 407, 502, 518, 723nn. (also 997, 1021nn.). In 76, Elmsley’s σὺ (subsequently found in one MS) could be right, instead of σοί (‘lends more force to the imperative’, Lj&W 1990: 118); but cf. Ismene’s ‘answer’ at 98.

77–99 A short, irregular stichomythia concludes the scene, with Ant. impatient and resentful, Ismene anxiously defensive. The ‘pair’ of sisters (cf. 3 νῶϊν with n.) are by now opposed as ‘you’ and ‘me’, even as ‘enemies’ (86–7, 93; cf. 9–10, 80–11n.).

78–9 μέν: as at 11, 65, emphasizing ἐγὼ (*GP* 168) and not answered by any δέ (so Jebb); or possibly = ἐγὼ ἄτιμα μὲν οὐ ποιοῦμαι . . . , with answering δέ (for such transposed word-order, cf. *A. Ag.* 759–60, *E. Hel.* 264–6).

ἄτιμα ποιοῦμαι = ἀτιμάζω.

τὸ δὲ | . . . δρᾶν: acc. of respect (*Smyth* §1601c), equivalent to either ἀμήχανος εἰς τὸ δρᾶν (cf. *E. Med.* 408) or ἀμήχανος δρᾶν. For the enjambment, cf. 67–8n.

βίαι πολιτῶν: again at 907; cf. 44 ἀπόρρητον πόλει, 59–60n.

ἔφυν: her (‘feminine’) nature forbids it; cf. 61–2 γυναῖκε . . . ἔφυμεν, and contrast Ant. at 523 συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν.

ἀμήχανος: cf. 90, 92 (also 175, 363). Once again, Ismene emphasizes the impossibility of useful action (cf. 67–8).

80–1 σὺ μὲν τάδ’ ἂν προύχοι ‘You may make these excuses’ (προέχομαι, cf. πρόσχημα); the ‘polite’ 2nd p. potential optative (*GMT* §237; cf. 444–5, 1339) is here perhaps slightly sarcastic.

τάφον | χῶσους: this implies more than just ‘raising’ the body (43), and more than a mere sprinkling of dust (246–7). But Ant.’s plan may not yet be precisely formulated.

πορεύσομαι: Ant. begins to move towards one side-entrance, on her lonely ‘journey’ to the dead (cf. 98 στεῖχε, 892 πορεύομαι), while Ismene remains on stage, to exit through the palace door. The ‘pair’ of sisters (2–3n.) are going separate ways (cf. 540–1).

82 οἴμοι ταλαίνης ‘Alas for you, wretched one’ (gen. of exclamation = of source or cause, cf. *Aj.* 367 οἴμοι γέλωτος, *Smyth* §1407); contrast 554n. For ταλαίνης, cf. 39 ὦ ταλαῖφρον with n.

83 μὴ μοῦ προτάρβει ‘Don’t be afraid on my account!’ προ- here = ὑπερ-, in response to 82 ὑπερδέδοικά σου (cf. *Tr.* 89 πατρὸς . . . προταρβεῖν) as at 688 σοῦ . . . προσκοπεῖν, 741 σοῦ . . . προκῆδομαι). For the *aphaeresis* (prodelision), cf. 219, 281, 384, 389, 457, 539, 546, 557, 558, 736, 904, 1202.

τὸν σὸν ἐξόρθου πότμον ‘keep your own life straight’ (or ‘up-right’: ὀρθός can have either sense), cf. *A. Ag.* 1005 πότμος εὐθυ-

πορώων, 162–3n. βίον, found in most MSS, seems to be an intrusive gloss.

84–7 The two-line exchange, briefly interrupting the one-line stichomythia (cf. 45–6n.) introduces an important new point: whom does Ant. want to know about her burial of Pol.? Ismene wants it to remain ‘hidden’, like the corpse itself (85 κρυφῆι ... κεῦθε; cf. 25 ἔκρυσσε, 257–8n.); but Ant. wants her act to be ‘proclaimed’ to all, like Kreon’s edict (87 πᾶσι κηρύξεις, cf. 7–8, 306–7n.). ‘Honour’ (Pol.’s and her own) is an essential part of religious observance: the burial will be worthless if it is not publicly witnessed (84 προμηνύσεις); cf. 72, 205–6nn.

84 ἀλλ’ οὖν ... γε ‘Well anyway, at least ...’, signifying the introduction of a second-best suggestion, upon the rejection of the first (*GP* 442–3); cf. *El.* 233, *Ph.* 1305, *A. Prom.* 1071.

προμηνύσεις ... μηδενί ‘inform nobody’ (μή + aor. subj. = negative command). The compound προμηνύω is found nowhere else before the Imperial period; perhaps προ- connotes ‘betray your deed by informing ...’ (cf. 46 προδοῦσα, and 83 προτάρβει).

σὺν δ’ αὐτως ἐγώ ‘and I <will do> likewise as well’ (sc. κεύσω; σὺν adverbial, as *Aj.* 1288). The closest Ismene will come to ‘sharing’ in Ant.’s ‘deed’ is to ‘share’ in ‘concealing’ it (cf. 41 ξυνεργάσθην and n.); also 489–90, 536–7nn.

86 οἴμοι: here expressing annoyance (cf. 1048 φεῦ with n.); contrast 1105.

καταύδα: poetic equivalent of καταγόρευε or κατειπέ, ‘announce’ (cf. 87 κηρύξεις), or perhaps ‘denounce’. The present tense suggests ‘go around denouncing (me) ...’

πολλόν: adverbial, ‘much (more hateful)’, the epic (Ionic) form for Attic πολύ (cf. *Tr.* 1196, but nowhere else in tragedy). Again, ‘explanatory’ asyndeton (72n.).

88 ‘You have a hot heart for chilling deeds’ (ἐπί + dat. = ‘with a view to’, *LSJ s.v. B.II.2*). In Greek as in English, ‘hot’ often connotes ‘lively’, ‘passionate’, even ‘criminal’, while ‘cold’ can mean ‘lifeless’, ‘dreadful’ (e.g. κρυερός, ῥιγεῖν κτλ.; and cf. 650 and *OC* 621–2); see further N. Zink, *Griechische Ausdrucksweisen für warm und kalt* (diss. Mainz 1962), esp. p. 26.

89 ἀρέσκουσ’ ... ἀδεῖν: ἀρέσκω (from the root ἀρ-, cf. ἀραρίσκω,

ἀρμόζω) and ἀνδάνω (cognate with Latin *suadeo*, *suavis*) are virtually interchangeable (as at 500–1; cf. 504).

90 εἰ καὶ δυνήσῃ γ' 'Yes (γε), if in fact (καί) you succeed'; εἰ + fut. indic. = a vivid warning, as again at 93–4. For similar instances of καί, cf. 278–9, 280, 726, 770, 772, 928, 1062, 1192, 1253, 1314, *GP* 294–308; also 403, 554nn.

91 'So, when – and only when (ὅταν δῆ) – I lack the strength, I shall stop' (fut. perfect, cf. *Tr.* 587 εἰ δὲ μή, πεπαύσομαι), sc. 'but not before', *GP* 219–20.9.iii.

92 ἀρχὴν . . . οὐ 'absolutely not' (cf. *Ph.* 1239, *El.* 439, *LSJ s.v.* ἀρχή 1.c), emphasizing the 'basic' incompatibility of their outlooks.

θηρᾶν . . . τὰμήχανα: cf. 78–9n., 90. θηράω is a vivid metaphor for 'desire', 'pursue' (cf. *El.* 1054), appropriate to Ant.'s 'unfeminine' spirit of self-assertion and independence (cf. 342–7, 471–2).

93 ἐχθαρῆ: fut. middle for passive, as often in tragedy (210 τιμήσεται, 230 ἀλγυνῆι, 637 ἀξιώσεται, 691 τέρψηι, 726 διδαξόμεσθα).

94 'You will justly be embraced as an enemy by your dead brother.' ἐχθρὰ . . . προσκείσῃ is virtually an oxymoron, as προστίθεμαι frequently means 'take (someone) as a friend' (*Tr.* 1224 ταύτην προσθοῦ δάμαρτα, *OC* 404–5, *A. Cho.* 114, *LSJ s.v.* προστίθημι B.II; but cf. *Xen. Cyr.* 2.4.12 πολέμιον προσθώμεθα, and 1222, 1242–3 below). There may be a wry echo of 73 φίλη . . . κείσομαι.

95–6 ἔα: here monosyllabic (synizesis, 33n.), cf. *OT* 1451.

δυσβουλίαν refers sarcastically to Ismene's criticisms of Ant. (67–8, 88–92, 99; 49–68n.); cf. 1269, and *Introd.* §5(d)(iii).

τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο: again, slightly sarcastic (cf. 82 ὑπερδέδοικα).

96–7 'For I will certainly not (οὐ . . . οὐδέν, emphatic) suffer anything so terrible as to prevent me from dying honourably'; cf. 72n.

μὴ οὐ: synizesis (as at *OT* 13, 283), cf. 33n. μὴ οὐ, instead of simple μὴ, is regular after a negated main verb (*Smyth* §2745).

98–9 εἰ δοκεῖ σοι: cf. 71, 76.

ἄνους . . . φίλη: Ismene's sententious conclusion (again following enjambment, cf. 67–8n.) sums up their contrary positions: it is because Ant. is 'truly devoted to kin' that she is now behaving 'impossibly' (92 ἀμήχανα) and 'crazily' (ἄνους, cf. 562). (ὀρθῶς φίλη must be primarily active here, cf. 73, 81, 9–10n., and *E. IT* 610; but 'loved by' may be understood too.) She thus acknowledges the legitimacy

of Ant.'s attitude, albeit half-disapprovingly and to her departing back.

100–61 Entrance Song (*Parodos*) of the Chorus

The Chorus, fifteen white-haired old men of upper-class appearance (159, 281, 1092–3; 843, 940, 988), arrive up one or both side-entrances, and take up position in the *orchēstra*. As long-standing supporters of the Theban royal family (164–74), they have been summoned now to serve as a Council of Elders (159–61); but they speak for the city as a whole (102, 149, 153; cf. 110 ἀμετέροι γᾶι), and their utterances, esp. thus early in the play, are bound to shape the audience's interpretation of the present situation in Thebes. (Only after the Song is over do we learn of the Elders' close association with Kreon: 159–61, 164–9.)

Their first Song is an expression of the city's joy and relief at the defeat of the invading army. With many echoes from A.'s *Th.* and from epic (esp. 106–7, 125, 127–33nn.; cf. Else 1976: 35–40, Davidson 1983, Introd. §2), they rehearse the horror of the Argive onslaught and the highlights of the battle, and credit the gods with the sudden and total victory. Whereas the opening scene showed Pol.'s family reacting in anguish to the prospect of his unburied corpse, this ode vividly points out what Pol. had represented while he lived – a hideous threat to his whole community. The form of the ode is similar to that of the Entrance Songs of *Aj.* and *Ph.*, *A. Prom.* and *E. Med.* (cf. too *Ag.* 1448–1575), with strophic lyric stanzas alternating with chanted anapaests. In those other cases, however, an actor delivers the non-lyric passages, whereas here it is the Chorus Leader (*koryphaios*), with the anapaests serving to explain and supplement the more oblique lyrics rather than to contrast with them.

The Song is a hymn of thanks to the gods of Thebes: specifically, to the dawning Sun (100–9), Ares (124–6, 138–40), Zeus (127–33, 141–47), Victory (148–51), the pantheon (153–4), and Dionysos (154–5). Hymnic form normally follows a sequence of *invocation* (name plus epithets, often inc. birth, attributes, and localities; cf. 1115n.), *hypomnēsis* ('reminding' the deity of past benefactions or epiphanies), and *request* ('so now please grant . . .' in the case of a *kletic* hymn; cf. 1142

μολεῖν, 1149 προφάνηθι, with 1115–54n.) or *envoi* ('farewell and thanks ...', for a *rhapsodic* hymn, as here; cf. 148–54n.); cf. Wunsch, *RE IX s.v. Hymnos*, E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Stuttgart 1956), Parry 1978: 26–9. Much of the ode is given to narrative describing this most recent demonstration of divine favour (= 'epiphany'), with characteristic use of the connective relative (110 ὃς) and explanatory particles (127, 141, 148 γάρ), and of temporal particles (103 ποτε, 120 πρίν ποτε, 132 ἤδη, 135 τότε, 151 νῦν), referring to the constantly renewed 'contract' of χάρις ('you have saved us now, as in the past ...; so we honour you now, as in the past'; cf. 110–16, 148–54nn.). Images of athletic competition add an 'epinikian' flavour (106–9 running with shield and armour; 125–6 wrestling; 131 javelin-throw; 131–2 finishing-line; 135 torch-race; 109, 140, 149 horses and chariots; 133, 148 victor's vaunt).

While hymnic form is not strictly observed throughout (e.g., the only direct address is to the Sun; and there are no patronymics, pedigrees, etc.), none the less the style is characteristically allusive and epithet-laden, singling out key moments and images while omitting or telescoping many of the narrative details (cf. 944–87); and the topical and temporal references of the first and last stanzas have the flavour of authentic cult.

Metre: strophe & antistrophe α

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|---|------------|
| 100 | $\bar{\alpha} \kappa \tau \iota \varsigma$ | $\bar{\alpha} \epsilon \lambda \iota \omicron \upsilon$ | $\tau \omicron \kappa \alpha \lambda -$ | glyconic | |
| 117 | στας δ' ὑπερ μελαθρων φωνω- | | | | |
| 101 | $\lambda \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \nu$ | $\epsilon \pi \tau \alpha \pi \upsilon \lambda \omega$ | $\phi \acute{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \nu$ | glyconic | |
| 118 | σαισιν ἀμφιχανων κυκλωι | | | | |
| 102 | $\Theta \eta \beta \alpha \iota$ | $\tau \omega \nu$ | $\pi \rho \omicron \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ | $\phi \acute{\alpha} \delta \omicron \varsigma$, | glyconic// |
| 119 | λογχαις ἑπταφυλον στομα, | | | | |
| 103 | $\epsilon \phi \alpha \nu \theta \eta \varsigma$ | $\pi \omicron \tau'$, | $\omega \chi \rho \upsilon \sigma \epsilon \alpha \varsigma$ | choriambic dim. | |
| 120 | ἔβα πριν ποτ' ἀμετερων | | | | |
| 104 | $\acute{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \varsigma$ | $\beta \lambda \epsilon \phi \alpha \rho \omicron \nu$, | $\Delta \iota \rho \kappa \alpha \iota -$ | glyconic (dragged) | |
| 121 | αίματων γενουσιν πλησθη- | | | | |

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 105 | ων ὕπερ ῥεεθρων μολουσᾱ, | hipponactean// |
| 122 | ναι τε και στεφανωμα πυργων | |
| 106 | τον λευκασπιν Ἄργολικον | choriambic dim. |
| 123 | πευκαεντ' Ἐφαιστον ἔλειν. | |
| 107 | φωτᾱ βαντᾱ πανσαγιᾱι | choriambic dim. |
| 124 | τοιος̄ ἀμφι νωτ' ἔταθη | |
| 108 | φυγαδᾱ προδρομον̄ ὄξυτερω̄ι | choriambic dim. |
| 125 | παταγος̄ Ἄρεος, ἀντιπαλου | |
| 109 | κινησᾱσᾱ χαλινω̄ι. | pherecretean// |
| 126 | δυσχειρωμᾱ δρακοντος̄. | |

The aeolic character of this strophic pair is homogeneous and smooth, almost serene, in accordance with the cheerful subject-matter. Critical moments in the narrative are subtly highlighted by rhythmic shifts, in both strophe and antistrophe: at 103 = 120, the changed anceps-shape of ἐφάνθησ/ἔβα (υ- instead of -x), represents the moment of resolution from tension/danger; and towards the end, the pace quickens from the heavy longs of the 'base' in 106 = 123 to the resolutions in 108 = 125 (υυ υ υυ υ -υυ-), corresponding to the 'headlong fleeing' and 'clatter' (106-9, 125nn.). Overall, the correspondence of word-shape and word-division between str. and ant. is unusually high, and there are significant verbal correspondences too (esp. in 103 = 120, 108-9 = 125-6; cf. 125-6n.); the effect seems to be to emphasize the harmony and serenity of mood.

The stanzas are built of familiar aeolic elements, esp. the glyconic (x x -υυ-υ-) and its 'anaclastic' variant (-x-x -υυ- or x-x--υυ-, West 1982: 30-1, 115-18; cf. Cole 1988: 79-97), also known as the 'choriambic dimeter' (Dale 1968: 132-6). There are three periods, of 3, 3, and 4 cola. Straight glyconic predominates in the first. In the second, chor. dim. makes an appearance (103 = 126), but gives way again to (slightly less regular) glyconic, with heavier ('dragged') ending in 104 = 121 (cf. 1122 = 1133, West 1982: 116-17), and a 'hipponactean' clausula in 105 = 122 (i.e. 'pendant' extension

of glyconic: $\times\times -\cup\cup-\cup-$). Then, in the third period, chor. dimeters prevail, but glyconic rhythm is reasserted in the clausula (109 = 126 pherecretean, $\times\times-\cup\cup-\wedge-//$, the common syncopated 'cap' to glyconics). Dovetailing between first and second cola of the first period, and between second and third of the second, binds together the long sentences, and helps to build suspense towards the moments of resolution (103/120, 107-8/124-5).

Strophe & antistrophe β

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 134 | $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\iota}\bar{\tau}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\pi}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\delta}'\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\pi}\bar{\iota}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\pi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\omega}\bar{\theta}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$ | D2 ba. |
| 148 | $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\eta}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\iota}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}$ | 'praxilleian' |
| 135 | $\bar{\pi}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\phi}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\nu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\xi}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\rho}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}$ | D2 ba.// |
| 149 | $\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\tau}\bar{\omega}\bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\iota}\bar{\chi}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\Theta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\beta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}$, | 'praxilleian' |
| 136 | $\bar{\beta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\chi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\pi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}$ | (\wedge choriambic dim.) |
| 150 | $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\delta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}$ | |
| 137 | $\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\pi}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\chi}\bar{\theta}\bar{\iota}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}$. | choriambic dim. |
| 151 | $\bar{\tau}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\theta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\eta}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}$. | |
| 138 | $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\chi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\delta}'\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}$, | 2 cretics // |
| 151 | $\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}\bar{\delta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\chi}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$ | |
| 139 | $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\delta}'\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\pi}'\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\pi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\omega}$ - | d d |
| 152 | $\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\chi}\bar{\iota}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\pi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\lambda}$ - | (choriambic dim.) |
| 140 | $\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\phi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\iota}\bar{\zeta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}$ - | d d |
| 153 | $\bar{\theta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}$, $\bar{\omicron}\bar{\Theta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\beta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\delta}'\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}$ - | (choriambic dim.) |
| 141 | $\bar{\eta}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\delta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\xi}\bar{\iota}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\varsigma}$. | -d -// |
| 154 | $\bar{\chi}\bar{\theta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}\bar{\beta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\chi}\bar{\iota}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\chi}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\iota}$. | (reizianum) |

The metre is again aeolic (or 'aeolo-choriambic', Dale 1968: 131-56) and the overall character is similar to that of the first pair (esp. to the second half, with its choriambic dimeters). But the opening cola introduce a quasi-epic flavour, with the flow of 'lyric dactyls' (134-

5 = 148-9 -UU-UU ...), and accompanying 'correction' (149 πολυαρμάτωι ἀντι- ...), suggesting an air of victorious confidence. Then, in mid-stanza, the introduction of iambics, following the strong rhetorical and metrical pause after 137 = 151, provides a more sober contrast; and towards the end (139-40 = 153-4), the pairs of choriambics (modifying the earlier pattern of 'base' + choriamb) draw attention to the prominence of Bakchos and Ares respectively. Verbal correspondences between str. and ant. are less pronounced than in the first strophic pair; but there are significant resemblances at 139 = 152, 140-1 (Ares) = 153-4 (Bakchos).

Throughout the stanza, the use of the simple choriamb (-UU-) rather than the glyconic (x-x-UU-U-) as the basic recurrent element, links the aeolics with those of the previous pair, as similar but distinct. Likewise, the two long, flowing 'praxilleans' of the opening period (134-5 = 148-9) pick up on the pattern of 105 = 122 (-U-UU-U-U-), with reiteration of the pendant ending, and internal expansion of the choriambic element (-UU- into -UU-UU-UU-, cf. *A. Ag.* 1547; and 966-7 = 978-80 below). A sharper contrast comes with the syncopated iambics (138 = 152), which seem to derive from the nearby cho. dim. base (cf. esp. 136 = 150 'spondee' = ?sync. cretic -^-, cf. 1123 = 1134?). But the aeolic character of the whole ode is reasserted with the concluding string of choriambics; and the final clausula (141 = 154 - -UU- -//, echoing that of 109 = 126 - - -UU- -//) resoundingly winds up the sequence of choriambics into which it is dove-tailed.

100-3 ἀκτίς ἡελίου ... | ἐφάνθησ ποτ': (for the Doricism, cf. 809 ἡελίου, *OC* 1245). These opening words echo those of Pindar's 9th Paian (fr. 50 S-M, composed for a Theban audience shortly after an eclipse): ἀκτίς ἡελίου ... ὦ μήτηρ ὀμμάτων, ἄστρον ὑπέρτατον ἐν ἀμέραι κλεπτόμενον κτλ. There the disappearance of the sun is taken as a sign of danger, to be averted by prayer; but here the movement is reversed (darkness into light) and the mood is one of pure joy. Characters alone on stage often address the sun in quasi-soliloquy (e.g. *El.* 86ff.; cf. *A. Prom.* 88-92 with Griffith's n.); and the 'light' of day is often taken as a symbol of salvation from the 'darkness' of danger or misery (cf. 600 φάος, and *A. Ag.* 22-3 ὦ χαῖρε λαμπτήρ νυκτὸς ἡμερήσιον | φάος πιφαύσκων). Here both ideas are

combined in an invocation striking for its assonance and word-play (*parēchēsis*: φανέν . . . φάος, ἐφάνθη), followed by a string of descriptive clauses filling the whole stanza. The accumulation of words connoting brightness and prosperity (cf. 103–4 βλέφαρον, χρυσέας, κτλ.) quickly dispels the sombre tones of the previous scene (cf. 699–700n.).

The time-references are effectively vague, as the sun's rays are hailed (i) as the source of daylight, just now dawning; (ii) as the light that appeared earlier and sped the Argive army on its retreat; and even (iii) as the previous day's light that witnessed the defeat of Pol. and his allies (cf. 1–99n., Taplin 1977: 290–4).

τὸ κάλλιστον . . . τῶν προτέρων φάος: in apposition to ἀκτίς, 'Ray of the sun, the fairest light that <ever> appeared of all previous <ones>', i.e. fairer *than* all, cf. 1212–13, Thuc. 1.1.1; also 508 μούνη τῶνδε.

ἑπταπύλωι . . . | Θῆβαι: all seven gates were successfully defended (cf. 119, 141–3). The ornamental epithet, with its epic resonances (Hom. *Od.* 11.263, Hes. *WD* 161), is characteristic of rhapsodic style.

103 ἐφάνθη ποτ': rhythm and alliteration highlight this narrative moment (cf. 120 ἔβα πρίν with n., and n. on *Mètre*): 'you appeared at last', i.e. just in time (ποτε, cf. 303, LSJ *s.v.* 11.2; also 132–3). For the thankful 2nd person aor. statement, cf. Alkaios fr. 150 L–P ἦλθες . . . ἐτέλεσσας . . . εὐρύσαο . . .

104 βλέφαρον: the 'eye' of heaven (cf. 880 ὄμμα, A. *Th.* 389–90) is commonly used in poetry of the sun or moon; cf. Hom. *Il.* 3.277.

Διρκαίλων: the River Dirke lies to the west of Thebes (the Ismenos lies to the east, cf. 1124, *Introd.* §2 n. 35); so either the rays came (sc. from the east) 'over its waters' to the armies fighting in the plain west of Dirke, and sped the enemies' retreat south-west towards Argos (so Campbell), or strict geography is ignored and 'Dirke' stands loosely for any river near Thebes (so Jebb), cf. 844.

106–9 Word-order and the accelerating rhythm (see n. on *Mètre*) present a vivid sequence of images: 'the white-shielded / Argive man / stepping / in full gear / in flight / headlong / <you> urged <him> with sharper bridle'.

106–7 τὸν λεύκασπιν: singular in collective sense, cf. 110–12n.

Popular etymology linked Ἄργος with ἀργός = ‘gleaming’, ‘bright’; so the city was traditionally supposed to favour ‘white’, cf. 114n. and A. *Th.* 91 ὁ λεύκασπις ... λάος, E. *Pho.* 1099 (where Mastronarde comments that ‘white’ shields might perhaps be painted, or linen-covered, or made of a pale silver alloy).

Ἄργολικόν: this appears to have been read by the scholiasts, and is the most probable correction for the unmetrical Ἄργόθεν of our MSS. For the form, as an alternative to Ἄργεῖον, cf. Θηβαϊκός/Θηβαῖος. Other possibilities are Ἄπίοθεν (‘Ἀπία’ often = ‘Argos’: Ahrens) or Ἄργόθεν ἕκ (Hermann); but see the next n.

βάντα πανσαγίαί ‘departing in full armour’. For βαίνω = ‘leave’, cf. 120 ἔβα and LSJ s.v. A.1.3. Alternatively, if 106 contains some -οθεν formation, ‘(the man) who came from Argos ...’; but βάντα is then rather weak, and instead of a continuous acceleration (cf. 106–9n.) we have a reversal, pivoting on φυγάδα (‘came ... ran away ...’). πανσαγίαί is found only here (lit. ‘with all his gear’, for the more regular πανοπλίαί, cf. 115), cf. A. *Th.* 125, 391 σαγαῖς (also of the Argive champions).

108–9 ὄξυτέρωι | κινήσασα χαλινῶι: (cf. 413–14 κινῶν ...) metaphorical, ‘urging him with sharper/swifter bit’. Critics have objected that, rather than making a horse go faster (like a spur or whip), a bit or bridle normally restrains it. But shaking the reins can speed up a slowly moving animal (e.g. E. *El.* 712–3, *IA* 151) and a χαλινός may compel someone to change direction and act against his will (e.g. A. *Prom.* 671–2, *Ag.* 218ff.). ὄξυτέρωι is appropriate because (i) Greek bits were indeed ‘sharp’ (see Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1067, J. K. Anderson, *Greek horsemanship* (Berkeley 1961) 40–63, and 477–8n.); (ii) the sun’s rays are ‘piercing’ (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 14.344–5 ... ὄξύτατον φάος, *H. Hymn Ap.* 374 ὄξείος Ἥελίοιο, (iii) the result is that the enemy flee ‘faster’. The MS variant ὄξυτόρωι (‘sharp-piercing’, cf. διάτορος) would also be possible; see Lloyd-Jones 1957: 12–15.

110–16 In the anapaestic stanza, or *epithymion*, the ‘Argive man’ of 106–7 is described, in a relative clause (‘pronominal cap’) that expands still further the long main sentence of the strophe, a characteristic mannerism of hymnic style (Bundy 1961: 8 n. 27, 30); cf. 1118, and esp. 1137, where, as here, the rhetorical period overlaps stanza-end (cf. FJ&W on A. *Supp.* 49). ‘He’ (i.e. the army) is compared to an eagle swooping over the land, in an extended image that

shifts back and forth between literal and metaphorical (cf. 117–26n., and Davidson 1983). Resonances from epic add to the narrative texture: esp. *Il.* 12.200–7, in which an eagle carrying a snake (δράκοντα, cf. 127) is bitten by its prey, abandons it and flies screeching off home (κλάγξας, cf. 112); cf. too *A. Ag.* 48–59, 110–20. Here the symbolic identities of the two foes are esp. transparent because the snake (or ‘dragon’) is the traditional emblem of Thebes; cf. 125–6, 1124–5nn.

110–12 ὄν . . . | ἤγαγε· κείνος δ’ κτλ.: the MS reading contains a subject (Πολυνεΐκης), an object (ὄν), but no main verb; furthermore, it makes ‘Pol.’ the object of comparison to an eagle, whereas common sense and the coincidence of 106 λεύκασπιν / 114 λευκῆς both require that this should be the ‘Argive man’. Scaliger emended neatly to ὄς . . . Πολυνεΐκους (and so e.g. Jebb); but there are reasons for supposing instead a lacuna in 112, containing a stop and change of subject: (i) ἐφ’ ἀμετέροι γᾶι and εἰς γᾶν would be clumsy in the same sentence; (ii) ἄρθεις κτλ. suits Pol. better than the Argives (111n.); (iii) the scholiast appears to have read ἤγαγεν or a synonym (ὄντινα στρατὸν Ἀργείων ἐξ ἀμφιλόγων νεϊκέων ἤγαγεν ὁ Πολυνεΐκης). So Nauck’s supplement is probably on the right lines, at least. (The fact that it also produces exact equivalence between 110–16 and 127–33, i.e. eleven metra each, plus paroemiac, is of marginal importance, since such anapaestic ‘stanzas’ need not respond exactly: 141–7 = twelve, 155–61 = eleven metra; cf. too 836–8n.)

111 ἄρθεις combines several ideas: ‘brought here’ (LSJ *s.v.* αἰείρω 1.3), ‘urged on’ (= ἐπαρθεις: thus the scholia), ‘setting out’ (LSJ *s.v.* 1.5, usually in the active, but cf. Hdt. 1.165, 9.52); even, in light of 112–13, ‘raised aloft’ (LSJ *s.v.* 1.2).

νεϊκέων ἐξ ἀμφιλόγων ‘as a result of a contentious squabble’ (poetic plural); for ἐξ, cf. 63–4n. The Chorus do not specify who was primarily to blame, and ἀμφι- might suggest both brothers; but the ‘etymological’ play on Pol.’s name (as *A. Th.* 658, 829–30) seems to single him out (cf. 199–201n.).

112 ὄξέα κλάζων: a vividly epic (and Aischylean) formula, used both of ‘shouting’ warriors (*Il.* 12.125, 17.88) and of ‘screaming’ birds of prey (*Il.* 16.429), or both (as here, and at *A. Ag.* 48–9, 56–7); cf. Davidson 1975: 43–4. The simile thus continues the shift back and forth between literal (the Argives) and figurative (the eagle); cf. 111 ἄρθεις, and 110–16n.

113 αἰετός εἰς γῆν ὡς ὑπερέπτα: the metaphor ('an eagle into our land') is belatedly converted into a simile ('like an eagle'), and the image is further blurred, as ὑπερέπτα (ὑπερπέτομαι) combines the notions of 'flying' and 'crossing' (cf. ὑπερβαίνω, ὑπερβάλλω, and 117 ὑπὲρ μελάθρων, A. *Ag.* 827 ὑπερθορών). The position of ὡς, after a phrase (εἰς γῆν) that belongs to the main sentence, is very unusual – harsher than e.g. A. *Th.* 393 ἵππος χαλινῶν ὡς κατασθμαίνων μένει (LJ&W 1990: 120 compare E. *And.* 538). Some editors, unhappy with this *hyperbaton*, and with the combination εἰς γῆν ὑπερέπτα have resorted to emendation: so αἰετός ὡς γᾶν <τάνδ> ὑπερέπτα (Dawe; but ὡς as preposition = πρὸς is used only of people, not places, cf. LSJ *s.v.* c.iii and Jebb on *Tr.* 366); or αἰετός εἰς γᾶν ὑπερέπτα (omitting ὡς, Hermann and Pearson: but this introduces an unwanted paroemiac (-οοο-- οοο--//), interrupting the flow of anapaestic dimeters).

114 στεγανός is probably active, 'covering (the land) with wing of bright snow', cf. A. *Ag.* 358 with Fraenkel's n. The eagle is imagined as stretching out its white wings/weapons to envelop the city (cf. the rampaging lion of A. *Ag.* 824–8). Others interpret, 'covered all over', i.e. with no gaps in the formation of shields.

115–16 Typical hymnic abundance of description, with epic colouring ('Ionic' form κορύθουσι, and cf. Hom. *Il.* 13.132 etc. ἵππόκομοι κόρυθες). μετὰ . . . ξύν = mere variation.

117–26 The image of the (Argive) eagle is merged with that of a bloodthirsty beast with gaping jaws (118 ἀμφιχανών, 121 γένουσι) looming over the city-walls, but then routed by the clatter of battle (124–5) and defeated by its intended victim, the (Theban) snake (126); cf. 110–16n.

117 στάς δ' ὑπὲρ μελάθρων: again both figurative and literal: (i) (the eagle) 'checking' its flight, before swooping down; (ii) (the eagle) 'alighting' on the roof; (iii) (a gigantic monster?, cf. 117–19n.) 'towering over the buildings'; (iv) (the soldiers) climbing the walls and 'poised' over the city (cf. 131–3 with n.; but not 'stationed above the halls . . . in a circle', since Thebes is not surrounded by hills, cf. 411–12n.). The same scenario is described at *OC* 1312 τὸ Θήβης πέδιον ἀμφέστασι πᾶν. The aor. participles (στάς . . . ἀμφιχανών) represent the critical moment between the arrival (110–16) and the rout (120ff.) of the invaders; cf. 120n.

117–19 In metaphorical terms, the eagle-monster, with its 'blood-

thirsty' beak and talons (φονώσαισιν, from φονάω, cf. *Ph.* 1209: the emendation is metrically necessary), 'gaped' and almost 'swallowed' the city (ἀμφιχάσκω, cf. *Hom. Il.* 23.79). In literal terms, the soldiers 'encircled' (ἀμφι-, κύκλωι) the city with their 'murderous . . . spears' (λόγχαϊς).

120 ἔβα: emphatic position and rhythm (corresponding to 103 ἐφάνθης) mark the turning-point of the narrative (cf. 117n., n. on *Metre*).

120–1 Lit. 'Before ever with his jaws (instrumental dative; or locative, 'in his jaws') he was sated on our blood'. γένυς can also mean the 'blade' of a weapon (*Ph.* 1205, *El.* 196).

ἀμετέρων | αἱμάτων: the 1st-p. references (cf. 110 ἀμετέροι γαῖι) bring home the immediacy of the threat, and strengthen the link between Chorus and audience. For the plural αἱμάτων ('streams of blood'), cf. *A. Ag.* 1293, *E. Alk.* 496.

122–3 ' . . . (and before) the Fire-god's pine-fed flame had seized our crown of towers' (Jebb). For the metonymy ("Ἡφαιστος = 'fire'), cf. 1007 with n., and 125 Ἄρεος; and for στεφάνωμα πύργων, cf. *E. Hek.* 910, *Pind. O.* 8.32, and the common epic and lyric use of κρήδεμνα for 'battlements'. There is forceful alliteration of π/φ in 122–6 and of τ/θ in 124–6; cf. 125n.

124 τοῖς: explanatory, in asyndeton, as *Aj.* 251, 562; cf. Jebb on *OC* 947.

ἐτάθη 'grew intense' (τείνω), cf. *Hom. Il.* 12.436 μάχη τέτατο, *A. Pers.* 574 τεῖνε δὲ . . . αὐδάν, *E. Med.* 201; also 600 τέτατο φάος.

125 πάταγος Ἄρεος: cf. *A. Th.* 103. The flurry of short syllables is striking, even onomatopoeic (cf. 122–3n., n. on *Metre*).

125–6 ἀντιπάλου | δυσχείρωμα δράκοντος 'a hard-won victory of <his> snake antagonist' (cf. 110–16n.). δυσχείρωμα is not found elsewhere; normal rules of formation would derive it from χερσομαί, i.e. ultimately from χείρων: thus it would mean 'a thing hard to conquer' (cf. *A. Ag.* 1326 εὐμάρους χειρώματος = 'an easy conquest'). But χείρωμα at [A.] *Th.* 1022 seems to mean 'effort', at *OT* 560 'violent deed', in both cases as if derived from χεῖρ (though LSJ call this a 'false formation'; cf. Hutchinson's n. on *Th.* 1022), and 'difficult struggle' gives the best sense here, with associations from wrestling (100–61n.); see further Müller *ad loc.*, C. Kopff, *AJP* 96 (1975) 117–20, D. C. Pozzi, *HSCP* 75 (1971) 63–7. With the more

orthodox derivation, ‘a thing hard to conquer’ (cf. Hdt. 7.9β2 δυσχείρωτος), we must either adopt ἀντιπάλωι . . . δράκοντι (referring rather incongruously to the Argives, cf. 110–16n.); or read ἀντιπάλωι . . . δράκοντος (‘a thing too hard to conquer for the opponent of the dragon’), a weak (epithet-less) circumlocution.

127–33 The Chorus interpret the defeat of the Argives as Zeus’s punishment for their boastfulness (κόμπους), wealth (χρυσοῦ), and numbers (πολλῶι ρεύματι). This theme is not central for this play (in contrast to *A. Th.*; but cf. 615–25, 1349–53), but is important here both because of the added Aeschylean associations (127, 129nn.), and because Kreon’s view will be found to tally with the Chorus’.

The switch to anapaests brings a more straightforward style. Once again, an individual from the Argive force is pin-pointed (131–3, after the plural 128 σφας; cf. 106ff.); but this time he is identified clearly as Kapaneus, notorious in tradition for his impious boasts and Zeus-defying attempt to scale the walls and set fire to the city (*A. Th.* 422–56, *E. Pho.* 1172–86 with schol., and many visual representations, *LIMC s.vv.* ‘Eteokles’, ‘Kapaneus’, ‘Septem’).

127 μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους: in *A. Th.*, ‘κόμπους and its derivatives abound’ (Kamerbeek; cf. Hutchinson on *Th.* 391).

128 ὑπερεχθαίρει: the present tense is here both generalizing and historic; hence paratactic καί (‘Zeus hates/hated and . . . he strikes/struck’).

129 πολλῶι ρεύματι: cf. *A. Th.* 80 ρεῖ πολὺς ὄδε λεῶς . . . , *Pers.* 88 μεγάλωι ρεύματι φωτῶν, 412 – there too slightly pejorative: the mighty are humbled by Zeus, the many made few (cf. Hes. *WD* 5–6). The rhythm of this anapaestic metron (– – – ∪ ∪) is rare; cf. *Tr.* 1275, *OC* 146.

130 χρυσοῦ καναχῆς ὑπεροπλίαις ‘in the arrogance of the clang of gold’. For the prosody (ὑπεροπλίαις), cf. *Hom. Il.* 1.205 (quoted below) and also 339 ἀκαματαν, 837 ἴσοθεος, and *A. Prom.* 185 with Griffith’s n. This (Vauvilliers’s) emendation satisfies sense and metre, and is almost certainly correct. (Musgrave’s ὑπεροπτεῖαις, adopted by LJ&W, is equally neat, but formations in -οπτεῖα are not attested before the first century CE. None of the MS readings gives adequate sense and syntax – nor, in most cases, metre.) ὑπέροπλος is common in epic for ‘overweening’ violence (e.g. Hes. *Th.* 516, 619, 670), while the noun ὑπεροπλία is found just once – also in the dat.

pl. – in a famous passage, as a virtual synonym for ὕβρις (Hom. *Il.* 1.205 ἦις ὑπεροπλήισι τάχ' ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσηι, after 203 ὕβριν). In A. *Th.* 434, 660, Karaneus and Pol. inscribe their boasts on their shields in gold; and it was traditionally with a golden necklace that Pol. bribed Eriphyle to procure him Argive assistance (Introd. §2).

131–3 '(Zeus) hurls him down with brandished fire (= thunderbolt) as he is already at the very topmost goal, starting to shout his victory song.' The focus narrows to one man (127–33n.); and although no change of object is expressly indicated (see n. on ὀρμώντα), Karaneus' identity is unmistakable.

παλτῶι . . . πυρί: cf. Ar. *Birds* 1714 πάλλων κεραυνόν.

βαλβίδων | ἐπ' ἀκρῶν: metaphorical for γείσων, as the 'finishing-line' of Karaneus' assault was the 'top' of the city wall; see LSJ *s.v.* βαλβίς, and also E. *Pho.* 1180–1 ἦδη δ' ὑπερβαίνοντα γείσα τευχέων | βάλλει κεραυνῶι Ζεὺς νιν (and illustrations in *LIMC s.v.* 'Karaneus').

ὀρμώντ': cf. 135 ὀρμαῖ. For the lack of definite article cf. *El.* 697 δύναιτ' ἄν οὐδ' ἄν ισχύων φυγεῖν (= 'not even a strong man'), with Jebb's n., A. *Ag.* 69–71, 391–3 with Fraenkel's nn. Usually in such cases the participle is generalizing ('anyone') or vague ('someone'); but here it is quite specific ('the one who . . .'), assisting the transition from plural to singular (127–33n.).

134 ἀντιτύπαι . . . τανταλωθείς: alliteration (τ/θ, π) and word-order add emphasis to the 'hard-crashing' impact of the fall. The precise meaning of τανταλωθείς is not certain: either 'after swaying to and fro', 'tottering' (connected with τάλαντα, ταλαντεύω, ταλαντόομαι) or 'shaken down', 'sent flying' (schol.: διασεισθείς, διατιναχθείς); see further IJ&W 1990: 121.

135 πυρφόρος 'torch in hand', to be taken with the relative clause (cf. 122–3, and Karaneus at A. *Th.* 433–4); but the ambiguous word-order may suggest too πέσε . . . πυρφόρος, 'he fell, aflame . . .' (sardonic irony, as at A. *Th.* 432, 444).

136 βακχέων 'raging', here, as often, with no specifically Dionysiac reference; cf. A. *Th.* 498 βακχᾶι . . . θυιάς ὤς, E. *Or.* 835 (and contrast 153–4n., 953ff.).

137 Lit. '<Karaneus> had been breathing on <the city> with blasts of hostile wind'; the imperfect has pluperfect sense. Terms for 'breathing' are common in epic and tragedy, connoting 'inspiration'

from an external source, or the laboured breath of extreme emotion: e.g., anger (A. *Cho.* 33 κότον), battle-lust (Homer μένεα passim; *El.* 610 μένος), madness (A. *Prom.* 883–4 λύσσα), and ‘moods’ in general (*OC* 612 πνεῦμα). Esp. close are the parallels from A. *Th.* (343 μαινόμενος δ’ ἐπιπνεῖ ... Ἄρης, cf. 63, 115; also *Ag.* 219, 1235, *Cho.* 390–2); see further van Nes 1963: 7–22, Padel 1992: 89–95, 114–17. ἄνεμος is not found in such metaphorical usage except here and at 929–30; but ῥιπή is sometimes used of the ‘rush’ of fire or of a frenzied warrior (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 8.355).

138–9 Lit. ‘but those things (= Kapaneus’ threats) ended up otherwise <than he expected>, while to others Ares assigned <various> other <fates> ...’, i.e. not the thunderbolt but less spectacular deaths on the battlefield (cf. 141–3). For ἔχω plus adverb, see LSJ *s.v.* Β.Π.Ι. The MSS are confused, perhaps because two familiar constructions are merged, (i) doubled ἄλλος, (ii) τὰ μὲν ... τὰ δὲ ... (plus adverbial ἄλλῃ in the first member). Of the many emendations that have been proposed, Erfurd’s has been adopted here as the simplest, though it entails metrical pause after μὲν (for respension with 152), and τὰ μὲν is oddly vague. A possible alternative is Wecklein’s εἶχε δ’ ἄλλα τὰ τοῦδ’, ἄλλα δ’ ἐπ’ ἄλλοις.

ἐπενώ|μα: cf. A. *Th.* 727 κλήρους ἐπινωμάι (of the two brothers’ deaths).

140 δεξιόσειρος ‘(great Ares) our right-hand trace-horse’, i.e. the strongest, pace-setting horse in a team of four (cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.336–7, *El.* 721–2), continuing the athletic imagery (cf. 108–9, 100–61n.). The word is not found elsewhere: but cf. A. *Ag.* 842 σειραφόρος, 1640–1, with Fraenkel’s nn. The variant δεξιόχειρος (also unparal-leled) could be right, to be taken closely with στυφελίζων: ‘striking hard with his right hand’ (cf. Pind. *O.* 9.111 ἄνδρα εὐχειρα, δεξι-άγυιον, and Apollo at Hom. *Il.* 16.703–4 τρις δ’ αὐτὸν ἀπεστυφέ-λιξεν Ἀπόλλων, χεῖρεσσι ... κτλ.), or ‘with both hands ambidex-terously’ (so Müller, cf. Hom. *Il.* 21.163 περιδέξιος).

141–7 In this anapaestic section, the Chorus elucidate their cryptic reference (138–40) by summarizing the two main components of the story (already well known to the audience; cf. *Introd.* §2): the defeat of the seven Argive champions, and the death of the brothers. But they show little interest in the moral implications of the fratricide (cf. 148 ἀλλὰ γάρ with n.).

142–3 Lit. ‘They abandoned to Battle-turner Zeus all-bronze

tributes', i.e. their hoplite armour: a sardonic allusion to the custom of 'trophies' (τροπαῖα), whereby a victor 'set up' (ἀνατίθημι, ἴστημι; cf. 146 στήσαντε with n.), at the place where the enemy had been 'turned' to flight, a wooden frame hung with the enemies' shields, helmets etc., together with an inscription to the responsible deity; see Pritchett 1974: 246–75; for Ζεὺς Τροπαῖος, cf. *Tr.* 303, *E. El.* 671, *Hkld.* 867. Here the 'offerings' (τέλη) are involuntary.

144 πλὴν τοῖν στυγεροῖν 'except for the two ill-starred <brothers>', whose trophies were different (145n.). στυγεροῖν here is both 'wretched' (*Tr.* 1017, *Hom. Il.* 16.723) and 'hated' (by gods, by each other – perhaps by others too). For the duals, and 147 κοινοῦ, cf. 1, 2–3nn.; for the alliteration (τ, θ), cf. 124–5.

145–6 καθ' αὐτοῖν | δικρατεῖς λόγχας στήσαντ' 'after planting their twice-victorious spears in each other<'s bodies>' (αὐτοῖν = ἀλλήλοιν, cf. 55–7), a mordant play on the 'erecting' of a trophy (142–3n.). Less likely, 'after setting their spears against one another', an unusual sense for ἴστημι.

148–54 In this final stanza, the Chorus return to the themes and mood of the first. Characteristic of hymnic style (100–61n.) are the grateful acknowledgement of divine help (149–50 Νίκα ... ἀντιχαρείσα), ornamental epithets (μεγαλώνυμος, πολυαρμάτωι, παννυχίοις, ἐλελίχθων), repeated mention of Thebes (149, 153; cf. 102, 104–5), and the (nocturnal) invitation or *envoi* to Dionysos (152–4), recalling the invocation to the day (100ff.). The self-referential announcements of 151–3 also begin the Chorus' transition from narrators to participants in what follows (155–61n.).

148–9 ἀλλὰ γάρ: as often (cf. 155, 392–4), indicating an interruption or rejection of the previous train of thought, with explanation why it is not appropriate: the Chorus do not wish to spoil the bright mood by dwelling on the brothers' deaths. Usually, when ἀλλὰ is understood with the main clause and γάρ with a dependent clause (as here, ἀλλὰ with ἐπέλθωμεν, γάρ with ἦλθε νίκα), they are separated and γάρ is placed within its clause: so ἀλλὰ γάρ are normally found together only in ellipsis, 'But (enough of that), for ...' (*GP* 98–108); the only other exception in tragedy is *E. Pho.* 1308–9 ἀλλὰ γάρ Κρέοντα λεύσω ... παύσω ... γόους ('but since I see Kreon ... I will stop my groaning'), where see Mastronarde's n.

μεγαλώνυμος: Victory herself has a 'great name' (cf. Zeus at

Alkaios 304 L-P = *LGS* 139), and she confers ‘glory’ on others. Nike was the object of cult in several cities, often in subordination to Zeus (see West on Hes. *Th.* 383) or Athena (especially in Athens after the Persian Wars).

πολυαρμάτωι: cf. 845 εὐαρμάτου. In the Classical period, no Greek cities employed war-chariots; so this is an exotic–heroic detail, enhanced by dactylic rhythm (with ‘epic’ correption, -αρματῶι ἀντι-).

ἀντιχαρεῖσα: χαίρω, χάρις, κτλ. occur constantly in hymns, for the reciprocal gratitude and favour exchanged between worshipper and divinity (100–61n.). The prefix intensifies the reciprocity, ‘responding to our joy and repaying us for our worship’; cf. *OC* 814, *A. Ag.* 294 ἀντέλαμψαν.

150–1 ἐκ . . . πολέμων | τῶν νῦν ‘after these wars just past’. For ἐκ, cf. *Ph.* 271 ἐκ πολλοῦ σάλου εὐδοντα (‘after much buffeting’) and *LSJ s.v.* II.2. For νῦν referring to the recent past, cf. 16n.

θέσθαι: jussive infin., as often in formal (esp. religious) requests (cf. 1143 μολεῖν, Smyth §2013, *GMT* §784): it might be taken as 1st p. (‘let us . . .’), as 153 ἐπέλθωμεν implies (but this is rare), or as 2nd p. with a switch to 1st p. in 152–3. Some prefer the more obvious θέσθε, read by a majority of the MSS (this fourth syllable of the ‘base’ of the choriambic dimeter could be anceps, though respension between str. and antistr. is otherwise exact).

λησμοσύναν: probably with πολέμων to be supplied again. The word is heavily charged with pleasurable and escapist associations (as at Hes. *Th.* 55, where see West’s n.; and cf. ‘Lethe’). Song and story-telling could help blot out unhappy thoughts; but conversely a festive occasion could be spoilt by inappropriate words. So the command to ‘forget about war/politics/troubles’ is a common introduction to sympotic or cult song; e.g. Stesichoros, *PMG* 80, and cf. E. *Med.* 195ff.

152–3 χοροῖς | παννυχίοις: especially appropriate for Dionysos (cf. 1151 πάννυχιοι, and E. *Ba.* 485–6 τὰ δ’ ἱερά νύκτωρ . . . τὰ πολλά), but also implying non-stop celebration, night and day.

153–4 ‘And may Dionysos, earth-shaker of Thebes (sc. with his vigorous dances), be our leader!’ Βάκχιος, Βακχεῖος, Βάκχος, Βακχεύς (1121) are used interchangeably: the name seems originally to denote ‘the frenzied one’. Dionysos is patron-god of Thebes, and will be invoked again by the Chorus in a mood of fervent – but

misguided – optimism at 1115–54. The almost incantational alliteration and assonance of 152–4 (π, θ, χ/κ, and esp. παν-, θω/θη) are typical of cult invocation. W-Ingram suggests (1980: 115–16) that the occurrence of the name Βάκχιος in similar position to Ἄρης in the strophe (140) carries a sinister message (cf. too 136 βακχεύων); but there is no other hint here that Dionysos' activity will be anything other than beneficent.

ὁ Θήβας ἐλελίχθων: honorific epithet (elsewhere applied more literally to Poseidon, Pind. *P.* 6.50), governing objective gen. Θήβας (= Θήβης); this seems more likely than the variant ὁ ... ἐλελίζων (participial clause, 'the one who shakes Thebes', with Θήβας acc. plural).

ἄρχοι: both 'lead' us (= ἐξάρχοι, and cf. 1147 χοραγέ) and 'begin' the dance.

155–61 Enter Kreon, presumably up the opposite side-entrance to the Chorus'. His mask, costume, and bearing proclaim him a mature and authoritative king. He may still be wearing armour (cf. 33n.), and he is doubtless attended by a royal retinue.

These choral anapaests are formally the last 'stanza' of the epirrhematic Entrance Song (answering 141–7); but functionally they belong to the following scene (cf. 526–30), as the Elders announce the arrival of the new ruler and explain their own presence. The division between Song and dialogue is thus blurred, as if the Chorus are cut a little short in their celebrations by the speed of events and Kreon's haste.

155 ἀλλ' ὅδε γὰρ δῆ . . . 'But (enough of that; cf. 148n.); for here (ὅδε) in fact comes the king . . .', with δῆ, as often, 'marking the appearance of a new character on the stage', *GP* 103.4).

156 For the unusual monosyllabic prosody Κρέων (by synizesis), cf. *OC* 1073 Πρεῖς, *A. Ag.* 1493 ἐκπνεῶν. (The synizesis of Μειοικέως is not unusual; cf. *OC* 1003 Θησεῶς etc.) We are missing οο — or — — before or after νεοχμός, and we need a noun for νεοχμός to agree with ('a new <ruler> in these new circumstances'): perhaps ταγός or ἄρχων. But it is likely that the corruption is more extensive, since (i) Κρέων ὁ Μειοικέως seems pleonastic (West, following Hermann, suggests the more idiomatic παῖς ὁ Μειοικέως, cf. 211–12n.), and (ii) νεοχμός is nowhere else applied to a person.

158 τίνα δῆ μῆτιν ἐρέσσω . . . ; lit. 'rowing just what counsel

<is he coming?>’, i.e. ‘what is on his mind?’ ἐρέσσω is common in the metaphorical sense ‘ply vigorously’ (van Nes 1963: 116–17); cf. *Aj.* 251 τοίας ἐρέσσουσιν ἀπείλας.

159–60 σύγκλητον τήνδε γερόντων . . . λέσχην ‘this special conference of elders’ (Jebb). In Athens, a σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία was a ‘specially convened’ meeting (cf. Hansen 1991: 133–5). In Homer, an advisory ‘council of elders’ is occasionally summoned (e.g. *Il.* 2.53 βουλήν . . . γερόντων); and Sparta and other states had a Γερουσία (‘Senate’). Here, however, the Theban Elders will be asked not for advice, but for endorsement of a policy already implemented (164–9, 207–10, and cf. 211–14, 1091–1114, 1347–53nn.).

161 ‘Having sent <a message to us> in a shared summons’, cf. 164–5.

162–331 Scene Two (First *Episodion*)

This Scene (or ‘Act’; *Introd.* §3 n. 44) comprises two parts: (i) Kreon’s statement to the Chorus of his policies, and their noncommittal response (162–222); (ii) the arrival of a Guard, reporting the mysterious burial of the corpse, and Kreon’s furious reaction to this news (223–331).

162–210 Kreon’s long opening *rhēsis* sounds confident and assertive. After complimenting the Elders on their loyalty (162–74), he first outlines the general principle on which his rule will be based: single-minded concern for the city’s well-being, even at the expense of personal ties of φιλία (175–91); then he proceeds to the present application of this principle, i.e. the treatment of his two nephews’ corpses (192–206); and concludes with a brief restatement of his ideals (207–10). For the structure of the argument, see Friis Johansen 1959: 114–16.

Kreon characterizes himself at once as a leader dedicated to maintaining the stability of his city through the proper exercise of his authority. In describing both his own qualities as a ruler and his expectations of his subjects (175–7n.), he makes frequent use of *gnōmai* and ethical generalizations (*Introd.* §5(c)), and his language is typical of contemporary Athenian political debate: e.g., ἀρχαί (177), νόμοι (177, 191) and εὐθύνοι (178); the constant harping on πόλις (162, 166, 178, 191, 194, 203, 209), πάτρα (182), χθών (187), γῆ (199),

ἄστοι (186, 193); and the subordination of family interests to those of the city (182–90; cf. ‘Perikles’ at Thuc. 2.38–46 and esp. 2.60 (quoted on 188–90n.); cf. Dem. 19.247, *Introd.* 5(e)(ii)). For most Athenians, such phrases would presumably be charged with positive associations; and Kreon’s references to ‘straight’, ‘upright’ government (162–3 ὠρθωσαν, 167 ὠρθου, 190 ὀρθῆς) and the ‘ship of state’ (162–3, 189–90) may also sound reassuringly traditional and legitimate. But his rejection, or redefinition, of φιλία (184–91) is quite radical, and such undemocratic terms as θρόνος (166, 173), κράτη πάντα (173, cf. 1163) and σέβοντας (166), as applied to his own status, strike a discordant note; cf. Bowra 1944: 72–8, Podlecki 1966. Furthermore, the references to his own person and opinions become obtrusive (ἐγώ, ἐμός, κτλ. occur nine times in these 49 lines, often in emphatic positions: 164, 173, 178, 184, 188, 191, 207 twice, 210; cf. 484–5n.).

162–3 τὰ μὲν δὴ . . .: ‘one aspect’ of the city’s affairs (= the battle) has turned out well; the others will require the Elders’ co-operation (ὑμᾶς δὲ . . .). For πόλεος = πόλεως, cf. A. *Th.* 218, *Supp.* 345; not elsewhere in S.

σάλωι σείσαντες: cf. *OT* 22–4 πόλις . . . σαλεύει κτλ. (also 586–92). This is the first of several nautical images employed by the ‘good captain’ Kreon; cf. 189–90, Goheen 1951: 44–52, van Nes 1963: 92.

θεοὶ . . . ὠρθωσαν: like the Chorus, Kreon piously acknowledges the role of the gods in the Argive defeat and his own accession to power (cf. 280–314n., and 184; also 993–5, 1058nn.). ὀρθός and its derivatives occur esp. frequently in Kreon’s speeches, reflecting his determination to direct and shape nature and human beings as expertly as one might a boat or piece of metal (167, 190, 403, 494, 675; mimicked by Haimon at 636, 685, 706, Teiresias at 994; cf. too 99, 1158, 1195, 1203, *Introd.* §5(c) (and contrast 1343–6n.).

164–5 Lit. ‘By messengers I summoned you, from all <the others> apart, to come here’ (cf. 159–61, 100–61n.).

165–9 ‘. . . <because> I know well that, first, <you> always honoured the power of Laios’ throne, and <then> again, while Oidipous was directing the city, <you honoured his rule>, and after he perished, you still remained reliable advisers around their children’. The variation of connectives (τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτ’ αὖθις . . . καὶ . . . ἔτι . . ., cf. 61–4, 1199–1202), and the ellipse of the second participial clause

(we have to supply σέβοντας ... κράτη again after 167), blur the distinctions between the three stages, esp. since the plural κείνων (168) is oddly vague (= Oidipous and Iokaste, or Laios and Oidipous?). But there is no need to posit a lacuna after 167 (Dindorf, LJ&W); with this family some vagueness may be tactful.

170–2 διπλῆς ... μίαν κτλ.: Kreon's words echo Ant.'s (13–14n.). But he does not employ the dual: to him the brothers are separate entities (cf. 2–3, 769nn.).

αὐτόχειρι σὺν μιάσματι: cf. 49–52n. Kindred bloodshed was a powerful source of 'pollution' (Parker 1983: 120–6). In this case, it might be uncertain whether each brother had expiated the pollution with his death, or whether some residue might continue to stain the rest of the family and community.

173–4 From requesting the Elders' continuing loyalty, Kreon goes on to assert his own authority (echoing 166 θρόνων ... κράτη). ἐγώ (173) is emphatic, first word in the long-awaited main clause and in the trimeter, and juxtaposed with κράτη πάντα, which is in turn underlined by δῆ.

γένους κατ' ἀγχιστεῖα 'by reason of being next of kin'. ἀγχιστεῖα (neuter pl., not found elsewhere; but analogous to ἀριστεῖα) seems here to be equivalent to ἀγχιστεῖαν, the regular legal term for 'kinship' in matters of inheritance. In some traditions, Pol. and/or Eteokles had sons (Thersandros and Laodamas respectively: e.g., Hdt. 4.147, 5.61). But in extant tragedy this tradition is ignored (cf. 599). Kreon is thus not only the (implicitly, state-approved) στρατηγός (7–8n.), but, as the brothers' uncle, also their legal heir and κύριος of their sisters (7–8, 58nn.; also 486–7n.)

175–7 As he turns from the past to the immediate future (what kind of ruler will he turn out to be?), Kreon begins with a *gnōmē*, elaborating the proverb, ἄρχῆ ἀνδρα δείξει ('rule will reveal the <real> man', Aristotle, *NE* 5.1 1130a1, etc.). But his generalization (παντὸς ἀνδρός κτλ.) also raises the question, what kind of *subjects* he will turn out to have (cf. n. on ἐντριβῆς below, and 668–9n.) – and how do we 'learn' the true characters or thoughts of others, or even of ourselves, before it is too late (1347–53n.)?

ψυχὴν ... φρόνημα ... γνώμην: not easily distinguished; perhaps (roughly) 'character ... mentality ... judgement'. ψυχὴ in the Archaic period is limited to 'life-breath', 'ghost', or 'courage' (cf.

1069), but by the mid-fifth century it has begun to extend into the wider semantic field that we find in Plato and later Greek; cf. 227, 317, 322, 708, 930, 1069, and D. B. Claus, *Towards the soul* (New Haven 1981). For φρόνημα, cf. 458–60n.; for γνώμη, Coray 1993: 358–74.

ἐντριβής ‘tested’, cf. LSJ *s.v.* τρίβω III.4. A person’s worth, like a coin’s, may be tested by ‘rubbing’ it against a touchstone (βάσανος): any base metal under the gilded or silvered surface will ‘show through’ (177 φανῆι); cf. 1078–9, 1113–14nn., Goheen 1951: 18–19, Kurke 1995. Kreon means that a man’s true value has not been revealed until he has held office and made laws; but his words also suggest, ‘nobody’s true character is revealed until he rubs up against the rulers and the laws’.

178–83 ἐμοὶ γὰρ . . . ‘<I say this> because, in my own view . . .’, introducing two failings typical of rulers: reluctance to pursue unpopular policies (178–81), and personal favouritism (182–3). Since Pol., against whom Kreon’s edict is directed, had many supporters in Thebes (cf. 289–94), and was Kreon’s own nephew, Kreon himself clearly passes both tests.

εὐθύνων ‘steering’, perhaps maintaining the nautical image; cf. too 167 ὠρθου and 162–210n., 1163–4.

ὅστις . . . | μὴ . . . ἀπτεται . . . | καὶ . . . ὅστις . . . νομίζει: the more normal construction would be ὅστις ἂν μὴ ἀπτηται κτλ. (*GMT* §534; again 182–3). ἀπτεται here = ‘pursue’.

βουλευμάτων ‘(the best) policies’, whether his own or from others (cf. 160–2, 169).

ἐκ φόβου του (= τινός): either ‘as a result of (cf. 111 ἐκ) some fear or other’, or ‘as a result of fear of somebody’; cf. 504–5n. For ἐγκλήσις ἔχει, cf. 505, and 21–2n.

νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι: an emphatic formula, ‘seems now and always has seemed’; cf. *El.* 676, *Ph.* 966 (also 289 below).

182–3 μείζον ‘more important’, cf. 638, *OT* 772. ἀντί (= ‘in preference to’, as again at 186) is equivalent to ἢ or a plain gen. of comparison (cf. *Tr.* 576–7, LSJ *s.v.* A.5, K–G I 454).

φίλον: again 187, 190; cf. 9–10, 187–8nn., *Introd.* §5(d)(ii).

οὐδαμοῦ λέγω ‘I count him nowhere’ cf. *E. Andr.* 210 τὴν δὲ Σκῦρον οὐδαμοῦ τίθης, and Bond on *E. Hkls* 841.

184–91 ἐγὼ γὰρ . . .: Kreon elaborates his two key principles: he

cannot ‘keep silent’ when the city is faced with ‘ruin’ (ἄτη, cf. 4n.); and he cannot treat as a ‘friend’ one who was an ‘enemy of the country’, since this would undermine the civic basis of *φιλία* itself. His argument is tidily symmetrical (1-line ἐγὼ ... / 2 + 2 lines οὐτ’ ἄν ... οὐτ’ ἄν ... / 2-line gnomic cap / 1-line ἐγὼ ...), while his language echoes – and contradicts – that of Ant.’s opening speech (esp. 9–10/185–6).

ἴστω Ζεὺς ...: highly emphatic, confirming the strength of Kreon’s convictions (cf. 162–3, 304–5nn.; also 69–70n. for the optatives).

187–8 φίλον ... | θείμην ‘I would never consider <him> my friend’, cf. 183, 190 (and 94 ἐχθρὰ ... προσκείσῃ with n.). Kreon here excludes those aspects of *φιλία* that belong ‘naturally’ and inalienably to family, and speaks as if all were free to ‘choose’ (190 ποιοῦμεθα) their ‘friends’ (cf. 9–10, 522nn., Introd. §5(d)(ii)). But later he shows a more conventional concern for ‘family loyalty’ (634, 641–4nn., 651–2).

188–90 The 2-line *gnōmē* (with enjambment, cf. 67–8n.), neatly redeploys Kreon’s key terms (σώζουσα, cf. 186; πλέοντες, cf. 162–3, 178; ὀρθῆς, cf. 163; τοὺς φίλους ποιοῦμεθα, cf. 183, 187–8), in a resoundingly ‘democratic’ assertion of community over individual and family (189 ἦδε ... ταύτης refer to 187 χθονός; cf. 191 πόλιν); cf. Ober 1989. The passage is echoed by Thucydides’ Perikles (2.60.2): ἐγὼ γὰρ ἠγοῦμαι πόλιν πλείω ξύμπασαν ὀρθουμένην ὠφελεῖν τοὺς ἰδιώτας ἢ καθ’ ἕκαστον τῶν πολιτῶν εὐπραγοῦσαν, ἀθρόαν δὲ σφαλλομένην (and cf. 2.60.6 ὁ ... τῇ πόλει δύσνους / 187 δυσμενῆ χθονός; and 2.60.5–6 χρημάτων κρείσσων, χρήμασι ... νικωμένον / 295–303n.).

ταύτης ἔπι | πλέοντες ὀρθῆς ‘<only if we are> sailing on her (= the city) upright, <can> we make friends for ourselves’. (For ἔπι, cf. 193 περί with n.) With the 1st p. pl. (ποιοῦμεθα), Kreon implicitly aligns with himself all ‘upright-minded’ citizens; cf. 191n. For the nautical image, cf. 715–17n.; and for Kreon’s obsession with ‘straightness’, cf. 162–3n.

191 τοιοῖσδ’ ... νόμοισι: Kreon sums up his philosophy of rule (184–91n.; contrast 452 νόμους with n., 908n., 1113–14), while clinching the identification of his own authority (ἐγὼ) with the health of the whole city (αὔξω πόλιν, cf. 368–71n.).

192–206 At last (καὶ νῦν) Kreon draws the particular conclusion from his general principles, and announces his edict to the Chorus. He begins in measured 2-line periods (192–7), mostly end-stopped; then, as he comes to speak of Pol., his indignation bursts out in a single, convoluted 9-line period (198–206n.). At several points he employs language identical to Ant.'s in 23–32 (192 κηρύξας ἔχω / 22 & 32; 194 / 23 Ἐτεοκλέα μὲν; 196 κρύψαι / 25; 196 τοῖς ... κάτω νεκροῖς / 25; 198 / 26 τὸν δ' ... Πολυνεῖκ-; above all, 203–6/27–30 passim; cf. too 184–91n.); thus the incompatibility of their viewpoints is ironically underlined.

192 ἀδελφὰ τῶνδε 'things (= an edict) akin to these (principles)'. ἀδελφός used metaphorically is not uncommon (*OC* 1262, *LSJ* s.v. II.2); but in this context, with παίδων κτλ. following, Kreon's choice of words sounds off-key; cf. 486–7 with n., and 11.

193 παιδῶν ... πέρι: postponement (*anastrophe*) of a disyllabic preposition is not uncommon in tragedy, for metrical convenience (189, 214, 518, 528, 566, 682, 932, 1012; Moorhouse 1982: 94–5).

196–7 τὰ πάντ' ἐφαγνίσαι 'to make every kind of holy offering over him (= ἔφ-)', equivalent to ἐναγίσαι; cf. 247 κάφαγιστεύσας, 545 ἀγνίσαι, and *E. IT* 705 ἀγνισθεῖς = 'sacrificed'. Eteokles will be honoured like a Hero, as ἀριστεύσας, τοῖς ἀρίστοις further imply (cf. *Aj.* 1379–80). The MS variant ἀφαγνίσαι would normally mean 'purify' (so *E. Alk.* 1145; see Jebb's n. here).

ἔρχεται: the offerings (primarily χοαί) were supposed to pass through the earth for the spirits below to drink (*A. Cho.* 164, *E. Hek.* 535); τοῖς ... νεκροῖς is thus dative of interest, cf. 233–4n.

198–206 This single period contains five enjambments, anaphora (200–1 ἠθέλησε μὲν ... ἠθέλησε δὲ ...; 204 μήτε ... μήτε ...), alliteration (200–1 τ/θ and π; 203–4 τ and κ) and strained word-order (203–4, 205–6nn.), all expressive of Kreon's increasing vehemence (192–206n.).

199 Πολυνείκην and Πολυνείκη are both possible forms of the acc. in the fifth century (see Jebb here and on *OC* 375). For the construction of 198–203, cf. 203–4n.

199–201 γῆν ... καὶ θεοὺς ... | πρήσαι: i.e. burn the city, with its temples and wooden images of the gods; cf. *A. Th.* 434 πρήσω πόλιν, *Pers.* 809–10 πιμπράναι νεώς. The lines recall too *A. Th.* 582–3 πόλιν πατρώϊαν καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς | πορθεῖν, 639 θεοὺς

γενεθλίους ... πατρωίας γῆς, both likewise referring to Pol. Whereas Eteokles, in Kreon's eyes, was defending the *political* integrity of his community (194 πόλεως ὑπερμαχῶν), Pol.'s crimes are described in terms of *land, gods, and family* (cf. 201–2 αἵματος κοινοῦ). These charges (reiterated at 285–7) may or may not be justified; they are corroborated by 110–47, and by the echoes of A. *Th.*

θεοὺς τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς 'the gods of his family' (cf. 938 θεοὶ προγεγεῖς, *El.* 428), for the more normal θεοὺς πατρώιους (for which see 839, and Jebb on *OC* 756). Possibly too the dragon-born Thebans are to be thought of as a single γένος, their communal gods as θεοὶ ἐγγενεῖς (cf. Hutchinson on A. *Th.* 582–3).

φυγὰς κατελθών: κατέρχομαι is the technical term for the 'return' of a political exile (cf. A. *Cho.* 3): Pol. is not just an enemy, but a traitor.

ἠθέλησε μὲν ... ἠθέλησε δ' ...: emphatic epanaphora, cf. *OT* 259–60 ἔχων μὲν ... ἔχων δὲ ..., *OC* 610. The accusatives of 199 (γῆν, θεοὺς) should strictly be included within the μὲν-clause, since πάσασθαι does not apply to them; but Kreon's vehement denunciation overrides strict syntax.

πρῆσαι κατ' ἄκρας 'burn from top to bottom'. κατ' ἄκρας (lit. 'from the citadel downwards', see Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 1364–7) is combined with πορθέω at A. *Cho.* 691, E. *Hel.* 691, *IA* 778, as well as Hom. *Il.* 24.728–9; so some have here adopted Musgrave's πέρσαι, esp. in light of A. *Th.* 582–3 (quoted in 199–201n.). But the MS reading, πυρὶ πρῆσαι, is not objectionable, and is supported by Hom. *Il.* 22.411 Ἴλιος ... πυρὶ σμύχοιτο (= 'burn', 'smoulder') κατ' ἄκρης.

201–2 αἵματος | κοινοῦ πάσασθαι 'to consume kindred blood'. πατέομαι is mostly an epic word; here the hyperbolic use prepares for the ugly details of 205–6. (Cf. too Theognis 349 τῶν εἶη μέλαν αἶμα πιεῖν, 'May it be granted <me> to drink their dark blood!')

τοὺς δέ 'the rest <of the Thebans>', as if τῶν μὲν (or τοῦ μὲν, i.e. 'Eteokles' blood') had preceded. Enslaving the captured population of an enemy city was common practice; but to sell off one's own citizens (to the Argives?) would be esp. shocking (though not unheard-of in the vendettas of intra-polis *stasis*).

203–4 'It has been proclaimed to/for/by this city (cf. 44n.) that nobody (μήτε ... τινα) honour him with burial or lament over him.'

ἐκκεκήρυκται: cf. 27n. The MS ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι seems impossible, for we lack a verb of saying (hardly 198 λέγω, nor 192 κηρύξας ἔχω).

τάφωι | μήτε κτερίζειν: more normal word-order would be μήτε τάφωι ... (or τάφωι μὴ κτερίζειν μηδὲ ..., cf. 27–8); the variation (*hyperbaton*) adds emphasis to τάφωι. τάφος can be ‘funeral rites’ (as 395, 503), or ‘tomb’ (cf. LSJ *s.v.*); usually both belong together (as at 80, 196). κτερίζειν, an epic word, means properly ‘honour with funerary gifts’ (cf. 1071, 1207); for the combination, cf. 1069–71, *OC* 1410.

205–6 ‘... to leave his corpse unburied, eaten by both birds and dogs, and foul to see’, or possibly ‘to leave him (= τοῦτον) unburied, a corpse eaten ...’ Although Kreon’s language is less emotive than Ant.’s at 29–30, he too dwells on the ugliness of the spectacle.

αἰκισθέν τ’ ἰδεῖν: epexegetic, like Homeric θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι, and *OT* 791–2 γένος ἄτλητον ... ὄρᾶν (cf. Latin *mirabile uisu*, etc.). αἰκεία, αἰκίζω are legal terms in Athens for ‘assault’, ‘outrage’ (see Griffith on A. *Prom.* 93). It is not enough merely to deny burial: for the proper public example to be made, the corpse must be *seen* to suffer violence and humiliation, to match the honours paid to Eteokles (196–7; cf. too 29–30, 84–7, 308–9nn.).

207–10 A four-line coda rounds off the speech (cf. 677–80, 1087–90, and 211–14n.), restating Kreon’s self-justification, and his demand for support. Again the 1st person is prominent (ἐμόν, ἔκ γ’ ἐμοῦ, ἔξ ἐμοῦ); cf. 162–210n.

207–8 ἔκ γ’ ἐμοῦ ‘from my hands (in my eyes), at any rate ...’ (cf. 210n.).

τιμῆι προέξουσ’ κτλ. ‘the bad will never surpass the just in honour’, cf. 22 προτίσας. The MSS have τιμῆν, but there is no parallel for such a construction with προέχω.

209 εὖνους: opp. 187 δυσμενῆ, and cf. 166 σέβοντας εὔ, 169, 176, 212.

210 ἔξ ἐμοῦ τιμήσεται ‘will be honoured by me’ (fut. middle for passive, 93n.). Some MSS read ἔκ γ’ ἐμοῦ, as at 207; but unqualified ἐμοῦ makes Kreon’s final pronouncement all the more assertive (cf. 191 ἐγώ).

211–14 Choral comment within dialogue scenes is usually bland and inconsequential (e.g. 681–2, 724–5; see too 278–9n.). Here, while they echo Kreon’s words (211/207; 212/209; 213/177, 191; 214/

209–10, etc.) and accept his decision, the Chorus refrain from approving it, despite their strong feelings of loyalty and fear (cf. 159, 165–74, 216, 278–9, 505–9, 770nn.): ‘That’s what *you* want to do (σοί emphatic): . . . well, it’s your privilege . . .’ A particularly undemocratic note is struck by the suggestion (213) that *any* policy at all would be within Kreon’s ‘right’ (cf. 506–7, 667–9, 873–4nn.).

211–12 ποεῖν (= ποιεῖν) is read in the margin of one MS; the rest have Κρέον, which must be corrupt, since the combination of proper name and patronymic is redundant (only found in S. within such formal addresses as *Ph.* 4, 1261; cf. 156n., *OT* 85), and the accusatives of 212 require a verb (see Jebb’s n.). ποεῖν, with the brothers as object, does provide the infin. we need; or else e.g. λαβεῖν, or λαχεῖν, or κυρεῖν, with the brothers as subject (cf. *app. crit.* on 1098).

213 νόμῳ . . . παντί πού γ’ ‘any measure at all, I suppose’, a two-edged reminder of Kreon’s own claim at 191 (and cf. 177): παντί may even recall such expressions as πανουργεῖν, πάντα ποιεῖν/τολμᾶν, κτλ. (cf. 73–6n.). πού is often ‘used ironically, with assumed diffidence, by a speaker who is quite sure of his ground’ (*GP* 491). The word-order here is abnormal (γε πού would be usual); but no other emendation of the meaningless πού τ’ of the MSS seems at all likely. (Platt’s τοὔτ’, adopted by LJ&W, is very flat.) Possibly δὲ . . . γε are working in combination (*GP* 155.4.i).

ἔνεστί σοι ‘it lies in your power’, cf. 173–4, and 506–7 (ἔξεστιν).

214 For the ellipse (= καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀπόσοι ζῶμεν), cf. 35–6n. For the word-order, cf. 193n.

215–18 Kreon asks the Elders to be the (metaphorical) ‘guardians of the aforementioned <edict>’ (cf. 164–9); but they understand him to mean ‘watchers over the aforementioned <corpses>’. Kreon uses the concrete term (σκοπός = ‘scout’, ‘watcher’, ‘spy’) for the more commonly figurative ἐπίσκοπος or φύλαξ (see LSJ *s.v.*, and e.g. *A. Eum.* 518 φρενῶν ἐπίσκοπον; contrast 217n., 1148).

215 ὥς ἂν . . . ἤτε ‘So <see to it> now that you be . . .’, with ellipse of the implied imperative (e.g. ὀρᾶτε or ἐπιμελεῖσθε; Smyth §1921, *GMT* §326, 328, cf. *OT* 325): less assertive than ὅπως (μῆ) + future indicative (*GMT* §271–8, K–G II 376.6). ἂν in purpose clauses after ὥς or (esp.) ὅπως, regular in Homer, is not uncommon in Attic prose and tragedy (Smyth §2201).

216 ‘Impose this task on some (τωι = τινι) younger man, <for

him) to undertake' (epexegetic infin., cf. 439, 489–90, 520, 699–700, 1098n., 1248–9; also 63–4, 1076). For this sense of βασιτάζω, cf. A. *Prom.* 889 ἐν γινώμαι τὸδ' ἐβάστασε.

217 τοῦ νεκροῦ γ': contrasted with 215 τῶν εἰρημένων, now that Kreon realizes he has been misunderstood (215–18n.). For the position of γε, cf. 648 and *GP* 149.

218 'Then what <is> this other <duty that> you would command in addition <to watching over the corpse?>' Less likely, with the variant ἄλλωι, 'Why then would you be giving these further instructions to someone else (i.e. other than the guards)?'; or, with Pallis's ἄλλ' ἐκ τοῦδε, 'What else from me would you command . . .?'

219–22 '<I command you> not to collaborate with the ones who disobey these <edicts>.' For ἀπιστέω = ἀπειθέω, cf. 381, 656, LSJ *s.v.* II; for the internal acc. τάδε, cf. 66 τάδε with n. It remains unclear whether Kreon means 'those who are disobeying' or 'any who may disobey'; but cf. 289–94. Likewise, ἐπιχωρεῖν could mean 'give in to', 'permit' the rebels, or more actively 'join', 'side with'.

220 οὔτω μῶρος ὅς . . . ἐρᾷ 'such a fool as to desire . . .', consecutive; more usual would be ὅστις (Smyth §2556, *GMT* §575, K–G II 422.3), cf. Hdt. 1.87 οὐδεις γὰρ οὔτω ἀνόητός ἐστι ὅστις πόλεμον πρὸ εἰρήνης αἰρέεται. For μῶρος, cf. 469–70, and 99, 281 ἄνους.

221 καὶ μὴν . . . γ' 'Yes, indeed, the payment is exactly that' (i.e. death): καὶ μὴν 'substantiating a required condition' (*GP* 353.3), with γε emphasizing μισθός; cf. *OT* 345 καὶ μὴν παρήσω γε, 836.

221–2 ὑπ' ἐλπίδων | . . . τὸ κέρδος 'the anticipation of profit <has> ruined men'. διώλεσεν = gnomic aorist; for the 'generalizing' definite article, cf. 1242 τὴν ἀβουλίαν. Kreon likes to present his views in gnomic form (162–210n., *Introd.* §5(c)); and his belief in the irresistible lure of 'gain' (κέρδος, cf. 221 μισθός) repeatedly leads him to misunderstand the motives and conduct of others (cf. 293–302, 1032–63, Goheen 1951: 14–19; contrast Ant. at 461–4; also 1327, 701–4n.). For dangerous ἐλπίδες, cf. 615–25 with n.

ἄνδρας: cf. 248, 290, 297 (and 347). It does not occur to Kreon that φιλία and honour (not cash) might lead a *woman* to risk death.

223–331 Before the Elders get to express any further opinion on Kreon's policy, the dialogue is interrupted. Up one side-entrance, slowly and hesitantly (223–6, 268–70), enters a man in military dress. He is variously described in the MSS and *hypotheses* as 'Messenger' or

‘Guard’, and he is both: he could be a slave, or a low-class citizen soldier. His news comes as a surprise (though not to the audience): someone has slipped by the guards and buried Pol.’s body. After hearing Ant. at 71–2, 80–1, we must assume that she did it; but the Guard’s account of the miraculous invisibility of the perpetrator (249–58) leads the Chorus to conclude that the gods may be responsible (278–9), while Kreon assumes that the guards are just part of a well-financed plot against himself. With horrible threats, he sends the Guard back, under orders to catch ‘the man who did it’ (248, 306, cf. 239, 319).

As is usual for messengers in S. and E., this entrance is unannounced (R. Hamilton, *HSCP* 82 (1978) 63–82). But, whereas most messengers remain featureless ciphers, serving merely to channel news to others, this Guard is one of the more colourful characters in Greek tragedy: a garrulous, cowardly, yet witty figure whose selfish preoccupations and practical perspective throw into relief the more high-minded ideals of the main characters (Seidensticker 1982: 78–80). He is also, unlike them, a ‘survivor’ (297–301, 388–400, 434–40nn., Introd. §5(f)), and in this scene he brings out aspects of Kreon’s character that strikingly correspond to his own: literal-mindedness, mistrust, and self-concern. And although he begins the scene in terror of Kreon’s power and temper, he ends up outmanoeuvring the King and controlling the outcome of their dialogue (315–31n.).

223–36 The self-announcement is elaborate: 4-line introduction (223–6), 6-line explanation and narrative (227–32), 4-line conclusion (233–6). The diction too is ‘high’ (esp. the periphrases at 224, 226, 235); but the mode of self-address is peculiar (227–30n.), and the gnomic conclusion lamely platitudinous (236). The Guard seems to be giving himself airs (Long 1968: 84–6, Seidensticker 1982: 78–80).

223–6 Messengers often begin with references to their haste and eagerness (e.g. A. *Pers.* 247–8). But this Guard almost parodically disclaims such a role (cf. 227–30, 231nn.).

φροντῖδων ἐπιστάσεις ‘pauses for thought’ and/or ‘thought-induced pauses’.

δοῖς ‘on my way’ (locative dative, cf. *El.* 68).

227–30 ψυχὴ γὰρ ἠῦδα κτλ.: in early poetry, and in E., characters in distress often address their φρήν or θυμός or καρδιά, as a form of soliloquy (W. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch* (Berlin

1926) 189ff., Dodds 1951: 16, 138–9, Hutchinson on [A.] *Th.* 1034; in *S.*, only *Tr.* 1260). The reverse, however, is rare (e.g., *Hom. Il.* 22.122); and the incongruity is increased by the conversational jingles of 228–9 (τάλας, τί χωρεῖς . . . ; / τλήμων, μένεις αὖ;). ψυχή may mean ‘spirit of self-preservation’, rather than ‘mind’ or ‘inner soul’ (cf. 175–7n., *Tr.* 1260; but also 317, 322).

μένεις αὖ; ‘are you stopping now?’ The future μενεῖς is possible; but πολλὰ μυθουμένη (‘repeatedly telling me’) suggests rather that he is constantly stopping and starting. Thus αὖ probably means ‘again’, rather than ‘on the other hand’.

231 ἐλίσσω ‘turning over <in my mind>’ (= Latin *uolutans*); possibly the literal (intransitive) sense is present too (‘turning <myself> round and round’, see LSJ *s.v.* 5, and 226 κυκλῶν). This unparallelled expression may be derived from *Hom. Od.* 20.24–8 . . . ἐλίσσετο ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα | . . . ἐλίσσετο μερμηρίζων (after 18ff. τέτλαθι δὴ, κραδίη, κτλ.).

ἦνυτον σχολῆι βραδύς ‘I was taking my time completing <the journey> slowly’ (see LSJ *s.v.* ἀνύω 6, and 805n.); or possibly, ‘I ended up being slow’, cf. *Ph.* 720 εὐδαίμων ἀνύσση. But βραδύς seems syntactically and rhetorically a little awkward: the variant ταχύς could be correct, with σχολῆι = ‘hardly at all’ (cf. 390, LSJ *s.v.* β.2), in a flippant oxymoron (‘by no means quickly’); or even ‘quick <though I am>, I took my time arriving’ (so the scholiast). Seyffert’s σπουδῆι βραδύς is neat (cf. the proverbial σπεύδει βραδέως), but would mean ‘eager, but slow’.

233–4 ἐνίκησεν: impersonal, ‘it prevailed <for me> to come here’ (cf. *Hdt.* 6.101 ἐνίκα μὴ ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν); or else μολεῖν is subject (as 274 ταῦτα ἐνίκα). The decision was collective (cf. 396–7).

σοί: dative of ‘interest’ or ‘advantage’ (‘come and place myself at your disposal’ Jebb); see Smyth §1481, and 196–7n., 272–3, *OT* 711 χρησμός . . . ἦλθε Λαίωι, *OC* 70. For the enjambed position, cf. 250, 273, 421, 435, 460, 923, 1039, 1078. The Guard’s thoughts are focused on Kreon: it is on him that his own ‘freedom’ and ‘salvation’ depend (331, 399–400, 436–40; cf. 241–2n.).

234 ‘And if I shall be reporting <news that may be worth> nothing, none the less I *will* state <it>.’ For τὸ μηδὲν, cf. *Tr.* 1107 κἄν τὸ μηδὲν ᾧ, *OT* 638; also 1325. But since this expression may also de-

note ‘extinction’, ‘death’, the Guard may have in mind, ‘... talking annihilation <for myself> ...’ For ‘apodotic’ δέ (rare in tragedy), cf. *OT* 302 εἰ καὶ μὴ βλέπεις, φρονεῖς δ’ ὅμως, *GP* 181.

235 τῆς ἐλπίδος ... δεδραγμένος ‘grasping firmly onto the expectation that ...’, cf. Callim. *Epigr.* 1.14 μείζονος οἴκου δράξασθαι, and (in literal sense) Hom. *Il.* 13.393 κόνιος δεδραγμένος; also 179 ἄπτεται βουλευμάτων. The Guard’s ‘expectations’ fluctuate wildly during this scene and the next: cf. 330–1, 392–3, 436–40.

236 The fatalistic truism is a more ponderous version (triter than 95–7) of A. *Th.* 263 πείσομαι τὸ μόρσιμον; cf. 223–36, 437–40n.

238–40 Emphatic tricolon crescendo (οὐτ’ ... οὐτ’ ... οὐδ’ ...), cf. 264–7, 296–301nn. For the optative of ‘total negation’, cf. 69–70n.

241–2 ‘Well, you are certainly doing a good job of figuring <me> out and getting your defences up around this whole matter.’ For δηλοῖς, cf. 20n. στοχάζομαι is used esp. of one person ‘guessing at’ the thoughts of another (cf. 233–4n.). ἀποφράγνυμαι/ἀποφράσσομαι is unparalleled in this metaphorical sense; it seems to mean ‘protect the matter from harm’ (cf. A. *Th.* 63 φάρξαι πόλισμα) or ‘seal the affair off’ (cf. Plato, *Tim.* 91c τὰς διεξόδους ἀποφράττων). In any case, Kreon is still ignorant of what τὸ πρᾶγμα amounts to (242, cf. 238–9, 267, 407, 435 πράξεις; and ἔργον 85, 273, etc.), though he could not fail to notice the Guard’s circuitous approach (κύκλωι, cf. 226).

Aristotle appears to quote this line as beginning τί φοροimiάζη; But this is probably just a slip of memory (see *app. crit.* to 223, and Jebb’s n.), or may even come from another play (cf. E. *IT* 1162).

244 οὐκουν ἐρεῖς ποτ’ κτλ. ‘So won’t you finally speak out, and then take off and leave?’ Cf. *OT* 334–5 οὐκ ... ἐξερεῖς ποτε; *Ph.* 816, 1041. ἀπαλλαχθεῖς may imply also ‘rid yourself of fear’, cf. 400.

245 καὶ δὴ λέγω σοι ‘I am telling you now!’ καὶ δὴ ‘signifies, vividly and dramatically, that something is actually taking place at the moment ... in response to a definite command’ (*GP* 250–1).

245–7 Word-order conveys, first, the startling facts (‘The corpse – someone has just now buried <it> and is gone’), then the explanation (246 καί is exegetical, ‘that is to say ...’, LSJ *s.v.* A.2).

διψίαν | κόνιν: almost a cliché (cf. 429, and the ‘kenning’ at A. *Ag.*

496 ‘mud’s sister, thirsty dust’), but appropriate here because the dust craves the liquid libations, washing, and tears (cf. 28–9, 204–5, 427–31, 901–2, 1201; also A. *Cho.* 185–6 with Garvie’s n.).

παλύνας κάφαγιστεύσας ἅ χρή: sacral language, indicating that this ‘burial’ (θάψας), though skimpy and secret (255–6), is correct and sufficient: no further ceremony is required (cf. 278–9, 376–581, 900–3nn.).

248 τίς ἀνδρῶν: cf. 61–2, 221–2, 347nn.

249–77 The ‘messenger-speech’ proper begins in a jerky and disjointed manner (249–52 enjambed, with asyndeton and short sentences), then settles into a more regular flow (253–67 mostly end-stopped, with 2- or 3-line periods). The narrative focuses especially on the uncanny nature of the burial, and then, with increasing vividness, on the viewpoint and reactions of the guards themselves (259–60, 262–3, 268–73nn.).

249–50 ‘There was no stroke of any (του) pickaxe there, no <earth> thrown up by <any> mattock.’ γενής (only here and in Hesychios) is an implement with a γένυς (‘jaw’) or blade (cf. *El.* 485, and 1109 ἀξίνας). δίκηλλα is a two-pronged hoe (Latin *bidens*).

οὔτε . . . οὐ: cf. *OC* 972, and Smyth §2948, *GP* 510 (‘the writer/speaker intends to express the addition formally, but, for emotional effect, breaks off with an asyndeton. This use is almost entirely confined to serious poetry’). Comparable, but slightly different, is 952–4.

ἐκβολή: the term (along with ἐκβολάς) is found in later (and Modern) Greek for mining ‘output’ or ‘slag’ (Strabo 14.5.28, 9.1.23), and ἐκβολή, ἔκβολος in poetry have a wide range of applications, e.g. E. *Hek.* 1078 ὄρειον ἐκβολάν = ‘(children) exposed on the mountain’, *IT* 1424 ἐκβολαὶ νεώς = ‘(human) jetsam from the ship’, cf. *Hel.* 422. So there is no need to follow recent editors in adopting ἐμβολή, esp. since this would virtually repeat the previous phrase (‘no pickaxe stroke, no mattock blow’).

250–2 Unusual epithets and forms (γενής, ἐκβολή, ἄρρῶξ for ἄρρηκτος, and the ‘epic’ smooth breathing for Attic ἐφημαξευμένη, cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἄμαξα), together with enjambments and punctuation at irregular points within the line, add tension and force to the string of negatives, building up to ἀλλ’ ἄσημός . . . τις (‘someone untraceable’, almost ‘incomprehensible’, cf. 1209, 998n.). For τις, cf. *OT* 618 τάχυσ τις ὁ ἐπιβουλεύων, A. *Th.* 491 (also 262).

253 ὁ πρῶτος . . . ἡμεροσκόπος ‘the first day-guard’. Presumably the guards had started their watch during the night, immediately after Kreon’s battlefield edict (1–99, 16nn.). We learn later (411–14) that they may have fallen asleep and/or been positioned too far from the corpse; so Ant. could slip by them, attend to the body, and depart unobserved. Some have supposed instead that the guards were only to begin their duty at daybreak, and that Ant. (or the gods) performed the deed before they began: but in that case 259–67 would be pointless, and Kreon, not the Guard, should be to blame.

255 ὁ μὲν (answered by 257 σημεῖα δὲ . . .) refers back to 245 τὸν νεκρὸν, on which all thoughts are already focused.

τυμβήρης ‘entombed’; more usually, ‘tomb-like’ (947), cf. 888, 1220. For the position of οὐ, cf. 96.

256 ‘But a thin <layer of> dust lay on him, as if from <someone> trying to escape pollution’, gen. of origin (Smyth §1298; cf. 259–60n.) with τινος understood (cf. *OT* 629). For the position of ὧς, cf. 423. A corpse requires burial, and ‘pollutes’ those who touch it or come near it until it is properly buried (cf. 775n.). The obligation falls primarily on the φίλοι; but even strangers may be ‘cursed’ if they pass by a neglected corpse. (So the scholiast: οἱ γὰρ νεκρὸν ὀρώντες ἄταφον καὶ μὴ ἐπαμησάμενοι (‘heaping up’) κόνιν, ἐναγεῖς εἶναι ἐδόκουν, cf. Horace, *Odes* 1.28.33 with Nisbet and Hubbard’s n., Parker 1983: 4–11.) Cf. too 521 εὐαγῆ with n. In practical terms, a ‘thin layer of dust’ would not keep predators away for long (cf. 1017–18, 1197–8, 1202) – unless the gods are somehow protecting this corpse (257–8, 988–1114n.)?

257–8 σημεῖα . . . ἐξεφαίνετο: cf. 242 σημανῶν, 252 ἄσημος, 255 ἠφάνιστο (and 263 ἐναργής, 288 εἰσοραῖς, 291 κρυφῆι, 307/325 (ἐκ)φανεῖτε, 314 ἴδοις; also 998, 1004, 1021). Kreon had wanted the corpse to be ‘seen’ being mauled by animals (30, 205–6n., 257): but now it has ‘disappeared’ from view, and clear ‘evidence’ is lacking (84–7n.); investigation and interpretation are required (259 λόγοι, 268 ἐρευνῶσι, 279 ξύννοια, 293 ἐξεπίσταμαι, and 306–7n.). For οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὐ, cf. 249–50n. του (= τινος) goes ἀπὸ κοινοῦ (= German *Versparung*) with both θηρός and κυνῶν; cf. 365–7, 537, 697–8, 850–2, 917–18, 1105–6, 1155 (and for the position of του, e.g. *Tr.* 2–3 οὔτ’ εἰ χρηστός οὔτ’ εἰ τῶι κακός).

259–60 A ‘sense construction’, with incorrect syntax but clear

meaning. Properly we should have ἐν ἡμῖν (for ἀλλήλοισιν) and φύλακος ἐλέγχοντος (gen. of origin, cf. 256n.; or absolute), since φύλαξ is not in apposition to λόγοι. Similar is A. *Prom.* 200–2 στάσις δ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ὠροθύνετο, | οἱ μὲν θέλοντες ... οἱ δὲ ..., cf. *Ag.* 313 with Fraenkel's n., E. *Ba.* 1131–2 (and see 413–14n.). In all these cases, the solecism produces a more lively and spontaneous-sounding narrative (cf. 262–3n., and 1021–2). For ἐρρόθουν, cf. 290 with n.

260–1 'And finally it kept coming to blows, and nobody was there to prevent it', iterative imperfect + ἄν, see Smyth §1790, *GMT* §162. Or possibly contra-factual, 'it would have come to blows, for nobody was there ...' For the 'adverbial' use of τελευτάω, see LSJ *s.v.* π.4; and for the idiomatic article + fut. participle, cf. *Ph.* 1242 τίς ἔσται μ' ὁ ἐπικωλύσων τάδε; (with Jebb's n.), A. *Prom.* 27.

262–3 'Each one <of us> (sc. in the minds of the others) was the culprit; nobody was clear<ly guilty>; <each> was disclaiming any knowledge': a vivid representation of the guards' confused and apprehensive state of mind. For ἐναργής, cf. *OT* 535.

ἔφευγε: in legalistic sense, virtually = 'denied', 'was pleading not guilty'; hence followed by μή + infin. (cf. 442, Smyth §2739–41).

264–7 The Guard's insistently tripled claims and disclaimers (καὶ ... καὶ ... καὶ ..., τὸ μήτε ... μήτε ... μήτ' ... , cf. 238–9) underline his anxiety. Oaths (θεοῦς ὀρκωμοτεῖν) are the standard means of reinforcing a claim (Burkert 1985: 250–4). Ordeals are much less commonly attested (*ibid.* 253 with n. 36), though metaphorical or hyperbolic offers to 'walk through fire' (διὰ πυρὸς ἵεναι) are found, e.g., at Aristoph. *Lys.* 133–4, Xen. *Symp.* 4.16, Virgil, *Aen.* 11.787–8. No exact parallel is known for 'lifting lumps of molten iron in <one's> hands', but cf. C. Mucius Scaevola's act of thrusting his hand into a fire (Livy 2.12–13.5, with R. M. Ogilvie's n. *ad loc.*, 'The burning of the right arm ... is ... the punishment for the breaking of an oath'). Or, if the guards are slaves (223–331n.), this may refer to the torture (βάσανος) legally required for their testimony to be valid in Athenian courts; see Hunter 1994, index *s.v.* 'torture', M. Gagarin, *Early Greek law* (Berkeley 1986) 29 n. 34. (Quite different is the practice of *sinking* lumps of iron in the sea, as e.g. Hdt. 1.165.)

268–73 Enjambment and tortuous syntax recapture the evasiveness of the guards at the prospect of informing Kreon.

268–70 ‘At last, when we were getting nowhere in our inquiries, one of us said something that made us all droop our heads to the ground in fear.’ For οὐδὲν πλεόν (‘nothing better’), cf. 40, *OT* 37.

τις εἷς = εἷς τις, the enclitic gravitating, as often, to the front of the sentence.

ὁ . . . προὔτρεψεν: (cf. *OT* 358) The MS ὁς is not impossible, but would focus undue attention on the author, rather than the content, of the awful pronouncement; and an object is wanted for λέγει (ὁ = τοῦτο ὁ).

ἐς πέδον κάρα | νεῦσαι: contrast 441, with n.

270–2 ‘We did not have ⟨any way⟩ to contradict ⟨him⟩ nor ⟨any way⟩ how, doing ⟨what he said⟩, we might benefit’ (ὅπως . . . πράξαιμεν = the indirect version, in historic sequence, of the deliberative question πῶς . . . πράξωμεν?). For the change of construction after ἔχω, cf. *Aj.* 428–9 οὔτοι σ’ ἀπειργεῖν οὐδ’ ὅπως ἔῶ λέγειν | ἔχω, and *LSJ s.v.* ἔχω III. Some prefer to take ὅπως δρῶντες together: ‘we did not know how we should act to do well’. But, as the Guard says, there is no prospect of any alternative course of action (οὔτ’ ἀντιφωνεῖν).

272–3 ἦν δ’ ὁ μῦθος ‘⟨this⟩ suggestion was . . .’

ἀνοιστέον | σοί ‘that you *must* be informed’, σοί = dat. of interest, for the more usual εἰς + acc. after ἀναφέρω (cf. 233–4n.).

274–5 ταῦτ’ ἐνίκα ‘This view prevailed’, cf. 233 ἐνίκησεν, with n.

κάμῃ . . . καθαιρεῖ . . . λαβεῖν ‘condemns me to get this pleasant ⟨task⟩’, flipperly sarcastic (cf. 31, 397nn.). For this sense of καθαιρέω, see *LSJ s.v.* II.5, and esp. (with following infin.) *OC* 1689 κατὰ με . . . Ἀίδας ἔλοι πατρὶ ξυυθανεῖν.

276 οἶδ’ ὅτι: parenthetical, = ‘doubtless’, cf. 758.

278–9 The Elders venture a suggestion: was Pol.’s burial perhaps a miracle, a supernatural intervention? (Cf. *Il.* 16.666–83, 24.18–21.) Some critics have taken this suggestion to be correct (in which case Ant.’s subsequent act of reburial might seem superfluous); cf. 376–440n. But after 72–3, 80–1, 98–9, it is natural that the audience will understand the ‘deed’ of 253–67 as Ant.’s; and this, while it is never quite established as a certainty (435n.), is strongly confirmed at 423–8, 434–5, 442–3. Yet the Chorus’ interpretation may not be wholly mistaken: perhaps the burial was indeed ‘god-sent’ or god-assisted (θεήλατον, cf. *OT* 255; and 421 θείαν νόσον with n., 376–440n.).

ἐμοί τοι ... ‘<speaking> for myself, to be sure ...’, with τοι ‘revealing the speaker’s emotional or intellectual state’ (*GP* 541.6).

μή τι καὶ θεήλατον ‘(whether) this event may not be perhaps (τι) in fact (καί, 90n.) god-sent’. For μή + indicative (ἔστι, understood) in a cautious assertion or suspicion, see 1253–6 μή τι ... καλύπτει, *Aj.* 278 (*GMT* §269, Smyth §1772, K–G II 394–5); contrast 1113–14.

ἡ ξύννοια βουλεύει πάλαι ‘my anxious thoughts have for some time been suggesting to me’; for πάλαι, cf. 289, 1244–5n. σύννοια is found nowhere else in S. (though cf. συννοέω at *OC* 454): it may mean here ‘second thoughts’ (after 211–14?), almost ‘conscience’ (cf. *A. Prom.* 437, Stevens on *E. Andr.* 805).

Pairs of long speeches in tragedy are often punctuated and/or concluded by 2- or 4-line comments from the *koryphaios* (cf. 471–2, 681–2, 724–5). Usually these are blandly moralistic or non-committal; but this one provokes an unexpectedly vehement reaction.

280–314 Kreon responds furiously: first against the Chorus-leader (280–9) for suggesting divine complicity in the burial; then against the rebellious faction who must have bribed the guards (289–92); then finally against the guards themselves, whom he threatens with torture and death if they do not capture the culprit (293–314). Once again, Kreon sees himself as defending civic and religious order (cf. 207–10); but in his anger he reveals an unpleasantly mercenary view of human nature (*gnōmai* at 295–301, 312, 313–4; cf. 295–303n.), and a strong preoccupation with his own authority (personal pronouns 290, 292, 304, 307; plots 289–92).

280–3 πρὶν ... καὶ με μεστῶσαι ‘before you really (καί, cf. 726–7, 770, and 90n.) stuff me full ...’ μεστῶ is rather a coarse, graphic word (cf. 420, *El.* 713, and LSJ *s.v.* μεστός). For the position of καί, see *E. Hipp.* 92, *GP* 326, W. J. Verdenius, *Mnem.* (1976) 181. The MSS write κάμῃ (‘me too’), which makes nonsense here.

ῥεπυρεθῆις: for the *aphairesis*, cf. 83n.

ἄνους τε καὶ γέρων ἄμα ‘foolish as well as old’, old age being naturally associated with wisdom (cf. 681–2, 726–9); cf. the same insult at *OC* 930 γέρονθ’ ὁμοῦ ... καὶ τοῦ νοῦ κενόν (against Kreon!).

δαίμονας: emphatic, and contrasted with 290 ἄνδρες. Here, as often, the term is used interchangeably with θεοὺς (278, 288).

284–8 πότερον ... | ἦ ...: heavily sarcastic, ‘Were they honour-

ing him as a benefactor when they covered him . . . , or do you see gods honouring evil-doers?’

ἀμφικίονας ‘with columns all round’ (not ‘at both ends’); cf. E. *IT* 405 περικίονας ναούς, *Andr.* 1099. The sonorous epithet may be merely conventional, since most of the grandest temples were so built; but it may allude to a particular temple of Dionysos at Thebes, since he was worshipped there as περικιόνιος (Farnell 1909: v 281 n. 10); cf. 153–4, 1115–52nn.

γῆν . . . καὶ νόμους διασκεδῶν: a modification of 120–3, 200–2, with a bold zeugma and unusual usage of διασκεδάννυμι (‘looking to tear apart their land and their rites/laws/customs’), cf. *OC* 619–20.

289–94 οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλὰ . . .: emphatic and decisive (cf. 293 ἐξεπίσταμαι καλῶς); yet the scenario he sketches, though vivid, is a little incoherent. How long has this supposed disaffection been going on? If it is ‘hidden’ (291 κρυφῆι), how does he know all about it?

ταῦτα . . . τῶνδε τούτους . . . τάδε: the sequence is convoluted, but it finally emerges that ταῦτα (289) must refer to his edict, even his rule (‘all of this’, cf. 33 ταῦτα, 219 τάδε), and is the object of μόλις φέροντες: in 293–4, τῶνδε refers back to ἄνδρες, τούτους to the guards (as a gesture would indicate), εἰργάσθαι τάδε to the burial (cf. 273 τοῦργον, 262 οὐξείργασμένος, 248 ὁ τολμήσας τάδε). The alternative, of taking ταῦτα with ἐρρόθουν (‘were always complaining to this effect’), does not make the right point in this context, and leaves μόλις φέροντες dangling (though, for this, cf. A. *Eum.* 794).

καὶ πάλαι ‘from the very start’, i.e. from the moment Kreon issued the edict, just a few hours ago (cf. 1–99n. and 279 πάλαι). Yet it is hard not to begin to take 289–92 as describing ‘long-standing’ opposition (‘They’ve always been out to get me . . .’). Possibly Kreon is referring to a period when he was acting as regent for Oidipous’ young sons (cf. 993–5, 1302–3nn.); but 155–7, 170–4 imply that he is new to such authority.

πόλειωσ | ἄνδρες: contrasted with 282 δαίμονας (and cf. 221–2n.).

ἐρρόθουν ἔμοι ‘were in uproar against me’. ῥοθέω is used of human voices at 259, but nowhere else in extant Greek, though cf. 413–14n., E. *Andr.* 1096 ἐχώρει ῥόθιον ἐν πόλει κακόν, A. *Pers.* 406, Hes. *WD* 220 (ῥόθος).

κρυφῆι implies secrecy (cf. 85); yet ἐρρόθουν and the graphic

imagery of 291–2 imply outspoken and visible resistance. Kreon seems to be picturing vividly what he has not seen or heard.

κάρα σείοντες . . . ὑπὸ ζυγῶι | λόφον: an ugly image, of citizens submitting ‘justly’ (δικαίως), like mules or oxen, to the ‘yoke’ of domination (cf. 477–8, 663–7, 690–1nn., *A. Ag.* 1638–41, Goheen 1951: 27–9, and further 162–3n., *Intro.* §5(c); also 350–2).

ὡς στέργειν ἐμέ ‘so as to (= ὥστε, cf. *OT* 84) accept me cheerfully <as ruler>’, cf. *A. Prom.* 11 τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα στέργειν, *S. Tr.* 486. The reverse (‘to my satisfaction’, Brown) may also be understood.

293–4 ‘It was by these men, I know perfectly well, that those guards have been corrupted with bribes, and have done this deed.’ For ἐκ, cf. 63–4n. For the infin., rather than participle, after the verb of knowing (not found in Attic prose), cf. 473–4, 1092–4, *Ph.* 1329, Smyth §2139. (Different is 472, = ‘knows *how* to . . .’)

μισθοῖσιν: cf. 221–2, 295–303, 302–3nn.

295–303 Dissident factions, greedy politicians, and venal subordinates are familiar features of any Greek polis, esp. Athens: and complaints about the corrupting power of wealth are common in the sixth and fifth centuries (e.g. *Theognis* 697–728, *Solon* 13.7–16). So Kreon’s generalizations, though sweeping, are not absurd (cf. 221–2n.). But obsessive suspicion of one’s fellows was thought to be esp. characteristic of ‘tyrants’ (*Hdt.* 3.80–2, *Aristot. Pol.* 1313b30, *Dio Chrys. Or.* 2.75; cf. 484–5, 1033–4nn.; Bowra 1944: 72–3, 77–8, Podlecki 1966, Ober & Strauss 1990: 261–3), and in this case we know the suspicion to be unfounded (cf. *OT* 380–9, 540–2).

295–6 ἄργυρος | . . . νόμισμα: wry word-play. The original meaning of νόμισμα (found only in poetry, e.g. *A. Th.* 269, *E. IT* 1471) is ‘institution’ (i.e. what is νομίζω-ed; cf. 455 with n.); but the regular fifth-century sense is ‘coinage’ or even ‘coin’. Thus, ‘there is no institution/currency worse than silver’. The sordidness of ‘silver’ coin is often contrasted with the purity of ‘gold’; cf. 699–700, 1037–9, 1055–6nn., Kurke 1995.

νόμισμα’ ἔβλαστε: since βλαστάνω (a favourite word of S.) is virtually synonymous with πέφυκα (φύω), and νόμος and φύσις are normally opposed, not combined, this is another oxymoronic word-play. Kreon sees bribery and corruption as endemic, ‘growing’ within human societies (cf. *El.* 1095 μέγιστ’ ἔβλαστε νόμιμα (of divine

'laws'), *OC* 611 βλαστάνει ... ἀπιστία); contrast 455-7 ζῆι ταῦτα (= νόμιμα) with *n*.

296-301 Personified 'money' (295 ἄργυρος, to which τοῦτο ... τόδε ... τόδε ... all refer; for the neuter, cf. 334 τοῦτο) remains the subject of the series of verbs ('ravages ... banishes ... teaches ... perverts ... shows ...'), through a powerful tricolon crescendo (cf. 238-40, 673-4nn.).

298-9 ἴστασθαι: governed by both ἐκδιδάσκει and παραλλάσσει, which are virtually a hendiadys. For ἴστασθαι πρὸς ... ('to attend to shameful deeds'), cf. Thuc. 4.56 πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων γνώμην αἰεὶ ἴστασαν, Plato, *Rep.* 452e, E. *IT* 961-2 ἐς δίκην ἔστην. The assonance (α) is strikingly insistent.

300-1 πανουργίας ... ἔχειν = πανουργεῖν (cf. 1273, and *Aj.* 564 θήραν ἔχων, Hom. *Od.* 1.368 ὕβριν ἔχοντες.) Thus Kreon sums up 295-9; but then, with the 'etymology' (παντὸς ἔργου δυσσέβειαν, cf. 74 ὅσια πανουργήσασα), he narrows the scope again to that of his original complaint (280-3): this was no θεήλατον ἔργον (278-9), but a human act of criminal impiety.

εἰδέναι 'become familiar with', cf. 71, 477nn., *Ph.* 960 οὐδὲν εἰδέναι κακόν.

302-3 Although these two lines could be taken gnomically, as the conclusion to Kreon's general complaint against money (with τάδε = τοιάδε, and ἐξέπραξαν gnomic aor.), they seem more particularly directed at the Guard (cf. 293 τούτους), esp. in light of the echoes of 294 in 302.

μισθαρνοῦντες: a sneering, low-prose word ('hiring'); cf. 313 λημμάτων with *n*., 1035-9n.

ὡς = ὥστε (cf. 292). 'They brought it about that eventually (ποτε, cf. 103n.) they pay the penalty.'

304-12 At last Kreon turns to address the Guard (the switch to direct address is marked by 304 ἀλλά). In one elaborate period, ten clauses long, he swears to make an example of the guards if they fail to find the culprit: he will either catch the one(s) who bribed them, or punish the guards themselves and thereby teach a 'lesson' to all (309 δηλώσητε, 310 εἰδότες, 311 μάθητε). His threats of torture and death are extreme, but might not be outrageous by Greek standards if the guards were indeed guilty (308-9n.).

304-5 The threat is prefaced with a solemn oath, by Zeus (cf. 184,

450n.; contrast 487 Ζηνὸς ἐρκείου with n.). The clash between Kreon and Ant. is not simply between ‘human’ and ‘divine’ law, but between two incompatible sets of social and political principles, both of which can lay legitimate claim to divine sanction (cf. 184–91n., Introd. §5(c)(i)).

306–7 εἰ μή + fut. indic. is the regular construction for threats and warnings (Smyth §2328, *GMT* §447).

τὸν αὐτόχειρα: cf. 49–52, 170–2, 1175, 1315nn. (also 900); and, for the misleading masculine, 239 ὁ δρῶν, 248 τίς ἀνδρῶν, 252 ὁ ἐργάτης.

ἐς ὄφθαλμοὺς ἐμούς: the hidden, ‘unidentified’ man (cf. 252, 257–8n.) must be ‘discovered’ (εὐρόντες), ‘brought into the open’ (ἐκφανεῖτε, cf. 324–5) and hauled ‘into view’ for Kreon himself to inspect: cf. 30 εἰσορῶσι, 34 σαφῆ, 206 ἰδεῖν with n., 309, 329, 405–6 (and 84–7n., Griffith 1998, Goheen 1951: 84–6).

308–9 ‘Mere death will not suffice for you all, until, suspended alive, you demonstrate <the full implications of> this outrage’; i.e. Kreon will make an example of them. Less likely: ‘... until you reveal <those responsible for> this outrage’. The construction is a mixture of (i) ‘Simple death will not suffice’ and (ii) ‘You will not die until ...’. Hanging a man from a gibbet or board, and either leaving him to die of starvation and exposure, or beating him to death (*apotympanismos*), was a familiar mode of execution, at least for low-class criminals and traitors: Hom. *Od.* 22.172–6, Hdt. 7.33, 9.120, *Aj.* 106ff., *A. Prom.* 26 with Griffith’s n., *Ar. Thesm.* 931ff.; cf. K. Latte, *RE s.v. Todesstrafe*, Hunter 1994: 154–84, esp. 179. Contrast 773–6n.

μῶνος: this Ionic form of μόνος, metrically convenient, is common in S. (cf. 508, 705), but not in A. (only *Prom.* 804 μουνῶψ) or E.

310–11 ἴν’ ... ἀρπάξητε καὶ μάθηθ’ ...: grim sarcasm (‘that will teach you to ...’), cf. *Aj.* 100, *OC* 1377ff. (and 888n.). The construction of 310 is proleptic: lit. ‘knowing profit, whence <it> ought to be derived’, with ἔστι understood.

313–14 After rounding off his tirade with one *gnōmē* (312, following enjambment, cf. 67–8n.), Kreon adds another (‘crime doesn’t pay’). The construction is a mixture of (i) ‘you can see more people ruined than saved’ (πλείονας ... ἢ ...) and (ii) ‘you can see most people coming to ruin’ (τοὺς πλείονας); cf. *OC* 796, E. *Hipp.* 471–2.

λημμάτων: exclusively a prose word; cf. 302 μισθαρνοῦντες with n.

ἀτωμένους ... σεσωμένους: cf. 4, 17 ἀτωμένη, 189 σώζουσα, 331, 440.

315–31 A brief stichomythia rounds off the scene, as the Guard, still preoccupied with saving his own skin (331 σωθείς), continues to annoy Kreon (316, 318) with what seems to him mere small-talk (320 λάλημα, 324 κόμπυσε). By harping on the difference between actual events (317 ὁ δρών, 321 τὸ δ' ἔργον) and the false interpretation of them (317 ἐν τοῖσιν ὤσιν, 319 τὰ δ' ὤτα, 323 ψευδῆ δοκεῖν), the Guard invests this little confrontation (*agōn*) with a deeper resonance, reinforced by several unconscious ironies (323, 329, 331nn.), – and it is he, not his King, who ‘wins’ the exchange and enjoys the last word.

315 ‘Will you allow <me> to say something, or am I just to turn round and go?’ (cf. 244–5). οὕτως = ‘just like this’, cf. *Ph.* 1067. ἴω is deliberative subj.

316–21 The Guard’s pedantic wit will not be quelled: Kreon’s ‘annoyance’ (316 ἀνιαρῶς, 319 ἀνιάι) is not caused by the *sound* of the Guard’s words, but by the *consciousness* that the man exists who did such a deed (present tense, 319 ὁ δρών).

317 **πὶ τῆι ψυχῆι:** here equivalent to the Homeric ἐπὶ φρεσὶ (e.g. *Il.* 1.55), as 319 τὰς φρένας shows; cf. 227–30n.

318 **τί ... ῥυθμίζεις ... ὅπου** (sc. ἐστί) ‘Why are you trying to define where my pain <is>?’ (again, proleptic, cf. 310n. and *Aj.* 890 ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὅπου). There is something to be said for the MS variant τί δαί, rather than τί δέ, in 318. Although δαί is very rare in A. or S. (only perhaps at A. *Cho.* 900, where see Garvie’s n.), it occurs occasionally in E. and often in Aristoph., with a colloquial and indignant flavour (‘Why on earth ...?’, *GP* 263(2), K–G II 134) which would be appropriate here (cf. 302, 313, 320 λάλημα with n.). Metre does not help us decide, since δέ would in any case scan long before initial ῥ-.

320 **λάλημα δῆλον κτλ.:** lit. ‘Oh, how you were born (to be) an obvious chatterbox!’ (ἐκπεφυκός attracted to the gender of λάλημα). For δῆλον, cf. 20, 242 δηλοῖς and 471 δηλοῖ with n.; more common in S. is the idiom δῆλος εἶ/ἐστί + participle (e.g., *OT* 673, *Aj.* 326).

Neuters in -μα are commonly used in drama to express contempt for a person (Long 1968: 114–20: cf. 650 παραγκάλισμα, 756 δούλευμα, and e.g. *Aj.* 381 ἄλλημα, *Ph.* 927, *E. Rhesos* 499 κρότημα; also 760 τὸ μῖσος). λάλημα, though not found elsewhere before the fourth century (Euboulos *PCG* v 109; cf. *E.* (?) *Andr.* 937) would suit sense and tone here (cf. 324 κόμψευε). But a scholiast seems to read a variant ἄλλημα (lit. ‘fine-ground flour’, hence ‘word-sifter’, ‘manipulator’, *Aj.* 381, 390), glossing it as = περίτριμμα τῆς ἀγορᾶς (a ref. to *Dem.* 18.127; cf. too *Ar. Clouds* 260 τρίμμα, 447 περίτριμμα δικῶν with Dover’s nn., and *LSJ s.vv.* παιπάλη, παιπάλημα). The choice between them is difficult.

321 οὐκουν . . . γ’ ‘Well, <I may be a chatterbox, but> I certainly never did this deed’ (cf. 993, *GP* 422–4).

322 ‘Yes you did (γε), and what’s more (καὶ ταῦτα) you betrayed your life for money.’ (For ψυχῆ, cf. 227.) Here, and in 324–6, Kreon mechanically repeats his earlier assertions, as if no longer listening to anyone else.

323 φεῦ: The extra-metrum exclamation, interrupting the flow of stichomythia, marks this as a significant moment (cf. 1048, and *E. Ba.* 810), and underlines the degree to which the Guard by now controls the terms, tone, and pace of the discussion.

There follows an alliterative *gnōmē* levelled at Kreon himself, playing on the two senses of δόξα (δοκεῖ μοι ταῦτα can mean, ‘These things appear to me <so>’, or, ‘This is my opinion/decision’, cf. 1102, 1111): ‘It is indeed disturbing, when someone is making up his mind according to <mere> appearances (ῶι δοκῆι γε), for those appearances in fact (καί, 90n.) to be false’ (cf. 622–5). ῶι δοκῆι is equivalent to ἐάν τιτι δοκῆι or ῶιτιτι ἄν δοκῆι (for the omission of ἄν, cf. 710–11, 1025–6nn.). The MS variant ἦν δοκῆι, though possible, is less idiomatic than the relative. Some editors read ῶι δοκεῖ, i.e. not gnomic but particular, ‘It is terrible that this man . . .’, which seems too bold even for this cocky character.

324 κόμψευε . . . τήν δόξαν ‘keep on playing that clever *doxa*-game of yours (= τήν)!’ To Kreon, the Guard is just a smart alec (κομψός, cf. 320 λάλημα with n.; κόμψευε also echoes 323 καὶ ψευδῆ).

324–6 εἰ δὲ . . . | φανεῖτε κτλ.: construction, thought, and lan-

guage all repeat Kreon's earlier threats (306–7; 303; 310–12); cf. 322n.

δειλά 'vile', 'worthless', cf. Theognis 835 κέρδεα δειλά.

327–31 Kreon is already departing, and may not be intended to hear the Guard's final comments (Mastrorarde 1979: 30, cf. *E. El.* 1142–6, *Ba.* 515–18), which are typically breezy and self-centred, echoing his opening remarks (330 ἐκτὸς ἐλπίδος / 235; 328 τύχη, 331 τοῖς θεοῖς / 236). The larger issues are not *his* concern, but Kreon's, the gods', fate's, luck's . . . ; he himself is just surprised and relieved to be alive, and sure that he will not be back (329 heavily emphatic; but see 388–400 with n.). The Guard's own little comedy, with its unexpected conflicts and reversals, is integrally bound up with Ant.'s tragedy.

332–75 Second Song (First Stasimon) of the Chorus

The Elders have heard Kreon's edict; and now they have heard the Guard's account of the mysterious burial. Their reactions have hitherto been muted and non-committal (211–20, 278–9). Now, left to themselves, rather than comment directly on the previous scene, or speculate as to the outcome of future events, they launch into a far-ranging consideration of the resourcefulness and ingenuity of the human race. This is perhaps the most celebrated song in all Greek tragedy (often referred to as the 'Ode to Man'). It is also one of the least straightforward in its function and meaning.

The Chorus begin by describing, in ascending order, the extraordinary achievements of human civilization: *strophe* α – control over the natural environment (navigation and agriculture); *antistrophe* α – control over animals (hunting and fishing, harnessing of horse and bull); *strophe* β – the civilized arts (language, reason, urbanization and house-building, medicine – but not immortality); finally (*antistrophe* β) they consider the proper and improper use of these talents, and issue a prayer to avoid the latter. The sustained level of generality is such that modern critics have disagreed radically in their interpretation of the Song, even as they have admired it as a piece of poetry. Is the view of 'Man' (333 ἄνθρωπος, 347 ἄνθρω) predominantly favourable, predominantly unfavourable, mixed, or neutral?

(Or, to put it another way, should we translate the key term of the opening line, δεινά, as 'wonderful', 'terrible', 'strange', or 'extraordinary' (cf. 332n.)?) And what is the true point of 368–71, which ought to provide the connection with the immediate context (cf. 372 ἐμοί, 375 ὅς τὰδ' ἔρδει)? What and whom should we have in mind when the Chorus sing of 'respecting the laws and ... gods' (368–9) on the one hand, and 'excessive daring' (371 τόλμας) on the other?

Some have concluded that the Chorus here transcend the perspective of the Elders of Thebes, to offer instead S.'s own insights; or even that the song was composed by S. as a self-contained entity, a lyric *tour de force* on the human condition that bears no particular relevance to this play (so Brown 1987). But there is no need to resort to such desperate critical measures. Rather, we may read the ode (like several in tragedy) from a double perspective, both as an attempt by this group of old Thebans to make sense of what they have just seen and heard, and as a complex and open-ended verbal structure in which S. allows us to explore larger themes arising out of this particular situation. In the choral lyric tradition, audiences were accustomed to using their intellects and imaginations to make connections between allusive myths, or free-standing moral generalizations, and the immediate occasion and context of performance (cf. 944–87n.). So here, the ironies and paradoxes that we come to recognize with regard to the different 'authors' and audiences of this ode, and the sweeping vistas that are opened up for interpretation, in no way detract from its immediate dramatic relevance and function.

In the preceding scene, the Elders' puzzlement and fear were conspicuous; and these mixed emotions continue to colour their description of 'Man' and his achievements throughout this ode. They see 'Man' as ethically double-edged, talented but flawed; by 'the act of daring' (371) they mean specifically the ingenious but illegal burial of Pol.'s body (cf. 248 ὁ τολμήσας τὰδε, 59 νόμου βίαι, 287 νόμους διασκεδῶν); and they worry that the man who perpetrated it (375; cf. 262, 302, 321) may bring ruin on himself and all of Thebes (370 ἄπολις). This, we may say, is the 'surface' meaning of the Song – what the Elders *intend* to say.

But from the better-informed perspective of the reader/audience, many of their words take on quite different significance (even as we

share their point of view too, at least intermittently): we can see things that they cannot. We know who performed the burial, and why – the ‘daring’ that accomplished it was proof, not only of human ingenuity, but also of piety and courage (as well as luck or divine favour; cf. 278–9n.); and it was intended not so much to subvert the laws of the land as to uphold them (23–4, 74–7; cf. 454–7). Conversely, the figure of the over-zealous civilizer (catcher, tamer, builder, teacher), may remind us (if not the Elders) of Kreon, currently ‘high in his city’ (368–70; cf. 1160–71) through dedication to its laws and gods (367–9, cf. 175–83, 285–8, 510ff.); cf. Goheen 1951: 54–6, Segal 1964.

The ode is also of interest as a document in the ‘history of ideas’. It stands as one of the earliest extant examples of the growing Greek interest in the evolution of human societies and in the opposition between ‘nature’ (φύσις) and ‘culture’ (νόμος), subjects central to the new scientific, anthropological, and political currents of the mid-fifth century. Although the ode does not present a continuous evolutionary narrative, like that of ‘Protagoras’ at Plato, *Prot.* 320c–322d, or Prometheus at A. *Prom.* 442–506 (cf. Guthrie 1971: 60–8, 79–84, A. T. Cole, *Democritus and the sources of Greek anthropology* (APA Monogr 25, 1967)), it does provide a similarly comprehensive list of human achievements that distinguishes the higher stages of civilization from the life of beasts, and culminates with ‘political’ life, justice, and law (368 νόμους, 369 δίκαν, 370 ὑψίπολις, ἄπολις). Here, even more prominently than in those other accounts, the ambiguous moral character of ‘technology’ (esp. 365 τὸ μηχανόεν τέχνας) and of human ingenuity in general is emphasized: culture is presented as an aggressive process of ‘defeating’ and ‘mastering’ nature (338–9, 343, 347nn.). So, while the ‘wonderful’ benefits of architecture, medicine, language, and law are acknowledged, so is mankind’s ‘terrible’ urge to dominate and to push beyond accepted limits: οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου δεινότερον. See further esp. Benardete 1975, Burton 1980: 95–104, Segal 1964, 1981: 152–66.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| 332 | $\bar{\text{πο}}\bar{\text{λλα}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\bar{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ει}}\bar{\text{να}}\bar{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ἀ}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{-}}$ | choriambic dim. |
| 342 | $\text{κουφονοων τε φυλον ὄρ-}$ | |

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| 333 | θρῶπου δεινότερον πέλει· | glyconic |
| 343 | νιθων ἀμφιβάλων ἄγει | |
| 334 | τούτῳ καὶ πολίου πέραν | glyconic |
| 344 | καὶ θηρων ἀγριων ἔθνη | |
| 335 | ποντου χειμερίῳ νότῳ | glyconic |
| 345 | ποντου τ' εἰναλιαν φυσιν | |
| 336 | χωρεὶ, περιβρυχίοισιν | hagesichorean// |
| 346 | σπειραῖσι δικτυοκλωστοῖς | |
| 337 | πέρων ὑπ' οἰδμασιν, θεῶν | 2 iambics |
| 347 | περιφραδῆς ἀνηρ· κρατεῖ | |
| 338 | τέ ταν ὑπερτάταν, Γαν | iambic bacchiac |
| 348 | δε μηχαναῖς ἀγραυλου | (2 iambics _Λ) |
| 339 | ἄφθιτον, ἀκάματα ἀπότρυεταί | 4 'dactyls' |
| 349 | θηρος ὄρεσιβατα, λασιαυχενα θ' | |
| 340 | ἴλλομενων ἀρότρων ἔτος εἰς ἔτος, | 4 'dactyls' |
| 350 | ἵππον ὑπηγαγετ' ἀφιλοφον ζυγον | |
| 341 | ἵππειῳ γενεὶ πόλεων. | cr. _Λ cr. ba.// |
| 351 | οὔρειον τ' ἀκητα ταυρον. | (3 _Λ iambics _Λ) |

The first half of the stanza (= five cola, up to period-end at 336 = 346) resumes the even-flowing manner of the Entrance Song, consisting entirely of aeolic elements of the glyconic/choriambic dimeter type: 'the chorus have not altogether abandoned the buoyant mood of the parodos' (Ditmars 1992: 60). The fifth colon (336 = 346 $- - \cup - \cup \cup - - //$), whether it is analysed as a cho. dim. extended into pendant close, or as a modified pherecratean (as would be expected after a run of glyconics), strongly echoes the clausulae of that Song (109 = 126 $- - - \cup \cup - - //$, 140 = 154 $- - \cup \cup - - //$). But at the same time, it begins the movement away from the pure aeolics of the first half, towards the alternating dactylic and iambic

elements that will prevail in the rest of this (and all of the next) strophic pair.

The articulation of the second half is equally clear, and the rhythm continues to be predominantly light and free-flowing: a string (four metra) of iambs, all with short anceps, is followed by a string (again a multiple of four) of lyric dactyls. At the point of transition (338-9 = 349-50), the heavy pendant rhythm of the iambic close (esp. in the strophe, with punctuation after Γᾶν) suggests nature's resistance to human efforts, which is then quickly overcome in the swift dactyls that follow (338-41n.), but recurs in the final colon (341 = 352). This clausular cap could be taken either as iambic (resuming the rhythm of 337-8 = 347-8, but with initial 'spondaic' syncope, cf. Dale 1968: 84-5, Pohlsander 1964: 7, 210), or as contracted aeolic ($-\ddot{\text{z}}-\cup-\cup--$, i.e. a pendant form of the opening colon, 332 = 342 $-\cup\cup-\cup-\cup-$): the prosody of ἰππείῳ and οὐρείῳ might even allow for ambiguity between the two. The overall pattern (iambs, dactylic string, pendant iambic clausula) is common in S.; cf. 879, and e.g. *El.* 153-63 = 185-92, *OC* 539-41 = 546-8, Dale 1968: 39.

Strophe and antistrophe β

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------------|
| 353 | καὶ φθεγμά και ἀνεμοεν | × D |
| 365 | σοφον τι το μηχανοεν | |
| 354 | φρονημα και αστυνομους | × D' |
| 366 | τεχνας ὑπερ ἐλπιδ' ἔχων | |
| 355 | ὄργας ἐδιδασατο, και δυσσαλων | <u>UU</u> D × e _Λ // |
| 367 | τοτε μεν κακον, ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἐσθλον ἐρπει. | |
| 357 | παγων ὑπαιθρεια και | × e e |
| 368 | νομους γεραιρων χθονος | |
| 359 | δυσομβρα φευγειν βελη, | × e e |
| 369 | θεων τ' ἐνορκον δικαν | |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------|
| 360 | $\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\text{:}$ $\bar{\text{ἀ}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ς}}$ $\bar{\text{ἐ}}\bar{\text{π}}\text{'}$ $\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ὐ}}\bar{\text{δ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ $\bar{\text{ἐ}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{χ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}$ | $e \times e \times e$ |
| 370 | $\bar{\text{ὕ}}\bar{\text{ψ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ς}}\text{:}$ $\bar{\text{ἀ}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ς}}$ $\bar{\text{ὅ}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ω}}\bar{\text{ι}}$ $\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ο}}$ $\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{η}}$ $\bar{\text{κ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ | |
| 361 | $\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ο}}$ $\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}\text{:}$ $\bar{\text{Ἄ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{δ}}\bar{\text{α}}$ $\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ | $\times e e$ |
| 371 | $\bar{\text{ξ}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ι}}$ $\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ς}}$ $\bar{\text{χ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ν}}\text{.}$ | |
| 362 | $\bar{\text{φ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{ξ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ $\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ὐ}}\bar{\text{κ}}$ $\bar{\text{ἐ}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ξ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}$, | $e \times e$ |
| 372 | $\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{η}}\bar{\text{τ}}\text{'}$ $\bar{\text{ἐ}}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ι}}$ $\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ς}}$ | |
| 363 | $\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{ω}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ $\bar{\text{δ}}\text{'}$ $\bar{\text{ἀ}}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{η}}\bar{\text{χ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ω}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ $\bar{\text{φ}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{γ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ς}}$ | $\times e \times e$ |
| 374 | $\bar{\text{γ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ο}}$ $\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{η}}\bar{\text{τ}}\text{'}$ $\bar{\text{ἴ}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ $\bar{\text{φ}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ω}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ | |
| 364 | $\bar{\text{ξ}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{φ}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}$. | $e \times //$ |
| 375 | $\bar{\text{ὅ}}\bar{\text{ς}}$ $\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{δ}}\text{'}$ $\bar{\text{ἐ}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{δ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ι}}$. | |

The metre could be categorized as ‘dactylo-epitrite’, as it is easily described in ‘D × e’ notation; but it might better be regarded as ‘prosodiac-enoplian’, for the dactylic (D) and epitritic (e = iambic) elements are less integrated with one another than is usual for true dac.-ep. (cf. West 1982: 132–6, Dale 1968: 162, 180–4). Thus the first period (353–5 = 365–7) is predominately ‘dactylic’ (i.e. deploys largely the expanded choriamb, or ‘hemiepes’, –υυ–υυ–, plus anceps; but no cretics), whereas the rest is entirely cretic/iambic, and contains no double-shorts at all (apart from the scurrying resolutions of 360 = 370). In the clausula to the first period (355 = 367), the resolution of $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon \mu\epsilon\nu \dots \tau\omicron \delta\rho\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ confirms that this is a ‘rising’ acolic colon of the expanded ‘aristophanean’ type (in effect, ‘Alcaic decasyllable’ preceded by one long syll.; cf. 585 = 596), rather than dac.-ep., since resolution of anceps in dac. ep. is very rare.

In the iambic portion, we twice have a movement from syncopated dimeters, to a faster, less syncopated element (360 = 370, 363 = 373), and back to a heavier, syncopated clausula (361 = 371, 364 = 375). The final element of all (–υ–υ–), although analysable as a ‘trochaic’ metron, maintains the cretic/iambic character (Dale 1968: 95–6), while reasserting the pendant tendency of the first strophic pair (cf. 341 = 351).

Particularly striking are the strong punctuation and resolutions in

360 = 370 (see 355–60n.), which provide a climactic effect, of build-up and release, followed by renewed, unresolved tension. Overall, in both strophe and antistrophe the words accompanied by iambic rhythms are generally darker in mood than those of the dactylic portions.

332 *πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ . . .*: a brief example of *priamel*, a common rhetorical device for focusing attention on the intended object of praise or blame (here, ἄνθρωπος) by briefly considering and rejecting others first (e.g. Sappho fr. 16, Pindar, *O.* 1.1ff.). The opening words recall those of A. *Cho.* 585ff. *πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ τρέφει δεινὰ . . .*, which likewise ends up focusing on ἄνδρὸς φρόνημα (594): there the associations of δεινὰ are almost entirely sinister; but here it soon becomes obvious that the epithet has been chosen precisely because of its multivalence ('terrible', 'awe-inspiring', 'wonderful', 'strange', 'clever', 'extraordinary'). These first two lines thus open up for 'humankind' an almost infinite range of possibilities.

ἀνθρώπου: cf. 347 ἄνθρω with n., and contrast 278–9.

334 *τοῦτο*: i.e. ἄνθρωπος, cf. 296 τοῦτο after 295 ἄργυρος. The pronoun seems to be attracted into the neuter by the adjacent neuter predicate noun (here, sc. τὸ δεινόν, cf. 295 νόμισμα).

334–41 The list of human achievements begins with a 'polar' or 'universalizing' doublet: sea and land (Bundy 1961: 24–5; cf. 39–40, 785–6, 951–4nn.). What is emphasized is not, as often, the initial invention of ships and ploughs, but the daring and perseverance that continue to drive people to defy natural limits. Both elements present challenges; but sea-faring is esp. appropriate to set the tone for the whole ode, given its notoriously ambiguous status, as a positive symbol of adventure and technical mastery, but also a negative one of temerity, violation of boundaries, and unnatural greed (Horace, *Odes* 1.3.9ff. with Nisbet and Hubbard's nn.). To the Athenians of the 440s, heavily dependent on imported grain, victors of Salamis, and rulers of the Aegean through the Delian League, triremes and trade were indispensable sources of power and prosperity; but none the less, at least among the upper classes, and in the rest of mainland Greece, farming, hunting, hoplite and cavalry warfare, and landed wealth continued to be more highly respected.

335 νότωι: dat. of agent, cf. 586–9, Hom. *Od.* 14.253 ἐπλέομεν Βορέηι ἀνέμωι. The stormy south wind blows in the winter, when sailing is most hazardous (Hes. *WD* 675–7).

336–7 περιβρυχίοισιν | ... ὑπ' οἴδμασιν 'proceeding beneath billows that engulf <them> all around', cf. LSJ *s.v.* βρύχιος, ὑπόβρυχα, ὑποβρύχιος. The alliteration of initial π- (and χ-) in 334–7 is striking; then τ/θ in 338–9.

338–41 ὑπερτάταν 'most august', because 'oldest'; cf. Plato, *Tim.* 40c γῆν ... πρώτην καὶ πρεσβυτάτην θεῶν, Solon fr. 4a.2 West.

Γᾶν | ἄφθιτον, ἀκαμάταν ἀποτρύεται: oxymoron, with a slightly sinister flavour, perhaps enhanced by the heavy rhythm and punctuation (see n. on *Metre*). Though the earth is 'inexhaustible and untiring', mankind still 'rubs her away', 'wears her out <to his own advantage>' (middle), as if she surrenders only grudgingly (cf. Hes. *WD* 42–6). For the rare (but metrically convenient) fem. ending of ἀκαμάταν, usually two-termination, cf. *El.* 1239 ἀδμήταν, A. *Cho.* 619. For the initial lengthening (ἄκαμ-), convenient in dactylic/anapaestic contexts, cf. epic ἄθάνατος κτλ., and 837 ἰσοθείος.

ἰλλομένων ἀρότρων ἔτος εἰς ἔτος 'as the ploughs ply up and down (or 'circle round'; cf. LSJ *s.v.* εἴλω c), year after year', an adaptation of Homeric περιτιλλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν ('as the seasons wheel round'). For ἔτος εἰς ἔτος, cf. A. *Prom.* 682 γῆν πρὸ γῆς, Hes. *Th.* 742, Blaydes on Ar. *Ach.* 235. The quick, steady dactylic rhythm of 339–40 reinforces the sense of regularity.

ἵππειωι γένει: probably periphrasis for the less dignified 'mules' (ἡμίονοις; cf. Simonides fr. 515 *apud* Ar. *Rhet.* 3 2.14.1405b). Horses were rarely used for ploughing.

πολεύων: here transitive, the regular term for 'turning over' the soil; cf. Hes. *WD* 462 ἔαρι πολεῖν, with West's n. More strictly correct would be the neuter, πολεῦον; but the switch to the masc. is not uncommon (and cf. 343 ἀμφιβαλῶν). The two forms would in any case have been written identically by S. in the old Attic script.

342–7 Birds, wild beasts, fish are caught (for food) in mankind's cunning nets.

κουφονόων ('unthinking') goes primarily with ὀρνίθων (cf. 617, and Theognis 580 ὀρνιθος κούφον ἔχουσα νόον), but applies implicitly to all three classes of creature, in contrast to 347 περιφραδῆς ἀνήρ.

ἀμφιβαλὼν ἄγει | ... | σπείραισι δικτυοκλώστοις are to be taken together, with φύλον, ἔθνη, φύσιν objects of both verbs. The elaborate, even pleonastic, periphrases are typical of high choral lyric. ἄγει = ‘carries off’, ‘takes’; cf. 877 ἄγομαι, and the common idiom ἄγειν καὶ φέρειν.

347 περιφραδῆς ἀνὴρ: ‘cunning’/‘careful’/‘skilful’ would all fit here (cf. 364 ξυμπέφρασται); the περι- prefix may be intensive (‘very’) or may denote ‘on every side’ (cf. περιφράζομαι). The delayed subject gains emphasis (cf. 360 παντοπόρος with n.), further enhanced by the mid-colon punctuation. For ἀνὴρ, shifting unobtrusively from ἀνθρώπου (333), cf. 221–2, 248, 290nn.

347–52 The higher animals, horses and oxen (and sheep and goats?), are domesticated and harnessed for mankind’s use. κρατεῖ (347) presents a more politically charged image of ‘control’, ‘domination’ over nature than ‘passing through’ (336–7 χωρεῖ, περῶν) or ‘wearing out’ (339 ἀποτρύεται) or ‘capturing’ (343 ἄγει); cf. Kreon at 173, 485, 679–80; also 61–4. In 347–50, it is hard to determine what kind of animal(s) is meant by θηρὸς ὀρεσσιβάτα, and whether this is a separate category from that of horse and bull in 351–2: ἄγραυλος and ὀρεσσιβάτης may be applied to almost any semi-domesticated animal, including cattle (cf. 352 οὔρειον), pigs (cf. Pindar fr. 313 ὀρείκτιτος), and horses (cf. Strabo 3.4.15 ὀρειβατεῖν). Sheep and goats might seem the most obvious candidates (cf. Plato, *Laws* 677b, *OT* 1100, Hom. *Od.* 9.155 αἴγες ὀρεσκῶιοι, Hes. *Shield* 407): but this would entail taking μηχαναῖς as ‘fences’, ‘pens’ etc. – rather feeble as examples of human ‘mastery’ (unless we think too of shears, gelding-irons, milk-pails?). ‘Harnesses’ (yoke, reins, bit, etc.) used to ‘control’ oxen and horses suit the normal sense of μηχανή much better. So, rather than taking θ’ in 350 as linking separate statements (‘he masters animal *x* and harnesses animals *y* and *z*’), we should probably regard it as explanatory (‘he masters the wild animals, *i.e.* harnesses horse and bull’; cf. 355 καί and Smyth §§2968, 2869a). In 351, the MSS offer ἄξεται, ἔξεται, ἄξεται, or ἔξεται, none of which scans or makes sense: we need a past or present tense (‘has put under’ or ‘puts under’) scanning ◡–◡◡. The scholiast’s gloss is ὑπάγει (cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.148 ὑπαγε ζύγον ὠκέας ἵππους, 23.291, etc., Sappho fr. 44.17), so we might read ὑπηγάγετο (or ὑπήγαγεν, or possibly ὑπήγαγ’ ἔς, Blaydes), perhaps with Doric α (ὑπάγ-).

Another possibility is ἵππων ὀχμάζεται ἀμφὶ λόφον ζύγωι, with the final -ωι shortened by correption (Schöne and Franz, accepted by Dawe, Brown, LJ&W).

353–64 By learning language, reasoning, city-planning and house-building, and medicine, mankind has devised ‘refuge’ from the elements and from disease – from everything except death itself. The stanza dwells on human resourcefulness in finding a ‘way out’ or ‘escape’ from inanimate threats (360 παντοπόρος, ἄπορος; 359 φεύγειν, 362 φεῦξι, 363 φυγᾶς). The ‘impulse to organize cities’ (ἄστυνόμοι ὄργαι) develops after technical mastery of the natural world is complete (cf. 332–75n., and Aristot. *Pol.* 1.2.12, 6.8.4 on ἄστυνομία). Usually the invention of language is listed at an earlier stage (e.g. E. *Supp.* 201–13, Guthrie 1971: 61–2; cf. 332–75n.).

353–4 ἀνεμόεν | φρόνημα ‘thought as quick as the wind’, cf. Hom. *Il.* 15.80–3 (νόος), *Od.* 7.36 (νόημα), and esp. A. *Cho.* 593 ἀνεμόεντα ... κότον (332n.). So φρόνημα here = νοῦς (contrast 458–60n.).

355 ὄργας ‘impulses’, ‘disposition’. Although ὄργαι are usually innate (as e.g. *Aj.* 639 συντρόφοις ὄργαις, A. *Supp.* 763), the idea that people might acquire, even ‘learn’ different ‘dispositions’ is not uncommon: E. *Tro.* 53 ὄργας ἠπίους, Semonides fr. 7.11 ὄργῆν ἄλλοτε ἄλλοιῆν ἔχει, Theognis 214; cf. too 875.

ἐδιδάξατο ‘he taught himself’ (or ‘they taught one another’), a rare use of the middle as reflexive (cf. *Aj.* 1376 ἀγγέλλομαι ... εἶναι φίλος = ‘I announce myself ...’, Campbell 52, Smyth §1717).

355–60 After the three acc. objects of 353–5, the construction switches to infin. (φεύγειν): ‘... <and he taught himself> how to escape ...’

ὑπαίθρεια or ἐναίθρεια is the most likely correction of the MS αἴθρια (to restore correspondence with 368; see n. on *Metre*). It is probably best taken as a noun: (lit.) ‘to escape the open air of uncomfortable frosts and the harshly-raining shafts’. The alternative, adj. agreeing with βέλη, is awkward: ‘to escape the open-air <shafts> of frost and the rainy shafts’. (What are ‘shafts of frost’?) For the whole phrase, cf. A. *Ag.* 335–6 τῶν ὑπαιθρίων πάγων | δρόσων τ’ ἀπαλλαχθέντες (and cf. *Ag.* 555 δυσουλίας); also S. fr. 96 Radt.

παντοπόρος· ἄπορος ...: παντοπόρος = εὔπορος (see LSJ *s.v.* II.2), summing up all of 353–9, while alliteration, *homoioteleuton*, asyn-

deton, punctuation and resolutions combine to emphasize this pivotal antithesis (echoed in 370 ὑψίπολις· ἄπολις . . . , cf. n. on *Metre*).

360–I οὐδὲν . . . | τὸ μέλλον ‘nothing that might occur’ (i.e. the opposite of πᾶν τὸ μέλλον); more normal would be οὐδὲν τῶν μελλόντων.

361–4 Ἄϊδα μόνον . . .: the blunt (asyndetic) reminder of mankind’s one inescapable limitation is quickly mitigated by the bold claim that ‘(previously) irresistible diseases’ *can* be escaped. Thus medicine, as the art that comes closest to bringing immortality, represents the apex of the list (as at A. *Prom.* 477–83 . . . πόρους ἐμησάμην | τὸ μὲν μέγιστον . . . τὰς ἀπάσας ἐξαμύνονται νόσους).

ἐπάξεται ‘will procure’ (LSJ *s.v.* ἐπάγω II.I).

365–7 Lit. ‘Having this resourceful (quality) of invention (as) something clever beyond expectation, (he) proceeds sometimes (to) harm (or ‘evil,’ cf. 370), other times to good.’

τὸ μηχανόεν | τέχνας: an almost Thucydidean abstraction (e.g. 1.90 τὸ . . . ὑποπτον τῆς γνώμης), cf. J. S. Rusten, *Thuc. Book II* (Cambridge 1989) 22–3. For τέχνας in this context, cf. Plato, *Prot.* 321c τὴν ἐντεχνον σοφίαν, A. *Prom.* 506 with Griffith’s n.; also 494 τεχνωμένων.

τοτέ μὲν . . . ἄλλοτ’: variation for ἄλλοτε μὲν . . . ἄλλοτε δὲ . . . , or τοτέ μὲν . . . τοτέ δὲ . . . ; cf. *El.* 739 τότ’ ἄλλος, ἄλλοθ’ ἄτερος . . . (The MS variant ποτέ would also be possible. For the respiration, ποτέ μὲν / ὄργᾶς (355), see n. on *Metre*.)

ἐπ’ goes (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ) with κακόν as well as ἐσθλόν (257–8n.).

368–71 Hitherto, ‘mankind’ (333 ἀνθρωπος, 347 ἀνὴρ) has been the single, unified subject of every verb. With τοτέ . . . ἄλλοτ’, it was suggested that ‘sometimes’ this subject acts one way, ‘sometimes’ another; but now the existence of two distinct kinds of people, or individuals, is implied (370 ὄτωι, 375 ὄς).

γεραίρων is the most likely correction of the MS παρείρων (‘interweaving . . .’, vainly defended by Campbell, LJ&W 1990: 124). The Elders assume that the (human) ‘laws of the land’ and the ‘justice of the gods’ go hand in hand (cf. 304–5n., contrast 450–60).

ὑψίπολις· ἄπολις: (cf. 360 παντοπόρος· ἄπορος with n.) We may understand both (i) ‘. . . his city is high; but his city is nothing, if . . .’ (cf. Pind. *P.* 8.2 μεγιστόπολις, LSJ *s.v.* ἄπολις III), and (ii) ‘He is high in his city; but he is outcast if . . .’ (cf. *OT* 510 ἡδύπολις, LSJ *s.v.*

ἄπολις ἱ). Like Kreon, the Elders see the interests of citizen, ruler and *polis* as identical (191n.).

370–5 At last comes the more specific and personal application (372 ἐμοί) of the ode's general message. Someone has committed an act of 'daring' (τόλμας, cf. 248 ὁ τολμήσας, and 278–9), which may endanger the whole city: so the Chorus pray never themselves to associate with the 'perpetrator of these deeds'.

μήτ' . . . παρέστιος | . . . μήτ' ἴσον φρονῶν: i.e. sharing neither domestic nor political association; cf. *OT* 249 ξυνέστιος, and *Hdt.* 1.60 τὸ αὐτὸ φρονήσαντες ('making common cause'). Less likely, 'May he never think like me' = 'May I never think like him', cf. *Hom. Il.* 15.50 ἴσον ἐμοὶ φρονέουσα (so Jebb).

ὃς τὰδ' ἔρδει: most naturally taken as 'he who who is doing these things' (i.e. the defier of Kreon's edict; cf. 252 ὁ ἐργάτης), though the phrase could be equivalent to ὅστις ἂν τοιάδε ἔρδηι (like the MS variant ἔρδοι).

376–581 Scene Three (Second *Epeisodion*)

There are three phases to this Scene, but the transitions between them are smooth and seamless (441–9n.). In the first (376–445), the Guard returns with Ant. under escort, and describes to Kreon how she was caught re-burying the corpse. When Kreon questions her, Ant. acknowledges responsibility, and the Guard departs. In the second phase (446–525), Kreon and Ant. argue about the rights and wrongs of honouring Pol.'s corpse: neither gives way, and Kreon becomes even angrier, going on to accuse Ismene of complicity in the burial and threatening to execute her too. In the third phase (526–81), Ismene is brought in, and a three-way dialogue ensues, with Ismene insisting that she did participate in the burial, but Ant. rejecting her claim. As the scene closes, Ismene tries unsuccessfully to dissuade Kreon from executing Ant., by appealing to the prospect of his son's marriage to her.

376–440 In previous scenes we have seen Ant. and Kreon state their principles and intentions, and we are by now fully prepared to witness the confrontation between them. But after Ant. is led in, suspense for the *agōn* ('formal debate', *Introd.* §3) between them is further increased, as Ant. stands silently by (441n.) while the Guard

delivers his long *rhēsis* narrating her capture. This speech vividly portrays Ant.'s devotion to her brother's body, while also deepening the sense of mystery surrounding the burial, as we hear of the sudden dust-storm that allowed her to escape the notice of the guards. Critics have puzzled (though audiences generally have not) as to why Ant. returned to Pol.'s body, and, if she was planning to re-bury it (as her carrying of a pitcher implies, 430), why she was so surprised to find the corpse uncovered (423–8). (Of course, if the first burial was the gods' doing, and did not involve Ant. at all, this would actually be her first visit to the corpse (M. H. McCall, *YCS* 22 (1972) 107–11); but see 223–331, 278–9, 435nn.). Some have argued that, by uncovering the corpse (409–10), Kreon's guards have indeed negated the earlier burial rites, so that Ant. is impelled by religious obligation to repeat them: but the Guard's earlier account explicitly stated that 'due burial' was completed (246–7 θάψας . . . ἄ χροή, cf. 256). Others see the two burials as working on different levels, the first symbolically satisfying divine law, while the second represents Ant.'s human expression of devotion to her brother (G. Held, *Hermes* 111 (1983) 190–201). Or, in a cruder interpretation, S. has included two burials for purely 'dramatic' reasons: so that first Kreon can react to the (successfully completed) secret burial, and then Ant. can be caught in the act (Wilamowitz 1917: 33–4).

However, it seems unnecessarily pedantic thus to analyse Ant.'s (or S.'s) motives, esp. since the two burials are surrounded with mysterious ambiguities that subtly thwart rational explanation. In purely human terms, there is nothing surprising about Ant.'s returning to the corpse to pay further respects, or about her distress at seeing it lying exposed again (423–8n.). Yet the possibility of divine intervention is again left open: 'The second burial is as uncanny as the first. Ant. is hidden from the guards by the whirlwind of dust until she is already beside the body . . . This is an implicit miracle – just natural enough to explain Kreon's failure to see the gods at work. And if Ant. is aided by miraculous help here, we may suspect she had it earlier' (Scodel 1984: 55–6; cf. 256, 278–9nn.).

376–83 The choral anapaests abruptly announce an unexpected 'apparition' (τέρας): Ant. is being led in (up the same *eisodos* used for her exit at 97: Introd. §4) under an armed escort – headed by the familiar figure of the Guard. The *koryphaios* greets her with amazement

(πῶς . . . , τί ποτ' . . . , οὐ δὴ που . . . ;), tinged with pity (379–80) and unconcealed disapproval (381 ἀπιστοῦσαν, 383 ἀφροσύνη). Can *this* really be the bold and lawless criminal of whom they have just been singing (370–5)? What are they (or we) to think (ἀμφινῶω) or say (πῶς . . . ἀντιλογῆσω . . . ;)? In performance it could be made clear whether their address to Ant. is a genuine greeting, or a self-contained *apostrophē*, the questions merely rhetorical and ‘apistetic’ (‘I can hardly believe . . .’, Mastronarde 1979: 12, 94). In any case, they receive no response from her (384–5, 441nn.).

376–8 ἐς ‘in the face of’, cf. *Tr.* 1243 ἀπορεῖν ἐς πολλά, *OT* 980.

τόδε ‘here’ (deictic). Postponed thus, and followed by punctuation and asyndeton, it gives an unsettled rhythm, emphasizing the Chorus’ consternation. It is probably a mistake to smooth this out, e.g. by punctuating before τόδε rather than after, or adopting εἰ for ἐς and inserting <δ’> after πῶς (with Reiske, LJ&W).

ἀντιλογῆσω: probably aorist subj. (deliberative), though fut. indic. is possible: ‘How, when I know that this is Ant., can I maintain that it is not?’

381 οὐ δὴ που introduces ‘a surprised or incredulous question’ (*GP* 223.ii, 267.iii); here followed by emphatic σέ γε = ‘Surely it can’t really be *you* . . . ?’

ἀπιστοῦσαν: cf. 219, 656. The present (= ‘imperfect’) tense denotes a continuing attitude, while her particular act of disobedience is specified by the aorist καθελόντες (383).

382 The one-syllable overlap of the anapaestic metron (τοῖς βασιλείοισιν ἀγούσι νόμοις) is unusual for S. (elsewhere only at 141 ἐπτά λοχᾶγοὶ γάρ, and *OC* 1771; see Parker, *CQ* 8 (1958) 82–9); so some read βασιλείοις ἀνάγουσι or ἀπάγουσι. (ἀπάγω is often used of ‘arresting’ a criminal, but usually with the force of ‘taking him away’, which is out of place here; cf. 435n.)

383 ἀφροσύνη: cf. 49, 95, 220nn., and 562, 603; *Intro.* §5(d)(iii).

384–5 ἦδ' . . . | τήνδ': emphatically deictic, ‘Here she is . . . ! This is the one . . . !’ (cf. 377 τόδε, 386 δεῖ). With no formalities (contrast 223–36), the Guard blurts out his news, and himself supplies the answer to the Chorus’ questions (376–83n.). Only then (ἀλλά) does he pause abruptly to note that Kreon is not present to hear it.

386–7 ἐς δέον . . . ποῖαι . . . τύχηι: by dramatic convention, the

King returns ‘just at the right moment’, cf. 1180–2, *OT* 1416. The MS variant ἐς μέσον (‘in public’) fits less well with 387.

388–400 Another half-comic moment from the Guard (cf. 223–36n.), as he trots out seven lines (388–94) of self-important truisms to explain his re-arrival: four more lines (396–7, 399–400) on his own good fortune, and just three lines (395–6, 398–9) about the capture of Ant. (See again 437–40, Mastronarde 1979: 37.)

388 οὐδέν ἐστ’ ἀπώμοτον ‘There is nothing that you could swear would never happen’ (cf. 329–31), echoing the proverbial χρημάτων ἀελλπτόν οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ’ ἀπώμοτον (Archil. fr. 122.1 West; cf. 394 ἀπώμοτος).

389 ‘Second thoughts make a lie of intentions.’ ἐπίνοια apparently here = ‘after-thought’, as in ‘Epimetheus’ (and perhaps A. *Supp.* 1043; Griffith, *Phoenix* 40 (1986) 339). But usually it means much the same as γνώμη (Coray 1993: 202), and this may be another example of the Guard’s over-inflated manner. (For the *aphaeresis*, cf. 83n.)

389–91 ‘I was insisting that I should not be here again at all soon, by reason of your threats just now’, referring to 329–31 (cf. 394). For σχολῆι ποτε, cf. 231n., and LSJ *s.v.* β.2. For (emphatic) ἄν + future indic./infin., see *GMT* §197, 208, 216, and e.g. Plato, *Rep.* 615d, Thuc. 2.80.1 ῥαιδίως ἄν ... κρατήσουσι and 2.80.8, with Rusten’s nn., Moorhouse 1982: 216–17. For the dative (ἀπειλαίς), cf. 690–1n.

ἐχειμάσθην: a common image, esp. in tragedy and medical writers; cf. *Ph.* 1460, A. *Prom.* 563, 838, van Nes 1963: 22–5.

392–4 ἀλλ’ ... γὰρ ... | ἦκω: see *GP* 98–9, and 148–9n., 155. Lit. ‘But – since joy that is outside, and contrary to, all expectation is in no way like any other pleasure in its extent – I have come back!’ (οὐδέν adverbial, μήκος internal acc. of ‘respect’ or ‘extent’.)

ἐκτός: sc. ἐλπίδος, cf. 330. The zeugma of ἐκτός (+ gen.) καὶ παρ’ (+ acc. ἐλπίδας) is harsh and somewhat pleonastic, and no near parallel has been adduced (K–G II §450.h, 444.b); perhaps it should be taken as an expansion of παρέξ, as in Homeric παρέκ νόον. If emendation is preferred, Bothe’s εὐκτός is neat (‘wished-for even against expectation’, cf. LJ&W 1990: 125), though normally the *event*, not the ‘joy’, would be expressly ‘wished-for’.

395-6 τάφον | κοσμοῦσα 'paying due burial-rites', cf. 490, 901, 203-4n.

κλῆρος ἐνθάδ' οὐκ ἐπάλλετο 'This time there was no casting of lots ...' (cf. 233-4, 274-5), with 'explanatory' asyndeton (72n.).

397 θοῦρμαιον (= τὸ ἐρμαῖον) 'this piece of luck' (the earliest occurrence of this expression). Several guards together caught Ant. (385, 432-5), and several are presumably escorting her now (382 ἄγουσι). But he alone will deliver the good news (contrast 228-30, 272-7). He may hope for material reward too (cf. *Tr.* 190-1, *OT* 1005-6).

399 κρῖνε = ἀνάκρινε, as often in S. (e.g. *Aj.* 586 μὴ κρῖνε, μὴ ἔξεταζε, *Tr.* 195, and LSJ *s.v.* III).

399-400 'As for me, I am entitled to be released <so as to be> free from these troubles.' This personal usage of δίκαιος (cf. ἄξιός εἰμι), common in prose and Aristoph., is not exactly paralleled in tragedy (but cf. A. *Eum.* 55-6); it may be colloquial (Stevens 1945).

401-6 In a brief stichomythia, Kreon insistently demands a fuller account (401 τῶι [= τίνι] τρόπῳ πόθεν, 403 ἦ καὶ ... καὶ ..., 406 καὶ πῶς ...), while the Guard responds matter-of-factly (402 πάντ' ἐπίστασαι, 405 ἄρ' ἐνδηλα ... λέγω;) before finally obliging him (407ff.).

403 'Do you really (ἦ καὶ, cf. 752, *GP* 285.iii.5.ii; also 90n.) understand what you are saying, and are you saying it right?' Kreon is incredulous (cf. 376-8).

404-5 'Yes (γε, *GP* 133.v) <I am saying that> I saw her burying the body that you forbade <to be buried>.'

406 ὁρᾶται ... ἠιρέθη: the alternation of historic present and aorist is not unusual (cf. 419-20, and *Aj.* 31, *Tr.* 359ff.).

κάπιληπτος 'caught in the act' (in prose = ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ).

407-40 The Guard launches into his long *rhēsis* (virtually a 'messenger-speech'), describing the vigil over the corpse, Ant.'s stealthy attempt at re-burial, and her arrest. The account is vivid and quick-moving, with occasional Homerisms (415-22n., parataxis 423-4n.) interspersed with some 'low' touches (409-12n., 437-40n.); but it also reveals unexpected sensitivity and sympathy in its description of Ant. (423-8, 427-8, 437-40nn.). The Guard is a small and self-centred figure; but his actions and reactions become curiously compelling and authoritative (cf. the Messenger in E. *Ba.* 660-774).

407 The rhythm, with halting mid-line quasi-caesura and punctuation, emphasizes the artificiality of the introductory remark: ‘Well then, this is the full story . . .’ (cf. 76–7, 722–3nn.). Then follow three elaborate, enjambed periods, as the narrative builds up (407–21) to the moment of Ant.’s appearance (423).

409–12 The rotting corpse, so disturbing a spectacle for others (29–30, 205–6, 1016–22), to the Guard is merely a practical concern – where to sit to avoid the smell: another ‘low’ detail.

μυδῶν: cf. A. *Eleusiniōi* fr. 53a Radt διεμύδαιν’ ἦδη νέκυς in a similar context (Introd. §2).

γυμνώσαντες εὖ: the tone is morally neutral, of a job ‘well done’. For the enjambment τὸν | νέκυον, cf. 238–9, *Ph.* 263, *El.* 879 (and 67–8n.).

411–12 The corpse is lying on a high part of the plain (1110, 1197–8); the Guards stationed themselves upwind, ‘<facing down> from the hill-top(s), out of the wind’. For this use of ἐκ, cf. E. *Pho.* 1009, *Tro.* 522, Moorhouse 1982: 108–9.

ὄσμῆν . . . μὴ βάλῃ: proleptic, lit. ‘avoiding the stench, lest it assail us’. The opt. would be normal (in historic sequence, cf. 414), but the more ‘vivid’ subj. is not unusual.

413–14 κινῶν ἄνδρ’ ἀνήρ: echoing 259–60; but here the apposition is syntactically easier.

ἐπιρρόθοις | κακοῖσιν ‘with noisy threats’ (cf. 259 λόγοι ἐρρόθουον κακοί, 290 ἐρρόθουον, and *Tr.* 263–4), followed by εἰ + fut. optative, in virtual indirect speech (‘we threatened one another . . . , if . . .’).

ἀφειδήσοι ‘disregard’, i.e. ‘neglect’, a usage otherwise confined to later authors (esp. Ap. Rhod.; cf. LSJ *s.v.* φείδομαι III, and Müller *ad loc.*); hence Bonitz’s ἀκηδήσοι is preferred by some editors.

415–22 The narrative build-up is heightened both by the conventional associations of ‘midday’ (when supernatural visitations are esp. likely to take place), and by the quasi-epic manner, seen in the paratactic construction (καί, δέ), with clear temporal markers (χρόνον . . . , ἔστ’ . . . , τότε, . . . χρόνῳ) and echoes of *Il.* 8.66–9 ὄφρα . . . | τόφρα . . . | ἦμος δ’ ἠέλιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει, | καὶ τότε δὴ . . . , etc. (cf. too *Il.* 11.84–5); also frequent tmesis (420n.), and see next n.

417–18 Lit. ‘A sudden whirlwind, raising from the ground a pillar of dust, a sky-high trouble, filled the plain <with it>.’ Uncontracted

forms of αἶρω/αἶρω are generally avoided in tragic dialogue; this may be another 'epic' touch (415-22n.). The rhythm (three resolutions in 418-20) underscores the storm's violence.

σκηπτόν: in prose, this would be a κονιορτός. Usually σκηπτός = 'thunderbolt', but it can be any 'shaft' or 'beam', travelling up, down, or across (cf. σκήπτω for the 'flashing' beacons at A. *Ag.* 302-10).

οὐράνιον: either 'up-to-the-sky' (cf. A. *Ag.* 92 οὐρανομήκης λαμπάς, *Pers.* 573 οὐράνια ἄχη, *Aj.* 196), or 'in the sky' (cf. *OC* 1466 οὐράνια ἀστραπή), rather than 'heaven-sent' (despite 421 θείαν).

420 ἐν δ' ἔμεστῶθη: tmesis for ἐνεμεστῶθη δέ, cf. *El.* 713 ἐν δὲ πᾶς ἔμεστῶθη δρόμος, and 427-8, 432-3, 978, 1107, 1233, 1274, Moorhouse 1982: 94.

421 'We closed our eyes and endured the divine visitation'. μύω can also have a proverbial sense, like our 'grit the teeth' (μύσαντα φέρειν, cf. Plato, *Gorg.* 480c6 παρέχειν μύσαντα εὖ καὶ ἀνδρείως).

θείαν νόσον '<that> awful plague' (metaphorical); but suggesting also 'divinely-sent', cf. 278-9 θεήλατον with n. (and 1015-22).

422 ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῶι 'after a long while'; for ἐν, cf. *OC* 88, *Ph.* 235, Mastronarde on E. *Pho.* 166.

423-8 It is natural for Ant. to return to pay further honours to the corpse (e.g., to heap more earth over it, and pour more libations), and natural for her to be distressed at finding her earlier burial undone, for the uncovering of the body amounts to renewed dishonour. So the 'double burial' is not as problematic as it has been made out to be (376-44on.). As the Guard describes how the dust settled and Ant. became visible, for a moment he forgets his self-concern, in presenting her reactions. First she is compared to a mother bird robbed of its nestlings (as grieving women often are, e.g. *Tr.* 105, *Aj.* 629 οἰκτρᾶς γόον ὄρνιθος ἀηδοῦς); but quickly a note of vengeful anger supervenes (427-8n., cf. A. *Ag.* 49-59).

423-4 κἀνακωκύει: cf. 28n., 1227, and A. *Pers.* 468. More normal syntax would be ὄραται ἀνακωκύουσα, but the 'epic' parataxis is more arresting (407-40n.); cf. 594 ὄρωμαι with n.

πικρᾶς | ὄρνιθος . . . ὤς: for the position of ὤς, cf. 113, 256, E. *Andr.* 538 (and next n.). πικρᾶς may suggest (i) 'shrill' (cf. *OC* 1610 φθόγγον . . . πικρόν, *Ph.* 190 πικραῖς οἰμωγαῖς), (ii) 'angry', 'hostile' (as usually, e.g. *Aj.* 1359, Solon fr. 13.5 West ἐχθροῖσι πικρόν; cf.

423-8n.), (iii) 'tormented' (Campbell: 'ἄτε πασχούσης πικρά', an unparalleled, but easily grasped, transferred use). If all this is too much for πικρᾶς to be doing, emendation is simple: either to πικρά (cf. A. *Pers.* 468 ἀνακωκύσας λιγύ, A. *Ag.* 48 μεγάλα κλάζοντες), or to πικρῶς (though this elsewhere = 'painfully').

ὧς, ὅταν . . .: this is the punctuation and accentuation of G. Wölff. The MSS have . . . φθόγγον, ὧς ὅταν . . .; but S. never uses the clumsy combination ὧς ὅταν (even clumsier with οὔτω . . . ὧς following in 426).

424-5 Either, 'She looks at the bed of her sleeping-place robbed of young' (εὐνής . . . λέχος pleonastic, cf. E. *Med.* 436, Hom. *Od.* 3.403, 23.179); or, as word-order suggests, 'with her sleeping-place empty she looks at the bedding deprived of young'.

426 οὔτω δέ: in the second half of a simile, 'apodotic' δέ is rare in tragedy; but cf. *Tr.* 112-7, *El.* 25-8 (*GP* 179-80).

427-8 ἐκ δ' ἄρᾶς . . . | ἡρᾶτο: tmesis (cf. 420n.). The imperf. denotes repeated cursing, while the aor. ἐξώιμωξεν is 'ingressive' ('burst into wails', cf. *Aj.* 347). The sequence of Ant.'s reactions is characteristic of her: first, shock and grief (423-7), then fury at 'those who performed the deed' (427-8 τοῖσι . . . ἐξειργασμένοις, ironically echoing 384; cf. 267, 273), then action (429-31).

429-31 Ant. repeats the 'burial', by sprinkling dust and pouring libations (cf. 246-58, 901-2). Thus the earlier mystery is explained (249-52, etc.): no tools or vehicle, just bare hands and a pitcher (πρόχοος) of water.

ἄρδην '<poured from> on high'.

χοαῖσι τρισπόνδοισι . . . στέφει: three is the usual number for libations. Here all three are of water, though rites for the dead might involve honey and wine too (Hom. *Od.* 10.519; see Burkert 1985: 70-3).

στέφει: probably (lit.) 'encircles', like a crown; or else, by extension, 'honours' (LSJ *s.v.* II.3); cf. *El.* 53 τύμβον λοιβαῖσι . . . στέφαντες, E. *Or.* 1321-2.

432-3 σὺν . . . θηρώμεθ': tmesis, cf. 420n., *El.* 746.

435 'Her stance (or 'attitude') was, to deny nothing', cf. *Aj.* 306 ἔμφρων . . . καθίσταται. This (typically tragic) circumlocution falls just short of explicitly asserting that she performed 'the former actions' (434); but 442-3 make that inference almost inescapable (cf.

278–9n.). In Athenian law, one caught ‘in the act’ (ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳι) and confessing guilt would be handed over (= ἀπαγωγή, cf. 382n.) without trial for summary execution (Harrison 1971: 2.221–3, Introd. §5(b) p. 30).

436 ἄμ’ . . . καὶ . . . ἄμα: equivalent to ἄμα μὲν . . . ἄμα δὲ . . . (cf. LSJ *s.v.* A.2). For the idiomatic adverbs (ἠδέως . . . ἀλγεινῶς), cf. 70 ἠδέως, 637–8.

437–40 The Guard rounds off his narrative with a jingly four-line tag (ἠδιστον | ἀλγεινόν, ἐκ κακῶν | ἐς κακόν), explaining the paradox of 436 and reiterating the concerns with which he began (388–91, cf. 236n.).

τοὺς φίλους: perhaps the Guard is an οἰκέτης of the royal household (cf. 578 δμῶες), so that Ant. is part of ‘his’ family, hence φίλος (cf. 9–10n.). But we may detect too a note of sympathy, even of affection.

πάντα ταῦθ’ κτλ. ‘all these <concerns> are less <important> for me to pursue (λαβεῖν epexegetic, cf. 216n. and 638) than my own survival’. Again, the Guard’s naïve relief at getting himself out of trouble, tempered with concern for Ant., contrasts with Ant.’s absolute commitment to her principles (327–31, 407–40nn.).

441–9 Kreon and Ant. are finally face to face (with the Guard hovering anxiously to the side). In a short stichomythia, Kreon challenges her to deny, or explain, her action; but Ant. merely restates, baldly, her full responsibility (cf. 434–5). The Guard is dismissed ‘free of blame’ (445), and the *agōn* is primed. These lines thus seamlessly join the two parts of the Scene (376–581n.), while also making explicit the irony of the Guard’s reversal of fortune, inversely linked to Ant.’s.

441 σέ δή, σέ τήν κτλ.: almost (sc. καλῶ), ‘Hey, you!’ For such ellipse, cf. E. *Hel.* 546 with Kannicht’s n., K–G I §412.1. Even without the ellipse, this manner of address is peremptory and harsh, cf. *Aj.* 1226–8 σέ δή . . . | σέ τοι, τὸν ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωτίδος λέγω, *El.* 1445–6, E. *Ba.* 913–5; also 531 σὺ δὲ . . .

νεύουσαν ἐς πέδον κάρα: presumably Ant.’s eyes have been fixed disdainfully on the ground ever since her entrance. She made no response to the Chorus’ address (376–83n.), and did not intervene in the dialogue between Kreon and the Guard. Conventional ‘contact’

between Kreon and Ant. is hard to establish, and quick to break down (473–96, 526–81, 572–6, 883–900n., Mastronarde 1979: 94–6).

442–3 The ‘polar’ expressions (‘say’/‘deny’) add formality and finality to this ‘open and shut’ case (435–6, 446–8; cf. 535, 806–16, 1192–3).

444–7 **σὺ μὲν . . . | σὺ δ’:** the Guard is cleared (ἐλεύθερον, cf. 399) and duly departs (giving the actor time to change into Ismene’s costume before 531; Introd. §4). Kreon can now focus all his suspicions and rage on Ant.

446 **μὴ μῆκος, ἀλλὰ συντόμως:** for the internal acc. (‘a lengthy speech’), cf. A. *Eum.* 201 τοσοῦτο μῆκος ἔκτεινον λόγου, *OC* 1139, and *Aj.* 1040, A. *Ag.* 916 μὴ τεῖνε μακράν. (The MS variants σύντομον or σύντομα would be just as good.) For the whole expression, cf. A. *Pers.* 698–9.

447 **ἤϊδησθα κηρυχθέντα** ‘Did you know it had been proclaimed . . .?’ This is the older Attic 2nd p. form, restored by Cobet, though Campbell defends the MS ἤϊδεις on the basis of Homeric ἠείδης (*Il.* 22.280). For the impersonal plural κηρυχθέντα, cf. 576 δεδογμένα (also 570, 677–8); the MS τὰ κηρυχθέντα (metrically necessary if ἤϊδεις is read) would be more specific (‘my decree’).

448 ‘Yes, I knew it. How could I not? It was plain to everyone.’ Kreon asked for a ‘short reply’, and he gets it. Ant.’s curt and choppy sentences suggest impatience and contempt (cf. 469–70n., 69–77n.).

449 **καὶ δῆτ’:** indignant, ‘And then, even so, you had the audacity . . .?’ (see *GP* 272–3).

τούσδ’ ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους: cf. 59–60n.; also 452–7, esp. 455 νόμιμα . . . ὑπερδραμεῖν.

450–70 After two one-line responses (443, 448), Ant. at last erupts, spurred by 449 ἐτόλμας (cf. 371). It was not ‘audacity’ that drove her to defy Kreon’s edict, but consciousness of the penalty for disregarding the gods’ statutes (458–60 τὴν δίκην δώσειν). This would truly have caused her ‘pain’ (ἄλγος, 466–8); but the death that Kreon threatens will bring her only ‘profit’ (κέρδος, 462–4).

This speech is one of the most famous in all Greek tragedy. With its forthright espousal of unwritten = divine = natural ‘laws’, as against written (or proclaimed) = human = civil legislation, it has

been quoted in support of countless acts of disobedience and rebellion against governments of all kinds. Since subsequent events and speeches appear to vindicate Ant. (esp. 1068–76, 1113–14, 1349–50 with nn.), this speech is often assumed to represent S.’s own views, his ‘message’ to the Athenians. Whether or not this is the case, the speech is firmly anchored to its context and to the particular character of Ant. It is largely a *negative* statement, a refusal rather than an affirmation, with nine negatives in 450–62, plus two alpha-privatives in 454; only 456–7 contain any strong statement of positive values (ἄει . . .), as Ant. insists that she acted out of ‘fear’, welcoming early death as the lesser of two ‘pains’ (465–8). Her concern is not to distinguish and define the limits of secular authority, nor to articulate a coherent set of religious or political principles (cf. 453–5n.), but simply to defend her deeply-felt conviction that her brother and the gods below *must* be honoured, come what may – and she seems to be driven also by a virulent antipathy to Kreon himself (458–9, 469–70; cf. 31, 31–2nn.).

The speech is tightly organized: an opening tricolon crescendo of negatives (with anaphora: 450 οὐ . . . τι . . ., 451–2 οὐδ’ . . ., 453–5 οὐδὲ . . .), acts as ‘foil’ to the (positive) gnomic statement (456–7), which explains Ant.’s particular act of disobedience (458–61: οὐκ ἔμελλον, ἐξήϊδη, προυκήρυξας, all echoing and ‘trumping’ the exchange of 447–8, while (οὐ) δείσασα responds to 449 ἐτόλμας). Then Ant. goes on to defend this action against possible criticisms (461–8), and concludes with a personal insult directed at Kreon (469–70). Polar oppositions throughout are emphatic, and reinforced by word-play and repetition: human vs divine; change vs permanence; pain vs profit; *you* vs *me* (453 τὰ σά, 461 σύ, 469 σοί; cf. 455 θνητόν, 458 ἀνδρός vs 450 μοι, 458, 462, 463 ἐγώ, 465 ἔμοιγε, 466 ἐμῆς).

450 οὐ . . . τί μοι ‘Certainly not, as far as I am concerned’ (sc. ‘whatever others like you may think’); μοι = ethic dative (cf. 453 ωτίμην, and 31–2 with n.). Yet the juxtaposition with Ζεύς may also suggest a closer relationship (‘announced to me’).

Ζεύς is the highest political authority; and, as Hades’ brother, he can also be χθόνιος (e.g., *OC* 1606); cf. 304–5n., 1039–41.

451–2 ἡ ξύνοικος τῶν κάτω θεῶν Δίκη: *Dikē* (Right, Justice, Law and Order) has no fixed parentage or habitation, though she is often described as daughter of Zeus, and as living on Olympos

(when not resident among mortals): e.g. *OC* 1382 Δίκη ξύνεδρος Ζηνός, Hes. *WD* 256–62. So Blaydes here proposed ἄνω for κάτω (cf. 1072–3 τοῖς ἄνω θεοῖσιν). But the gods below have ‘their own’ Justice too, which requires that the dead be buried and allowed to join them (cf. 75 τοῖς κάτω, 1070–1; also 458–60, 538–9, 542–3nn.). *Dikē* is also frequently invoked as the ally of the chthonic Erinys (e.g. *Aj.* 1390, A. *Eum.* 510–11; cf. 1103–4). For the gen., rather than dat., with ξύνοικος, cf. *OC* 1382 (quoted above).

τοιούσδ’ . . . ὥρισεν νόμους: answering 449 τούσδε . . . νόμους. The MSS have οἱ τούσδ’ . . . ὥρισαν νόμους; but this would entail taking τούσδε as meaning ‘these laws of mine’ (i.e. different ‘laws’ from those of 449, and 450 τάδε). (Better would be Wieseler’s οὐ τούσδε . . . ὥρισαν, with punctuation after 451 and asyndeton.) τοιούσδε . . . ὥρισεν is an easy correction, and gives far better rhetoric and sense.

453–5 The third and longest limb of the tricolon (οὐ . . . Ζεὺς, . . . οὐδ’ . . . Δίκη, οὐδὲ . . . τὰ σά . . .), with σθένειν, ὑπερδραμεῖν injecting a note of personal challenge which Kreon does not miss (484–5n.).

ἄγραπτα . . . θεῶν | νόμιμα: as opposed to human νόμοι or ψηφίσματα or κηρύγματα, which are normally written down, and always subject to cancellation. This is the earliest extant mention of ‘unwritten laws’, which by the late fifth and early fourth century are frequently invoked in appeals to universal codes of morality, as against the letter of a particular statute (e.g., Thuc. 2.37.3, Lysias 6.10–11, Xen. *Mem.* 4.4.19–20). Aristotle’s analysis is helpful: ‘Speaking of “law”, there are two kinds, particular (ἴδιον) and universal (κοινόν). Particular law is defined by each group of people with regard to themselves, and is subdivided into unwritten and written (ἄγραφον, γεγραμμένον); but the “universal” kind exists by nature (φύσει). For there is, as everyone senses, a natural and universal justice and injustice (φύσει κοινὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἄδικον), even if there is no community or formal agreement among the people concerned. That is what Antigone obviously means when she says that it was “just”, even though forbidden, to bury Pol., since this is naturally just (δίκαιον ἀπειρημένον θάψαι τὸν Π., ὡς φύσει ὄν τοῦτο δίκαιον). [Here Ar. quotes *Ant.* 456–7. A little further on, he remarks:] . . . so much for what the written laws say. And of the unwritten laws, there

are two kinds: one kind concerns extraordinary cases of good and bad conduct . . . , the other deals with what is omitted from the particular, written law (τοῦ ἰδίου νόμου καὶ γεγραμμένου ἔλλειμμα). For what is fair-and-decent (ἐπιεικές) seems to be just, and justice that goes beyond the written law is fair-and-decent' (Ar. *Rhet.* 1 13 1373b3–74a22; cf. too Plato, *Laws* 793a). In Aristotle's terms, then, Ant. is claiming that an 'unwritten' but divinely sanctioned code of decency, a 'universal and natural law,' requires burial of Pol.; and it is likely that most fifth-century Athenians would feel sympathy with this claim, though at this date precise definitions and distinctions between written and unwritten law were probably lacking, since νόμος and νόμιμα both cover a broad range that includes 'custom', 'tradition', 'taboo', 'religious precept', as well as 'law', 'statute' (see esp. *OT* 865–72, and below 908, 914). The same νόμοι might often be maintained *both* by spoken injunctions (whether in prose or verse) *and* in written form (on stone, bronze, or papyrus): would the precepts contained in Hesiod's *WD* and *Precepts of Chiron*, or the poems of Orpheus and Solon, be regarded as 'written' or 'unwritten', 'human' or 'divine'? See further Knox 1964: 97, Ostwald 1969: esp. 57–61, 1986.

θνητὸν ὄνθ' ὑπερδραμεῖν 'that you, a mortal, could outrun . . .', with σέ understood from τὰ σά κηρύγματα. (Strict syntax would require θνητοῦ ὄντος, after σά.) Some 'general' sense is possible here ('anyone who is a mortal', Jebb); but it is Kreon's edict, and his mortal nature in particular, that Ant. wishes to emphasize, as the conspicuously placed τὰ σά shows (enjambement, cf. 67–8n.). ὑπερτρέχω, ὑπερθέω ('outrun') regularly mean 'surpass', 'prevail over' (E. *Ion* 973 καὶ πῶς τὰ κρείσσω θνητὸς οὖσ' ὑπερδραμῶ;), an image that may suggest efforts to 'overstep <limits>' or 'outrun', 'escape <the inevitable>'; cf. 449, 481 ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους, 605 ὑπερβασία, 667 [663] ὑπερβάς, 60, 921 (παρεξέρχομαι), and LSJ *s.v.* ὑπερβάλλω II.2 (also 1065?, 667 [663] ὑπερβάς, 1086 ὑπεκδραμηῖ). Bruhn's emendation, θνητά γ' (adopted by LJ&W), regularizes the syntax, but depersonalizes the phrase and deprives it of this vital undercurrent.

456–7 νῦν γε καὶ χθές: a variation on the proverbial πρῶν τε καὶ χθές (Hdt. 2.53, Plato, *Laws* 677d, and Hom. *Il.* 2.303 χθίζα τε καὶ πρωίζα, Catullus 61.137); cf. our 'here today, gone tomorrow'.

αἰί ποτε | ζῆι: gods are immortal, so their laws too must ‘live for ever’ (ποτε helps the phrase to stretch indefinitely into the past as well as the future). For ζῆι, cf. *OT* 41 συμφορὰς ζώσας, 481 τὰ δ’ [= oracles] αἰεὶ ζῶντα περιποῦνται, *A. Ag.* 819. (Cf. too *OT* 865–72.)

ἐξ ὅτου ’φάνη (83n.) ‘when they first appeared’. The source of the deepest wisdom is too ancient to be recorded (cf. 620–1, and 521n.; also *Lysias* 6.10).

458–60 ‘I was not going to be convicted before a jury of gods of <breaking> these <laws>, <merely> out of fear of any man’s ideas’ (τούτων emphatic, while δείσασα responds to 449 ἐτόλμας). For ἐν, cf. *Aj.* 1136. Failure to bury kin is not elsewhere listed among the crimes deserving of divine punishment after death; but such a fundamental duty might well be sanctioned on the same terms as oaths, hospitality, etc. (cf. 74–5, 89, 256n.).

ἀνδρός: rather than ἀνθρώπου, or βροτοῦ, because Ant. is concerned, not only with abstract principles, but with a personal opponent too; cf. 484–5n., and 248, 290, 679–80, 942.

φρόνημα: probably neutral here (‘purpose’, ‘thought’, ‘mentality’, cf. 176, 207; also 353; Coray 1993: 197–8), though the word can be positive (‘spirit’, ‘resolution’) or negative (‘presumption’, ‘pride’, cf. 473, 479): the sneer is conveyed sufficiently by ἀνδρός.

τί δ’ οὔ; ‘How <could I> not <know>?’; cf. 448. The more common parenthetical idiom is τί μήν; (*Aj.* 668, *A. Supp.* 999, *Ag.* 672).

461–8 Ant. goes further (as at 72–6, 96–7): not only did she not fear the threat of death; she welcomed it. (Contrast 933–4n.)

461–4 τοῦ χρόνου | πρόσθεν ‘before my time’ (cf. 896), an unusual shorthand use of χρόνος, for ὁ μακρὸς χρόνος <βίου> (*Ph.* 306, *OT* 963, *E. Alk.* 670; cf. *Aischines* 3.126 πρὸ τοῦ καθήκοντος χρόνου); perhaps quasi-legal, ‘due-date’ (LSJ *s.v.* χρόνος 1.2b).

αὔτ’ = αὐτό: ‘I count this <fact> as a gain’, cf. *El.* 1268–9. The MS variant αὐτ’ (= αὐτε) would mean ‘on the contrary’; but αὐτε occurs only once in *S.* (*Tr.* 1010, in lyrics), and never in *E.*, though quite often in *A.* and epic.

κέρδος: cf. *A. Prom.* τί δῆτ’ ἐμοὶ ζῆν κέρδος; *Aj.* 392–3, *E. Med.* 145. In contrast to *Kreon’s* crass mercantilism (221–2, 1035–9nn.), Ant. uses the term to mean ‘a true benefit’ (almost ‘salvation’, Reinhardt 1979: 87); cf. *Teiresias* at 1032; also 684, 702, 1050 κτήμα.

466 παρ' οὐδὲν ἄλγος: lit. 'to no extent <is it> a pain' (sc. ἐστί), i.e. 'it doesn't matter at all to me'; cf. 34-5n.

466-8 ἀλλ' ἄν . . . ἄν ἤλγουν: repeated ἄν is common, e.g. *El.* 333-4, 439-41 (*GMT* §223).

ἄθαπτον ἠνσχόμεν νέκυν '(<if> I had let <him lie>, an unburied corpse . . .' *Apokopē* of ἀνα- to ἀν- for the metre is not unusual in tragedy (cf. 1274-5n.). This particular form is unparalleled (ἠνσχόμεν for ἠνεσχ-), but cf. epic ἀνσχεο, ἀνσχήσεται.

469-70 A sarcastic and inflammatory conclusion (ruder even than Elektra's to Klytaimestra at *El.* 608-9), spoken as if Ant. had heard 220, and effectively ruling out any reasonable discussion or compromise (cf. 754, 1028 with nn.). For the emphatic *polyptoton* (and *parēchēsis*: μῶρα/μώρωι/μωρίαν), cf. 77, 99, 466-8.

471-2 Lit. 'The savage breeding of the daughter, from her savage father, is making itself plain', with δηλοῖ intransitive (cf. 20, 242). For the omission of the participle (= ὦμὸν ὄν), cf. 709 ὠφθησαν κευοί, *OC* 783 ὡς σε δηλώσω κακόν, and many instances with φαίνομαι. The Chorus-leader addresses Kreon, not Ant., thus emphasizing her isolation; and he makes no comment on the issues raised by Ant. (burial, unwritten laws, and the gods below), remarking only on her attitude. ὦμός is a very strong term to apply to anyone, esp. a young woman (elsewhere in tragedy used only of men: e.g. *Aj.* 205, *Tr.* 975, *A. Th.* 536-7; cf. 484-5n. For γέννημα (needlessly emended by some), cf. 627, *OT* 1168, and esp. *Tr.* 315, *A. Prom.* 850; further Long 1968: 41-2, 120-2.

εἵκειν . . . κακοῖς: a leitmotiv in *S.* (Knox 1964: 15-17, 65-8), cf. 718 εἵκε, 712-13, 716; also 1029, 1096.

ἐπίσταται: this (rather than μανθάνειν, γιγνώσκειν, φρονεῖν, κτλ.) is the appropriate term for Ant.'s 'knowledge.' It suggests inner conviction, rather than experience or reasoning; cf. 480, 510-11, 686nn., *Introd.* p. 42, and Coray 1993: 58-80.

473-96 Kreon's reply is directed to the *korymbaios* (473 ἴσθι τοι, 476 ἄν εἰσίδοις), and he refers to Ant. in the 3rd p. throughout (480, 484, 488 αὐτή, 485 τῆιδε; cf. 495 τῆς; see 726-65n.). Reacting to the tone of Ant.'s speech rather than its arguments, he vows to crush her *hybris* (480-5), and his rage leads him into wild accusations against Ismene too (488-93). Beginning with a string of four *gnōmai* (473-9, cf. Menelaos at *Aj.* 1142-9, and *Introd.* §5(c)), his speech is crowded

with harsh images of felled tree-trunks, shattered metal, curbed horses, and submissive slaves. To Kreon, Ant.'s 'unwritten laws' are mere window-dressing (495-6n.): the real issue is power, and his own masculinity (484-5). His anger over Ant.'s challenge to his authority is not wholly unprovoked (31-2, 453-5, 469-70nn.), but it blinds him to the larger political and religious issues on which he so prided himself earlier (161-210).

473-4 ἀλλ' ἴσθι τοι: menacing, cf. 1064 ἀλλὰ ... τοι κάτισθι, *El.* 298, *Tr.* 1107. For acc. and infin. after verb of knowing, cf. 293-4n.

τὰ σκλήρ' ἄγαν φρόνηματα | πίπτειν: like stiff, unbending trees in a wind (cf. 712-14). See too 459 φρόνημα with n.

474-6 σίδηρον ὀπτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς περισκελῆ 'iron heated by fire <so as to become> extra-hard' (proleptic, Smyth §1579: cf. 659-60, 791-2, 881-2, 1138, 1186, 1253-4, 1274-5, 1302). This process, which also involved plunging the metal in water, was thought to produce harder but more brittle steel; cf. R. J. Forbes, *Metallurgy in antiquity* (Leiden 1950) 443. περισκελής (from σκέλλω, like σκληρός) is also sometimes used of personalities (*Aj.* 649 περισκελεῖς φρένες, cf. *Hom. Od.* 1.68 ἀσκελὲς αἰεῖ).

θραυσθέντα καὶ ῥαγέντα: emphatic pleonasm and assonance.

477-8 'And I have observed (οἶδα, cf. 300-1, 649, 883, 1043; also 71, 471-2nn., Coray 1993: 20) that high-spirited horses are broken in with just a small bit' (σ μικρῶι emphasized by position and by post-ponement of δέ). Horse-training metaphors are often used to describe (i) rulers 'curbing' opposition (e.g. *A. Prom.* 1009-10, *A. Ag.* 1624), and (ii) men 'taming' young women, who may be referred to as 'fillies' (πῶλοι, e.g. *Anakreon, PMG* 417, *Alkman, PMG* 1.50-60); cf. 826-7, 946-7nn. Training a horse was not a gentle process: Greek bridles and bits included spikes that bloodied the horse's mouth if it resisted; and whips and spurs were used freely too (cf. 108-9n.). For the whole expression, cf. *Aj.* 1253-4 μέγας ... βούς ὑπὸ μικρᾶς ὁμως | μάστιγος ὀρθὸς ... πορεύεται, Goheen 1951: 26-35; also 291-2 with n.

καταρτυθέντας: καταρτύω, ἔξαρτύω are used of 'schooling' horses (*E. Hipp.* 1186-7, *A. Eum.* 473), as well as people (*Solon fr.* 27.11 *West καταρτύεται νόος ἀνδρῶν*, *Plato, Laws* 808d); see *Jebb's n.* and *Plut. Them.* 2.

478-9 οὐ γὰρ ἐκπέλει 'sc. and those wild spirits deserve such

treatment), for it is not allowed for <one> who is the slave of those around him, to think big thoughts'. ἐκπέλει = ἔξεστι, a rare usage, but confirmed by Hesychios *s.v.* For the ellipse of τοῦτωι, cf. 35n.

δοῦλος: hyperbole, but still an ugly slur. Kreon again sounds like a tyrant or barbarian king (cf. 289–94, 756nn., and e.g. A. *Prom.* 49–50, Bowra 1944: 73–4).

480–3 ὕβρις ('insolence', 'violence', 'lawlessness') involves the aggressive violation of the property, honour, or person of others, and is generally a male offence (cf. 309, and D. M. MacDowell, *G&R* 23 (1976) 14–31, N. Fisher, *Hybris* (Warminster 1992)). No term could more strongly condemn Ant.'s earlier actions (480–1 τότε ...) and present attitude (479, 482–3).

νόμους ... προκειμένους: cf. 35–6 προκεῖσθαι with n., 59–60, 453–5nn.

τούτοις ἐπαυχεῖν καὶ δεδρακυῖαν γελᾶν '(<that she> exults in these <actions> and laughs after having done them', alluding to 469 δρώσα, and the 'mockery' of 470. The bitterest shame of all is to be laughed at by enemies; cf. 647, 839–41, and e.g. *Aj.* 79 with Stanford's n., E. *Med.* 381–3, A. *Prom.* 156–9.

484–5 ἦ νῦν: expressing 'subjective certainty' (*GP* 279). 'For sure, I am no man, and she is the man, if, with impunity, victory and control in these things are to reside with her.' (For this sense of ταῦτα κράτη, cf. *El.* 476, 689; cf. too 483 τούτοις. For κείσεται, cf. Pind. *I.* 4.17 τὴν ... ἀρετὰ ... κείται, *LSJ s.v.* III.1). Kreon may also have in mind, '... if this (= 'my') position of authority is to end up hers' (cf. κράτη in 60, 166, 173; and *LSJ s.v.* κείμαι IV and V). Many Athenians might sympathize with Kreon's personal anxiety at a woman's defying male authority and 'getting away with' (ἀνατεί, or ἀνατί – the correct spelling is uncertain); cf. 471–2n., 525, 679–80. Yet the dangerous irrationality of his anxiety is hard to miss.

486–7 'But whether she is my sister's <child>, or <even> closer to me by blood than my whole family ...', angrily hyperbolic (cf. 1039–41n.). The MS variant ὀμαιμονεστέρως would also be possible: '... or (child) of <someone else> even closer to me than my whole family'. For the omission of the participle (= ἀδελφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς παῖς οὔσα κυρεῖ), cf. *OT* 362 φονέα σέ φημι ... κυρεῖν, and many exx. with τυγχάνω. (For the gen. of parentage, without παῖς, cf. 379–80, 823–5, 37–8n., Moorhouse 1982: 51). The mention of ἀδελφῆς may

recall Iokaste's assertive role in the ruin of that 'like-blooded' family of Laios, into which his son now plans to marry (568, cf. 1, 863–5nn.): Kreon's anxiety about φιλία and aggressive women is deep-seated, and triggers additional unpropitious expressions from him (488–9n., cf. 192n.).

Ζηγὸς ἑρκείου 'Zeus of the courtyard' is (together with Hestia and Apollo Phratrios) the presiding deity of the household (Burkert 1985: 255–6, cf. 1301–5n.): here, a metonymy for the sacred family unit itself (hence παντός, rather than αὐτοῦ), cf. E. *Hek.* 345 πέφευγας τὸν ἔμὸν ἱκέσιον Δία. The reference here verges on the impious (Linforth 1961: 205, Kamerbeck; cf. 1039–41n.; but see too 304–5 with n.).

488–9 The inclusion of Ismene is unexpected: neither her words in 1–99 nor the Guard's report have implicated her in the burial. But Kreon has 'sisters' on his mind, and lumps the 'pair' together (dual, ἀλύξετον, cf. 2–3n., 533, 561–2). For ξύναιμος, cf. 1n., 659, 793, and ὄμαιμος at 198, 512, 513; also 192n.

ἀλύξετον | μόρου 'escape from death'; for the 'ablative' gen., cf. *Ph.* 1044 τῆς νόσου πεφευγέναι, K–G 1 395 (and 417–18 χθονός).

489–90 καὶ γὰρ οὖν: καὶ is probably to be taken with κείνην, while γὰρ οὖν = emphatic γὰρ (cf. 741, 771, *OC* 980, *Ph.* 298, 766, *GP* 446.i), 'For indeed, I blame her too . . .' Alternatively, the combination is just a strengthened form of καὶ γὰρ ('Yes, for in fact . . .'; cf. A. *Ag.* 524, E. *Hkld.* 202, *GP* 112).

κείνην ἴσον | ἐπαιτιῶμαι . . . τάφου: lit. 'I blame her to an equal degree for this burial, that she planned <it>', with βουλευσαι epexegetic (216n., though this would be easier if the infin. followed τάφου): Kreon asserts that, while it was Ant. who performed the deed and is now exulting over it (482–3, 495–6), Ismene planned it with her in secret and is now undergoing torments of guilty conscience (489–94). Possible alternatives: 'I accuse her too of having plotted an equal <share> of this burial', acc. + infin. (so Jebb); or, with ἴσον doing double duty, 'I blame her equally for her equal role in planning this burial' (so Campbell).

491–4 Kreon has seen Ismene 'indoors, in a frenzy (cf. 633 λυσσαίνων with n.) and beside herself' (though we know this to be not from guilt, but anxiety and/or self-recrimination about Ant.). And she was indeed 'scheming in the darkness' (494; cf. 15–17, 85).

καί νιν καλεῖτ' 'So summon her!' *καί* is often so used by the orators to introduce testimony (e.g. Lysias 13.35); cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.75 *καί μοι δὸς τὴν χεῖρα*, K–G II 248.5. The unusual punctuation (cf. 658 with n.) adds to the abruptness. Attendants go in to fetch Ismene.

ἀρτίως 'just now' (cf. 561), i.e. during the interval between the Guard's announcement of the 'first' burial and his return with Ant.

493–4 Lit. 'The heart tends to have been caught out first <as> the secret criminal, when <people> are contriving no good in the darkness', i.e. their own guilty demeanour gives them away.

κλοπεύς | ... ἐν σκότῳ: half-metaphorical (cf. 289–92), half-literal (16, 18–19, 84–5); cf. *El.* 37 κλέψαι σφαγᾶς (also 681, 1218 below).

τῶν μηδὲν ὀρθῶς ... τεχνωμένων: middle, cf. *Ph.* 80 μηδὲ τεχνᾶσθαι κακὰ (also 365 τέχνας with n). *μηδὲν*, not οὐδὲν, because the activity is habitual (cf. *Ph.* 407–9; also 690–1, 696–8, 1325n.).

495–6 'And yet (γε μέντοι, *GP* 412; cf. 233) I <especially> hate it too, when someone caught in wrong-doing then wants to dress it up to look good.' Ant.'s speech was merely 'fine words', 'beautification' (καλλύνειν, cf. 72 καλόν with n.).

497 'Do you want something more than <just> to kill me, now that you have caught me?' (cf. 308–9). For *μείζον τι*, cf. *E. Pho.* 1211. *θέλεις ... ἐλών* picks up 496 *άλους ... θέλη*, as Ant. suggests that it is Kreon, not herself, who is over-indulging in words now (499–501).

499 τί δῆτα μέλλεις;: impatient, 'Then why are you waiting?' (cf. *A. Prom.* 628, *Aj.* 540).

499–501 Lit. 'For to me nothing in your words is acceptable – and may it *never* be acceptable! – and likewise to you too my <words, deeds, attitude, nature> were quite unappealing' (with emphatic oppositions, 499 ἐμοὶ τῶν σῶν, 501 σοὶ τὰμά). Cf. 89n.

ἀρεσθεῖη is a peculiar form: we should expect the active ἀρέσειε (cf. 75, 89), since the passive ἠρέσθην in Attic usually = 'I am pleased'. But *Hdt.* 9.79 ... τοῖσι ταῦτα ἀρέσκειται ('to whom these things are pleasing', cf. 6.128 ἠρέσκοντο) may be sufficient parallel (unless these are middle forms); so emendation (e.g., to Elmsley's ἀρέστ' εἶη, or Hermans's ἀρεσθεῖην) is probably not warranted.

502–4 καίτοι ... γ': 'καίτοι introduces an objection ... of the speaker's own, which tends to invalidate ... what [s]he has just said ... An emphatic word following καίτοι [here κλέος] is often

stressed by γε' (*GP* 556, 564); cf. 904. So, although Kreon and she have nothing to say to one another (499–501), to everybody else her 'glory' is already assured (cf. 496 καλλύνειν, with n.). The unusual rhythm of 502 accentuates the word-play of κλέος ... εὐκλέεστέρον (cf. 76–7n.).

ἦ ... ἐν τάφῳ | τίθεισα '... than by undertaking (= present part.) funeral rites for my brother'. For ἀντάδελφον, cf. 1, 696, and 512–13; for ἐν τάφῳ, cf. 203–4n., and *OC* 1410.

504–5 τούτοις ... πᾶσιν: i.e. to the Chorus and other by-standers (cf. 509 οὔτοι: whereas to Kreon, these are 'his' people, hence τῶνδε 508, 510). The dative goes primarily with ἀνδάνειν, though it might also be dat. of the agent ('could be said *by* all these ...'), a usage usually restricted to the perfect passive: but cf. 44n., 1218, and *Aj.* 1342 οὐκ ἂν ἐνδίκως γ' ἀτιμάζοιτό σοι (Smyth §1488–90). ἐγκλήσιοι is a correction of the impossible fut. opt of the MSS.

This passage draws attention to a crucial uncertainty: how are we to assess the true feelings of the Chorus, and of the citizens of Thebes in general? The Elders may indeed be too timid to voice approval of Kreon's opponents, as Ant. claims (cf. 211–14, 509, 690–1, 692–3, 873–4nn.; also 180); but they have given her no sign of such approval (see esp. 381–3, 471–2 with nn.) – nor will they ever do so (though cf. 817–22n., 836–8, 1349–50 with n.). Kreon thinks that Ant. is deceiving herself (508), but in the next scene the claim of popular support for her is reasserted (690–700, 733). This persistent element of indeterminacy among the 'internal audiences' of the play contributes also to the theatre audience's mixed sympathies (cf. 407–40, 801–82nn., *Intro.* §§5(b), 5(f)).

506–7 'But one-man rule enjoys many benefits, and in particular it can do and say whatever it likes.' Another sarcastic couplet from Ant. (cf. 469–70), explaining 505 and contradicting Kreon's earlier claims to legitimate rule (esp. 178–81; cf. too 211–14). τυραννίς is usually (but not invariably) pejorative (cf. 739, 757; Podlecki 1966, Ober & Strauss 1990: 261–3).

508–25 In a rapid stichomythia, Kreon and Ant. lay out their incompatible views: Kreon argues that patriots and traitors do not deserve equal treatment, and that honouring Pol. means dishonouring Eteokles, while Ant. asserts that, since the laws of Hades are universal, the brothers have inalienably equal claims. Kreon's argument is

reasonable, and Ant. does not attempt to answer it directly (by denying that Pol. was a traitor). Instead, she appeals to a different set of principles: the natural obligations of kinship. We thus find here one of the earliest instances of the opposition of νόμος and φύσις, a common topic of sophistic debate in the later fifth century (Ostwald 1969: 34–40, Guthrie 1971: 55–134, F. Heinemann, *Nomos und Physis* (Basel 1945). For Kreon, entitlement to ‘reverence’ (511 σέβειν, 514 δυσσεβῆ, 516 δυσσεβεῖ, 521 εὐαγῆ) and ‘equality’ (516 ἐξ ἴσου, 520 ἴσος) is dependent upon performance and societal opinion; for Ant., it is inborn (511 ὁμοσπλάγχχνους, 517 ἀδελφός, 523 ἔφυν); cf. 187–8n.

508–9 τοὔτο: i.e. the ‘glory’ (502 κλέος) of her actions and the silent approval of everyone else (504–5 τοὔτο κτλ.).

μοῦνη τῶνδε: idiomatic, but illogical, as Ant. is not herself one ‘of these Thebans’ (i.e. the Elders), but separate from them (510 τῶνδε χωρίς); cf. 100–3n. (For the Ionic μουν- form, cf. 308n., 705.)

ὄραϊς. | ὄρωσι ‘see it this way’; for ὄράω = ἀξιώω, cf. *Aj.* 1313, *OT* 284.

ὑπίλλουσι στόμα ‘they keep their mouths barred shut’, cf. 180, 505 and LSJ *s.v.* εἴλω/ἴλλω A, B, and D. Less probably, the image is of dogs ‘tucking up’ their tails under their bellies in fear (cf. σαίνω, and Latin *adulor*), as in E. fr. 544 Nauck οὐράν δ’ ὑπίλασ’ . . .

510–11 ‘But do you not feel shame, that *you* think so differently from them?’ φρονεῖν (cf. 459n., 479, and 471–2n.) refers to her ‘ideas’ about the burial, but also perhaps to her ‘attitude’ in not keeping her ideas to herself (as, she claims, the Chorus have done).

511 ὁμοσπλάγχχνους: found only here and at A. *Th.* 890, equivalent to Homeric ὁμογάστριος. (Cf. too 1066–7, and 1, 486–7nn.)

512 χά καταντίον θανών: Eteokles. καταντίον = ἐναντίον, cf. Homeric ἄντην and 518 ἀντιστάς.

514 ‘Then why do you offer tribute that is impious towards him?’ (or ‘in his eyes’, ethic dat.: cf. 25, 904). For τιμαῖς χάριν, cf. E. *Or.* 828 πατρώϊαν τιμῶν χάριν.

515–17 ὁ . . . νέκυς and σφε (cf. 44n.) both refer to Eteokles. Kreon assumes (like most Greeks) that the dead continue to feel human emotions and therefore must resent seeing their enemies honoured (522; cf. 73–6n.). Ant.’s counter-arguments are forceful, but less clearly articulated: 515 could mean either (i) that Eteokles, being

dead, is unavailable as a witness, or (ii) that, being dead, he will sympathize with the need to revere all corpses (even Pol.'s). Lines 519 and 521–3 suggest (ii); but the emphatic pleonasm of 515 ὁ κατθανῶν νέκυς suggests (i).

ἐξ ἴσου: see 520 ἴσος with n. Kreon excludes all compromise: *any* reverence shown to Pol. amounts to 'equal honour' with Eteokles (cf. 9–10, 37–8, 632–4nn.). Ant. does not disagree (517 γάρ): for her, a brother (no 'slave') necessarily deserves treatment as an equal (508–25n.).

δυσσεβεῖ: explained in 518 (and cf. 199–202, 280–8).

518 'But <he died> trying to lay waste this land, while the other one <died> defending <it>' (ὑπερ in virtual *anastrophe* (193n.), with τῆσδε γῆς understood). The MSS are divided between δὲ and γε. Both are possible (γε = 'yes'); but the adversative needs to be emphasized. For the antithetical mid-line punctuation, cf. 76–7n.

519 'None the less, Hades at least craves these rites' (sc. 'for everyone'). For τοὺς νόμους τούτους, cf. 451–5; and for 'Hades' so personified, cf. 542, 575, 777, 811, (816).

520 'But the good man <is> not equal with the bad man for obtaining <these rites>', λαχεῖν epexegetic with ἴσος (cf. 216, 489–90nn. and similar infin. with ἄξιος, δίκαιος, κτλ.). With the MS variant ἴσον, or the emendations ἴσους (sc. νόμους) or ἴσα, ποθεῖ must be understood from 519 ('... does not yearn to obtain equal'), which makes a more subjective, and less appropriate, point.

521 τίς οἶδεν: implying an affirmative answer (and perhaps a nameless ancient authority, cf. 456–7, 620–1), but inconclusive as a rebuttal to Kreon's point (508–25n.). The MS variants κάτω 'στιν and κάτωθεν are equally likely (for κάτωθεν = κάτω, cf. 1070).

εὐαγῆ 'proper', i.e. 'free from ἄγος' (opp. ἐναγής, cf. 256, 775nn., OT 921 λύσιν ... εὐαγῆ).

522 Kreon returns to the point of 516: an 'enemy' does not become a 'friend' just because he is dead. Again he restricts φίλος to its narrowest sense, excluding all aspects of 'kin' (187–8n.).

523 οὔτοι ... ἔφουν: the scholiast puts it well, 'Even if my brothers hate each other, my nature is not such as to join one of them in hating the other, but to join in loving them as they love me.' In refuting Kreon's claim in 522, Ant. coins special terms to describe her own φύσις and its inextricable involvement in 'family': συνέχθω

and συμφιλέω are found nowhere else in classical Greek. (Elsewhere, Ant. has been quick to express her ‘hatred’, even of close kin: cf. 10, 86, 93.)

524–5 A sneering two-line cap to the stichomythia: ‘Then go down there and, if you have to love someone, love them! But as long as I live, no woman will rule.’ Ant.’s notion of φιλία has no place in Kreon’s kingdom (cf. 188–90, 484–5, 578–9, 677–80, 740–56nn.).

526–81 In the third phase of this Scene (376–581n.), Ismene is brought on stage to answer Kreon’s accusation that she collaborated with Ant. in the burial (cf. 488–94). A three-way dialogue ensues (Schwinge 1962: 73–5, *Introd.* §3 pp. 12–13; also p. 2 n. 7): first Kreon and Ismene converse briefly (531–7), as she boldly accepts his accusation of complicity; then Ant. indignantly contradicts her, and tells her to save her own skin (538–60); finally, Kreon re-enters the discussion, and, despite Ismene’s reminder that Ant. is his son’s fiancée, insists that both women shall be executed (561–81).

Most of the scene comprises stichomythia, taut and skilfully paced, as Ismene engages separately with both Ant. and Kreon, while direct interaction between Ant. and Kreon is pointedly avoided (473–96, 883–90, 925–8nn.). After an opening 5-line inquiry from Kreon, Ismene and Ant. argue at first in 2-line (536–47), then accelerating into 1-line exchanges (548–58) capped by Ant.’s dismissive 2 lines (559–60). Then Ant. falls silent, while Kreon and Ismene argue, likewise shifting from 2-line (561–4) to 1-line exchanges (565–76), until Kreon closes with 5 more lines (577–81, matching 531–5).

Ismene’s unexpected display of loyalty shifts our sympathies further away from Kreon, and suggests that support for Ant.’s cause may be growing; but Ant.’s rejection of her offer, though based on the truth and on a wish that Ismene not die needlessly, is expressed in disconcertingly selfish and hurtful terms (549–50; cf. 538–9, 542–3nn.). Then, as the scene ends, a new ingredient is introduced into the plot with Ismene’s mention of the betrothal of Haimon to Ant. (568–75). Although this element in the story may be S.’s invention (*Introd.* §2 pp. 9–10), and although, for the moment, Kreon’s callous responses to Ismene’s pleas on Haimon’s behalf do no more than confirm his crassness and insensitivity, we can immediately re-

cognize this as the link that will turn Kreon's political blunder into personal catastrophe.

526–30 The palace door opens, and anapaests from the *koryphaios* (as at 155–61, 376–83, 626–30, 801–5, 1257–60) announce the entrance of the distraught Ismene, led by Kreon's attendants (cf. 491–2).

καὶ μὴν 'and see now ...', often used to mark an arrival or call attention to something just seen or heard (*GP* 356, 586); cf. 1180, 1257, and 626 μὴν.

νεφέλη ... αἰσχύνει 'A cloud over her brows disfigures her flushed face' (for ὑπερ, cf. 193n.). The 'cloud' of worry or sorrow is a commonplace (E. *Hipp.* 172 στρυγνὸν δ' ὀφρύων νέφος, *El.* 1078, A. *Th.* 228–9, Hom. *Il.* 17.591), but here the image is intensified by personification and the unusual usages of ῥέθος = 'face' (cf. E. *Hkls* 1203, LSJ Suppl. *s.v.*) and αἵματόεν = 'suffused with blood' (unparalleled); also by the conceit of 530 (the 'cloud ... soaks the cheeks' (with rain/tears), cf. 828–32). Ismene's visible distress (described verbally, since the mask covers the actor's features) contrasts with Ant.'s defiant demeanour (441–2, 483; cf. 491–2, 626–30).

531–5 σὺ δ' ... | φέρ' εἶπέ ...: an imperious address (cf. 441–2n.).

ὡς ἔχιδν' ... ἐξέπινες: Kreon envisions Ismene as a 'viper' in his house, her poison secretly 'drinking up' his life-blood: cf. *Tr.* 771 ἐχίδνης ἰὸς ὡς ἐδαίνυτο, 1053–6 (the poison robe) ἐκ δὲ χλωρὸν αἶμά μου πέπωκεν, *El.* 784, A. *Cho.* 249 (Klytaimestra) with Garvie's n.

ὑφειμένη may combine (i) 'lying low', as E. *Hkls* 72, of a mother bird protecting her young (see Bond's n.), (ii) 'secretly introduced', as *OT* 387 ὑφαίς, and (iii) 'put to the breast', as Hom. *Od.* 9.245, E. *Pho.* 31. (Ismene is indeed Kreon's ward, virtually his adoptive daughter; cf. 533 τρέφων.) More prosaic would be ὑφημένη (Brunck, Müller, from the scholion ἡ γὰρ ἐχιδνα λάθραι καθεζομένη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκπίνει τὸ αἶμα).

δύ' ἄτα κάπαναστάσεις θρόνων 'two ruins and revolutions against the throne'; for such 'abstract for concrete' metonymy, cf. 646 πόνους and Long 1968: 10–11, 121. For ἄτη, cf. 4n.; and for the dual, 488, 561–2, 769nn. (At *OC* 530–2, δύο δ' ἄτα again refers to

Oidipous' two daughters.) For ἐπανάστασις, cf. Hdt. 3.44, Thuc. 3.39.

φήσεις . . . ἢ . . . μὴ εἰδέναι: closely parallel to 442–3.

536–7 Ismene did 'know' (535, cf. 542 ξυνίστορες) about Ant.'s plans; but her claim to 'share responsibility' as 'having perpetrated the deed' is an unexpected and moving moment (526–81n.).

εἴπερ ἦδ' ὁμορροθεῖ 'that is, if she agrees' (cf. E. *Or.* 530): the qualification, though illogical, is understandable (after 69–70).

ξυμμετίσχω καὶ φέρω: the prefixes (ξυμ-μετα-) belong with φέρω too ('share the burden'), cf. 257–8n.; hence the genitive τῆς αἰτίας (cf. E. *IT* 685, K–G π 568).

538–9 These lines refer back to 69–70. In rejecting Ismene's claim, Ant. seems to wish both to save her from death (547, 553n.) and to preserve for herself the full credit for her action (542–3, 546–7n.). For personified δίκη, cf. 451 and 542–3n. For κοινωσάμην, cf. 83n.

540–1 οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι: Ismene characteristically thinks of maidenly shame, not fear, as the emotion to be overcome in 'voyaging' with Ant. in her troubles (cf. 61–2, 72, 92). For ξύμπλουον, cf. E. *Hkls* 1226 with Bond's n., *IT* 600; also 81 πορεύσομαι.

542–3 'Whose deed <it really was>, Hades and those below <are> witnesses; and I do not care for a loved-one who loves <only> in words', cf. the proverbial μὴ μοι ἀνὴρ εἶη γλώσσηι φίλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔργωι (*Theognis* 979). Ant. consistently values other-worldly powers (Justice, Hades, the dead), above her living φίλοι (cf. 72–6, 450–60, 538, 777–8nn., *Introd.* §5(d)(ii); and contrast 523–5).

544–5 'Don't exclude me from dying with you.' After a negative prohibition, μὴ οὐ + infinitive is regular, the article optional (*Smyth* §2744, *GMT* §811; cf. 935–6, 27n.).

ἀγνίσαι: cf. 196–7n. By sharing Ant.'s death penalty, Ismene would be accepting responsibility for 'sanctifying' the corpse.

546–7 'Don't you share my death, and don't claim as yours <deeds> in which you had no hand.' κοινά is adverbial, as at *Aj.* 577 (and cf. 56–7, 539). Instead of ἄ we might expect ὦν (= ταῦτα ὦν), after a verb of touching; but cf. *Alkman fr.* 58.2 ἄνθη . . . ἄ μὴ μοι θίγηις, *Archilochos fr.* 118 West; also 857–8, 960–2nn.

548 σοῦ λελειμμένη 'forsaken by you' (*LSJ s.v.* λέίπω B.Π.1); cf.

13 ἐστερήθημεν, 58 λειψιμμένα, 554 ἀμπλάκω (also 574 στερήσεις, and 566). The MS variant τίς βίου . . . πόθος is equally possible.

549 ‘Ask Kreon <that>! *He’s* the one *you* care about!’ (cf. 47, 67). κηδεμών, used both of ‘tendance’ of the dead and ‘guardianship’ of a female or minor relative, here implies that Ismene’s ‘care’ for her uncle was greater than for Pol. or Ant. – a sneer by which Ismene is understandably ‘hurt’ (550).

550–3 The logic of pleasure and pain, benefit and harm, is grim and terse. To paraphrase: [*Is.*] ‘Why hurt me if it doesn’t benefit you?’ [*Ant.*] ‘Indeed (δῆτα) it doesn’t benefit me, but hurts me, if my mockery (sc. directed against Kreon) is <also> at your expense.’ [*Is.*] ‘Well then, what benefit can I still do you . . .?’ [*Ant.*] ‘You can save yourself!’ (sc. ‘and save me the pain of your death’). For Ant., there is no longer any ‘benefit’ that anyone (including herself) can provide, except to the dead (559–60n.). For 552 ἀλλὰ νῦν, ‘now at least’, cf. 779, and *GP* 13.

554 ‘Am I really to miss out on your death?’ ἀμπλάκω is deliberative subjunctive, like e.g. *Tr.* 973 τί πάθω; For καί in indignant question, cf. 1102, *GP* 311.ii.b; see too 90n. There may also be a sense of ‘yours *too* . . .’ (cf. 548n., 599–600; also 910, 1234).

555–60 Referring back to their earlier argument (71–81), Ant. insists that what each ‘chose’ then (555) cannot now be changed.

556 ‘But at least <we did> not <choose> without my views being expressed’ (ἐπί = ‘on the basis of . . .’, *LSJ s.v. v.iii.3*). Earlier Ismene did reveal mixed feelings about the burial (65–6, 98–9n.).

557 τοῖς, τοῖς δ’ ‘to one side (= Kreon and his citizens, 79) and to the other (= Pol. and the dead, 80–1, 89, 560)’, with μέν doing double duty. The schol. seems to have read σὺ μὲν σοί (= σεαυτῆι), which recalls 71–2, 76, 98, but would have less rhetorical point here, for Ant.’s words are directed primarily past Ismene at Kreon. For καλῶς . . . φρονεῖν, cf. 72, 97.

558 ἴση . . . ἡ ῥαμαρτία ‘our fault is equal’, i.e. in the eyes of one side or the other (and Kreon regards both as equally guilty).

559–60 θάρσει virtually = ‘farewell!’ Ant. refuses further association with Ismene and all she ‘lives’ for (cf. 542–3, 566–7), since she herself has ‘long since’ (πάλαι) decided to devote her life (ψυχῆ) to the dead (72–6, 89, 96–7; cf. 1168–71n.).

561–81 As Ant. breaks off discussion, Kreon steps forward. His sarcastic interjection takes the place of the conventional choral remarks, taking the dialogue into its next phase (526–81n.).

561–2 τὼ παῖδε: Kreon still uses the dual, despite the sisters' differences (cf. 533, and 488–9, 769nn.). For the construction, cf. 21–2.

ἄνουσ: earlier, Ismene judged Ant. 'mad' (99 ἄνους, with n.); now (ἄρτίως, cf. 491) Kreon finds Ismene so too (558n., cf. 489–92).

ἄφ' οὗ τὰ πρῶτ' ἔφου: the enmity between Ant. and Kreon seems to be of long standing (cf. 31, 486–9nn., Introd. §5(c)).

563–4 'Yes (γάρ), Your Majesty, when people are doing badly, not even their innate good sense ('native wit') stays with them; instead, it quits', Ismene replies deferentially (ἄναξ; cf. 7–8n., and 988). With ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ ... (as Plutarch quotes the line), Ismene would be indicating disagreement.

565 Lit. '⟨Your good sense⟩ certainly ⟨left⟩ you, when you chose to join the evil (i.e. Ant.) in doing evil', playing on the double meaning of 564 κακῶς πράσσοουσιν ('faring badly' / 'doing evil').

567 'But don't continue to talk as if she is in fact still alive for you'; i.e. Ant. is as good as dead (cf. 559–60). ἦδε ... σοι responds to 566 μοι τῆσδ'. This emendation (Semitelos) seems required for the over-elliptical ἀλλ' ἦδε μὲν σοι – μὴ λέγ'. οὐ γὰρ ἔστ' ἔτι in most MSS. Alternatively, Brunck and Bellerman's ἀλλ' ἦδε μέντοι – ('But as for her – don't mention ⟨her⟩: she's no longer alive', LJ&W 1990: 127).

568 νυμφεῖα: here 'bride' (= νύμφην, cf. E. *El.* 481 λέχεα); more normal usage at 814, 891, 1205. This is the first mention of Haimon or the betrothal (Introd. §2).

569 'Yes, for others too have fields to be ploughed.' The Athenian marriage-contract stipulated that the husband take the bride παίδων ἐπ' ἀρότῳ γνησίῳν, and the metaphor of the male 'sowing seed' in the female 'furrow' is common (e.g. A. *Eum.* 658–61 with Sommerstein's nn., *OT* 1256 ἄρουραν, 1485, 1497; cf. duBois 1988: 65–78). But Kreon's matter-of-fact coarseness is repellent ('there are plenty more where she came from ...').

570 'But ⟨these other marriages will⟩ not ⟨suit⟩ as well as this suited him and her.' ἀρμόζω can mean (transitive) 'to betroth' (cf. E. *Pho.* 491, LSJ s.v. I.2), but also (intransitive) 'to be suitable', 'be well-adapted' (cf. 1318, *OT* 902, *El.* 1293); so, by ἡρμοσμένα, Ismene

could mean that Haimon and Ant. are personally well-suited and in love, or that, as first cousin of a fatherless and brotherless heiress, Haimon is the ‘most suitable’ husband for her: perhaps both (cf. 781–800n.).

571 κακάς ... γυναίκα: although Kreon means primarily ‘an evil wife for my son’ (cf. 651–2), the plural may imply condemnation of Ismene as well (561–2, 579, 781–800 with nn.).

572–6 Assignment of speakers is problematic, as between Ismene and Ant. for 572, and between the Chorus and Ismene for 574 and 576. But both stichomythic economy and dramatic logic demand that Ismene should speak all three lines (Mastronarde 1979: 95–6). Many editors (beginning with the Aldine) have felt that the passionate *apostrophē* (572 ὦ φίλαθ’ Αἴμον ...) comes most appropriately from his fiancée, Ant., and that τὸ σὸν λέχος (573) must be directed at her in response (‘your marriage’). However, a third speaker’s single-line interruption of a two-person stichomythia would be highly unusual (unparalleled in S.); and it is in any case much more characteristic of the warm-hearted Ismene to express such concern, than of Ant., who is already devoted to death and never utters a word about Haimon or her feelings for him. Thus the attribution of 572 to Ant., while providing an arresting moment of theatre, would achieve this only at the cost of incongruously sentimentalizing her. (Dawe and others even assign 574 and 576 to Ant. too: but the first-person references of τῆσδε, τῆνδε (= ‘me’) would be clumsy. As for the Chorus, cf. 574, 576nn.)

573 ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς: sc. με, cf. *Aj.* 589; Ismene has been ‘annoying’ Kreon throughout this scene. (If Ant. were given 572 to speak, this response would be esp. feeble.)

τὸ σὸν λέχος ‘you and that marriage you refer to’ (= 568 νυμφεῖα), not an uncommon idiom (cf. *El.* 1110 οὐκ οἶδα τὴν σὴν κλήδονα, 1037 τῶι σῶι δικαίῳ, *Aj.* 792, *Ph.* 1251).

574 ἦ γάρ: Ismene repeats her question of 568, now with a more reproving tone: ‘Are you really going to ...?’, cf. 44n. (Such a tone would be out of character for the Chorus; 572–6n.) The emphasis on Haimon’s ‘loss’ is also typical of Ismene (cf. 548).

575 Ἄιδης ὁ παύσων ... ἔφου: Kreon sarcastically cites Ant.’s own arguments (519, 542 Ἄιδης), ironically presaging the eventual union of Haimon and Ant. in death (cf. 653–4, 806–16nn.). For ἔφου,

cf. 499–501, Ellendt 777 col. 1; with the MS variant ἐμοί, Kreon's reply would seem a little less absolute and decisive.

576–7 δεδογμέν' (sc. ἐστί) = δέδοκται (cf. 447 κηρυχθέντα with n.). ὡς ἔοικε adds a note of finality (cf. 7–10 with n.). Ismene means only to observe objectively, 'It is decided, so it seems, that ...'; but Kreon callously takes the phrase as meaning 'It seems good': 'Yes (γέ), to you *and* to me.' (If the Chorus spoke 576 (see 572–6, 574nn.), Kreon might genuinely believe that they agreed with his policy (cf. 211–14n.); but the Chorus would hardly use the singular τήνδε, when *both* sisters are under Kreon's sentence of death (489–90, 531–5, 577–81; cf. 769–70 with nn.).)

μὴ τριβᾶς ἔτ': sc. ποιείσθε; 'Don't delay!' (cf. A. *Ag.* 1055–6 οὐ ... σχολή ... τρίβειν). See too 1078 οὐ ... τριβή.

578–9 'From now on, they must be <proper> women, and not roaming loose' (cf. 18–19n.). Kreon's anxiety that his captives might escape (580 φεύγουσι) is characteristically tinged with horror of female independence; cf. 944–87n., Seaford 1990.

ἀνειμένως: cf. *El.* 516 ἀνειμένη μὲν ... αὖ στρέφῃ ('Are you on the loose again?'), and LSJ *s.v.* ἀνίημι II.6, ἀνετος (implying moral 'laxness' too).

580–1 Kreon concludes with another ill-chosen *gnōmē* (cf. 473–96n.): 'Even bold men try to escape, you know (τοί, cf. 473), once they see Death actually (ἦδη) closing in.' He underestimates the sisters' resolve.

Ismene and Ant. are led inside. Kreon probably remains on stage during the Choral Song that follows (626–30n., *Introd.* §4 p. 24).

582–625 Third Song (Second *Stasimon*) of the Chorus

With the two sisters, the last direct descendants of the House of the Labdakids, facing imprisonment and execution, the Chorus sing about the divine forces that can haunt and destroy a family, and about the recurrent patterns of human folly and misery. Although the opening phrase suggests a *makarismos* ('Blessed are they who ...'; 582n.), the rest of the ode dwells on the deceptive and destructive power of the gods.

The morality and theology of the Song are deeply traditional, with echoes from Hesiod, Solon, Hdt., and esp. A. *Th.* 720–91 (cf.

Easterling 1978, Else 1976: 11–18, 74–6). The key term is ἄτη, that inescapable complex of delusion, error, crime, and ruin (583, 614, 625; cf. 4n.): once a family is afflicted, disasters and sufferings may recur for generation after generation, until that family is wiped out completely (cf. Solon fr. 13.25–32, A. *Th.* 742–71, *Ag.* 758–71, *Eum.* 932–7); it is Zeus's law that no mortal can expect to live long free from disaster (cf. Bacchyl. 5.54–5 οὐ γὰρ τις ἐπιχθονίων πάντα γ' εὐδαίμων ξφν); but people are led by hope or desire to mistake evil for good, and to suffer the consequences (cf. Solon fr. 13.33–6, Theogn. 637–40). The Chorus insist throughout that all this is brought about by god(s) (583 θεόθεν, 597 θεῶν τις, 602 θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων, 604 Ζεῦ, 608–9 δυνάστας . . . Ὀλύμπου, 624 θεός: cf. 604–14n.). Usually, in other discussions of these issues (esp. in Aisch.), we find emphatic mention too of human responsibility for ruin: divine disfavour is not arbitrary, but is prompted by acts of wanton violence, sexual misconduct, or impiety, states of blood-guilt, curses, etc. (cf. A. *Th.* 720–91). But here the Chorus say little about the guilt of Oidipous' family: only that their sufferings are 'ancient' (593) and that god gives them no relief; see further W-Ingram 1980: 164–72.

The language of this Song is so densely packed and boldly imagistic (earthquake; sea-storm; a plant harvested as it strains towards the light; the glittering residence of never-sleeping Zeus; a foot stepping on hot embers) that the key ideas of divine victimization and ancestral suffering, conventional though they are, acquire fresh resonance and power, and bring vividly to the surface anxieties that have lurked unexpressed since the opening lines of the play (esp. 1–6, and cf. 49–57). Are these characters, whom we have seen speaking and acting with such independence of spirit, really mere victims of heredity and circumstance? – or (more terrifying still) of malevolent divinities bent on destroying them and their whole families?

These questions are raised, but not answered, for the particular relevance and application of the Song to the immediate context are not spelt out. That the family of Oidipous does, in general terms, fit this pattern of ἄτη is obvious enough. But, in seeking somehow to explain the capture and condemnation of Ant., the Elders leave some crucial issues vague and undefined (perhaps, in part, because Kreon is still present on stage). *Where* exactly should we locate the 'folly' (ἄτη), the 'expectation' (616 ἐλπῖς), the 'transgression' (605

ὑπερβασία), and the ‘deception’ (617 ἀπάτα)? And *whose* ‘mindlessness of word and Fury of the mind’ (603) was it that provoked this latest harvest of ruin (599–602)? Presumably, the Elders believe that the blame lies with Ant. (indeed, these phrases could describe A.’s Eteokles, cf. *Th.* 653–719, 742–65; Else 1976: 11–26); but the Chorus do not say so explicitly; and in any case, how reliable or authoritative is their voice? ‘Choruses ... are great explainers. They think they know: sometimes they are right, but equally they can be wrong, or partly wrong’ (W-Ingram 1980: 160; see *Intro.* §3, pp. 18–21). So, once again, we may be in two minds as to whether to endorse their interpretation of events, or to supplement, or even reject it, through our recognition of the ambiguities and ironies to which their words give rise. In particular, we can recognize that it is not only Oidipous’ family that is thus haunted by ἄτη, and guilty of mental aberration, but Kreon’s too (see 332–75n.).

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------|
| 582 | εὐδαιμόνες οἷσι κακῶν ἀγευστός αἰῶν· | × D × e × |
| 594 | ἀρχαία τα Λαβδακιδαν οἰκῶν ὄρωμαι | |
| 584 | οἷς γὰρ ἄν σεῖσθῃ θεοθεν δόμος, ἄτας | e × D × |
| 595 | πηματα φθιτῶν ἐπι πημασι πιπτοντ’, | |
| 585 | οὐδεν ἔλλειπει γενεᾶς ἐπι πληθος ἔρπον· | e × D × e _Λ // |
| 596 | οὐδ’ ἀπαλλασσει γενεαν γενος, ἀλλ’ ἔρειπει | |
| 586 | ὁμοιον ὥστε ποντιῶν | × E// |
| 598 | θεῶν τις, οὐδ’ ἔχει λυσιν. | (2 iambics) |
| 587 | οἶδμᾶ δυσπνοοῖς ὅταν | E |
| 599 | νυν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὅπερ | (_Λ 2 ia.) |
| 588 | Θρησσησιν ἐρεβος ὑφαλον ἐπιδραμη, πνοαι, | |
| 600 | ῥίζας ἐτέτατο φασ ἐν Οἰδιπου δομοις, | 3 ia. // |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 590 | $\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{-}{\upsilon}\overset{-}{\lambda}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\delta}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\theta}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\nu}$ | ba. cr. |
| 601 | $\kappa\alpha\tau' \overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon} \overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\nu} \overset{-}{\phi}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\alpha}$ | (\wedge 2 ia. \wedge) |
| 591 | $\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\lambda}\overset{-}{\alpha}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{-}{\nu} \overset{-}{\theta}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}, \kappa\alpha\iota \overset{-}{\delta}\overset{-}{\upsilon}\overset{-}{\sigma}\overset{-}{\alpha}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\mu}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\iota}$ | ba. cr. ia. |
| 602 | $\overset{-}{\theta}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\omega}\overset{-}{\nu} \overset{-}{\tau}\overset{-}{\omega}\overset{-}{\nu} \overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\rho}\overset{-}{\tau}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\rho}\overset{-}{\omega}\overset{-}{\nu} \overset{-}{\acute{\alpha}}\overset{-}{\mu}\overset{-}{\alpha}\overset{-}{\iota} \overset{-}{\kappa}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\iota}\varsigma,$ | (\wedge 3 ia.) |
| 593 | $\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{-}{\tau}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\omega}\overset{-}{\iota} \overset{\cup}{\beta}\overset{-}{\rho}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\mu}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\upsilon}\overset{-}{\sigma}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\nu} \overset{-}{\acute{\alpha}}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\tau}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\pi}\overset{-}{\lambda}\overset{-}{\eta}\overset{-}{\gamma}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\varsigma \overset{-}{\acute{\alpha}}\overset{-}{\kappa}\overset{-}{\tau}\overset{-}{\alpha}\overset{-}{\iota}.$ | 2 ia. ba.// |
| 603 | $\overset{-}{\lambda}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\gamma}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\upsilon} \overset{-}{\tau}' \overset{-}{\acute{\alpha}}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\omicron}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\iota \overset{-}{\phi}\overset{-}{\rho}\overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\omega}\overset{-}{\nu} \overset{-}{\epsilon}\overset{-}{\rho}\overset{-}{\iota}\overset{-}{\nu}\overset{-}{\upsilon}\varsigma.$ | (3 ia. \wedge) |

Like the second strophic pair in the Second Song (353–75), this pair begins in dactylo-epitrite (here more clearly defined as such in the first two long cola, 584–5 = 595–6), and then shifts into pure ‘epitritic’ (iambic-cretic, 586–7 = 598–9), and thus into straight iambs (syncopated) for the second half (see Dale 1968: 182–4 for parallels).

At the beginning and end of the stanza, the insistent falling rhythm (... \cup – – 582–5 = 594–6, 592 = 603) seems to reinforce the sense of an inescapable pattern of events, esp. with the final word of the ant. (Ἐρινύς). (This rhythm is even more insistent in the 2nd strophic pair.) In mid-stanza, the switch to iambs accompanies a quickening of the narrative tempo; in particular, 588 with its highly resolved ia. trim. enhances the verbal sense (rushing winds, etc.), while the abrupt syncopation that follows (590–1) suggests the storm’s disruption and turbulence; in the antistrophe (600) the resolution is less extreme, but the rhythm conveys a similar process of vigorous growth (600) stunted by the violent onslaught of the gods (601–2). There is striking correspondence between str. and ant. in 585–6/596–7, ‘the assonance and verbal repetition underscoring the repetition of ideas and theme of inherited woe’ (Ditmars 1992: 76; cf. 614/625); and a similar effect occurs in the strophe, with the assonance and symmetry of αἰών, ἄτας, and ἄκται at colon-end (582, 583, 592). A highly unusual kind of correspondence (possibly mere coincidence: but perhaps audible and significant) also links 593 and 603: the pattern of pitch-accents for the two lines is virtually identical (Ditmars 1992: 76).

The dac.-ep. period is concluded (585 = 596) by a clausula similar to 355 = 367. In the preceding colon (584 = 595), some editors retain the MS reading φθιμένων in the antistrophe, which would give a ‘resolved link-anceps’ (in resposion to unresolved: – \cup – $\cup\cup$

—υυ—υυ—), unparalleled in tragedy (though found occasionally in Pindar); or else the colon might be taken as ‘expanded hagesichorean’, analogous to the clausula (—×— υυ —υυ —υυ —). But Hermann’s correction to φθιτῶν is much more probable.

Strophe and antistrophe β

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 604 | τε̄αν, Ζε̄υ, δ̄υν̄ᾱσιν̄ τ̄ις̄ ἀν̄- | glyconic |
| 615 | ἀ γαρ̄ δε̄ πολυπ̄λαγκ̄τος̄ ἔλ- | |
| 605 | δρῶν̄ ὑ̄περ̄βᾱσιᾱ κᾱτᾱσχοι; | ×× chor. ba. |
| 616 | πις̄ πολλοις̄ μεν̄ ὄνησις̄ ἀν̄δρων, | (hipponactean) |
| 606 | τὰν̄ οὐθ̄’ ὑ̄πνο̄ς̄ αἰ̄ρεῑ πο̄θ’ ὄ†παν̄το̄γηρῶς† | ×2 chor. ba. |
| 617 | πολλοις̄ δ’ ἀπᾱτᾱ κουφονων̄ ἐρω̄των· | |
| 607 | οὐτ̄’ ἔτεων̄ ἀ̄κμᾱτοι | chor. ba. |
| 618 | εἶδο̄τι δ’ οὐ̄δεν̄ ἐρ̄πει, | (aristophanean) |
| 608 | μη̄νες, ἀ̄γηρῶς̄ δε̄ χρο̄νωῑ δ̄υν̄ασ̄τας̄ | 2 chor. ba. |
| 619 | πριν̄ πυρῑ θερ̄μωῑ πο̄δᾱ τ̄ις̄ προ̄σαῡσηι. | |
| 609 | κᾱτε̄χεις̄ Ὀ̄λυμ̄που | ^chor. ba. |
| 620 | σο̄φ̄ιᾱι γαρ̄ ἐκ̄ τοῡ | (or anacl. ^ionic) |
| 610 | μαρ̄μᾱρο̄ε̄σσαν̄ αἰ̄γλαν̄. | chor. ba. |
| 621 | κλεινον̄ ἐπο̄ς̄ πεφ̄ανται, | (aristophanean) |
| 611 | το̄ τ’ ἐ̄πεῑτᾱ καῑ το̄ με̄λλον̄ | ^chor. × e × |
| 622 | το̄ κακον̄ δο̄κειν̄ ποτ̄’ ἐ̄σθλον̄ | (or anacl. ionic) |
| 612 | καῑ το̄ πριν̄ ἐπᾱρκε̄σει | ^glyconic |
| 623 | τωιδ̄’ ἐ̄μμεν̄ ὄτωῑ φρε̄νας̄ | (telesillean) |
| 613 | νο̄μο̄ς̄ ὄδ’· †οῡδεν̄ ἐρ̄πεῑ | cr. ba.// |
| 624 | θεο̄ς̄ ἀ̄γεῑ προ̄ς̄ ἀ̄ταν, | |

614 θ̄νᾱτων β̄ιω̄τωι πᾱμπο̄λις† ἑ̄κτος ἄ̄τας. × 2 chor. ba.//
 625 πρᾱσσει δ' ὀ̄λιγισ̄τον χρο̄νον ἑ̄κτος ἄ̄τας.

The basic motif of this stanza is (-)υυ-υ- -, an element akin to glyconic (xx-υυ-υ-), with recurrent pendant close (υ- -) taken over from the 1st strophic pair. The motif occurs in virtually every colon, with the variations typical of this kind of aeolic metre (West 1982: 30-4): expansion by one or two syllables at beginning or end; 'acephalous' cola (609 = 620, 611 = 622?); and/or 'internal expansion' through an extra choriamb in the middle (606 = 617, 608 = 619, 614 = 625), i.e. the distinctive 'asclepiad' rhythm (cf. 785-6 = 795-6, 787 = 797, 944-65, Dale 1968: 133-47, 155: 'Only S. of the dramatists assimilates the Lesbian asclepiads, with their repeated choriamb, to choral use, and he does so with great elaboration and finesse'). Here again, although individual cola may be given different-sounding names ('glyconic', 'telesillean', 'choriambic', even 'ionic'), their basic metrical character remains constant, and shows strong continuity with earlier ones, esp. str. and ant. α of the 1st Song, and str. and ant. β of the 2nd Song, as well as the preceding strophic pair of this Song. This effect of continuity, and of an inescapable rhythmic, verbal, and cosmic pattern, is emphatically reinforced by the final phrase of both str. and ant. (614 = 625 ... ἑκτός ἄτας).

In 604-5 = 615-16, 'dovetailing' makes the distinction between 'glyconic' and 'hipponactean' arbitrary; likewise at 608-11 = 619-22, between 'choriambo-iambic' and 'anacreontic' (i.e. ionic of the 'anaclastic' kind): (-)υυ-υ-υ- - υυ-υ-υ-(-) ... etc. (cf. 839-40 = 857-9, Cole 1988: 190-2, Dale 1968: 144-7). The text and metre of 606-7 = 617-18 are uncertain. Cole (1988: 190-2) retains οὔτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν μῆνες of the MSS, and suggests that this (x-υυ-υ-υ- -) introduces a 'rhythmical leitmotif ... which is to reappear through much of the rest of the play' (cf. 789-90, 944-5); but this entails emending both str. and ant.

582 εὐδαιμονες οἷσι ... 'Blessed <are those> whose <life> ...', a conventional opening to a *makarismos* (though μάκαρ or ὀλβιος δς ... is the more common formula, as at E. *Ba.* 73-4, 910-11; but cf. Theogn. 1013). This positive 'blessing' serves only as a brief foil to the negative alternative (584ff. οἷς γὰρ ...; cf. 616-17), as often in archaic poetry (Bacchyl. 5.50-5, Theogn. 1013-17; Easterling 1978:

143); indeed, by the end of the Song it appears that *nobody* is entitled to be called truly εὐδαίμων, since nobody lives a whole ‘life without tasting troubles’ (582, cf. 614; also ‘Solon’ at Hdt. 1.30–2, Aristot. *NE* 1 9 1100a5–11).

583–5 Lit. ‘For those whose house has been shaken by god, no <element> of disaster is lacking, <but> it spreads over the multitude of their family’, i.e. through future generations (cf. 596–7n., Solon fr. 13.25–32), and perhaps laterally too (siblings, cousins, etc.), as in standard formulas for curses.

σεισθῆι: as by a thunderbolt or earthquake (cf. 153–4, 1273–4, *Tr.* 1087), or by a maritime storm (cf. 162–3, 586–90n.).

ἄτας: the keynote of this Song (614, 624, 625; cf. 4, 582–625nn.).

586–90 ‘Just as the swell, when it rushes before the harsh Thracian winds over the dark depths of the sea, churns up the black sand from the bottom.’ The ‘storm’ of god-sent troubles is a common image (cf. 162–3, *Tr.* 112ff., Solon fr. 13.17–25 West, A. *Th.* 758–61, van Nes 1963: 34–45). This elaborate simile is esp. reminiscent of Hom. *Il.* 9.1–8 (describing the terrified Achaians): ‘... as when two winds stir up the sea, Boreas and Zephyr, who blow from Thrace ... The black wave rears up high, and churns up much seaweed ...’

ὅμοιον ὥστε introduces the simile, as at Plato, *Laws* 628d ὅμοιον ὡς εἰ ... ἠγοῖτό τις ... , with ὥστε = ὡς (cf. 1033, 1084, LSJ *s.v.* A.1). Most of the MSS read ὅμοιον ὥστε ποντίας ἀλός οἶδμα κτλ., which makes good sense but impossible metre (cf. 597 in antistrophe, and n. on *Metre*). ἀλός is best deleted as a gloss (as the schol.’s paraphrase suggests), and Schneidewin’s πόντιον adopted to give οἶδμα an epithet (cf. 337): οἶδμα πόντιον or πόντου is almost formulaic (e.g. E. *IA* 704, *Or.* 991). Another possible solution is to omit ὅμοιον (Seidler, LJ&W), and scan 597 θεῶν as a monosyllable.

Θρήισσησιν ... πνοαῖς: proverbially fierce, e.g. A. *Ag.* 654, 192, 1418, and Hom. *Il.* 9.5 (quoted above). For the dative of ‘agent’ or ‘instrument’, cf. 335 νότῳι with n.

ἔρεβος ὕφαλον ‘darkness under the waves’: a bold adaptation of ἔρεβος, which normally denotes *subterranean* gloom (cf. *Aj.* 395, West on Hes. *Th.* 123).

591–2 δυσάνεμοι | ... ἀντιπλήγες ἄκται: cf. *OC* 1240 ἀκτὰ κυματοπλήξ (= the trouble-buffed Oidipous), Hom. *Od.* 5.417.

594–5 Word-order suggests that ἀρχαῖα is predicate (and em-

phatic), and φθιτῶν is to be taken with πῆμασι: ‘Of long standing <are> the afflictions of the House of the Labdakids <that> I see piling up on top of <earlier> afflictions of the dead’; i.e. the process of new troubles (= Ant.’s crime and impending death) piling onto old is an ‘ancient’ one – and mention of Labdakos, father of Laios, suggests that the origin lies far in the past; see 596–7n., 49–60, 856–71). Alliteration (π, φ, τ, θ) adds emphasis to the accumulation of ills in 595. φθιτῶν is a metrically necessary correction of the MS φθιμένων (n. on *Metre*).

ὄρωμαι: middle forms of ὄρώω are common in epic, occasional in tragedy (e.g. 423, *Tr.* 306, *Ph.* 351).

596–7 οὐδ’ ἀπαλλάσσει γενεᾶν γένος ‘nor does <one> generation release <the previous> generation <from afflictions>’; for the variation (γενεᾶν γένος), cf. 1067 νέκυν νεκρῶν ἀμοιβόν, *Aj.* 475 παρ’ ἡμᾶρ ἡμέρα. Alternatively, γενεᾶν = ‘the whole family’, equivalent to οἴκων (594), cf. 585 γενεᾶς in metrically corresponding position. For the continuous, divinely enforced succession of ills, cf. A. *Th.* 740–1 ὦ πόνοι δόμων νέοι παλαιοῖσι συμμιγεῖς κακοῖς, *Ag.* 1565–6, *Cho.* 403–4; Else 1976: 11–26.

ἔχει: the subject is presumably γενεά, i.e. the latest generation of the family, with ἄλλ’ ... τις parenthetical.

599–603 Lit. ‘For now the light <of salvation> which, arising from (or ‘consisting of’) the last <surviving> root, had been spread out in the house of Oidipous – the bloody dust of the Underworld is burying <it> again, mindlessness of speech and Frenzy of wits.’ The text is very uncertain, but, whatever reading is adopted, the imagery is extraordinarily rich, shifting, and evocative, and the word-order and sentence structure highly convoluted.

νῦν γὰρ κτλ. explains the preceding generalizations (594–7).

ἔσχατας ὄπερ | ῥίζας ἐτέτατο φάος: φάος is often used metaphorically, of ‘salvation’ or ‘hope’ (*Aj.* 709, *El.* 1354, A. *Cho.* 131, 809, 961); and τέινω is the regular expression for the ‘spreading’ of light or darkness across the earth (*Ph.* 831 αἴγλαν ἄ τέταται, Hom. *Od.* 11.19, Hes. *WD* 549; and cf. 124–5). This metaphor is combined with the image of the two sisters (and their brothers too? and cf. 626–7) as the ‘last root’ of the house (cf. A. *Ag.* 966 ῥίζης γὰρ οὖσης φυλλὰς ἴκετ’ ἐς δόμους, Pind. *O.* 2.46; also *El.* 765 πρόρριζον ἐφθαρται γένος, and A. *Supp.* 105–6, *Cho.* 260 πυθμῆν. At A. *Th.* 752, ῥίζαν

αίματόεσσα = Iokaste's womb). The mixing of the images is bold, but is helped by the close associations of both terms (light, root) with the central idea of 'house': comparable are E. *IT* 187 ἔρρει φῶς σκήπτρων ('the saving light of your rule is lost'), *El.* 449 τρέφεν Ἑλλάσι φῶς.

Most of the MSS read ὑπέρ for ὄπερ, which would further strain the combination of metaphors ('the light spread *over* the last root', rather than the 'light/salvation *of/from* the last root spread ...'). In any case, a relative pronoun is needed, unless very harsh asyndeton is to be accepted in 601 (as by LJ&W); so it would be better, if ὑπέρ is read, to adopt Hermann's ὁ τέτατο (the syllabic augment being optional in lyric.)

601-3 κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία | ... ἀμαῖ κόνις 'the bloody dust of the gods below is harvesting it in turn', a peculiar image, esp. since νιν, grammatically, should refer to φάος, not ῥίζας. But the proper derivation and meaning of καταμαῖ (here in tmesis) are uncertain: ἀμάω and its compounds normally = 'cut', esp. 'harvest', and may be separate from ἀμάομαι κτλ. = 'gather', 'scrape together' (always middle, cf. West on Hes. *Th.* 599, *WD* 778). A scholiast here glosses as θερίζει καὶ καλύπτει, but the latter sense, which would suit κόνις well ('bloody dust belonging to the nether gods covers <it>') is not attested anywhere else. If κατ' ... ἀμαῖ = 'hacks down', then the specific image of 'harvesting' a 'root' is hard to ignore, and this has led many editors to adopt Jortin's κοπίς ('knife') for κόνις, esp. in light of *Aj.* 1178-9 γένους ἅπαντος ῥίζαν ἐξημημένος | αὐτως ὀπωσπερ τόνδ' ἐγὼ τέμνω πλόκον. But κοπίς is properly a 'scimitar' or 'cleaver', not a pruning or harvesting implement (contrast *S.* fr. 534.7 ῥίζων ... ἄς ... ἦμα δρεπάνοισ), and why should the gods below be wielding a 'bloody scimitar' (cf. Easterling 1978: 146-9)? The choice is difficult, but it is probably better to retain κόνις.

Even more jarring (esp. if κοπίς is read) is the run-on of the image and syntax into line 603, whether this refers to Ant.'s behaviour (cf. 383 ἀφροσύνη, 562 ἄνου), or to Kreon's (cf. 755), or both (582-625n.). Syntactically, 603 is either appended in apposition to 602, in which case ἄνοια καὶ ... Ἐρινύς are somehow equivalent to κόνις/κοπίς: or the two nom. phrases are supplementary, with κόνις/κοπίς, ἄνοια, and Ἐρινύς combining in a zeugma, as triple subject of καταμαῖ. In either case, the interplay of human/divine, material/mental, agencies is extraordinary.

604–14 The Chorus return piously to the idea that somehow the old and new miseries of Oidipous' family must be due to divine will (cf. 1347–53). Their reverent yet pessimistic appeal to Zeus recalls A. *Ag.* 160–83, or *Supp.* 86–111 (cf. too *Tr.* 1269–78).

604–5 **τεάν . . . δύνασιν:** lyric colouring for σὴν δύναμιν, cf. 951, and 623 ἔμμεν.

τίς . . . ὑπερβασία κατάσχοις: potential, 'What human transgression could <ever> inhibit your power?' For the omission of ἄν (common in epic), cf. A. *Cho.* 594 ὑπέρολμον φρόνημα τίς λέγοι (*GMT* §24, Smyth §1821, Moorhouse 1982: 229–30), and the more common construction after οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις . . . (e.g. A. *Prom.* 292; *GMT* §241). For ὑπερβασία, cf. 455 ὑπερδραμεῖν with n., A. *Th.* 742 παρβασίαν (and cf. 797–9n.).

606–10 An honorific description of Zeus's dominance, affected neither by sleep (cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.244–62, *Od.* 591–2) nor by age (cf. the formulaic ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρω, and *OT* 872 μέγας . . . θεός, οὐδὲ γηράσκει, *Aj.* 646–7).

τὰν is definite article used as relative (= ἦν), as often in S., usually for metrical convenience (here, perhaps to avoid hiatus); mainly in lyrics (cf. 826, 1137) but occasionally in ia. trim. too (as at 1086; see Easterling on *Tr.* 47, Smyth §1105, K–G I 587–8).

606 †παντογήρωσι: though metrical, this can hardly be right: Sleep is conventionally 'all-subduing' (πανδαμάτωρ, *Ph.* 1467, Hom. *Il.* 24.5) and closely related to Death, but not because he makes everyone *old*. -γήρωσι must have slipped in accidentally from 608. Another epithet is required, scanning –ο–; possibilities include πάντ' ἀγρεύων (Jebb), παντοδμάτωρ (*Emperius*), or παντοθήρας (Bamberger).

607–8 **οὔτ' ἑτέων ἄκματοι | μῆνες:** cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.294–5 μῆνες . . . ἐξετελεύντο | ἄψ περιελλομένου ἔτεος, 10.469–70 (also 353 ἀκμήτα, 338–41n.). The MSS have οὔτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν μῆνες, which is not impossible, but seems unlikely: although the gods are often said to preside over the years and seasons (Hom. *Od.* 24.344 Διὸς ὄραι, *Il.* 2.134 Διὸς μεγάλου ἐνιαυτοί), and individual months are dedicated to particular deities (see LJ&W 1990: 129–30), 'the gods' months' is as odd in Greek as in English; furthermore, the responson of 607 – –οο– – to 618 –οο–οο– is unlikely (see n. on *Metre*).

608 **δυνάστας** (nom. sing.) 'supreme commander', a prosaic term; in tragedy only *OT* 593, E. *IA* 28, A. *Ag.* 6 (see Fraenkel's n.).

609–10 Ὀλύμπου | μαρμαρόεσσαν αἴγλαν combines the idea of ‘glittering halls’ of gold or marble (Hes. *Th.* 811 πύλαι μαρμάραι, Hom. *Il.* 13.22 δώματα μαρμαίροντα) with that of ‘dazzling sky’ (as of the gods’ abode in Hom. *Od.* 6.42–6, esp. 45 λευκή δ’ ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη, cf. *Il.* 1.532 ἀπ’ αἰγλήεντος Ὀλύμπου). Contrast 588 ἔρεβος κτλ.

611–13 ‘This law will endure for now, and the future, as well as the past’, cf. 452–7. τὸ ἔπειτα = ‘what comes next’ (cf. *Aj.* 34–5 τὰ πάρος τά τ’ εἰσέπειτα), and cf. the formulaic τὰ τ’ ἔόντα τά τ’ ἐσσόμενα πρό τ’ ἔόντα (Hom. *Il.* 1.70, etc.). The reference of ὅδε is probably to what follows (613–14n.), rather than back to the idea of Zeus’s unageing dominance (604–10).

613–14 The text is again very uncertain. The MS reading πάμπολις in 614 makes no sense, and the recurrence of οὐδὲν ἔρπει in 618, in a different metrical position, is suspicious. But no proposed emendation is entirely satisfactory. Heath’s οὐδὲν ἔρπει θνατῶν βίῳ τῷ πάμπόλῳ γ’ ἐκτὸς ἄτας (‘Nothing enormous comes to the life of mortals without <subsequent> disaster’) has been adopted by several editors: but γε here is suspect, and πάμπόλῳ can hardly mean ‘excessively great’ / ‘wealthy’, which the context demands (cf. Solon fr. 13.73–6 West, Hdt. 7.10, etc.): the parallels cited by Jebb (Plato, *Rep.* 531d πάμπόλῳ ἔργον = ‘a huge task’, *Laws* 823b, 677e) are much more straightforward. Taking πάμπόλῳ as temporal is no better (e.g., ‘Nothing proceeds for very long . . .’, Müller). Lloyd-Jones proposes οὐδὲν ἔρπει θνατῶν βίῳ τῷ πάμπόλῳ ἐκτὸς ἄτας (‘To no human creature comes vast abundance without disaster’, following the Aldine and Musgrave): but the acc. (οὐδένα) after ἔρπει is harsh (*Ph.* 141, E. *Hipp.* 1371, cited in support by LJ&W 1990: 130, are much easier), and βίῳ τῷ πάμπόλῳ would be peculiar for ὄλβος or κόρος. (With either proposal, Heath’s further alteration of ἔρπει to ἔρπειν is possible, in indirect statement after νόμος ὅδε, but not necessary.) Suggestions that entail taking 613 νόμος ὅδε as referring backwards to Zeus’s dominance (604–10), are even less appealing, not least because of the asyndeton that results in 613.

Even the general sense of 613–14 is in doubt. Do the Chorus mean that no life escapes without its measure of ἄτη, sooner or later – a pessimistic message (similar to *OT* 1186–96, 1528–30) that would seem to equate ‘Zeus’s power’ merely with the natural consequences

of human frailty? Or that excessive prosperity will inevitably lead to ἄτη and divine punishment, a more familiar view of the ‘law’ of Zeus? In any case, the echoes from Ant.’s opening words (2–6) are striking, though the Elders’ tone is more hesitant, less assured. Whether their theology comes across as profound or platitudinous, may depend on the reader (585–625n., Introd. §5(f)).

615–25 ἄ γὰρ δὴ . . . ἐλπίς κτλ.: the reason why human beings succumb to ἄτη is that they are lured by ‘hope’, in the form both of their own desires (617 ἐρώτων) and of god-sent deception (622–4 θεὸς ἄγει). The μέν-clause on the ‘benefits’ of ἐλπίς (πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνησις . . ., cf. A. *Prom.* 250 with Griffith’s n.) is foil (582n.) to the description of its delusory qualities (πολλοῖς δ’ ἀπάτα . . ., as in Solon fr. 13.36 West . . . χάσκοντες κούφαις ἐλπίσι τερπόμεθα, Semonides fr. 1.3–7 West), which lead directly to ἄτη. Obviously Ant. is in the Chorus’ mind, as the latest agent/victim of the Labdakids’ ‘ruin’; but the account applies also to Kreon (esp. 622–4).

615 πολὺπλαγκτος: both ‘far-ranging’ (because Hope affects so many people, cf. A. *Prom.* 250 πημόνη πλανωμένη) and ‘much-erring’ (because Hope leads them so far astray, cf. A. *Ag.* 12 νυκτίπλαγκτον with Fraenkel’s n., Hom. *Il.* 13.308 ἀνέμοιο πολυπλάγκτοιο).

617 ἀπάτα κρυφονόων ἐρώτων ‘deception consisting of (or ‘arising from’) thoughtless desires’ (cf. 342). ἀπάτη frequently goes hand in hand with ἄτη, cf. A. *Supp.* 110, *Pers.* 93–100 (and 630 below). For ἐρώτων, cf. 781–800.

618–19 ‘It (= deception) comes to one who knows nothing until he has <already> burned his foot on the hot fire.’ (For the delayed position of τις, cf. *Tr.* 2–3, *Aj.* 964–5.) For the general idea, cf. proverbial παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω, Solon fr. 13.33–5 West, and A. *Eum.* 377 πίπτων δ’ οὐκ οἶδεν τόδ’ ὑπ’ ἄφρονι λύμαι. To ‘walk on ashes’ is proverbial for risky conduct (‘skating on thin ice’), cf. Suda ἐν πυρὶ βέβηκας, Lucretius, *DRN* 4.927, Horace, *Odes* 2.1.7–8 *incedis per ignis | suppositos cineri doloso* with Nisbet and Hubbard’s n.

ἔπροσαύω is not otherwise attested. Whether it comes from αὖω (= ‘kindle’ or ‘collect’ fire, cf. ἐναύω), or from a different root, such as αὖω (= ξηραίνω, cf. αὔσος, ἀφαύω), is unclear. But there seems to be no need to emend. For the omission of ἄν with πρίν + subj., as often in epic, cf. *Aj.* 965, *Tr.* 608 (*GMT* §648).

620–1 For such ‘anonymous and age-old’ (ἐκ του) but ‘celebrated’ (κλεινόν) gnomic authority, cf. *Tr.* iff., *A. Cho.* 313–14, *Prom.* 887–9 ἡ σοφὸς ἦν | ὃς ... διεμυθολόγησεν; and cf. 457 ἐξ ὄτου ’φάνη.

622–4 ‘Bad often looks good to those whom <a> god is leading astray’, cf. *Theognis* 402–6 ἀνὴρ ... ὄντινα δαίμων | πρόφρων ἐς μεγάλην ἀμπλακίην παράγει, | καὶ οἱ ἔθηκε δοκεῖν, ἅ μὲν ἦι κακά, ταῦτ’ ἀγαθ’ εἶναι κτλ. A scholiast quotes from an unknown tragedy (*TrGF* II F 455) ὅταν δ’ ὁ δαίμων ἀνδρὶ πορσύνῃ κακά, | τὸν νοῦν ἔβλαψε πρῶτον ὧι βουλεύεται, cf. too the Latin proverb *quem Iuppiter vult perdere dementat prius* (see Jebb’s *Appendix*). Does god ever ‘lead astray’ people who are otherwise not disposed to wrongdoing? Theologians wrestle with this problem, and tragedians and novelists occasionally confront it too; but in Greek myth and literature, criminal proclivity and divine sabotage usually coincide (4n.).

623 ἔμμεν for εἶναι is an epic/lyric form (cf. 604–5n.), found only here in tragedy; perhaps the *gnōmē* is (or is pretending to be) a quotation from an archaic source.

625 ‘And he fares <only> a very brief time clear of disaster.’ The repetition of ἐκτός ἄτας as the final words of both strophe and antistrophe is highly effective; cf. n. on *Metre*, and 781/800.

626–780 Scene Four (Third *Epeisodion*)

Haimon arrives, and Kreon expounds to him the need for obedience and discipline within family and city (639–80). Haimon, while insisting on his own loyalty, reminds his father that no man is infallible, mentions that the citizens disapprove of Kreon’s policies, and asks him to reconsider (683–723). A bitter *stichomythia* ensues (726–65), in which Kreon accuses his son of valuing Ant. and marriage above his filial and civic duties, while Haimon’s language grows more overtly critical. Finally, Kreon threatens to execute Ant. in her fiancé’s presence (760–1), and Haimon storms off, vowing that Kreon will never see him again (762–5). In a short dialogue (766–80), the Chorus then persuade Kreon to spare Ismene; but Kreon specifies that Ant. will be executed by living entombment.

The arrival of Haimon is not unexpected (after 568–75), and both the Chorus and Kreon anticipate that he may be angry (627–33). For most of this *agōn*-scene, he does maintain at least a façade of polite-

ness; but he is constantly provoked by Kreon, who grows increasingly angry at the prospect of accepting 'instruction' from his young son (726 διδαξόμεσθα, cf. 710, 723) and interprets any expression of support for Ant. as evidence either of sexual infatuation or of treachery aimed against himself. As Haimon too finally loses his temper, he speaks more directly of his father's 'errors', 'irreverence', 'empty notions', and 'madness' (751-65), including even a couple of veiled threats (751n., 758-9). Like the earlier confrontation between Kreon and Ant. (450-70n.), this *agōn* has both moral/political and personal dimensions, as Kreon presses the analogy between the father within the home and the ruler within the city, in insisting on the obedience (πειθαρχία) owed to both, while Haimon, despite his personal connection to Ant., frames his complaints about Kreon's policies entirely in terms of 'the city' (690-5, 700, 733, 737) or 'the gods' (683, 745-9), in suggesting that Kreon has less to lose by 'giving in' (713, 716 ὑπέικει, 718 εἶκε) and changing his mind (718 μετόσταςιν) than by persisting in an unpopular and immoral policy. It is notable that, although Kreon keeps harping on 'marriage', 'pleasure', and, above all, 'woman' (648-52, 677-80, 740, 746, 756), Haimon himself never mentions his feelings for Ant. Perhaps it would be shameful for a man (on the tragic stage, or in Athenian public life) to attempt to justify his political activity by referring to his own sexual or marital ambitions (648-52n.); but Haimon's silence, or evasiveness, on this score, may contribute to his father's mistrust of him. (The strength of Haimon's love for his bride is indeed confirmed by others, cf. 568-72, 627-30, 632-3; and cf. 781-800, 1220-43. Probably too, the same actor played both roles: *Introd.* §4.)

It is curiously rare in Greek tragedy (much rarer than in Homeric epic, or Comedy) for a father and adult son to meet on stage: and when they do meet, relations are seldom comfortable (Griffith 1998). Sons are not supposed to confront their fathers in public, to answer them back, or criticize them (Dover 1974: 273-5, Campbell 1964: 159-64); and while fathers take pride in sons' achievements, and vice versa (cf. 701-4), and both owe allegiance to their common *oikos*, a tension exists between the son's dutiful subservience to the father, and his impulse towards self-assertion and acquisition of property, reputation, and – through marriage – a family of his own. In this

scene, the confrontation is esp. unsettling, because Haimon is Kreon's sole surviving child (626–7, cf. 1303 with n.), and tries so hard to restrain his feelings. Furthermore, even as Kreon continues to alienate our sympathies, by his refusal to listen, his autocratic identification of the city's well-being with himself (732–9), and his obsession with female rivalry, we can see signs that he might be capable of better, were the advice and opposition coming from any other source than his own son. For, as soon as Haimon has departed, Kreon does listen to the Chorus' advice, and spares Ismene (770–2); and he shows genuine concern not to harm his city with pollution (776); cf. 1091–1114n.

The structure of the *agōn* (626–766) is highly symmetrical. Kreon and Haimon begin with 4 lines each; then each utters a long *rhēsis* of approximately (or exactly?, cf. 690–1n.) 42 lines, followed by a 2-line comment by the Chorus. Then a strict stichomythia ensues, in which the same issues are discussed, but the tone becomes rapidly more savage, before the *agōn* concludes with 4 more lines from each of them. This rigid formalism contributes to the current of pent-up emotion and tension that pervades the scene, only slightly mitigated by the short concluding coda (766–80).

626–30 Once again, the Chorus' anapaests draw attention to the new arrival (526–30n.; here, unusually, there is no *καί* preceding *μήν*, *GP* 331). Since there is no mention of Kreon's arriving too, it seems likely that he has remained on stage throughout the preceding Song (cf. 780, 883–90nn., and contrast 385–7). Haimon presumably enters unattended, by the same side-entrance that Kreon did (155–61n., cf. 692–700, *Introd.* §4). His manner may indicate pent-up anger and dismay – at least, the Chorus and Kreon both suspect this (627 *ἄχνύμενος*, 630 *ὑπεραλγῶν*, 633 *λυσσαίνων*); however, his language is much more moderate throughout the scene than his father's (735 with n., contrast 1223–39).

véατον: both 'youngest' (cf. 728, 1266 *véος*) and 'last' (cf. 807–8, and 1303 with n.), hence most precious of Kreon's *φίλοι* (634, cf. 187–8, 1066–7, 1162–4nn.). *véατος* (found only in tragedy) properly is superlative of *véος*, but its usage may be influenced by *véιατος* ('lowest', 'utmost').

ἄχνύμενος | ... μόρον: usually *ἄχνυμαι*, *ἄχεύω* take a genitive; but cf. *Hom. Il.* 5.361 *ἄχθομαι ἔλκος*, *Ph.* 1314. Kreon's question

hangs unanswered throughout this scene; but Haimon's 'grief' and 'rage' become explicit at 1223ff.

τάλιδος is a rare, even exotic, word for 'fiancée' or 'bride' (found elsewhere only at Callim. *Ait.* fr. 75.3 Pf.; ancient grammarians say it is Aeolic); it may suggest royal luxury (cf. 1057 ταγούς). In 628, most of the MSS read τῆς μελλογάμου νύμφης τάλιδος. Metre (and Pollux's citation) indicates that νύμφης does not belong; Pollux also omits τῆς μελλογάμου (cf. 633), and some editors follow suit.

630 ἀπάτης λεχέων ὑπεραλγῶν 'feeling pain for the cheating of his marriage-bed', with λεχέων gen. of separation (contrast 617).

631 μαντέων ὑπέρτερον 'better than seers <could tell us>', proverbial for knowledge 'directly from the source', cf. [E.] *Rhesos* 952 οὐδὲν μάντεων ἔδει φράσαι, and *OT* 6 μὴ παρ' ἀγγέλων.

632–4 Haimon is asked immediately to declare his allegiance to one side or the other (cf. 9–10n.; contrast 683–7, 687nn.).

τελείαν ψῆφον . . . | τῆς μελλονύμφου 'the authoritative decision concerning <your> bride-to-be'. τέλειος is often found in public documents meaning 'duly enacted', 'official' (though the usual Attic term is κύριος, cf. 936 κατακυροῦσθαι); inevitably a sense of 'final' is present too; cf. *A. Supp.* 739 τελεία ψῆφος Ἀργείων, with FJ&W's n. For ψῆφον, cf. 59–60n., and for the following genitive, cf. 11 μῦθος . . . φίλων.

λυσσαίνων 'raving', a very strong expression (cf. 492 λυσσῶσαν). λυσσαίνω, for λυσσάω, is found nowhere else; but cf. ὀργαίνω at *Tr.* 552, *OT* 335. The variant θυμαίνων would be much milder.

634 'Or in your eyes am I <still> "your own" (φίλοι), however I act?' (contrast 187–8n.). σοὶ μὲν is contrasted implicitly with the two sisters. For πανταχῆι δρῶντες, cf. *Aj.* 1369 (also 211–14n.).

635–8 Haimon's pledge of filial allegiance is immediate, but not unequivocal. σός εἰμι could mean 'I am on your side', or merely 'I am <biologically> yours' (for similar ambiguity, cf. *OC* 1323 and *A. Eum.* 738 κάρτα δ' εἰμί τοῦ πατρός). Likewise, γνώμας ἔχων χρηστάς could be causal ('since you have . . .') or conditional ('if you have . . .'); and σοῦ καλῶς ἡγούμενου could be factual or conditional: 'No marriage will ever be considered more valuable for me to win than you since/if you lead <me> well' (with καλῶς responding to 634 πανταχῆι).

μοι . . . ἀπορθοῖς 'you lay them out straight for me' (μοι ethic

dat., 'in my view'), as if Kreon's γνῶμαι were builder's 'guidelines' (κανόνες, cf. fr. 474.5Radt, *E. El.* 52). Less likely, 'You guide me straight' with με understood (cf. 167 ὄρθου πόλιν, 163, *OT* 104), for then the future, ἐπέσομαι, rather than a generalizing present, is odd. Possibly the imperative ἀπόρθου should be read, followed by ταῖς (= αἷς, cf. 1086 τῶν with n.): 'Lay them out for me, and I will follow them.'

ἀξιώσεται is middle for passive, cf. 93n. (ἀξίως ἔσται in the MSS would require an impossible function for ἀξίως.) The construction is a conflation of μείζονος ἀξιοθήσεται and μείζων νομισθήσεται φέρεσθαι (cf. 1248 ἀξιώσειν). For μείζων, cf. 182–3n.

639–80 Kreon's arguments revolve around three principles: (i) sons are extensions of their fathers; (ii) women are a danger and a distraction to men; (iii) the key to domestic and military-political order is 'obedience' (676 πειθαρχία) to the rule of the father/leader (643–4n.). Thus an analogy is set up between the 'woman' (648–9) who leads a man into abandoning family loyalties in favour of 'pleasure', and the unruly soldier who talks back to his officers, disobeys orders, and jeopardizes his fellows' lives in battle. Haimon must prove himself an ἀνὴρ χρηστός on both scores (son and soldier-citizen, 661–2) by rejecting Ant. as an 'enemy' (653 δυσμενῆ), cf. *Tr.* 1174–5 τέκνον . . . σύμμαχον.

These principles would doubtless be endorsed by most fifth-century Greek men (cf. esp. Herakles and Hyllos at *Tr.* 1174–80). But, as so often in this play, Kreon's utterances drift back and forth between irreproachable civic-mindedness and crude authoritarianism, once he is faced with any hint of filial or female opposition: fathers/monarchs must be obeyed, even if their commands are unjust (642, 666–7), and male solidarity must be maintained at all costs (677–80); see further Griffith 1998.

639–40 'Yes (γάρ), this is how <you> should be disposed in your heart . . .', (with οὕτω looking both backwards and forward, since 640 corresponds to 635–8). For διὰ στέρνων, cf. 1060 διὰ φρενῶν, *Ph.* 791–2 διαμπερές στέρνων (literal), *A. Th.* 593; also 916, 1258.

πάντ' ὀπισθεν ἑστάναι: an unusual expression: either '... to take your stand in all things behind your father's will' (with the unexpressed subject of ἔχειν continuing as subject of ἑστάναι, and πάντα adverbial), i.e. to 'back him up' as in a military formation (cf. Plato,

Prot. 315b εἰς τὸ ὀπισθεν καθίσταντο); or ‘... that everything take second place behind your father’s will’ (cf. *Aj.* 1249 τοὺς ὀπισθεν ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν ἄξομεν). πάντα reasserts 634 πανταχῆι, ignoring 638 καλῶς.

641–4 ‘This is why men wish to beget obedient children within the household, so that they may pay back their enemy with harm, and honour their friend just as the father does.’ τούτου ... οὐνεκ’ refers both backwards and forwards (cf. 639 οὕτω); ἐξ ἴσου πατρί = ὡσπερ ὁ πατήρ (different is 516). κατήκοος, like ὑπήκοος, is rather a negatively-charged term (‘subject’, cf. 672–6, 683–7, 757nn.), but Kreon is exploiting the conventional analogy between family and polis (e.g., *Ar. Pol.* 1 1–7), and his language recalls that of interstate treaties: τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ φίλους νομίζειν (e.g. *Thuc.* 1.44).

645–7 The reverse of 641–4: children who do *not* obey their fathers are ‘useless’ (ἀνωφέλητα), providing trouble for him and fuel for his enemies’ ‘ridicule’ (γελῶν, cf. 483 γελᾶν with n.).

τί ... ἄλλο is object of φῦσαι, ‘What else would you say he begets but ...?’

648–52 After nine lines of generalizations (cf. 473–96n.), Kreon gets to the point (μὴ νῦν ποτε ... γε): Ant. is Kreon’s ‘enemy’, and a good son should aid his father in hurting such an enemy, not pursue her as a bed-fellow (651 ξύνευνος), just for pleasure.

τὰς φρένας = ‘that good sense of yours’ (cf. 298–9, 791–4, 471–2n.).

γ’ (restored by Triclinius, primarily for the metre) probably applies to the whole phrase (see Jebb’s n.). Alternatively, Meineke’s μὴ ... τὰς φρένας σὺ γ’ ἠδουῆι ... ἐκβάληις could be read.

ὑφ’ ἠδονῆς | γυναικὸς οὐνεκ’: two familiar threats to male good sense (e.g., *Hes. WD* 373–5, 703–5 with West’s nn., *Semonides* fr. 7 West, *A. Ag.* 448–9); cf. too the epic excuse, εἵνεκα κούρης ... (*Il.* 9.637, etc.), and Wohl 1998.

ψυχρὸν παραγκάλισμα: lit. ‘a cold object of embraces’, cf. *Tr.* 540 ὑπαγκάλισμα, and *E. Alk.* 353 ψυχρὰν ... τέρψιν. For the contemptuous -μα noun, cf. 320n. (These words will later resonate grimly: 1236–41.)

ἔλκος ‘wound’ or ‘ulcer’, cf. *Solon* fr. 4.17 West πάσῃ πόλει ἔλκος ἄφυκτον ... στάσιν ἐμφυλον, *S.* fr. 614 Radt (and Pearson’s n.); also 531 ὡς ἔχιδνα. Two passages in *E.* (both referring to mar-

riage) may be influenced by this phrase: *Alk.* 878 φρένας ἤλκωσεν, *Supp.* 223 ἤλκωσας οἴκους. (For the generalizing masculine φίλος, cf. 496 ἀλοῦς, 463–4.)

653–4 ἀλλὰ ... μέθες answers 648–9: ‘But instead let the girl go ...!’

πτύσας ὡσεὶ τε δυσμενῆ ‘spitting her out as if <she were> an enemy’. The compound ἀποπτύω is common in A. and E., for extreme loathing (e.g. A. *Ag.* 1192, *Prom.* 1070): simple πτύω is not elsewhere found in this metaphorical sense (but cf. 1232 πτύσας with n.). ὡσεὶ τε probably = ὥσπερ: the combination is common in epic and lyric, as an extension of ‘epic’ τε, though it is not found elsewhere in tragedy. (ὡσεὶ by itself occurs at *El.* 234, E. *Pho.* 1169, etc.) Jebb and others (incl. *GP* 528, 497 n. 2) prefer to take τε as connective, awkwardly linking πτύσας and δυσμενῆ, ‘With loathing, and as if she were your enemy’, cf. 381–3.

ἐν Ἄιδου ... νυμφεύειν: the first explicit mention of this motif, which dominates the middle portion of the play (806–16n., *Introd.* §5(e)(iii)).

655–8 The execution of Ant. has become for Kreon a matter of personal dignity: ‘... she defied me publicly (ἐμφανῶς ... ἀπιστήσασαν, cf. 448, 219–22n.), and I will *not* set myself up as a liar’. γε (657) is exclamatory (cf. E. *Ba.* 445, *GP* 127.10; also Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 472), rather than a special category of ‘apodotic’ γε (*GP* 126.9). Repetitions (ἐγὼ ... ἐμαυτόν; πόλεως ... πόλει) and alliteration (π, φ) add to the build-up, curtailed emphatically by 658 ἀλλὰ κτενῶ, with heavy punctuation, unusual at this position (cf. 491, *OT* 454, *Tr.* 27, Griffith on A. *Prom.* 41–2).

658–9 πρὸς ταῦτ’ ‘in the face of these <statements> ...’; as often, the phrase comes ‘after an announcement of resolve, and before a defiant imperative’ (Jebb), cf. *OT* 426, *El.* 820, A. *Prom.* 992.

ἐφουμνείτω Δία | ξύναιμον: lit. ‘let her keep harping on about Zeus-of-blood-relatives’, heavily sarcastic (cf. 486–7, and 511), and echoing Haimon’s name (cf. 486 ὄμαιμ-, 1175). For ἐφουμνέω, cf. 1305 with n.

659–60 ‘For if I am to raise my own flesh and blood <to be> unruly, then most certainly <I will raise> those outside my family

<to be unruly too>.’ Kreon sees the ‘nurturing’ (θρέψω) and ‘ordering’ (-κοσμ-, cf. 677) of both children and citizens as being entirely his own responsibility. For ἄκοσμα, cf. 677, 730, Hom. *Il.* 2.213 ἔπεα ἄκοσμα, and esp. Semonides fr. 7.3–4 West τῆι (sc. ‘for the pig-woman’) πάντ’ ἄν’ οἶκον . . . ἄκοσμα κεῖται.

661–80 Expanding upon the theme of 659–60, Kreon insists on the value of domestic discipline as the basis for civic order (677 κοσμουμένοις / 660 ἄκοσμα, and cf. 675 ὀρθουμένωνν). The qualities that make men ‘good’ family members will make them ‘just’ citizens (661–2): above all, obedience (676 πειθαρχία, opp. 672 ἀναρχίας). As before, Kreon tries to mitigate his authoritarian message by suggesting a democratic alternation of roles between ruler and ruled (669 ἄρχειν . . . ἄρχεσθαι, cf. 175–83, esp. 175–7n.): but his political ideal seems stronger on military discipline than on ἰσηγορία, παρρησία, and εὐθυνα (cf. 663–6, 667–9, 683–723nn.).

In 661–7, as printed (with Seidler’s widely-accepted transposition), the sequence of argument is straightforward: (661–2) a good family-man will be a just citizen; (663–6 [= 668–71]) such a man will be good at ruling or being ruled alike, and a reliable soldier; (667–9 [= 663–6]) by contrast, anyone who violates the law or answers back to his superiors cannot be approved; (670–1 [= 666–7]) for everyone should obey the city’s leader. It has been objected that this transposition separates ἀναρχίας (672) from the forceful expression ἄρχειν . . . ἄρχεσθαι (669) (Fraenkel, *A. Ag.* vol. II p. 397 n. 1, LJ&W 1990: 132); but 667–71 [= 663–7] keep the idea of ‘obedience’ prominent enough; and in return the phrase δίκαιον κάγαθόν (666) stands closer to 662 χρηστός . . . καὶ . . . δίκαιος, to which it refers.

With the order of lines given by the MSS, the link between 667 and 668 is very strained, for τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα (668) makes nonsense with its obvious referent, i.e. the ruler (τοῦδε) of 666–7; nor can it be taken to refer to the implied subject of κλύειν, as the argument would require. (For the additional difficulties of 666–7, 672–80, see nn.) LJ&W keep the MS order, but delete 666–7, and refer τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα back to 661–2 ὅστις ἔστ’ ἀνὴρ κτλ., regarding [663–6] as merely an ‘excursus about disobedience’. Certainty is hard to obtain here, partly because Kreon’s logic is contaminated by prejudice and hyperbole. But the transposition seems necessary.

661–2 ἐν τοῖς . . . οἰκειοῖσιν ‘in the case of . . .’ (LSJ *s.v.* ἐν, 1.7); either neuter or masc. is possible, cf. 677 τοῖς κοσμουμένοις (and 674–5n.).

κρηστός . . . δίκαιος: cf. 666 [671]. Kreon is focusing on the obedient qualities of the ruled; but he quickly shifts to the ruler (cf. 175–7n.).

663–6 [668–71] ‘I would be confident that this man would be a fine ruler, and willing to be well ruled <by others> too, and also would stand his ground in the storm of spears as ordered, a righteous and worthy comrade-in-arms.’ (τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα refers to 661 ἄνῆρ. ἄν goes with both ἄρχειν and θέλειν.) The tricolon crescendo (cf. 672–6) thus seems to describe an ideal democratic citizen, one year holding office, the next merely a voter, but always a loyal hoplite ‘standing side by side’ (παραστάτην) with his fellows. μένω, προστάσσω, παραστάτης are all military terms: cf. LSJ *s.v.* μένω 1.1, Thuc. 2.87 χώραν μὴ προλείποντες ἢ ἂν τις προσταχθῆι, and the Epeheic Oath (Tod. *GHI* 2.204) οὐδὲ λείψω τὸν παραστάτην (with LSJ *s.v.* 11.1 and 2); cf. 661–80n.

δορός . . . ἐν χειμῶνι: cf. E. *Supp.* 474–5 κλύδων . . . δορός (with Collard’s n).

667–9 [663–5] Lit. ‘But anyone who, transgressing, either does violence to the laws or thinks to dictate to his rulers – it is not possible that he gets approval from me.’ (This absolute use of ὑπερβαίνω may derive from Hom. *Il.* 9.501 ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβῆῃ. At 481, ὑπερβαίνουσα is transitive; cf. 455 ὑπερδραμεῖν with n.) Kreon’s language is becoming less democratic, more despotic: ἐπιτάσσω is often used of masters ‘giving instructions’ to their slaves; and κρατύνω (unlike 669 ἄρχω) is more appropriate to the ‘rule’ and ‘power’ of kings or gods than to the ‘authority’ of elected officials (cf. *OC* 839 μὴ (ἐ)πίτασσ(ε) ἄ μὴ κρατεῖς; also 61–4). The MS variant τοῖς κρατούσιν ἐννοεῖ is equally possible, and makes little difference.

670–1 [666–7] ὃν πόλις στήσειε could be said of democratic election, or of popular support for a new monarch (as at *OT* 939–40 τύραννον αὐτὸν . . . οἱ ἐπιχώριοι στήσουσι). In the indeterminate historical setting of Greek tragedy, such ambiguity is not uncommon (7–8n., Easterling 1984). These two lines are syntactically unusual (optative στήσειε, for ὄντινα ἄν στήσῃ); and as they also undermine the moral basis of Kreon’s argument (a ruler must be obeyed

even when his orders are ‘the opposite’ of just), they are deleted by several edd. (inc. Dawe, LJ&W). But the syntax is paralleled e.g. at 1032 and *Tr.* 93 ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο (see Easterling’s n.), *OT* 314–15, 979 (cf. *GMT* §555), and the hyperbole is not uncharacteristic of Kreon.

καὶ τάναντία: i.e. strictly speaking, *μεγάλα καὶ ἄδικα*; but this is a catch-all ‘polar’ expression (39–40n.): whether consciously euphemistic (cf. *Thuc.* 4.62 ἀγαθὸν ἢ . . . τὰ ἐναντία), or merely thoughtless, it reveals Kreon’s increasing disregard for morality. The notion, ‘Do what you’re told, right or wrong!’, is proverbial (*Paroem. Gr.* 1.213.11 ἀρχῶν ἄκουε καὶ δικαίως κἀδίκως [= ‘Solon’ fr. 30 West]), esp. in association with slavery (*TrGF* adesp. II F 436 = *Paroem. Gr.* 1.394 δοῦλε, δεσποτῶν ἄκουε καὶ δίκαια κἀδικα), *Ar. Knights* 256, *A. Cho.* 78.

672–6 ἀναρχίας . . . πειθαρχία: Kreon underlines (again, in tricolon crescendo, cf. 663–6n.) the familial/governmental/military ills and benefits resulting from the absence/presence of obedience (cf. *Aj.* 1073–86, and esp. *Tr.* 1174–8, where πειθάρχειν πατρί is called the κάλλιστος νόμος, cf. 639–80n.). For the personification, cf. *A. Th.* 224–5 πειθαρχία γάρ ἐστι τῆς εὐπραξίας | μήτηρ.

673–4 αὐτῆ . . . ἦδ’ . . . ἦδε: insistent anaphora (cf. 296–9 τοῦτο . . . τόδε . . . τόδε . . . , with similar variation in the first element).

674–5 ἦδε συμμάχου δορὸς | τροπὰς καταρρήγνυσι ‘it (disobedience) makes allied spears break out into flight’. καταρρήγνυμι in the passive often = ‘burst out’, ‘erupt’ (*Hdt.* 1.87 χειμῶν κατερράγη, *E. Alk.* 1068 ‘streams of tears’); but the active here is unusual (cf. *Athenaios* 130c κατέρρηξεν ἡμῶν γέλωτας, *Hom. Il.* 6.6 ῥῆξε φάλαγγας, 15.615). συμμάχου is the likeliest correction of σύν μάχηι in the MSS, where σύν makes no sense.

τῶν δ’ ὀρθουμένων ‘in the case of those who are successful’ (lit. ‘being kept straight’, a favourite word of Kreon’s, cf. 162–3n.); cf. 636, and *A. Th.* 204 εὐπραξίας (quoted in 672–6n.).

677–80 Kreon sums up his argument (677 οὕτως = ‘therefore’, as at *A. Supp.* 771, *Ag.* 1610) with two general and (as he sees it) interdependent assertions: keep order, and never be bested by a woman. For the impersonal neuter pl. (ἀμυντέα . . . ἡσσητέα), cf. *OC* 495 ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐχ ὀδωτά, *Aristoph. Lys.* 450 οὐ γυναικῶν . . . ἔσθ’ ἡσσητέα ἡμῖν, and often in *Hdt.* and *Thuc.* (also 447n.).

τοῖς κοσμουμένοις is probably neuter and passive: ‘(one must

protect) the proper order of things’, or more specifically ‘the regulations <of the rulers>’ (cf. Hdt. 1.100 τὰ δὲ δὴ ἄλλα ἐκεκοσμέατό οἱ). Some take it as masc. and middle (‘one must protect the rulers’: but the middle never seems to be used thus); or as masc. and passive (‘we must protect (our) well-ordered subjects’, cf. 675 τῶν ὀρθομένων: but this is not really Kreon’s point). Once again, some vagueness may be intentional (cf. 661–80n.).

For the insistence on not being defeated by a woman, cf. 484–5, 524–5, 648–9; for Kreon, this is the key to εὐκοσμία and πειθαρχία: if Haimon ‘obeys’ his father/ruler, he will be ‘keeping order’; but if he gives in to ‘pleasure’ (650) and ‘disobedience’ (ἀναρχία), he will be ‘bested by a woman’. The final universalizing flourish (‘If <any of us> *have* to be thrown out, it is better to be thrown out by a man, so nobody can call us weaker than women’) is a perennial cliché, the masculine counterpart to Ismene’s recommendation of female subservience (61–4).

ἐκπσεῖν is often used of ‘expulsion’, ‘removal from office’ (LSJ *s.v.* 2 and 3, and cf. 649 ἐκβάλλης): Kreon presents his confrontation with Ant. as if ‘defeat’ (678 ἡσσητέα, 680 ἡσσονες) entails political ‘downfall’. For the excited repetition of ἄν, cf. 69–70n., *OT* 339.

681–2 The Chorus’ customary 2-line commentary (278–9n.) offers continued support for their ruler; despite an echo of 281, there seems no trace of irony or equivocation.

εἰ μὴ τῶι χρόνῳ κεκλέμμεθα ‘unless I am deceived by time’, i.e. my wits have been ‘stolen’ (cf. *Tr.* 243, *E. El.* 364) by old age (cf. 281).

ὦν λέγεις . . . πέρι belong together (= περὶ τούτων ἃ λέγεις); cf. 193n.

683–723 Haimon presents himself as a devoted son and counselor. He makes no mention of his feelings towards Ant. (or ‘women’ in general), but focuses on Kreon’s policies and on the shared interests of father and son, with repeated reminders of the fallibility of human judgement, and the value of free comment and open minds. On the surface, Haimon’s speech is respectful; but his description of the citizens’ fear of Kreon (688–92, 700) and of their praise of Ant. (694–9), as well as his insistence on the need for Kreon to ‘adapt’, ‘bend’ and ‘yield’ (705, 710–18), leaves little doubt how misguided he thinks him to be.

683–7 Haimon begins deferentially. Without directly contradicting his father, he tries to mediate between Kreon's either/or positions (632–4n.), by suggesting that 'another point of view' may be valid (687). And whereas Kreon insisted on the 'natural' obligations owed to fathers by 'receptive', 'subordinate' sons (642 γονᾶς κατηκούς φύσαντες, 647 φῦσαι), and equated a son's 'good sense' (648 τὰς φρένας) with obedience, Haimon claims a wider application for 'good sense', as a natural 'possession' (684 κτημάτων, cf. 702, 1050, and 461–4n.) available to all.

ὅπως σὺ μὴ λέγεις ὀρθῶς τάδε: again, tactfully ambiguous (635–8n.); either '... that you are not right in what you say', or '... that you are not entitled to say this'. For Kreon and ὀρθ- words, cf. 162–3, 635–8, 674–5nn.

686 'I couldn't (sc. even if I wanted to) – and may I never know how to!'; for the syntax, cf. 499–500. Haimon's 'nature' rules out such 'knowledge' (683 φύουσιν, 688 πέφυκα, cf. 471–2, 721nn., Coray 1993: 80).

687 'However, it could turn also turn out well by quite a different route.' The referent of καλῶς ἔχον is vague, and the reading and interpretation are disputed, but there is insufficient reason to delete the line (as LJ&W do). γένοιτο may be contrasted with 685 λέγεις ('I won't criticize what you say; but *events* could turn out well none the less').

χάτεροι = καὶ ἑτέροι 'in an alternative manner too'. The variant χᾶτέρως makes equally good sense; but the form ἑτέρως is not found in tragedy. Most MSS have χᾶτέρωι ('another man, too, might have some useful thought', Jebb); but Haimon is not (yet) mentioning opposing views.

688 'But, for sure (or, 'in any case': δ' οὖν, cf. 769, 890, 1251, *GP* 461–2; also 722), my natural role is to watch out on your behalf for everything that people say or do or have (occasion) to blame (you for)', with σοῦ governed by the προ- of προσκοπεῖν (cf. 741 προκήδομαι, 83n.). But the word-order (σοῦ ... πέφυκα) strongly suggests also 'I am yours' (cf. 635 σός εἰμι, *A. Eum.* 738). In echoing both Ant. (with the infin. after πέφυκα, cf. 523) and Kreon himself (642 φύσαντες, 647 φῦσαι), Haimon seems to seek a compromise, neither joining in the criticism of Kreon, nor following him unquestioningly. The variant σὺ δ' οὐ πέφυκας ... ('You are not able to

anticipate everyone's reactions') is unlikely, since it is not so much Kreon's 'nature' (πέφυκας) as his *office* that prevents him from knowing, as Haimon goes on to explain.

690–1 δεινόν . . . ἀνδρὶ δημότη: cf. 243 τὰ δεινὰ, 323 δεινόν. We have already seen Kreon's harshness towards his 'citizens' (280–1, 305–14), and have heard of their fear of him (229–30, 243, 505, 509) and reluctance to 'face' him (290–2, 390–1).

λόγοις τοιούτοις: if the text is sound, and 691 follows directly on 690, this must be a dative of cause, or attendant circumstances (cf. 391 ταῖς σαῖς ἀπειλαῖς, 956): 'Your face is terrifying to the man . . . by reason of (or 'on the occasion of') such words <of his> as you will not enjoy hearing.' But the two sets of datives (ἀνδρὶ δημότη, λόγοις) and the sequence of thought are strained, and a line may have dropped out between 690 and 691. Haimon's speech would then comprise 42 lines, exactly matching Kreon's (626–780n.).

μὴ τέρψη: cf. 93n.; μὴ is generic, after τοιούτοις (493–4n.).

692–3 'But for me it is possible to hear these things <said> in the shadows, how the city laments for this girl . . .' In contrast to the ruler's 'eye' or 'appearance' that quells all discussion, his more 'obscure' son can overhear, even share, the private conversations of the townspeople (cf. A. *Ag.* 449–51, 457–60). Haimon's claim to know what 'the city' (cf. 733 ὀμόπτολις λεώς) is saying may or may not be valid or oversimplified (cf. 502–10, 734–9n.; also 211–14, 437–40nn.). As often in a tragic *agōn*, we are not in a position to know the exact truth of either side's assertions; and in this play the *dēmos* never gets to speak for itself (Intro. §5(f)).

696–8 ἦτις . . . μὴθ' . . . | εἶασ' . . . μὴθ' . . . 'inasmuch as she did not leave . . .' ('generic' μὴτε, rather than οὔτε; cf. 691, and 493–4n.). εἶασ' = both 'did not abandon' and 'did not allow'. For αὐτάδελφον, cf. in., 503; for τινος, cf. 257–8n. The sentence structure and diction of 693–8 (esp. superlatives in 694–5) suggest strong feeling, whether the citizens' or Haimon's own.

699–700 χρυσῆς ἀξία τιμῆς: cf. 694 ἀναξιωτάτη. 'For a moment Haimon seems to speak his own mind, but he immediately corrects himself: τοιάδ' etc.' (Kamerbeek). For χρυσῆς (of enduring lustre and value), cf. 103, *OT* 158, E. fr. 486 δικαιοσύνας τὸ χρύσειον πρόσωπον, and 295–6n. For the exegetic infin. (λαχεῖν), cf. 216n.

τοιιάδ' ἔρεμνῆ . . . φάτις: cf. 692 ὑπὸ σκότου (also 291 κρυφῆι,

491 ἔσω, 531–2). As often, τοιάδε closes the virtual quotation introduced by τάδε (692).

ἐπέρχεται is unspecific: ‘attacks <you>’, or ‘spreads over <the city>’ (cf. 752). There is no advantage in emending to ὑπέρχεται (‘infiltrates’), for the idea of secrecy is already prominent in 700.

701–4 Haimon returns to the topic of filial/paternal interdependence (cf. 634–47, 685–7): the one’s prosperity is the other’s most precious ‘possession’ (702 κτήμα, cf. 684 with n.).

τί . . . εὐκλείας . . . | ἄγαλμα μείζον . . .; ‘For what greater object of pride <can there be> for children than the good reputation of a living and successful father, or what <greater> for a father from the children’s side?’ This idea lies at the heart of Greek family-based ‘shame culture’ (cf. 49–52n., and e.g. *Aj.* 434–40, 462–5, *Hom. Od.* 11.487–540; Campbell 1964: 185–212). An ἄγαλμα (cf. 1116) may be an object (e.g., statue or ornament), a person (e.g., wife or child, cf. *A. Ag.* 208), or, as here, an intangible such as ‘fame’ (i.e. anything on which one ἀγάλλεται); cf. 702 κτήμα τιμιώτερον (and 684), and contrast Kreon’s emphasis on monetary κέρδος and μισθός (221–2, 295–303nn.). For θάλλω (absolute) in this sense, cf. *Ph.* 419 μέγα θάλλοντες, *Tr.* 235. The conjecture εὐκλείαι is attractive (‘What greater . . . than a father thriving in good reputation?’), since it mitigates the abundance of genitives and sigmas, and also produces a familiar idiom (θάλλω + dative, cf. 1164, *Pind. O.* 9.16 ἀρεταῖσι θάλλει). But the resultant parallelism with 701–2 is then perhaps excessive, and the construction with πρὸς παιδῶν in the second element is much harsher (and cf. 637–8).

705–6 Lit. ‘So don’t bear within yourself one mentality only, (i.e.) that the <only> thing that is correct is what you yourself say and nothing else.’ The construction might be clearer with Blaydes’s δ for ὦς in 706 (though ὁ τι ἂν φῆς would be more normal syntax); but adverbial ὦς φῆς = ‘the way you say <things>’ corresponds better with ὀρθῶς ἔχειν (ὀρθῶς almost in quotation marks, cf. 162–3, 675, 685nn.). For the advice, cf. *Theognis* 213–15 ἐπίστρεφε ποικίλον ἦθος (with van Groningen’s n.), *Aj.* 594–5; cf. too 746. Greek moralists debate whether men should maintain a pure and consistent character (like gold, or a lion; so Achilleus), or should be adaptable, and resourceful in self-presentation (like an octopus: *Theognis* 215–18; so Odysseus). The opposition, which is sometimes presented as

one between aristocratic and democratic values, is esp. marked in S. (e.g. Aias and Odysseus in *Aj.*; see Knox 1964: 124–5, Rose 1992: 270–1, 305–19).

707–9 ‘Anyone who thinks that he alone has good sense, or that he possesses eloquence or moral character that nobody else has – people like this, when opened up, are seen (ὠφθησαν = gnomic aor.) to be quite empty inside.’ (For the switch from ὅστις to οὔτοι, cf. 1021–2, 1165–7.) The point is proverbial (Theognis 221–3): ὅστις τοι δοκεῖ τὸν πλῆσιον ἴδμεναι οὐδέν | ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς μῦθος ποικίλα δῆνε ἔχειν, | κείνός γ’ ἄφρων ἐστί.

ἦ φρονεῖν . . . ἦ ψυχὴν ἔχειν: cf. 648, 683 φρένας, and 175–7n., Introd. §5(d)(iii).

διαπτυχθέντες: a writing-tablet, blank or decorated on the outside, is ‘opened up’ to read the truth inscribed inside, cf. E. *Tro.* 662 ἀναπτύξω φρένα, *Med.* 659–61 καθαρᾶν ἀνοίξαντα κληῖδα φρενῶν, *Hipp.* 985, and esp. the well-known drinking-song (*PMG* 889, ‘If only it were possible to open up a man’s breast, to find out what he is like; then, after looking at his thoughts (τὸν νοῦν), to close him up again and regard him for sure as your friend!’ Cf. too Alkibiades’ description of Sokrates, Plato, *Symp.* 215b.

710–11 Lit. ‘But for a man – even if he is wise – to keep on learning much, and not to strain over-much, <is> in no way shameful’, blending γηράσκω δ’ αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος (Solon fr. 18 West) with proverbial μηδὲν ἄγαν. For the omission of ἄν with εἰ + subj. in a general condition (an epic usage, not uncommon in tragedy), cf. *OC* 509 οὐδ’ εἰ πονῆι τις . . . , A. *Eum.* 234 (*GMT* §471, K–G II 474 n. 1); also 323, 1025–6nn.

τείνειν: intransitive either ‘press on’, ‘exert oneself’, as E. *Supp.* 720 (LSJ *s.v.* B.2), and cf. ἐντείνω, ἀντιτείνω (714, common in prose); or ‘stretch oneself out’, ‘be taut’, ‘be rigid’ (as of ships’ sails and rigging, 716).

712–18 Two vivid images of nature (712 ὄρᾱις) exemplify the need to be ‘flexible’, even to ‘yield’: (i) trees on the banks of storm-swollen rivers are swept away if they stand stiff, but not if they bend; and (ii) a sailor who will not slacken sail capsizes his boat. The language of the examples, as well as their tenor, is less harsh than Kreon’s to Ant. earlier (473–96n.): for here the victim contributes to the calamity by actively ‘straining’ against elemental forces (714, 716,

cf. 711). For these key terms of opposition, (ἀντι-)τείνω vs (ὑπ-)εἰκώ, cf. 471-2n., Introd. §5(c).

712-14 These lines became famous, and were parodied by at least two comic playwrights: Eupolis (?) *PCG* v 260.23-5 (= D. L. Page, *Gr. lit. pap.* 41.14-16) ὀραῖς παρὰ ρεῖθροισιν . . . ἦν μὲν τις εἴκηι τοῖς λόγοις ἐκσώιζεται, | ὁ δ' ἀντιτείνων αὐτόπρεμνος οἴχεται, and Antiphanes *PCG* II 228.3-7. Babrios also tells the fable of an oak-tree, swept away in a stormy river, asking a reed how it survived, and receiving the reply, 'You fought against the winds, but we bend . . .' (*Fab.* 36, cf. Aesop 70 Perry).

παρά: the final syllable scans long before ῥ- (cf. *OT* 847).

κλώνας ὡς ἐκσώιζεται '... how they preserve <even> their twigs', κλώνας contrasted with 714 αὐτόπρεμνα ('stumps, trunks and all').

αὐτόπρεμν': here literal, elsewhere figurative ('utterly', cf. πρόρριζος), e.g. A. *Eum.* 401, Aristoph. *Frogs* 903 (paratragic); cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.541-2 χάμαι βάλει δένδρεα μακρὰ | αὐτῆισιν ῥίζηισι.

715-17 'Likewise, if a man stretches tight the rigging that controls his ship, and does not slacken off at all, he overturns <the ship> and sails the rest <of his voyage> underneath with upside-down rowing benches.' The word-order enhances the sudden transition from orderly progress, to sudden up-ending (ὑπτίοις) and incongruous débâcle; cf. E. *Or.* 706-7 (after *Or.* 698-9 ἐντείνοντι . . . ὑπέικοι).

ναὸς . . . ἐγκρατῆ πόδα τείνας: a bold phrase (ναὸς is Doric for νηὸς, cf. 1196 ποδαγός), lit. 'stretching the sheet (= 'rope') that has command of the vessel' (the two 'foot'-ropes were attached to the lower corners of the mainsail, and thus controlled its tautness or slackness); or 'keeping the rigging of the ship stretched taut <so as to be> in command', with ἐγκρατῆ proleptic (Jebb; cf. 474-6n.). The MS variant ἐγκρατῆς would be rather flat (so too LJ&W's ἐν κράτει), 'the man who is in command of the ship, stretching . . .'; cf. van Nes 1963: 139-41.

ὑπτίοις . . . ναυτίλλεται: a picturesque expression (contrast 189-90), later recalled by Aratos, *Phain.* 425 ὑπόβρυχα ναυτίλλονται. Cf. too 1188 ὑπτία.

718 This single line of urgent advice (*parainesis*) sums up (ἄλλ' . . .) all that has preceded (Long 1968: 86-7); but the text is uncertain. Most likely is (i) εἶκε θυμοῦ, καὶ . . ., 'But cease from your anger, and

allow yourself a change.’ εἴκειν + gen. is found at Hom. *Il.* 5.348 εἴκειν πολέμου, 4.509, E. *Ion* εἴκειν ὄδοῦ (and Homeric λῆγ’ ἔριδος). But μετάστασιν remains oddly vague; perhaps θυμοῦ is to be supplied again. Alternatively, either (ii) ἄλλ’ εἴκε, θυμοῦ καὶ . . . (‘But yield, and allow <yourself> a change of heart’), or (iii) ἄλλ’ εἴκε, θυμῶι καὶ . . . (‘But yield, and allow your heart a change’). (But the MS variant θυμῶι may be just a slip, from Homeric εἴκε + dat. = ‘give in to <your emotions>’, e.g. θυμῶι at *Il.* 9.598.) With (ii) or (iii), καὶ would present an awkward *hyperbaton* (see J. H. Kells, *CR* 11 (1961) 188–95).

μετάστασιν can be a ‘removal’ or ‘escape’ from, something unpleasant (S. *Ichn.* 217 τίς μετάστασις πόνων, *Andok.* 2.8), or a ‘change’ (E. *Andr.* 1003–4 γνώμη, *Hek.* 1266 μορφῆς).

719–23 Haimon concludes, as he began (= ‘ring composition’), with a deferential *captatio benevolentiae*, restating the truism: ideally, one would be ‘born’ infallibly wise (721 φῦναι, cf. 683–4, 688), but, failing that, it is good to ‘learn’ from others (723 μαθάνειν, cf. 710, 687), cf. Hes. *WD* 293–5 οὔτος μὲν πανάριστος, ὃς αὐτὸς πάντα νοήσῃ | . . . | ἐσθλὸς δ’ αὖ κάκεινος, ὃς εὖ εἴπονται πίθηται (continuing, ‘He who does not understand for himself, and does not listen to anyone else . . . is a useless man indeed’); cf. too Hdt. 7.16, *Introd.* §5(d)(iii).

720 **πρεσβεύειν πολὺ**: lit. ‘<it> ranks first by far . . .’, cf. A. *Cho.* 631 κακῶν δὲ πρεσβεύεται τὸ Λήμνιον λόγῳ, *OT* 1365–6.

721 ‘. . . that a man be born completely full of understanding’ (πάντα adverbial). φῦναι is contrasted with τὸ μαθάνειν (723, cf. 686n.): in aristocratic contexts, ‘nature’ is preferred (Pind. *O.* 2.86 σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυαῖ· μαθόντες δὲ . . . κτλ., cf. *O.* 9.100); but if ‘innate omniscience’ is unattainable (722, cf. 683, 688), ‘even’ (723 καὶ) second-best ‘learning’ is καλόν.

τὸν ἄνδρα: the ‘generalizing’ definite article is unusual (hence Blaydes’ φῦνά τιν’ ἄνδρ’); but Lloyd-Jones & Wilson 1990 cite as parallels Hes. *WD* 297 ὁ δ’ αὖτ’ ἀχρήσιος ἄνθρωπος (see 719–23n.), Xen. *Anab.* 2.6.10.

722–3 **εἰ δ’ οὔν** ‘But otherwise . . .’. For the ellipse (‘if this is not the case’ = εἰ δὲ μή), cf. E. *Hipp.* 507–8 χρῆν μὲν οὐ σ’ ἀμαρτάνειν, | εἰ δ’ οὔν (‘but if you do . . .’), Plato, *Apol.* 34d (*GP* 466).

φιλεῖ γὰρ . . . ῥέπειν: parenthetical, ‘since things usually do not turn out this way’, cf. 936 τάδε ταύτηι, A. *Prom.* 511.

τῶν λεγόντων εὔ ‘(. . . learn from) those who offer good advice’ (cf. Hes. *WD* 295 εὔ εἰπόντι, quoted in 719–23n.). The abnormal word-order (for τῶν εὔ λεγόντων) produces a neatly chiasmic final line, with a distinctive mid-verse break (cf. 77–8, 407nn.).

724–5 σέ τ’ . . . μαθεῖν, σέ τ’ αὖ: the Chorus politely reaffirm their impartiality (cf. 681–2); but in repeating Haimon’s key term (μαθεῖν, cf. 723) they seem rather to endorse his case.

διπλῆι ‘twice over’, ‘on both sides’, cf. E. *Ion* 760; or possibly διπλᾶ (Jebb) ‘both speeches’, cf. 14, 170.

726–65 In fierce stichomythia, Haimon and Kreon goad one another into regrettable – but ironically accurate – threats. (For the symmetrical structure, cf. 626–780n.) Throughout, it is Kreon who leads off (up until 742 referring to Haimon only in the 3rd p.; cf. 473–96n.), Haimon who caps or refutes his father’s questions and complaints, often by reusing the same key words (a common stichomythic device; cf. 37–48n.). Thus Haimon emerges as the clear verbal and moral victor in the debate (cf. 313–31).

726–7 Kreon’s indignation is emphasized by word-order, repetition (τηλικοῖδε . . . τηλικοῦδε), and particles (καί = ‘really’, ‘actually’, cf. 280, 770, 90n.; and δῆ).

διδαξόμεσθα: cf. 93n. The plural may include the Chorus, or may be merely formal. For φρονεῖν, cf. 683–7, 707–9nn., 754–5.

728 μηδέν γ’ ὃ μὴ δίκαιον: sc. διδάσκου. ‘Yes (γέ), but <you will> not <be taught by me> anything unjust!’ τὸ μὴ, found in most MSS, would be unparalleled (different is 360 οὐδὲν τὸ μέλλον).

729–30 τᾶργα = τὰ ἔργα: ‘. . . (my age, rather than) my <good> deeds’ (see next n.).

ἔργον γάρ . . . ‘What? Is it a “good deed” to honour rebels?’ By τὰ ἔργα, Haimon meant his own demonstrated loyalty (701–4, though cf. too 695); but ἔργον is often used of ‘great deeds’, ‘accomplishments’, e.g. *El.* 689 ἀνδρὸς ἔργα καὶ κράτη, *Hdt.* 1.1 (and cf. εὐεργεσία), and Kreon echoes the term sarcastically. (The phrase also may suggest σὸν ἔργον ἐστί . . . ; ‘Is it your job . . . ?’) For ἀκοσμοῦντας, cf. 659–60 ἄκοσμα with n., 677; for σέβειν, cf. 744–5n. All of Kreon’s four questions (730, 732, 734, 736; also 744) are accompanied

by an outraged γάρ, signalling that ‘the question is rhetorical, or, at least, surprised and incredulous, often ironical ... Frequently the second speaker echoes, with contempt, indignation, or surprise, a word or words used by the first [so here ἔργον, 734 πόλις, 744 ἀμαρτάνω]’ (*GP* 77.ii).

731 ‘I would never even tell <anyone else> to show reverence to the wicked’ (sc. ‘let alone show it myself’), an evasive reply. οὐ τᾶν (= τοι ἄν) might be an improvement, ‘I certainly wouldn’t tell anyone ...’

732 τοιαῖδ’ ἐπέιληπται νόσωι: i.e. κακίαι. For ἐπιλαμβάνω of an ‘infection’ or ‘seizure’, cf. LSJ *s.v.* II.1a; for metaphorical ‘disease’, cf. 652, 1052n.

733 ὁμόπολις λεώς ‘the whole community’ (cf. 7 πανδήμωι πόλει, and 692–3n.).

734–9 As Kreon recoils at the notion that anybody else (736 ἄλλωι), even the whole citizen body, should ‘tell me what orders to give’ (734), Haimon bluntly accuses him of behaving like a young tyrant (735 ὡς ἄγαν νέος, cf. 737 ἀνδρός ... ἐνός, 739 ἄρχοις μόνος); cf. E. *Supp.* 429ff. οὐκ εἰσιν νόμοι | κοινοί, κρατεῖ δ’ εἷς τὸν νόμον κεκτημένος | αὐτὸς παρ’ αὐτῶι, A. *Prom.* 35, 186–7, Hdt. 3.80, Podlecki 1966, Ober & Strauss 1990: 260–3).

734 ἡμῖν ἀμὲ χρῆ τάσσειν: the switch from plural to sing. (ἐμέ) is not significant (cf. 1092–3, 1194–5). τάσσειν suggests a military context of ‘command’, in which even an elected official may insist on blind obedience, and no ‘answering back’ (cf. 664, 757).

735 ὀρᾶις ...; often introduces a blunt rebuke, cf. *El.* 628 ὀρᾶις; πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐκφέρηι ..., E. *Andr.* 87 with Stevens’s n. Different is 712.

ὡς ἄγαν νέος: the young make the most intolerant and hybriistic tyrants (cf. A. *Prom.* 35 with Griffith’s n.), and this is a highly insulting criticism for a son to make; see LSJ *s.v.* νεανιεύομαι, and cf. 719 ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ νεωτέρου, 726–7 τηλικούδε, 728 νέος; also 767n. (A scholiast remarks, αὐστηρῶς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.)

736 ἄλλωι ... ἢ μοι ‘answerable to anyone else ...’ (a vaguely ‘ethic’ dative), though the phrase suggests also ‘for anyone else’s benefit but mine’; for the prodelision (μοί) see 83n. The MS χρῆ γε makes no sense, and datives with χρῆ would be unparalleled; so Dobree’s με is certain.

737–8 ‘A city-state that belongs to one man is not <truly> a city-

state', cf. E. *Supp.* 410–11 πόλις ... ἐνὸς πρὸς ἀνδρός, οὐκ ὄχλωι, κρατύνεται (= Thebes), A. *Supp.* 370 σύ τοι πόλις, σὺ δὲ τὸ δῆμιον (spoken by an 'Egyptian'). Several *poleis* in the fifth century were in fact governed by tyrants (as Athens had been in the sixth), and monarchy was often included along with oligarchy and democracy as one of the 'three kinds' of *politeia* (e.g., Hdt. 3.78–85). None the less, S.'s audience would doubtless agree that in a true *polis* the citizens must participate in the government (cf. Cicero, *De rep.* 3.31); see *Intro.* §5(f), Griffith 1998.

740–57 Editors have made various proposals for transposing some of these lines, with a view to providing tauter interactions, a clearer sequence of argument, and a stronger climax (see esp. Dawe 1973: 109–10). But the order in the MSS presents no serious problems: see LJ&W 1990: 134–5, and below 750n.

740 ὄδ', ὡς ἔοικε ... marks a decisive moment in the *agōn*, as Kreon points out the implications of Haimon's words (cf. 576 ὡς ἔοικε): his son has adopted the first of the two alternatives presented in 632–4. From here on, insult rather than persuasion is uppermost in both men's minds. For the 3rd p. (ὄδε), cf. 726–65n.

συμμαχεῖ: military language characteristic of Kreon (663–6, 672–6, 734, 752nn., *Intro.* §5(c)).

741 γυνή σύ: an ironic echo of 484. Haimon is barely maintaining decorum with the sarcastic conditional (εἴπερ), cf. 635–8n.

γὰρ οὖν 'for ... in truth' (*GP* 446; cf. 489 with n., 771).

σοῦ ... προκήδομαι: for thought and syntax, cf. 688 σοῦ ... προσκοπεῖν. The κηδ- element suggests proper 'filial care' (549n.).

742 At last Kreon addresses Haimon directly (726–65n.). If punctuated as a question (Hermann), the construction is continued from 741: '<You are showing your care> by entering into dispute with your own father?' It is less pointed to take ἰών in apposition to παγκάκιστε, without the question-mark, 'Villain, that you enter ...!' διὰ δίκης ἰών here = δικάζόμενος (almost, 'bringing charges against ...'), cf. Thuc. 6.60 διὰ δίκης ἐλθεῖν, *OC* 905 δι' ὀργῆς ἦκον. On father–son legal disputes in Athens, see Harrison 1968: 170–8.

743 'Yes (γὰρ), because I see you making unjust mistakes.' οὐ γὰρ δίκαια picks up διὰ δίκης, cf. 728.

744–5 ἀμαρτάνω γὰρ ...; again, highly indignant (729–30n.).

σέβων 'duly exercising (my authority)'. For this sense of σέβω

(similar to Latin *colo*), cf. E. *Or.* 1079 ἑταιρίαν σέβων, and Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1612. But Haimon rejoins with the more conventional sense of οὐ σέβεις, ‘It is not pious for you to be trampling ...’ (cf. 730–1 εὐσεβεῖν, and 777, 780, 726–65n., 923–4; *Introd.* §5(d)(i)). Haimon’s contrast between human ἀρχαί and divine τιμαί recalls Ant.’s main speech (esp. 453–5), and provokes Kreon’s disgusted retort in 746, and 748 πᾶς ὑπὲρ κείνης.

746 μιαρὸν . . . καὶ γυναικὸς ὕστερον: Kreon supposes that Haimon’s accusation must be due to a ‘disgusting’ (disloyal, unmanly) subservience to his fiancée. For ὕστερον (‘taking second place to’, not quite as strong as ἦσσω, 678–80, 747), cf. LSJ *s.v.* III, and 640n.

747 ἦσσω γε τῶν αἰσχροῶν: cf. *Tr.* 489 ἔρωτος ἦσσω, and 680 (γε τῶν αἰσχροῶν = τῶν γ’ αἰσχροῶν: for the position of γε, cf. E. *Ba.* 501, *El.* 647, *GP* 149). αἰσχροῶν could be either neuter (‘overcome by shameful considerations’), or masc. (cf. 677–8).

750 Alliteration (τ, θ), *hyperbaton* (throwing emphasis onto ταύτην ποτέ), and blunt diction, all lend force to Kreon’s threat. The line does not really reply to 749; indeed, 746, 748, 750 seem to follow on from one another, as if Kreon is not listening to Haimon’s intervening remarks (cf. 757). Some editors transpose 756–7 to come between 749 and 750, because 755 might seem more provocative as Haimon’s final remark than 757, and also because another couplet here specifically focusing on ‘woman’ (756 γυναικός, cf. 746) would better prepare for 750. But the transposition is palaeographically unlikely, and 756–7 are more effective where they stand.

οὐκ . . . ἔτι ζῶσαν γαμείζ: cf. 575, 654, 1240–11n.

751 θανούσ’ ὀλεῖ τινα: an ambiguous and ironic warning, whether Haimon is predicting ‘catastrophe’/‘death’ for himself or for Kreon; cf. 1173–7, 1223–5, 1233–4. For ‘indefinite τις used with covert reference’ (*Campbell* 36), cf. *Ph.* 110, *Thuc.* 3.2, and esp. E. *IT* 548 τέθνηκ’ ὁ τλήμων, πρὸς δ’ ἀπώλεσέν τινα (= ἐμέ).

752 Lit. ‘Are you really (ἦ καί, 403n.) pressing ahead thus boldly making threats?’ ὦδε may be taken with ἐπαπειλῶν, or θράσους, or ἐπεξέρχηι (a word of military associations: ‘advance’, ‘attack’, ‘go right through’; cf. 700, 740n.).

753 ‘How can it be a “threat”, to speak out against empty thoughts?’; cf. *Pind. N.* 4.40 γνώμαν . . . κενεάν, and 709 κενοί, 635–6.

754 κλαίων φρενώσεις ‘You will regret it if you keep on trying to enlighten <me>, when you are completely devoid of enlightenment yourself.’ For the idiom (κλαίων ...), cf. 932 κλαύματα, *OT* 401, 1152, and the equivalent οὐ χαίρων (758–9).

755 σ’ (not enclitic) ‘... that it is *you* who have no sense’. Haimon maintains a semblance of decorum, by tempering the assertion with another conditional (εἰ μὴ ..., cf. 635 ἔχων, 638 ἡγούμενου, 741, with nn.).

756 μὴ κώτιλλε ‘Don’t try to chat me up (or ‘pull the wool over my eyes’) ...!’ κωτίλλω usually denotes deceptive, pretty speech (often feminine) that is calculated to disarm, even seduce, an opponent. If Haimon is a ‘woman’s slave’ (δούλευμα, cf. 478–9, 746nn., also 760 μῖσος, 320n.), his protestations of filial respect must be insincere (635).

757 λέγειν ... καὶ ἀκούειν (or κλύειν) is a familiar phrase for the give-and-take of ‘fair discussion’ (cf. *OC* 190, *El.* 628, 990, *Thuc.* 4.22). Haimon takes Kreon’s command (756) as a denial of his right to respond when Kreon ‘says something <bad>’ (λέγειν τι euphemistic, cf. *El.* 336 δρᾶν τι); cf. 664n., and 506–7 (also 642 κατηγοκούς).

758–9 ἄληθεις; ‘What!’, an incredulous and angry exclamation (with distinctive accentuation); cf. *OT* 350, *E. Kyk.* 241 (and Comedy).

τόνδ’ Ὀλυμπον ‘By Heaven!’, with μά understood, as often in negative oaths (*OT* 1088 οὐ, τὸν Ὀλυμπον ἀπείρων οὐκ ἔσῃ, *El.* 1063). For ‘this Olympus’ used of ‘the skies above’, cf. *Aj.* 1389.

οὐ ... | χαίρων ἔτι ... δεννάσεις ἐμέ ‘You won’t continue to insult me with impunity’, cf. 754 κλαίων with n., and *Aj.* 243 κακὰ δεννάζων ῥήματα. For parenthetical ἴσθ’ ὅτι (‘You can be sure’), cf. 276. The MS ἐπὶ ψόγοισι is improbable: ψόγος and δέννος are virtually synonymous, so ἐπὶ could hardly mean ‘in addition ...’, though Jebb cites *El.* 108, *E. Tro.* 315 as examples of ἐπὶ + dat. for ‘a continuing strain of utterance’.

760–1 ἄγετε τὸ μῖσος ‘Bring out the hateful creature!’ (i.e. Ant.), addressed to the attendants, cf. 491, 578, 931–2. (They do not in fact return with her till 801.) For τὸ μῖσος, cf. *Ph.* 991, *El.* 289 μίσημα, 320n. The vindictive proposal to have Ant. executed ‘right away, up close ... before his very eyes’ (pleonasm indicative of intense eagerness, cf. *OT* 430–1), makes a disgusting climax to the quarrel. Kreon

has won the *agōn* (his policies are unchanged), but his rhetorical and moral defeat is transparent.

762–5 As Haimon begins his exit (down the side-entrance by which he came) he announces his repudiation of his father: ‘You will never lay eyes on me again’, his final 4-line utterance contrasting absolutely with his first (635–8).

ἔμοιγε does not, as would be expected, go with both clauses (οὔτε . . . τε . . .), only with the first (cf. *OT* 652–3, *OC* 1397–8, etc.).

οὐδαμὰ ‘never’ (answering 759 **ἔτι**, 760 **αὐτίκα**) seems more likely than **οὐδαμῶς** (‘in no way’) or **οὐδαμοῦ** (‘nowhere’).

τοῦμόν . . . κράτ’: cf. **ἰ** **κάρα** with **ν**.

προσόψηι . . . ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄρων: Haimon’s furious pleonasm matches Kreon’s (760–1n.); cf. too Homeric **ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδωμαι**.

τοῖς θέλουσι τῶν φίλων . . . συνών ‘living with those of your loved ones who are willing <to put up with you>’. Haimon no longer classes himself as a **φίλος** to his father; contrast 634 (and cf. 73–5, 99, 187–8).

ὡς . . . μαίνηι echoes 760–1 **ὡς θνήσκηι**, and also ironically recalls 633 **λυσσαίνων**. (Cf. too 790 **μέμνηε**.)

766–80 As the Chorus react in dismay to Haimon’s furious departure, Kreon announces his intention of proceeding with the execution. But at the Chorus’ suggestion, he now exempts Ismene: Ant. alone will be entombed.

This short coda to the strident confrontation between father and son contains some important and unexpected developments. Kreon, though quick to anger in previous dialogues, is now politely receptive to the Elders’ query about Ismene; and he has modified his plans for Ant.’s execution, out of concern about ‘pollution’ (775), no longer intending to make it into a public spectacle (contrast 36, 308–9, 489, 760–1). Whether these changes of mind are due to fear of public opinion (inc. the Chorus’, and cf. 692–700, 733), or to some stirrings of moral feeling, they show that Kreon (unlike other Sophoklean heroes) is capable of rational calculation and of listening to good advice, provided it does not come from a woman or from his son (cf. 626–780, 1091–1114nn.); cf. *Introd.* §§5(c), 5(e)(iii).

In dramatic terms, two important results of Kreon’s changes of mind are: (i) to remove Ismene from the action and from our minds – she has nothing more to do in the play, a typical example of the

dramatic economy of Greek tragedy (like, e.g., the disappearance of Elektra from A. *Cho.*, or Apollo from *Eum.*); (ii) to complete the process of isolating Ant. and preparing for her lonely and pathetic ‘marriage to Hades’.

766–7 The Chorus are apprehensive (cf. 1091): Haimon’s angry exit portends trouble – for whom? βαρύς = ‘resentful’, ‘oppressive’, cf. *OT* 546, 673, E. *Med.* 37–9.

768 δράτω, φρονέτω ... ἰών ‘Let him go, let him keep on acting and thinking too big for a man (μείζον ἢ κατ’ ἄνδρα, cf. *OC* 598)!’ The doubled 3rd p. imperatives are impatient and dismissive, cf. A. *Prom.* 939 δράτω, κρατεῖτω. Haimon’s behaviour seems to Kreon almost impious (cf. 663–4, 726–7, 742, 752, 758–9); contrast 453–5.

769 ‘But, in any case (δ’ οὔν, cf. 688 with n.), he won’t save these two girls from death.’ For the duals, cf. 2–3, 170–2nn. (Possibly τῶ ... κόρα τῶδ’ should be read, as the regular fem. dual forms in fifth-century Attic.)

770 ‘Do you really (καὶ, 90n.) have in mind to kill *both* of them?’, ἀμφῶ emphatic by position, and γάρ signalling consternation (729–30, 1062nn.). The implied criticism, though mild, is more than we expect from the Elders; cf. 211–14n.

771 With remarkable docility and politeness, Kreon retracts his sentence on Ismene (echoing, with 771 μὴ θιγοῦσαν, Ant.’s own words to Ismene at 546 μὴ θιγες); cf. 766–80n.

772 ποίωι καὶ ‘By what kind of death exactly?’, cf. 1253, 1314, 90n., and *OT* 989 ποίας δὲ καὶ γυναικός ...;

σφε = αὐτήν (44n.); in context, it is obvious that it means Ant., though syntactically (after 771) it is ambiguous.

773–6 Execution by live burial and/or starvation was not a regular punishment; but Athenians might recall the fate of the Kylonian conspirators (Thuc. 1.126) and of the Spartan Pausanias (Thuc. 1.134), though in both these cases the victims had themselves sought sanctuary. For unmarried women in particular, immurement has often seemed esp. appropriate, since it sheds no blood and leaves their bodies still hidden (cf. 774 κρύψω), closed-off, and unviolated; see King 1983, Seaford 1990; but in tragedy, a ‘sacrificial’ death by the sword is more often employed (Loraux 1987: 31–48); cf. 1221–2n., 1232–40, 1315–16. There may have existed religious prescriptions (cf.

Plutarch, *Numa* 10, on the punishment of Vestal Virgins), underlying Kreon's provision of a modicum of food and water in order to avert responsibility and pollution: the victim would die of 'natural causes' – or else would be saved by a miracle (cf. 778, 887–8). Thus, although we soon learn that Kreon's denial of burial to Pol. (and the Argives?, cf. 1080–3n.) has incurred pollution, and that the gods are angry at his living 'burial' of Ant. (1068–9), his expressed wish that he and his city remain 'clean' in executing her is not absurd (cf. his earlier proposal to have her stoned to death, 35–6n.). In dramatic terms, the choice of this mode of execution leaves just enough room and time for some independent action by the victim – and others – with a resultant increase in suspense as to the outcome.

775 Lit. 'Providing only so much food as <to be> expiation', with ὡς = ὥστε and εἶναι to be supplied; πρότιθημι = 'set (a meal) before (someone)' is common in Homer. The construction is odd, but not in itself difficult. More troublesome is the usage of ἄγος, which usually means 'curse', 'stain', 'damage', 'pollution', but here has to mean the opposite, 'protection from pollution' (like Latin *piaculum*). The nexus of ἄγ- and ἄγν- terms is wide-ranging (cf. 887–9 with n.), and some procedures may be either polluting or hallowed or both (*tabu*), depending on context and performer; so it is best not to alter the MS text – esp. since ancient lexicists cite a separate occurrence in S. of precisely this usage (fr. 689 Radt = Hesychios a734 Latte) from S. *Phaidra*: ἄγος· ἄγνισμα, θυσία (cf. too, possibly, A. *Cho.* 155). If emendation is preferred, τοσοῦτον ὅσον ἄγος φεύγειν ('just enough to escape pollution'; Blaydes, Hartung, LJ&W) is possible (but then 776 merely repeats 775); or perhaps τοσοῦτον ἄγνός ὡς μένειν προθεῖς ('providing as much food as to <allow me to> remain pure').

777–80 A final taunt at the absent Ant. (and implicitly at Haimon too), for her exclusive commitment to the gods of the Underworld (cf. 745, 749), which Kreon sees as an impious rejection of the gods of Thebes (777 μόνον θεῶν, cf. 199–201, 280–9, 514–21; Introd. §5(e)(i)).

778 που is sarcastic (*GP* 491), 'Doubtless she'll succeed ...'

τὸ μὴ θανεῖν may be object of αἰτουμένα, or of τεύξεται (cf. *OC* 1106 αἰτεῖς ἅ τεύξῃ, A. *Cho.* 711), or both.

779 γοῦν ἀλλὰ τηνικαῦθ' 'at least now, finally ...', cf. 552 ἀλλὰ νῦν.

780 πόνος περισσός ‘a pointless waste of effort’ (cf. 68, A. *Prom.* 383). Alliteration adds emphasis to the concluding *gnōmē* (following enjambment, 67–8n.).

Exit Kreon into the Palace? Probably not. He has sent attendants to fetch Ant. (760–1), and is certainly present to address her at 883, without any announcement of departure or re-arrival (cf. 626–30n.). If Kreon does remain on stage during this Song, its tenor and significance may be crucially affected (781–800n., cf. 582–625, 872–4n., *Introd.* §4).

781–800 Fourth Song (Third *Stasimon*) of the Chorus

In direct response to the quarrel they have just witnessed, the Elders sing a short hymn to Eros and Aphrodite, whose mighty power, capable of ‘misleading even righteous men’s minds into being unrighteous, to their ruin’ (791–2), has caused ‘this dispute too’ (793–4), a clear reference to the youthful Haimon (790 μέμνηνε, cf. 765 μαινῆι). The Chorus again say nothing about Kreon’s role in the conflict (cf. 582–625n.), and nothing about the substance of Haimon’s arguments, as they develop their vivid but conventional picture of the overpowering effects of desire (Burton 1980: 113–17). If Kreon is still on stage (780n.), the Elders may hope to mitigate his anger at his son by reminding him that such youthful folly is nothing new, though they thereby give voice to the very feelings that Haimon chose to suppress. In any case, the Chorus’ one-sided interpretation (contrast 724–5) again allows the poet to introduce telling ironies: for the description of Eros’ irresistible nature recalls the language of a wedding celebration (Seaford 1987: 108), and thus begins to prepare us for Ant.’s (and Haimon’s) ‘marriage to death’; and it may suggest too the futility of Kreon’s attempt to challenge divine law (797–8, cf. 1192–1243; W-Ingram 1980: 92–8, esp. 97).

The Song observes regular hymnic form (100–61, 1115–54nn.): invocation by name, honorific listing of attributes, powers, and epithets (several in relative clauses), including a particular reference to the present (793 *σὺ καὶ τὸδε νεῖκος* ...), though there is no initial citing of parentage (notoriously uncertain in Eros’ case), and no final request, or *envoi*. Typical of hymnic style are the anaphora (“Ἐρῶς ... Ἐρῶς ...; ὃς ἐν ... ὃς ἐν ...; σὺ καὶ ... σὺ καὶ ...; οὐτε ...

οὐδεις οὔτε ...) and the 'universalizing' language of 785–8 (sea/land, god/mortal). As in other encomia of Love, emphasis is laid on His/Her power effortlessly to subdue animals (on land, air, and sea), human beings, and even the gods (782n.).

Metre: strophe and antistrophe

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------------------|
| 781 | Ἔρωσ ἀνικατέ μαχαν, | ia. chor. |
| 791 | συ και δικαιων ἀδικους | (chor. dim.) |
| 782 | Ἔρωσ, ὅς ἐν κτημασί πιπτεῖς, | ia. chor. –// |
| 792 | φρενας παρασπαις ἐπι λωβαί. | |
| 783 | ὅς ἐν μαλακαῖς παρειαις | × chor. ba. |
| 793 | συ και τοδε νεικος ἀνδρων | (hagesichorean) |
| 784 | νεανιδος ἐννυχευεις, | × chor. ba.// |
| 794 | ξυναιμον ἐχεις ταρξας | (hagesichorean) |
| 785 | φοιταις δ' ὑπερποντιος ἐν τ' | ia. chor. |
| 795 | νικαι δ' ἐναργης βλεφαρων | (chor. dim.) |
| 786 | ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαις. | chor. + [^] ia. _^ |
| 796 | ἡμερος εὐλεκτρον | ('chor. dim. _^ ') |
| 787 | και σ' οὐτ' ἀθανατων φυξιμος οὐδεις | ×× 2 chor. –// |
| 797 | νυμφας, των μεγαλων †παρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαις† | |
| 789 | οὐθ' ἀμεριων σε γ' ἀν- | telesillean |
| 799 | θεσμων· ἀμαχος γαρ ἐμ- | (_^ glyconic) |
| 790 | θρωπων, ὃ δ' ἔχων μεμηνην. | × chor. ba.// |
| 800 | παιζει θεος Ἀφροδιτα. | (hagesichorean) |

A uniformly 'aeolo-choriambic' pair of stanzas, comprising mostly elements already encountered in earlier odes. The prevailing pat-

terns are the choriambic dimeter (x-x- -uu-) and ‘asclepiadic’ cola with double choriamb (-uu- -uu-). In both cases there is occasional extension of -uu- into the pendant form -uu-- (‘adonean’); and these merge easily into ‘glyconic’-type cola (telesillean, glyconic, hagesichorean), all built out of the sequence (x)x -uu-u- x x-uu-u- (x) ..., often dovetailed together. Thus 782-4 = 792-4 could be analysed (with coincidence of word-end) as three successive pendant cola of the aristophanean type (... -uu-u-) or (with dovetailing) as containing two glyconics (cf. n. on *Metre* of 604-25); similar ambiguity operates in 787-90 = 797-800. In 786 = 796, the ‘dragged’ and syncopated clausula (-uu- -^_//, instead of the expected -uu-u- or -uu-u-) is characteristic of S. (cf. 947-8 = 958-9, and Dale 1968: 154, West 1982: 116-17; cf. 104, 1122). (For discussion of the irregular resolution and freedom of respension presented by the MSS in 787 = 797, see 797-9n.)

Aeolics of this straightforward kind suit a poem about Eros (cf. the asclepiadic stanzas of Anacreon, Sappho, etc.; Dale 1968: 155). At the same time, these rhythms mesh well with the prevailing aeolic patterns established earlier in the play, maintaining this Chorus’ solidly consistent tone. There are few verbal correspondences between str. and ant., but the first words (“Ερωσ ἀνίκατε μάχαν) and the last (ἄμαχος ... Ἀφροδίτα) of the Song give it a unifying ring structure that emphasizes its single theme, esp. striking in opposition to ‘Hades’ in 777, 780.

781 ἀνίκατε μάχαν ‘irresistible in battle’, cf. 799-800, and *Tr.* 441-3, Plato, *Symp.* 196d, E. fr. 433 “Ερωτα πάντων δυσμαχώτατον θεόν.

782 ὃς ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις: if the text is sound, the primary sense seems to be, ‘... you who make assaults upon herds’. It is conventional to specify that Desire affects animals, humans, and gods (*H. Hymn Aphr.* 2-5 ... θεοῖσιν ... καί τ’ ἑδαμάσσατο φύλα καταθητηῶν ἀνθρώπων | οἰωνούς τε ... καί θηρία πάντα | ... ἦδ’ ὄσα πόντος, E. *Hipp.* 1268-80, and esp. S. fr. 941.12 Radt ἰχθύων ... χέρσου ... ἐν οἰωνοῖσι ..., ἐν θηρσί, ἐν βροτοῖσιν, ἐν θεοῖς ἄνω); and such a usage for ἐν ... πίπτεις (tmesis?) is also appropriate. But κτήματα is peculiar for θηρία, or even for ‘domestic chat-

tels' (see P. Chantraine, *RPh* 20 (1946) 1–11), and might be emended (with Brunck) to κτήνεσι, since κτήνεα (also derived from κτάομαι) is frequently found in this restricted sense (*A. Ag.* 129 κτήνη τὰ δημοσιπλήθη, *H. Hymn* 30.10, Herakleitos 29.4 DK). Less likely, 'You who make assaults upon wealth', for, even though Eros may drive men to ravage cities (as Herakles for Iole, and Paris for Helen; cf. *E. Hipp.* 538–44) or squander their own fortunes, 'possessions' hardly merit such emphasis. Various other emendations have been proposed (several involving παίζεις for πίπτεις, cf. 799); but none is convincing. Perhaps Dawe is right to print daggers.

783–4 Another conventional but vivid image, recalling a passage from the early tragedian Phrynichos (*TrGF* I F 13) λάμπει δ' ἐπὶ πορφυρέαις παρήϊσι φῶς ἔρωτος. Cheeks and eyes (and, in the case of pederasty, thighs) are the most often-cited visual stimulants to desire.

ἐννουχεύεις 'you spend the night', like a sentry (Love / the lover = a warrior); cf. LSJ *s.v.* νυκτερεύω, νυκτοφυλακέω, and Horace, *Odes* 4.13.8 (*Cupido pulchris excubat in genis*).

785–6 φοιτᾶις δ' ὑπερπόντιος ἔν τ' | ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαῖς 'you range over the open sea and in the shelters of the pasture-land' (cf. *E. Hipp.* 1272–3). Neither language nor context specifies here whether the reference is to *animals* (fish and land-animals – in which case we are missing 'winged creatures' as the third element, cf. *S. fr.* 941 Radt (quoted in 782n.), Lucretius, *DRN* 1.18ff., etc. – or to *human beings*. This vagueness perhaps adds to the universalizing effect of the doublets (water/land, animal/human; cf. 39–40, 334–41nn.), and underscores Eros' ubiquity (φοιτᾶις, cf. 787 φύξιμος οὐδεῖς). For ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαῖς, cf. 945 and 356 δυσαύλων πάγων (= human habitation); but also 349 ἀγραύλου θηρός and *OT* 1103 πλάκες ἀγρόνομοι ('upland pastures' for animals).

787–90 'And none of the immortals <is> capable of escaping you, nor any of mortal humans; but he who possesses you is completely crazed.' φύξιμος has the force of a verb (governing σε), cf. *A. Prom.* 904 ἄπορα πόριμος, *Ag.* 1090, *K–G* 1 296. The notion that not even gods can avoid Eros/Aphrodite is commonplace (*Tr.* 443, *Hes. Th.* 121–2, *H. Hymn Aphr.* 34–7). For 789 σέ γε, picking up 787 σε, cf. *OT* 1098–1101 τίς σε, τέκνον, τίς σ' ἔτικτε | ...; ἦ σέ γε ..., *Ph.* 1116, *K–G* II 657. The MS reading, οὐθ' ἀμερίων ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων, presents

a peculiar use of ἐπί (?‘in the case of mortal men ...’), and also destroys the parallelism of the two οὔτε clauses.

790 ὁ δ’ ἔχων μέμνηεν: more often, it is Love who ‘possesses’, ‘captures’ the lover; but cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἔχω A.I.8, and Plato, *Phaedr.* 239c ἀνὴρ ἔχων ἔρωτα. The ‘madness’ of love is proverbial (cf. too 633 λυσσαίνων, 765 μαίνηι). After the assonantial series of ο/ω/ου sounds in 785–90, the ε/η of μέμνηεν adds another degree of surprise.

791–4 ‘You wrest aside the minds even of the righteous <so as to make them> unrighteous, to their ruin ...’ (ἀδίκους proleptic, 474–6n.). The antistrophe brings the particular application (793 καὶ τόδε) of the strophe’s generalizations about Eros; and again anaphora emphasizes the god’s potency (σὺ καὶ ... σὺ καὶ τόδε ..., cf. 781–3, 781–800n.). The Chorus’ words recall Kreon’s earlier complaints about money (298–9) and about sex (648–9); so they seem to have Haimon primarily in mind, and rightly so, for were Haimon not in love, his language would have been milder, and his father more receptive (cf. 766–80n.). But at the same time, there were *two* ‘men’ (ἀνδρῶν) whose hearts and minds Eros has ‘wrested astray’ (παρασπαῖς, cf. *OC* 1185) so as to cause ‘this turbulent quarrel’ (794 νεῖκος ... ἔχεις ταραξας, cf. *E. Hipp.* 969 ὅταν ταραξῆι Κύπρις ἠβῶσαν φρένα, and, for the prolepsis, *A. Cho.* 330–1, *E. Ba.* 797 φόνον ... ταραξας. For the periphrastic perf., cf. 21–2n.). Male rivalry is central to most Greek erotic interactions (Wohl 1998: xxvi–xxix), and Kreon’s opposition to his son’s desires has set him up to be another casualty of Eros (Kitto 1956: 165–7, 176–7, W-Ingram 1980: 97).

Ξύναιμον is transferred from ἀνδρῶν to νεῖκος (*hypallagē*, a common poetical trope), cf. Campbell 1879: 1 80, and 863 ματρῶναι, 980, 1022nn.

795–7 The primary sense may be (roughly): ‘Victorious is the allure shining in the eyes of the ready young bride.’ But the associations are multiple, suggesting the mutually irresistible radiance of *both* lovers (implicitly, Ant. and Haimon): ἐναργής could be predicative (‘desire’s victory is plainly visible’); ἕμερος could be the beloved’s ‘allure’ (affecting the lover) or the lover’s ‘desire’ (for the beloved); βλεφάρων could be objective (‘desire for the eyes ...’), possessive (‘the bride’s eyes’ allure’), or subjective (‘the eyes’ desire for the bride’); cf. W-Ingram 1980: 95 n. 14, *Introd.* §3, p. 18.

797–9 τῶν μεγάλων ἑπάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς | θεσμῶν: if the MS reading were sound, it would have to be taken as an extravagant amplification of Eros’/Himeros’ powers: ‘(Desire) ... the fellow-councillor in the offices of the great laws’; cf. E. *Med.* 843 (“Ἐρωτας) ... τᾶι Σοφίαι παρέδρους, παντοίας ἀρετᾶς ξυνέργους, *OC* 1382 (Δίκη) ξύνεδρος Ζηνὸς ἀρχαίοις νόμοις (also A. *Supp.* 1034ff., and cf. Burton 1980: 115–16). But there are reasons for doubting the text: (i) *ἑπάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς* gives a resolved longum in one choriamb (UUUU—) responding to φύξιμος οὐδέεις in the strophe (786—UU—), a freedom occasionally found in Pindar, but never in S. (though cf. 970–1n.); (ii) Love is hardly a ‘partner among’, but rather a *destroyer* of θεσμοί (hence 800 γάρ); (iii) the Chorus’ words at 801–2 refer unmistakably back to 797–8 (θεσμῶν κτλ.), and indicate that the Elders resemble Haimon in being ‘carried beyond/outside <the bounds of> the laws’. So emendation of 797–8 seems to be required (e.g., παρβασίαισιν, ‘through transgressions of the laws ...’, cf. 874 παράβατον, 605 ὑπερβασία, Hom. *Il.* 1.205).

799–800 ἐμπαίζει ... Ἄφροδίτα: what is madness and ruin to humans (791–4), is ‘play’, or even ‘mockery’, to Aphrodite and Eros (interchangeable here, as often).

801–943 Scene Five (*Kommos* and Fourth *Epeisodion*)

Ant. is led in, to make her final appearance before being taken off to execution. First (801–82) she engages in antiphonal exchanges (*amoi-baion*) with the Chorus, of a kind sometimes termed *kommos* (lit. ‘beating of the breast’, cf. Aristot. *Poet.* 12 1452b24–5); see H. Popp, in Jens 1971: 221–75, *Intro.* §3. Then, in a final confrontation with Kreon (883–943), she reiterates her devotion to her brother and parents, and takes leave of Thebes and its apparently uncaring divinities.

801–82 *Kommos*: Ant.’s strophic lyrics alternate at first with the Chorus’ anapaests (817–22, 834–8), then with their short lyric stanzas (853–6 = 872–5; see n. on *Metre*). This is the emotional and musical climax of the play (Ditmars 1992: 88–90, 109–31, Brown 1987: 188–90), and the epirrhematic structure helps to underline the participants’ different states of mind. Ant.’s lyrics express desolation:

she feels abandoned and mocked by gods and humans alike (839–52, 879–80nn.), even by her own φίλοι (881–2), as she conducts her own solitary funeral lament. As for the Elders, their attempts at sympathy and encouragement are hedged with critical reminders to Ant. of her own mistakes, and provide little comfort, while they themselves grow increasingly agitated, as their switch into lyrics indicates. The ‘contact’ between Chorus and actor is formally close (806–16, 817–22nn.), with frequent verbal echoes, addresses, and responses; yet the gulf between them is unbridgeable, and Ant.’s isolation overwhelming. No mention is made of Kreon, but he may be on-stage throughout, watching and listening with increasing impatience (780, 883–90nn.): if so, his brooding presence could account for the ambivalence of the Chorus, sorrowing over Ant.’s fate, yet still not retracting their support of the king.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 806 | ὄρατέ μ', ὦ γὰς πατρίας πολῖται, | choriambic dim. ba. |
| 823 | ἤκουσα δη λυγροταταν ὀλεσθαι | |
| 807 | ταν νεάταν ὄδον | dodrans |
| 824 | ταν Φρυγίαν ξεναν | |
| 808 | στείχουσαν, νεάτον δε φεγ- | glyconic |
| 825 | Τανταλου Σιπυλωι προς ἄ- | |
| 809 | γος λευσουσαν ἄελιου, | choriambic dim. |
| 826 | κρωι, ταν κισσος ὡς ἀτενης | |
| 810 | κούποτ' αὐθις· ἀλλὰ μ' ὄ πάγ- | choriambic dim. |
| 827 | πετραία βλαστα δαμασεν, | |
| 811 | κοίτας Ἄιδας ζωσαν ἄγει | choriambic dim. |
| 828 | και νιν ὄμβροι τακομεναν, | |
| 812 | ταν Ἄχεροντος | choriamb —// |
| 829 | ὡς φατις ἀνδρων, | ('adonean') |

- 813 ἄκταν, οὐθ' ὕμεναιῶν pherecretean
 830 χίων τ' οὐδαμα λειπεί,
- 814 ἔγκληρον, οὐτ' ἐπί νυμ- choriambic dim.
 831 τεγγεί δ' ὑπ' ὄφρουσι παγ-
- 815 φείοις πῶ μέ τις ὕμνος ὕ- glyconic
 832 κλαυτοῖς δειραδᾶς· ἄι με δαι-
- 816 μνησεν, ἀλλ' Ἄχεροντι νυμφεῦσῶ. glyconic [^]ba.//
 833 μων ὁμοιοτάταν κατευναζει.

(817–22, 834–8 Recitative anapaests from Chorus)

Although Ant.'s solo voice makes an aural contrast with the Chorus' preceding Song (781–800), and the subject and tone of her lyrics are very different from theirs, the metrical character is similar: again aeolo-choriambic, based on the common patterns of $\times\times - \cup\cup - \cup -$ (glyconic) and $\times\times\times\times - \cup\cup -$ (choriambic dimeter). The variations are minor, and of familiar kinds: clausular truncations and elongations (... $\cup\cup - \wedge - //$, ... $-\cup\cup - \cup - - //$); some glyconic/cho. dim. fluctuations (cf. nn. on *Metre* of 100–26, 332–51); occasional syncopations; and some dovetailing (808–11 = 825–8, 814–16 = 831–3). The opening and closing cola are longer than the rest, mirroring one another in a kind of 'ring composition': both are built around a glyconic pattern, and both have pendant close (... $\cup - - //$); but in 816 = 833 this is extended by an extra syllable (... $\cup - - - //$, cf. 947 = 958, and cf. n. on *Metre* of 781–800, on 786 = 796) in a slow, heavy cadence that matches the funereal words.

The Chorus' punctuating anapaests are straightforward, in both cases consisting of a single period: ten metra + paroemiac in 817–22, eight + paroemiac in 834–8 (cf. 836–8n.).

Strophe and antistrophe β

- 839 οἶμοι γέλωμαι. τί με, πρὸς θεῶν πατρῶϊων, ia. dodrans ba.
 857 ἔψαυσας ἀλγεινοτάτας ἔμοι μεριμνας,

- 840 οὐκ οἶχομενάν ὕβρι- × dodrans
859 πατρος τριπολιστον οἶ- (telesillean)
- 841 ζεις, ἀλλ' ἐπιφαντῶν; × dodrans_Λ//
860 κτον του τε προπαντος (reizianum)
- 842 ὦ πολις, ὦ πολεως dodrans
861 ἀμετερου ποτμου
- 843 πολυκτημονες ἀνδρες· ×× dodrans_Λ//
862 κλεινοις Λαβδακιδαισιν. (pherecretean)
- 844 ἰῶ Διρκαιαι κρηναι Θη- 4 spondees (?)
863 ἰῶ ματρωιαι λεκτρων ἀ-
- 845 βας τ' εὐαρματου ἄλσος, ἔμ- glyconic
864 ται κοιμηματα τ' αὐτογεν-
- 846 πας ξύμμαρτυρας ὕμμ' ἐπικτώμαϊ, glyconic --//
865 νητ' ἔμωι πατρι δυσμορου ματρος·
- 847 οἶα φίλων ἀκλαντος, οἶοις νομοις ia|ia.|cr.
866 οἶων ἐγω ποθ' ἄ ταλαιφρων ἐφυν. (3 ia.Λ)
- 848 προς ἔργμα τυμβοχωστον ἔρ- 2 iambics
867 προς οὐς ἀραιος ἀγαμος ἀδ'
- 849 χομαι ταφου ποταινιου· 2 iambics//
868 ἐγω μετοικος ἐρχομαι.
- 850 ἰῶ δυστανος, βροτοις 2 sp. (?) cretic
869 ἰῶ δυσποτμων κασι- (3 Λia.Λ)
- 851 οὐτέ νεκρος νεκροισιν dodrans ×//
870 γνητε γαμων κυρησας, (aristophanean)

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 852 | $\overset{\cup}{\mu}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$, $\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\lambda}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ | ia. cr. ba.// |
| 871 | $\overset{\cup}{\theta}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\omega}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\tau}$ $\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\eta}\overset{\cup}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\mu}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}$. | (3 ia.λ) |

[CHORUS]

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 853 | $\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\beta}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\pi}$ $\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\chi}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\theta}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ | 2 iambics |
| 872 | $\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\beta}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\mu}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\beta}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}$ $\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\varsigma$, | |
| 854 | $\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\pi}\overset{\cup}{\eta}\overset{\cup}{\lambda}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\Delta}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\beta}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\theta}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ | 2 iambics |
| 873 | $\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\delta}$ $\overset{\cup}{\omicron}$ $\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omega}\overset{\cup}{\iota}$ $\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\mu}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\lambda}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\iota}$, | |
| 855 | $\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\pi}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\pi}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$, $\overset{\cup}{\omega}$ $\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{\cup}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$, $\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\delta}\overset{\cup}{\iota}$. | 2 iambics// |
| 874 | $\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\beta}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\delta}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\mu}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\iota}$ $\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\lambda}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\iota}$, | |
| 856 | $\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\omega}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\delta}$ $\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\kappa}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\iota}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$ $\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\theta}\overset{\cup}{\lambda}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\nu}$. | ba. cr. ba.// |
| 875 | $\overset{\cup}{\sigma}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}$ $\overset{\cup}{\delta}$ $\overset{\cup}{\alpha}\overset{\cup}{\upsilon}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\gamma}\overset{\cup}{\nu}\overset{\cup}{\omega}\overset{\cup}{\tau}\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\varsigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\omega}\overset{\cup}{\lambda}\overset{\cup}{\epsilon}\overset{\cup}{\sigma}$ $\overset{\cup}{\omicron}\overset{\cup}{\rho}\overset{\cup}{\gamma}\overset{\cup}{\alpha}$. | (3 λia.λ) |

These stanzas begin with aeolics but give way to iambics, in a structure that is the most varied and unsettled of the lyrics hitherto, as befits the emotional climax of the play. The Chorus' responses now are lyric (suggesting a higher level of emotion than the anapaests of 817-22, 834-37), and their simple iambic dimeters echo the rhythm of Ant.'s, esp. the final cadence (856 = 875, cf. 852 = 871). Once again, it is the syncopated iambics (rather in the style of Aisch.) that tend to coincide with the gloomiest verbal phrases (cf. n. on *Metre* of 353-75).

Ant.'s pair of stanzas starts with a series of dodrans-based cola, with typical variations: unsyncopated telesilleian and glyconic ($[\times]\times-\cup\cup-\cup-$), syncopated reizianum and pherecretean as clausulae ($[\times]\times-\cup\cup-\lambda-//$), etc. After a shift to straight glyconics (845-6 = 864-5), the second half of the stanza comprises mostly iambics, with a single dodrans-based colon (aristophanean) recurring as penultimate element (851 = 870, a common device in lyric iambics; cf. Dale 1968: 83; cf. too the contrastive dactyls of 340 = 350, and the iambics of 613 = 624). The character of the long

first colon is ambivalent: the punctuation of the strophe suggests 'penthemimer' + anaclastic ionic ($\times - \cup - \times \cup \cup - \cup - \cup - -$); but the ant. is punctuated differently, and $-$ if one or the other has to be preferred – choriambic colometry works out more homogeneously. In any case, dovetailing and ambivalence of exactly this kind ('iono-choriambic', Cole 1988: 20–2, 182–4) are not unusual (e.g. A. *Prom.* 128ff., 397ff., with Griffith's nn.; also Dale 1968: 129, 143, and cf. n. on *Metre* of 608–11 = 619–22). In 844 = 863, 850 = 869, the clusters of long syllables are hard to interpret exactly, esp. since the quantity of the exclamations ($\acute{\iota}\acute{\omega}$) is uncertain ($\cup -$ or $- -$), as is their inclusion or exclusion from the metrical scheme (cf. n. on *Metre* of 1261–1346): but strings of long syllables are not uncommon in *amoibaia* and other contexts of lamentation; likewise, of course, exclamations.

Epode

| | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------------|
| 876 | \cup $-$ \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup $-$ ἀκλαυτος, ἀφίλος, ἀνυμναι- | 2 iambics |
| 877 | \cup $-$ \cup $-$ $ $ $-$ \cup \cup $-$ ος ἄ ταλαιφρων ἄγομαι | choriambic dim. |
| 878 | $-$ \cup $-$ $ $ $-$ \cup \cup ταν ἔτοιμαν ὄδον. | 2 cretics// (2 λ ia.) |
| 879 | $-$ \cup \cup $-$ \cup \cup $-$ \cup \cup $-$ \cup \cup οὔκετι μοι τοδε λαμπάδος ἱερον | 4 'dactyls' |
| 880 | $-$ \cup \cup \cup \cup $ $ $-$ \cup $-$ $-$ ὄμμα θεμισ ὄραν ταλαιναί. | 2 trochaics |
| 881 | $-$ \cup $-$ \cup $ $ \cup \cup \cup $-$ \cup τον δ' ἔμον ποτμον ἄδακρυτον | 2 trochaics// |
| 882 | $-$ $-$ \cup $-$ $ $ \cup $-$ $-$ οὔδεις φίλων στεναζει. | ia. ba.// (2 ia. λ) |

The epode maintains the movement of the second half of the preceding strophic pair, with prevailing single-shorts, mostly un-syncopated and with several resolutions. Within this basic 'iambotrochaic' movement, there are brief recurrences of double-short (aeolic or dactylic) patterns at 877 and 879 (for the latter, cf. 339–40 = 350–1, West 1982: 101–2), providing contrast and also recalling the opening of the *kommos* (cf. 806 = 823, 809–11 = 826–8). For the

fluctuation between iambic and trochaic rhythm (i.e. shifting of aneeps from before the cretic to after), cf. Dale 1968: 69–71, 94–6. The precise colometry of the final two cola (881–2) is unclear, as the analysis above gives an awkward switch from tro. to ia., with aneeps following aneeps; some prefer to take the last colon as $-\wedge-\times-\cup-\times//$ (i.e. cretic_^ (or ‘palimbacchiac’, cf. 814 = 831) + ‘penthemimer’ $\times-\cup-\times$), with the last syllable of ἄδάκρυτον remaining short (aneeps), with no pause: the difference is slight.

801–5 Choral anapaests again announce the incoming character (526–30n.), as Ant. is led on stage (or, more likely, out into the *orchēstra*) by Kreon’s attendants.

καὺτὸς θεσμῶν | ἔξω φέρομαι ‘Even I too’ (sc. ‘like Haimon’, cf. 793–8, esp. 799 θεσμῶν) am being swept outside the proper bounds ...’ The image is of a chariot or boat being carried ‘off course’, cf. A. *Prom.* 883 ἔξω δὲ δρόμου φέρομαι λύσσης πνεύματι μάργωι. To show sympathy for Ant., by weeping for her (802–3), is to stray from the ‘rules’ of the city, as defined by Kreon. The implicit comparison between the Chorus’ feelings of pity and Haimon’s passionate love and rage is startling, and the ‘streams of tears’ elicited in these sober Elders by the sight of Ant. add powerfully to the pathos.

τὸν παγκοίτην ... θάλαμον ‘the chamber in which all come to lie’ (cf. 811, but also 947 τυμβήρει θαλάμωι). The primary senses of θάλαμος are ‘women’s room’, ‘bridal chamber’, ‘bedroom’; but it is frequently used of a tomb (e.g. A. *Pers.* 624 θάλαμον ὑπὸ γῆς, and R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs* (Urbana 1962) 192); cf. 806–16, 891–2nn.

ἀνύτουσαν ‘making her way to’ (cf. 231 ἦνυτον), with θάλαμον as direct obj., cf. *Aj.* 607 ἀνύσειν τὸν ... Ἄιδαν, *OC* 1562–4 (also 813 ἀκτάν).

806–16 ὀρᾶτέ μ’: Ant. picks up the Chorus’ words (802 ὀρῶν, 804 ὀρῶ, cf. 811 παγκοίτας / 804 παγκοίταν), thus establishing sympathetic ‘contact’ between them; but her insistent *epanaphora* (νεάταν ... νέατον ..., οὔθ’ ... οὔτ’ ...), and ‘polar’ opposites (810 κοῦποτ’ αὔθις· ἀλλά ..., 813–16 οὔθ’ ... οὔτ’ ... ἀλλ’ ...) add an emphatic, almost ritualistic note of her own. Like a bride departing for her new home, Ant. calls on her fellow-citizens to witness her ‘newest/last journey’, from her ‘father-land’ (806) to her

husband's residence: no processional song (813 ὑμέναια, cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.492–3, Aristoph. *Peace* 1332ff.), no bridal hymn (814 ἐπὶ νυμφείῳς ... ὕμνος = *epithalamion*, cf. Theokr. *Id.* 18, Catullus 61, 62) escorts her, the 'living bride' of Death (811 Ἄιδας ζῶσαν in striking juxtaposition, cf. 653–4n., 821–2, 814–15n.).

Greek marriage and funeral ceremonies had many similarities, esp. from the bride's perspective (torches, veils, the escorted journey to a new and unfamiliar 'home', fear and lamentation at loss of loved ones, delivery into the hands of a new 'owner', etc.). So the motif of 'marriage in/to Hades' is widespread: see Seaford 1987, Rehm 1994: esp. 11–29, 63–4. In this play, in addition to enhancing the pathos of Ant.'s death (inc. emotive associations with Persephone: 893–4, 1118–21nn.), the insistent repetition of the motif underlines the failure of both Ant. and Haimon to complete the 'rite of passage' from child to adult, and the failure of their two (already tainted) families to achieve normal exogamic relations. See further 73, 524–5, 575, 1240–1 with n., Introd. §5(e)(iii).

νεάταν ... νεάτον δὲ ... 'last' (cf. 627 νεάτον with n.). The omission of μέν is not unusual when the same word is repeated in balancing clauses (as *Tr.* 517, 1147–8; see *GP* 163).

μ' ... ἄγει | τὰν Ἀχέρωντος | ἀκτάν: omission of the preposition is rare (and confined to lyric), cf. *Ph.* 1175 Τρώιαδα γὰν μ' ἤλπισας ἄξειν, and 804–5, 822.

ὁ παγ|κοίτας 'who puts all to bed', cf. 804, and 833 κατευνάζει.

814–16 ἐπὶ νυμφείῳς: either 'at my marriage' (cf. *Tr.* 7 νυμφείων, Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 552; also 568), or 'in my bridal chamber', as at 891, 1205; for the form, cf. 358 ἐναιθήρεια. Dindorf's ἐπινύμφειος would also be possible ('a bridal song' = ἐπιθαλάμιος). The MS ἐπινυμφίδιος is unmetrical.

Ἀχέροντι νυμφεύσω: marriage of women to river gods is not uncommon in Greek mythology. Here the Underworld 'River of Pain' adds to the grim conceit, emphasized by the dragging clausular rhythm (cf. 831 κατευνάζει, and n. on *Metre*).

817–22 The Chorus try to console Ant. by mentioning the glory she must receive for her unique death, which she is incurring, not through illness or war, but of her 'own independent will' (αὐτόνομος). The tone is hard to gauge: although they show sympathy (cf. 802–5), the Chorus will continue to blame Ant. (853–6, 872–5), and

here their mention of ‘glory’ and ‘praise’ seems more a response to Ant.’s self-assessment than an expression of their own opinion (see 502, 695. and W-Ingram 1980: 137–9). There are verbal parallelisms with Ant.’s stanza (esp. 819–21 οὔτε ... οὔτε ... ἀλλά ..., cf. 813–15), while the structure and rhythm (esp. the matching word-divisions of 819 and 820) continue the ritualistic manner (806–16n.).

817 οὐκοῦν κτλ. ‘Well, are you not dying a glorious death ...?’ οὔκοῦν would give a ‘livelier interrogative’ (*GP* 436), and imply stronger approval: the difference is minimal. Less likely is Jebb’s οὐκοῦν, punctuated as a statement, ‘Glorious, therefore ...’

καὶ ἔπαινον: for the correction (καὶ) in anapaests, cf. 383, 838.

819–22 ‘Wasting diseases’ and ‘wages of the sword’ form a ‘universalizing doublet’ (334–41n.), representing all kinds of natural or violent death. But Ant.’s departure to Hades, uniquely (μόνη δῆ, cf. 823–33n.), is neither natural (since she is still alive) nor violent (because self-chosen; cf. 71–6, 80–1). For ἐπίχειρα, cf. A. *Prom.* 318–19.

αὐτόνομος ‘observing your own law’ (cf. 454 θεῶν νόμιμα, 875 αὐτόγνωτος ὀργά); or ‘voluntarily’ (‘mistress of thine own fate’, Jebb); cf. Loraux 1986: 170. This is the earliest occurrence of the word, which soon became a semi-technical term for ‘a weaker state which tries to exert its independence’ (M. Ostwald, *Autonomia* (Chico 1982) 1, citing e.g. Hdt. 1.96, Thuc. 1.144).

Ἄιδην (υυ–) rather than Ἄιδην (–) here, because ‘spondaic’ paroemiacs are rare.

823–33 In response to the Chorus’ mention of her ‘unique’ fate (821), Ant. compares her rock-bound death to the petrification of Niobe (832–3 ἄι με ... ὁμοιοτάταν), someone else who did not die by violence or disease (819–20), but by indeterminate transition from a living to an inanimate state – a ‘most hideous’ prospect (823 λυγροτάταν, contrast 817 κλεινή), seeing that death is supposed to be clear-cut, final, and distinguished from life by unmistakable rituals (Garland 1985: 31–4, Brown 1987: 189; cf. too 850–2n.).

Daughter of Tantalos, and sister of Pelops, Niobe came to Thebes to marry King Amphion (hence 824 ξέναν); she bore him ten sons and ten daughters (or seven, or six, according to different traditions); when she boasted of her superiority to Leto, mother of only two children (Apollo and Artemis), these two retaliated by killing all her

children with arrows (i.e. disease). Niobe returned to her father, near Mt Sipylos in Lydia/Phrygia (823–5n.), and remained there weeping incessantly over her children's tomb. She was finally transformed into rock by the gods (827), and later generations claimed still to recognize her shape, with water (rain and springs) pouring down her face and flanks (831–2), an eternal monument to maternal grief (and to rash boastfulness and impiety). The story is often told (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 24.602–17, Ovid, *Met.* 6.146–312), and was the subject of tragedies by A. and S. (cf. esp. W. S. Barrett, in R. Carden, *The papyrus fragments of S.* (Berlin 1974); see too *El.* 150–2 παντλάμων Νιόβα, σὲ δ' ἔγωγε νέμω θεόν, | ἄτ' ἐν τάφῳι πετραίῳι | ... δακρύεις.

Critics have suggested further significance, intended or not by Ant. herself, for this exemplum: is Ant., like Niobe, being punished for impiety and boastfulness (Müller)? Or are the gods (832 δαίμων) unfairly mistreating her just as they mistreated Niobe (Hester 1971: 34)? Or is it her exceptional φιλία that has brought misery to each (Else 1976: 60–1)? None of these interpretations receives direct support from the text; yet in allusive lyric of this kind, perhaps none can be completely excluded (cf. 944–87n., *Intro.* §3, pp. 18–21).

823–5 ἤκουσα δὴ 'I have heard tell ...', cf. 829 ὡς φάτις ἀνδρῶν (and responding to ὄρατέ μ' at 806 in the strophe).

λυγροτάταν 'died) most miserably', predicative (cf. 1200 εὐμενεῖς, 1215 ὠκεῖς, 1230 ἰκέσιος).

τὰν Φρυγίαν ξέναν | Ταντάλου 'our Phrygian guest-friend, <daughter> of Tantalos', typical lyric periphrasis. For the bare gen. ('child of ...'), cf. 37–8n., 486 ἀδελφῆς, *Aj.* 172 Διὸς Ἄρτεμις. Amphion's family was separate from the Labdakids, so Niobe and Ant. are not related.

Σιπύλωι: Mt Sipylos is part of the Tmolos range, just S. of Sardis in Lydia (which poets often count as 'Phrygia').

826–7 Lit. 'whom a stony growth, like stubborn ivy, subdued', i.e. a layer of rock grew to encase her body, an even grimmer image of 'living entombment' than Ant.'s. (For τὰν, cf. 606 τὰν with n.) δάμασεν continues the nuptial language, as δαμάζω, δάμνημι are often used of men 'taming'/'mastering' women in and out of wedlock (477–8n., cf. 832–3). κισσός too is a common symbol of rampant virility.

828–32 'Rains and snow, so men say, never leave her, as <she>

wastes away <with grief>, but from under ever-weeping brows <she> bedews <her> sides <with tears>.’ The interwoven images of weeping woman and trickling mountainside suggest Niobe’s gradual petrification: ὄφρουσι and δειράδας (cf. δειρή = ‘upland valley’) can be used of both people and hillsides.

ὄμβροι . . . | χιῶν τ’ . . . λείπει: the verb agrees with the nearest subject (cf. 1132–3, Smyth §966). With the MS ὄμβρωι, the construction would be redundant.

832–3 ἄι με . . . ὁμοιοτάταν: echoing 823 λυγροτάταν. For the points of ‘similarity’, cf. 823–33n.

δαίμων . . . κατευνάζει ‘. . . takes me to bed’, continuing the marital language (cf. 827 δάμασεν with n., 806–16n.). Presumably the ‘deity’ is Hades (810–12, cf. 575, 777–9) or Acheron (816).

834–8 ἀλλὰ . . . τοι . . . ‘But, you know . . .’ The Chorus attempt to nullify Ant.’s use of the Niobe exemplum, by reinterpreting it as a source of consolation (cf. 823–33n.): even if her fate was horrible, she was of divine ancestry, and for Ant. ‘even to be spoken of’ in the same breath is ‘a great achievement’ (836–7 μέγα).

834 For the ellipse of ἦν, cf. 948; and ἐκείνη μὲν also has to be supplied (835 ἡμεῖς δὲ . . .). Niobe’s father, Tantalos, was son of Zeus; her mother was Taygete (one of the Pleiades), or Dione (one of the Hyades): so she is scarcely θεός, but certainly θεογεννής and ἰσόθεος (837); cf. too A. *Niobe* fr. 162 Radt.

836–8 Lit. ‘And to be sure <it is> a great <thing> for one who has passed away, even to have it said of her that she received joint shares with the demigods while living and later after she died.’ (For this usage of ἀκούειν, cf. *Ph.* 1074, LSJ *s.v.* III.) σύγκληρα is a likely correction of the MS ἔγκληρα, which would mean ‘having a share in’ (cf. 814) or ‘included in someone’s share’.

Some critics have proposed a lacuna between 837 and 838, to give (e.g.) ‘and people will praise you both living and dead’: with this additional dimeter, the Chorus’ anapaests would correspond exactly in length to 817–22 (as their lyrics do, 853–6 = 872–5); and 838 would have more point. This is tempting, but anapaests need not respond as exactly as lyrics (cf. 110–12n.). (Some MSS omit 838; but we need the paroemiac to close the anapaestic system.)

839–52 Ant. feels the Chorus’ words as ‘mockery’ (839 γελῶμαι), an ‘insult’ (840 ὑβρίζεις) better reserved until after she is gone, not

mentioned to her face (840–1). Oblivious to Haimon and the people's admiration (692–700), and regarding the Chorus not as φίλοι (847) but merely as 'prosperous men of the city' (843–4), she stands completely alone: an 'alien' (851 μέτοικος) who belongs neither among the living nor the dead (850–2).

839–41 γελῶμαι ... ὑβρίζεις: cf. *Aj.* 367 οἴμοι γέλωτος, οἶον ὑβρίσθην ἄρα (also 480–3n.).

οὐκ οἰχομέναν ... ἀλλ' ἐπίφαντον 'not after I am dead and gone, but while I am still in plain view'. Most MSS have ὀλομέναν, which does not scan (we need –υυ–); οὐλομέναν would mean 'accursed'; ὀλλυμέναν would scan ––υ–; so οἰχομέναν is almost certainly correct.

842–7 ὦ πόλις ... | ἰὼ ... κρῆναι ...: scorned by the (male) political community (842–3 πόλις ... ἄνδρες, 843n.), Ant. appeals, as if in a legal complaint, to the nurturing waters and soil of Thebes to be her witnesses (cf. 937–43n.). For such an appeal, cf. *Aj.* 862 κρῆναί τε ποταμοί τε ..., *OC* 1333, *A. Prom.* 88–92, 1091–2.

843 πολυκτῆμονες ἄνδρες: cf. 942 ἀνδρῶν. The Elders represent the ruling elite of Thebes: cf. 159n., 940 κοιρανίδαι, 988 ἄνακτες, *Introd.* §5(f).

844 Διραταῖαι κρῆναι: cf. 104 with n.

845 εὐαρμάτου: cf. 149 πολυαρμάτωι with n. The final syllable scans short by 'correction' (cf. 817n.)

ἄλσος here = 'sacred plain' or 'precinct' (rather than 'grove'), as at *El.* 5 and e.g. *Aisch.* (= *TrGF* III) τ 162.3 Μαραθώνιον ἄλσος.

845–6 ἐμ|πας ... ὕμμ' 'at least *you*' (842–7n.). The Aeolic/epic form ὕμμε (for ὕμᾱς) is rare in tragedy; cf. *OC* 247 ὕμμι, *A. Eum.* 620.

847 οἶα ... οἴοις: indirect q. after ξυμάρτυρας, '(witnesses to) how, <and> by what laws, I go, unwept by loved-ones ...'

848 ἔργμα τυμβόχωστον 'the heaped-up burial-prison'. εἶργω, εἶργμός usually connote 'fencing in' or 'walling in' (not 'cairn', 'barrow', LSJ), as of a cage or prison building (cf. Plato, *Rep.* 495d, and LSJ *s.v.* εἶργμός; cf. 774, 886, 1216. The MS variant ἔρμα (? 'sunken rock') is less appropriate.

849 ποταίνιου 'new', 'unique', because tombs are not normally designed for the living.

850–2 'Ah, wretched me, <neither a living mortal, resident> among mortals, nor a corpse resident among corpses!' For the ellipse

of the first οὔτε (and βροτός), cf. *Ph.* 771, *A. Ag.* 532 Πάρις γὰρ οὔτε συντελής πόλις, *GP* 511(v), and 257–8n. The MS text gives satisfactory sense, but defective metre.

μέτοιχος: cf. 868, 890, and 1069 κατώικισσας. Ant.'s 'in-between' status, not truly 'resident' among the dead yet disenfranchised from the upper world, creates added distress (823–33, 1068–9nn.).

853–6 = 872–5 The Chorus shift into lyrics, as the emotional temperature rises (see n. on *Metre*). The Aischylean rhythms of their syncopated iambics match the moralistic content.

853–6 'Stepping forward to the furthest <extreme> of boldness, you collided with <your> foot against the high pedestal of Justice'; the Chorus still regard Ant. as a law-breaker (cf. 381–3, 603, and 873–4). The 'altar' or 'throne' of Justice is a common image, as is the criminal who 'kicks' it (*A. Ag.* 383, *Eum.* 539–40): βάθρον could be the 'base' of such a monument (e.g. *Hdt.* 1.183). πολύ in the MSS would have to mean 'you collided *hard* . . .', an improbable expression.

856 'You are paying out some torment <inherited> from your father'. ἐκτίνω δίκην/τίσιν = 'pay the penalty': here the payment is death, derived 'somehow' (τινα) from Oidipous' crimes (πατρῷον emphatic, cf. 2–6, 49–52, and esp. 594–603).

857–8 Lit. 'You touched on the most painful care for me, <a touching that is> a constantly-repeated <source of> lament for my father . . .'; τριπόλιστος = lit. 'thrice turned-over' by the plough (cf. 341 πολεύων, and *Ph.* 1238, *LSJ* s.v. ἀναπολέω). τριπόλιστον οἶκτον = internal acc. in apposition to the sentence, even though μερίμνας is gen. (with verb of touch); cf. Moorhouse 1982: 37. Some take οἶκτον as direct object ('you touched the pity of my care'), but this entails an inadmissible use of the acc. after ψάύω (cf. 546–7, 960–2nn.). LJ&W emend to τριπολίστου οἴτου, in apposition to μερίμνας, 'the thrice-renewed doom of my father . . .'; but the correction (-ιστου οἴτου) is unlikely.

860–2 ' . . . and (lament over) our entire fate, <us,> the renowned descendants of Labdakos' (cf. 594–5n.), ἀμετέρου equivalent to ἡμῖν, a usage more common with the gen. (e.g. *OC* 344 τὰ ἐμὰ δυστήνου κακά).

863–5 'Alas, the horrors of the maternal bed, and the wretched mother's incestuous union with my father!' (or, 'and my father's in-

cestuous union with my wretched mother!’ – the construction can be taken either way). For ἄται, cf. 4n.; ματρῶναι really belongs to λέκτρων, but is ‘transferred’ (cf. 793 ὀμαιμον with n.). The language and syntax are densely packed: κοιμήματα αὐτογέννητα suggests both ‘sleeping with her/his own kin’ and ‘sexual union that produces incestuous children’ (cf. I, 49–52nn.).

866 οἴων ‘from what (kind of) parents ...!’, exclamatory, cf. 1228. For the bare genitive, cf. 486–7n.; and for the idea, cf. 37–8 with n.

867–8 ‘<Back> to whom I am going now, as you can see (ἄδε deictic) to live with them, cursed, unmarried.’ (ἄραϊος is usually three-termination, here two-) For μέτοικος, cf. 852: an unmarried woman would normally ‘reside’ with her parents or guardian.

869–70 It was by marrying Argeia, daughter of Adrastos, that Pol. acquired Argive allies for his attempt on Thebes (Introd. §2; cf. 130n.).

871 ‘By your death you killed me, the still living.’ Cf. 751, and *El.* 808 ὡς μ’ ἀπώλεσας θανῶν (also 3 ἔτι ζώσαιν, and 812, 821–2).

κατήναρες: lit. ‘despoiled’, a rare form, from κατεναίρομαι (cf. κατεναρίζω, *Aj.* 26, *Tr.* 94.), with military associations.

872–4 An enigmatic final comment: perhaps, ‘It is a kind of reverence, to show honour <to your brother>; but authority, in <the eyes of> him whose business authority is (ethic dat., ὅτωι for τούτωι ὦιτινι), is in no way to be violated.’ The Chorus concede Ant.’s piety (cf. 924, 942–3; also 510–11, 730–5, etc.); but their law-abiding nature, and allegiance to Kreon (perhaps present on stage: cf. 780, 801–82nn.), lead them to qualify the term with a grudging τῆς. In any case, the distinction between σέβειν and εὐσέβεια seems artificial, suggesting some uncertainty or incoherence in their position.

παράβατον: cf. 449 ὑπερβαίνειν, 452–5, 605 ὑπερβασία with n.

875 ‘But as for you (σέ emphatic), your own-willed temper ruined you!’ For αὐτόγνωτος, cf. 821 αὐτόνομος, 1028 αὐθαδία with nn.; also 1259–60. For ὄργά, cf. 355n., and 471 γέννημα.

876–82 In the astrophic epode, Ant. sums up her situation, with renewed images of funeral and wedding. Alpha-privatives and negatives underline the anomaly of her lonely, unfulfilled death.

877–8 ἄγομαι τὰν ἐτοίμαν ὀδόν ‘I am being taken <on> this journey that cannot be delayed’, cf. 807–9, and Hom. *Il.* 18.96 πότεμος ἐτοῖμος. (See too 80–1, 892.)

879–80 ‘It is no longer allowed for me, wretched <as I am>, to go on seeing this sacred eye of fire’ (i.e. the sun, 104n.; cf. E. *IT* 193–5, Ar. *Clouds* 285). θεῖμις usually carries connotations of divine or traditional sanction (though these may be muted, e.g. 1259 εἰ θεῖμις εἰπεῖν): in addition to the constraints imposed by Kreon, Ant. discerns an inexorable divine ordinance (cf. 921–8n., and 798, 802 θεσμῶν).

881–2 ἀδάκρυτον: proleptic, ‘<so that it remains> unwept’ (474–6n.). There are no φίλοι present to provide the wails and groans (στέν-) that should accompany a funeral procession (cf. 919); and Ant. does not think to mention Haimon or Ismene (cf. 839–52n.).

883–943 Scene Five (Fourth *Epeisodion*)

Kreon and Ant. confront one another for the last time – though neither addresses the other directly. The scene repeats themes from the preceding lyrics (‘... A situation is realized first in its lyric, then in its iambic aspect’, Dale on E. *Alk.* 280ff.). It opens and closes with Kreon impatiently trying to hasten Ant.’s removal for execution (885–6, 931–2); but in the meantime she continues to make her farewell to Thebes and to prepare for death. In a long *rhēsis* (891–928), she addresses her family in Hades, justifies her action once again, and indignantly questions the gods, proclaiming her piety and protesting at what ‘the men’ are doing to her. As the Chorus remark, ‘the winds of her character still blow the same’ to the end (929–30).

883–90 If Kreon departed at 780, he must re-enter at this point; but more likely he has been present in the background throughout (780n., cf. 626–30n.), and now steps forward impatiently to address the attendants (883 ἴστε, 885 οὐκ ἄξετε, 887 ἄφετε). He refers to Ant. only in the 3rd p., and with heavy sarcasm (cf. 927 οἶδε with n., 473–96n.).

883–4 ‘Don’t you know that, if it were required to utter songs and lamentations before dying, nobody would ever stop?’, i.e. everyone would prolong their wails so as to postpone death – a strange notion, perhaps indicative of Kreon’s crass mentality (cf. 192, 486–7nn., *Introd.* §5(c)). But the reading is uncertain. The MS εἰ χρεῖ’ ἦ

λέγειν is ungrammatical and violates Porson's Bridge. Dawes's εἰ χρεῖη λέγειν is translated by Jebb, 'if it profited to utter them', making a clearer point, but requiring an unparalleled meaning for χρεῖη. Substituting λέγων for λέγειν makes little difference, as in either case the verb is understood with both χρεῖη and παύσαιτο. But λέγειν would in any case be odd for *sung* lamentations: so Blaydes's χέων might be right ('... nobody would ever stop pouring out songs and groans'), cf. A. *Cho.* 449 χέουσα γόον.

885–7 οὐκ ἄξεθ' ...; καὶ ... | ἄφετε 'Won't you hurry up and take her away? And ... abandon her ...!' Kreon's angry instructions strain both syntax (καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσετε would be more consistent; or else no καὶ) and metre (resolution 887; cf. 760, 1108nn.).

περιπτύξαντες 'enfolding <her>'. περιπτύσσω, περιπτυχή are used especially of human 'embraces', as well as military 'encirclement'. Thus the marriage imagery persists (cf. 1237 προσπτύσσεται, with n.).

ἐρῆμον: two-termination, as regularly in Attic, cf. 919; but 739 ἐρήμης.

887–9 εἴτε χρῆι θανεῖν | εἴτ' ... ζῶσα τυμβεύειν 'whether she wishes to die or ... to go on living entombed', with τυμβεύω intransitive (only here); or possibly sarcastic, 'to keep on holding funerals ...' (G. Björck, *SIFC* 27 (1956) 55–8), cf. 310–11. χρῆι is the 3rd p. sing., present indic. of χράω (cf. *Aj.* 1373, *El.* 606, Smyth §394–5). The disingenuous offer of alternatives allows Kreon to claim that he is 'pure as far as this girl is concerned' (ἀγνοί, cf. 773–6n.) – and it ironically prepares for Ant.'s subsequent action in the cave (cf. 1220–9, and 875).

890 'But in any case (δ' οὔν, 688n.) she will be deprived of residence up above' (cf. 852 μέτοικος with n., 1068 τῶν ἄνω). στερήσεται is fut. middle for passive (93n.).

891–928 After 885 οὐκ ἄξεθ' ὡς τάχιστα ... , we expect Ant. to be removed at once (cf. 931–2); but instead the action 'freezes' (Seale 1982: 24–9), while she delivers her final *rhapsis* of the play. She addresses her tomb (891–2) and the φίλοι with whom she will be reunited there (893 τοὺς ἐμαυτῆς, 898–9), esp. Pol. (899–903); then she goes on to explain (904–12) the unique obligation she feels to him, as her brother, before concluding (913–28) with complaints about Kreon's treatment of her and of the gods' apparent lack of

concern (with many echoes from the *kommos*, cf. 883–943n.). Her repeated use of the emphatic 1st p. pronoun (893, 895, 900, 904, 913, 928) underlines her isolation and self-assertion (cf. 450–70, 876–82nn.).

891–2 Tricolon crescendo with anaphora (ὦ ... ὦ ... ὦ ...), emphasizing the oxymoron of the marriage to death (801–5, 806–16nn.): the same room is ‘tomb’, ‘bridal chamber’, and ‘permanent home’.

κατασκαφής: both ‘deep-dug’ (cf. 920) and ‘destructive’.

πορεύομαι: cf. 81 with n., 877–8, 806–16n.

893–4 Lit. ‘... to my own family, of whom, dead, Persephone has welcomed the greatest number among the corpses’. For the spelling of the Underworld goddess’s name, cf. E. *Hel.* 175, A. *Cho.* 490, and the popular Attic form Φερσέφαττα. As the original ‘bride of Hades’, she too was isolated from her family, and taken to an underground home (cf. 1118–21, Segal 1981: 152–86).

895–6 ‘And I, the last of them, and by far the worst off of all (κάκιστα = adverbial), shall go down <there> before the due portion of my life has come’ (contrast 72–6, 461–2). For δῆ with the superlative, cf. *GP* 207 and 58n. Alliteration of κ adds emphasis.

897 ἐν ἐλπίσιν τρέφω = ἐλπίζω (followed by fut. infin. ἤξειν).

898–9 Another tricolon with anaphora (φίλη ... προσφιλῆς ... φίλη, cf. 891–2n.) builds to the climactic σοί, κασίγνητον κάρα (cf. 915, and 1): the final destination and quasi-marriage partner is her brother (cf. 73, 99) – presumably Pol., since he is always the focus of her concern, and is addressed in the same words at 915. (If Eteokles were meant, as some critics prefer, with Pol. introduced only at 902, greater balance and completeness would be achieved (cf. 512–23): but nobody is thinking of him now, and there has in fact been little opportunity for her to tend his corpse: 901–2, cf. 23–5.)

900–3 The washing, dressing, and laying-out of a corpse (πρόθεσις), in preparation for carrying-out-to-burial (ἐκφορά), and the subsequent libations (cf. 430–1) over the tomb, were all normally performed by the women of the family (Garland 1985: 21–37); cf. 43n., 245–7. Here Ant. emphasizes her own exclusive responsibility, in language that ironically recalls the acts of familial violence that made the funerals necessary (θανόντας αὐτόχειρ ὑμᾶς ἐγώ, cf. 170–2, and 49–52 αὐτουργῶι χερὶ with n.).

ὕμᾱς: father, mother, and brother(s). (So in this version, Oidipous apparently died at Thebes, not Kolonos; 49–52n., Introd. §2, pp. 5–6.)

περιστέλλουσα: equivalent to the three operations of 900–2 (as at *Aj.* 1170, *Hom. Od.* 24.293; cf. LSJ *s.v.* 1.2), though in Pol.’s case she only sprinkled dust and water.

904–15 Ant. reaffirms her special sense of obligation to Pol., as the last surviving male member of her natal family: if it had been her husband or child that had died, she would never thus have disobeyed the law, for either would be replaceable: but her brother was not. The argument, and some of the diction (909–12n.), seems to be borrowed from Herodotos’ account of the deal struck between Dareios and Intaphernes’ wife (3.119):

After his arrest, Intaphernes’ wife came to the palace and began to weep and lament outside the door, and continued so long to do so that Dareios . . . sent someone out to speak to her: ‘Lady’, the message ran, ‘the king is willing to spare the life of one member of your family – choose which of the prisoners you wish to save.’ Having thought this offer over, the woman answered . . . that she would choose her brother. The answer surprised Dareios, and he sent again and asked why it was that she rejected her husband and children, and preferred to save her brother, who was neither so near (ἀλλοτριώτερος) to her as her children, nor so dear (ἥσσον κεχαρισμένος) as her husband. ‘My lord’, she replied, ‘God willing, I may get another husband, and other children when these are gone. But as my father and mother are both dead, I can never possibly have another brother.’ Dareios appreciated the lady’s sense . . . (Tr. A. de Selincourt)

Here, Ant.’s *hypothetical* choice as to which dead family member she might *bury* (when no others in fact exist), is obviously more far-fetched than the *real* choice in Hdt. of which one to *save* from death: so there can be little doubt that Hdt. is the original. (The *Histories*, though probably not completed until the 420s, were doubtless circulating earlier, and there is a tradition that Hdt. and S. were friends (Jacoby 1913: 233–7).)

Ant.’s discussion of the precise circumstances under which she

might or might not have buried a family member comes quite unexpectedly at this moment. Indeed, some commentators have deleted the passage (first, A. Jacob in 1821; and in 1829 Goethe expressed his wish that S. had never written these lines for Ant.), on the grounds that (i) it runs counter to her earlier assertions about universal obedience to the divine laws (454–60); (ii) the pedantic and unemotional tenor of the argument is out of character for the ‘passionate’ Ant.; (iii) certain details of phraseology in 905–6, 909–12 are clumsy. (Some scholars (e.g., Lehrs, Jebb, Müller, Brown) excise all the way to 920, because so much of 913–20 repeats motifs and phrases from the *kommós*.) But the passage is treated by Aristotle as unquestionably Sophoklean (*Rhet.* 3 16 1417a32–3), and should not be doubted. The objections may easily be answered: (i) In 454–68, Ant. is vague about the particulars of the ‘divine and unbreakable statutes’, and she specifies only that they require her to bury τὸν ἐξ ἑμῆς μητρὸς θανόντα (466–7). (ii) The principle that she is implicitly affirming here is consonant with her actions throughout the play, in rating loyalty to her brother higher than the prospect of marriage. In Greek culture (and many others), in which women are transferred in marriage from one household to another, they necessarily face a sharper conflict than men do, between blood-ties (to their family of origin) and marriage-ties (to their husband and his family, including any children they may have together). So, for a woman who is about to die unmarried and childless (916–18), to reaffirm her valuation of the former over the latter is not out of place. (See further Introd. §5 (e)(iii).) As for the elaborately hypothetical mode of argument, this may strike a modern reader as artificial, or even as confirmation of the irrational and desperate nature of her commitment to her dead brother and parents (so Knox 1964: 104–7, ‘She is reduced to purely human feelings ... In ... almost hysterical hyperbole ... , she is telling Pol. that no other love ... could surpass her love for him’). But argumentative artifice and hyperbole are not uncommon in Greek tragedy (cf. Aristotle’s διάνοια, *Poetics* 1456a32–b8), and may here partly be explained by the audience’s familiarity with Hdt.’s version – furthermore, Ant.’s hypothetical cases (potential husband and children) are indeed relevant (568–70, 806–16, 980nn.). (iii) The awkwardnesses of expression in 905–6, 909–12 are not great, and not unSophoklean; see nn. (For helpful discussion of the passage in

general, see further Kamerbeck, Murnaghan 1986, Neuburg 1990: 54–76, Cropp 1997.)

The rhetorical structure of this segment of Ant.’s speech is carefully balanced in ring composition (904 ἐγὼ ’τίμησα ... εὖ / 913–14 ἐκπροτιμήσασ’ ἐγὼ ... ἀμαρτάνειν, 905 τέκνων / 910 παῖς, 906 πόσις / 909 πόσις), to bring out the paradoxical ‘principle’ of 911–12 (908 τίνος νόμου ...; / 913–14 τοιῶνδε ... νόμωι); cf. 913–15n.

904 ’τίμησα ... εὖ ‘I did well to honour you’, cf. 913 (also 83n.).

τοῖς φρονοῦσιν ‘in the eyes of those with good sense’, ethic dat. (cf. 25, 514nn., and e.g. *OT* 8); contrast 914 Κρέοντι.

905–6 εἰ τέκνων μήτηρ ἔφυν ‘if I had been the mother of children (sc. who had died)’: the ellipse is easy, and Winckelmann’s emendation (adopted by LJ&W) to τέκν’ ὧν (‘if children of whom I was the mother ... <had died>’), though tidy (with τέκνα parallel to πόσις, as subject of ἐτήκετο), is unnecessary.

ἐτήκετο: lit. ‘was dissolving’, a vivid image of a putrefying corpse (cf. 100 1008; also 978, 409–12n.).

907 βίαι πολιτῶν ‘in defiance of the citizens’ (cf. 79). Ant. here implicitly concedes Kreon’s right to act for the whole city (7–8, 44nn.; also 47–8).

908 τίνος νόμου ... πρὸς χάριν ‘in deference to what principle?’ (cf. 30 πρὸς χάριν). For νόμος (again at 914), cf. 452, 455, and 191n.

909–12 Here the syntactical and lexical echoes from *Hdt.* 3.119 are unmistakable (904–15n.): ἀνὴρ μὲν μοι ἂν ἄλλος γένοιτο, εἰ δαίμων ἔθελοι, καὶ τέκνα ἄλλα, εἰ ταῦτα ἀποβάλοιμι· πατὴρ δὲ καὶ μητὴρ οὐκέτι μοι ζώντων, ἀδελφεὸς ἂν ἄλλος οὐδένι τρόπῳ γένοιτο.

909–10 ‘With my husband dead, there could be another husband for me; and a child from another man, if I had lost one.’ κατθανόντος is gen. absolute, with ἀνδρός or *πόσεως (a form never attested) understood. For the two sentiments, cf. 569 above, and ‘Perikles’ at *Thuc.* 2.44.3. τοῦδε is awkwardly ambiguous, but presumably refers to the first husband’s child, with both the child and the husband imagined as having died.

911 κεκευθότοις: intrans. ‘lying buried’, cf. *El.* 868, *OT* 968 (LSJ *s.v.* 11). For the dual, cf. 2–3n.

913–15 τοιῶνδε ... | νόμωι echoes 908 τίνος νόμου, and the re-sounding ἐκπροτιμήσασα (found only here) emphatically rounds off

the ring composition (cf. 904 ἐτίμησα, and 904–15n.). Likewise, 914 Κρέοντι responds – ironically – to 904 τοῖς φρονουσιν, and ἀμαρτάνειν to εὔ (cf. 469–70). Syntax and word-order enhance the sense, as σε (= κασίγνητον κάρα, cf. 899) and ἐγώ (as at 904, 913) cohere closely together, with Κρέοντι (914) in a separate clause; cf. 557, 458–60n. For ἀμαρτάνειν, cf. 926, 1024 (with 1023–32n.).

916 διὰ χειρῶν . . . λαβῶν ‘laying hands on me’ (i.e. the attendants’ hands), cf. 1258, and 639–40n., LSJ *s.v.* διὰ A.IIb.

917–18 του (= τινος) goes with both γάμου and τροφῆς (257–8n.).

919–20 ἐρήμος πρὸς φίλων ‘deserted by my nearest and dearest’ (cf. 887, *Ph.* 1070, and 847, 876–82); yet Ismene did offer to accompany her (cf. 537–48, 566).

κατασκαφάς ‘hollowed-out places’, ‘cave’ (LSJ *s.v.* II), cf. 891–2n.

921–8 In conclusion, Ant. questions the gods’ apparent lack of concern for her, and prays that Kreon suffer in turn for what he has done. Is Ant. losing faith in the divine principles she invoked earlier (74–7, 89, 450–60, 519, 542; cf. Knox 1964: 104–7)? Certainly the mood is bitter and bleak. But her suggestion that she ‘may soon learn (in death) that she has been mistaken’, and that ‘this is all fine with the gods’ (925–6), seems designed more as an indignant foil to her curse of Kreon (927–8) than as her considered opinion. Her rhetorical questions (921–3) and conditional alternatives (925–8) signify frustration and reproach (cf. Hesiod’s questioning of Zeus at *WD* 174–6, 270–3, or Hyllos’ complaints at *S. Tr.* 1266–74), rather than self-doubt; see Cropp 1997.

921 ποίαν παρεξελθοῦσα . . . δίκην; ‘And what divine law (or ‘claim’) have I transgressed?’ (cf. 455 νόμιμα . . . ὑπερδραμεῖν with n., 367–70, and 854, 873–4, 880).

922–3 ‘Why should I still continue to look to the gods <for help>, miserable as I am? Of <divine> allies, whom should I continue to invoke?’ For βλέπω εἰς in this sense, cf. *Aj.* 514–15, *El.* 958–9; for αὐδάω, see LSJ *s.v.* II.1.

923–4 ‘. . . since, to be sure, <by/despite> being pious, I acquired <the label of> impiety’. For this usage of κτάομαι, cf. *E. IT* 676 δειλίαν . . . κекτήσομαι, *Hel.* 1097 κάλλος ἐκτίσω, and *S. El.* 968–9 εὐσέβειαν . . . οἴσηι (with Kaibel’s n.). Disagreement has raged throughout the play, as to what constitutes proper ‘reverence’ (to

the dead, to rulers, to traitors, to the gods, etc.; cf. esp. 74 ὄσια πανουργήσασσα, 99, 278–88, 514–16, 730–3, 744–5, 777–80, 872–5; also 942–3, Introd. §§5(b), 5(d)(i)); now Ant. is dismayed to find that nobody is intervening to support her claims. γε δὴ is emphatically limitative, i.e. an intensified γε (common in prose, rare in verse; cf. E. *Hel.* 1176, *IT* 512, A. *Prom.* 42, *GP* 244–6).

925–8 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν οὖν . . . | εἰ δ' . . . : a grimly symmetrical pair of alternatives: 'if the gods approve of what is happening, then by suffering (i.e. after I die) I will come to realize my mistake; but if it is these <people> who are in error, may they suffer no worse than the injustice they are in fact doing me!' The introductory particles make clear that the alternatives are not of equal plausibility. ἀλλά marks the break-off from the questioning tenor of 921–4, but then μὲν οὖν emphasizes (as often) the prospect of a more probable sequel (here εἰ δ' . . . ; cf. *OT* 496–501, *GP* 473). In 926, two proverbs are echoed, (i) 'Learn through suffering' (πάθει μάθος, e.g. A. *Ag.* 177), and (ii) 'A fool learns only after suffering' – i.e. 'too late' (παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω, Hes. *WD* 218); then 928 adds (iii) 'The doer must suffer' (δράσαντα παθεῖν, A. *Cho.* 313, i.e. the *lex talionis*, 'an eye for an eye . . .'); see Cropp 1997: 140–3.

οἷδ': Kreon (and his supporters). Ant. does not address Kreon directly in this scene (cf. 883–90n.). For the vague plural, cf. 10 ἔχθρῶν, 942 ἀνδρῶν. (In 926, the poetic pl. is masculine, as is regular, even though the 1st p. subject is Ant. herself.)

μὴ πλείω κακά: i.e. 'equal' (because none greater could be imagined). For καί, cf. 770, 1314, 90n.

929–43 The action 'unfreezes' (891–928n.): as the attendants, chivvied by Kreon, begin to lead Ant. out of the *orchestra* to her death, the scene closes with a series of short anapaestic exchanges between the Chorus, Kreon, and Ant. (3–4 metra each in *synaphēia*, rounded off by Ant.'s final farewell of 11 metra + paroemiac). Anapaests often mark the end of a tragedy (cf. 1347–53 with n.); so at this point, even though the play is far from over, the sense of 'closure' to Ant.'s individual drama is strong.

929–30 Lit. 'The same soul-blasts, of the same winds, still possess her', cf. 137 with n.

931–2 Lit. 'So, to those leading <her>, there will be tears arising from all these <things>, because of <their> slowness.' For the threat

of κλαύματα, cf. 754 κλαίων with n. Kreon's impatience (already evident at 885) continues to mount.

ὑπερ here = ἔνεκα (in *anastrophe*, 193n.). The second syllable is counted long, despite the following vowel (οἴμοι); the change of speaker allows a slight metrical pause (as *OC* 139, 143; cf. 935–6n.).

933–4 'Ah, this <last> remark has arrived very close to <my> death.' Although Ant. never expresses regret for her choice of action, and never tries to save herself from execution, when the moment comes her horror and fear are intense: hence οἴμοι (cf. 850–2, 876–80; but at 838 οἴμοι has different force). This is no cheerful martyrdom, but a terrifying, lonely journey into darkness (contrast 72, 83, 461–8n.). The pathos would be reduced if these lines were given to the Chorus (Lehrs, Müller; see next n.).

935–6 Lit. 'In no way (οὐδέν) do I reassure <anyone> to be confident that these things (i.e. 'death', 933) are not ratified in this way.' (For τάδε ταύτηι, cf. 722–3, and 39.) The sardonic remark is virtually, but not explicitly, addressed to Ant., and κατακυροῦσθαι, like other words of the κυρ- root, has a legal/political tinge characteristic of Kreon's speech (cf. E. *Or.* 1013, S. *OC* 1779, and 632 τελείαν with n.). (Attribution of speakers has been disputed. If 933–4 are spoken by the Chorus (Lehrs), ταύτηι would refer to Ant., 'I don't reassure <you = the Chorus> that for her ...' If 935–6 are given to the Chorus (Böckh), their tone towards Ant. would not be sardonic, merely formal and rather distant.) μὴ οὐ is regularly used after a negated verb of prohibition or denial (544–5n., Smyth §2742, 2744). For the hiatus between 936 and 937 (κατακυροῦσθαι. | ὦ γῆς ...), cf. 931–2 ὑπερ with n.

937–43 Ant., the lone woman on stage, addresses her final words in the play to the 'paternal city and ancestral gods' (937–8, cf. 839–43), and then to the 'lords of Thebes' (= the Elders, cf. 842–3, 988). Thus, as in the *kommos*, she contrasts her own (implicitly feminine) piety (900–3n., 941, 943) with the conduct of the 'men' who surround and mistreat her (885, 931; cf. 842–7n., *Intro.* §5(e)(iii)). Ant.'s indignation continues unabated to the end, and her words recall those of Prometheus (A. *Prom.* 93 ἴδεσθέ μ' οἷα πρὸς θεῶν πάσχω θεός, and esp. 1093 ἔσορᾶις μ' ὡς ἔκδικα πάσχω), as she calls on witnesses (940 λεύσσετε) to her undeserved sufferings.

938 προγενεῖς: both 'protectors of the γένος', and 'ancestors'

(incl. Ares and Aphrodite, parents of Harmonia, Kadmos' wife); cf. A. *Th.* 135–8 ... Κύπρις ... γένους προμάτωρ, and 1115–18 below).

κοιρανίδα: cf. 843n., 988.

941 '... the only one left of the royal family' (cf. 599–602), for Ismene no longer counts (Introd. §5, pp. 62–6). βασιλειδῶν (gen. pl. of βασιλείδης) is a necessary correction of the unmetrical βασιλίδα in the MSS.

943 τὴν εὐσεβίαν σεβίσασα: resounding last words; cf. 74, 514–16, 731, 872–5, 924, and 1349–50.

Antigone is led away, while Kreon and the Chorus remain.

944–87 Fifth Song (Fourth *Stasimon*) of the Chorus

The Chorus address their Song to the absent Ant., who (as we must imagine) arrives at her living tomb during the course of the ode. Unlike any others in S. or A. (but e.g. E. *El.* 432–86, *Hel.* 1301–68), this Song consists entirely of three mythological narratives: *strophe* α (944–54) Danae, unjustly imprisoned by her father; *ant.* α (955–65) Lykourgos (?killer of his children?), justly imprisoned by Dionysos; *strophe* and *ant.* β (966–87) Kleopatra, imprisoned(?) by Phineus (and his new wife?), and her children cruelly blinded.

The explicit paradigmatic point of the three stories is simple: fate is inescapable (951–4, 986–7), and may require even the high-born (949–50, 956, 981–6) to endure hardships, including imprisonment. Signpost phrases at the beginning and end of the Song explicitly compare these mythological fates to Ant.'s (944 ἔτρα καὶ ..., 986–7 ἄλλὰ κάπ' ἐκείναι ... Μοῖραι ... ἔσχον); and Ant. herself is directly addressed twice (948, 987 ὦ παῖ) in her absence. So, on one conventional, even banal, level, the ode represents the Elders' attempt at a kind of 'consolation' for her: 'Others like you have suffered too ...' (Burton 1980: 126–9). Yet the three stories are narrated in such a way that their particular correspondence to Ant.'s situation, or even to each other, is far from obvious: the allusive, convoluted lyric style highlights certain aspects of each narrative, while much of the rest of the story (including some key events) goes unsaid – and unfortunately (esp. in the last two stanzas) we cannot be sure what details of these myths would be taken for granted by a fifth-century audience. As in previous Songs (368–71, 582–65nn.), the Elders remain vague

and reticent about their own opinions of Ant.'s fate, and its precise relationship to these infamous narratives of the past. (And, to make matters worse, the text in places is seriously corrupt.) Consequently, unless we reconcile ourselves (as several critics have) to the idea that the ode may be nothing more than a filler or diversion before the next scene, we must look more closely and imaginatively for connections: why are these particular stories told now, with these particular details and emphases?

Interpretations that try to find a common thematic denominator, and/or a common moral, in the three *exempla*, all run into the problem that the narratives are so varied – not to say contradictory. Imprisonment and parent/child violence are prominent in at least two of the stories, but neither theme is explicit in all three: only if we could be sure that the Lykourgos story presupposes the death of his children (955–65n.), and that the Kleopatra story is supposed to involve her imprisonment (966–87n.), could we point to these as the requisite features in common, and we could recognize the obvious points of analogy between these and Ant.'s fate at her uncle's hands; but we cannot be at all sure that those elements of the story should be supplied in either case. And even if they are, the moral implications of each story as narrated still seem radically different from one another, and therefore quite confusing as examples for judging Ant.: for whereas Danae, a young woman unjustly imprisoned by her father, resembles Ant., Lykourgos, a king who improperly opposed a god and was duly punished by imprisonment (and madness? and the death of his children?, cf. 955–65 with nn.), seems rather to resemble Kreon; and Kleopatra, divorced mother of two, tormented by her ex-husband and his new wife, seems to resemble neither Ant. nor Kreon, esp. as the narrative ends up focusing primarily on the agonies of the blinded children (972–6), and on Kleopatra's illustrious origins (981–6); cf. 966–87n. Another possible connection is the theme of 'thwarted desire' (erotic and/or Dionysian; cf. 951–4, 963–5, 980nn.) and its catastrophic consequences (W-Ingram 1980: 98–109).

The very absence of any clear assignment by the Chorus of responsibility and guilt for the (increasingly horrific) details of the three accounts, may itself encourage us imaginatively to reconstruct that mythical past – and to project (parts of) it into the present and future: that is how lyric often asks to be read (Introd. §3, pp. 17–19).

Here again, we may assume that more than one 'point' may be made simultaneously, and that each myth, while it must be intended by the Chorus to apply to Ant.'s situation (since it is she that they address, 949, 987 ὦ παῖ), on another level may reveal something too about Kreon's – whether or not the Chorus intend or recognize this, as Kreon stands by listening.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 944 | ἔτλα και Δαναας οὐρανον φως | ×× dd × // |
| 955 | ζευχθη δ' ὄξυχολος παις ὁ Δρυαντος, | |
| 945 | ἄλλαξαι δεμας ἐν χαλκοδετοις | ×× dd |
| 956 | Ἰδωνων βασιλευς, κερτομοις | |
| 946 | αὐλαις κρυπτομενα δ' ἐν | ×× d × |
| 957 | ὄργαις ἐκ Διονυσου | (pherecretean) |
| 947 | τυμβηρει θαλαμωι κατεζευχθη· | ×× dodrans ×× // |
| 958 | πετρωδει καταφαρκτος ἐν δεσμωι. | (glyconic ᾶba.) |
| 948 | καιτοι και γενεαι τιμιος, ὦ παι παι, | ×× dd ×× // |
| 959 | ούτω τας μανιας δεινον ἀποσταζει | |
| 950 | και Ζηνος ταμειεσκε γονας χρυσορυτους. | ×× ddd |
| 960 | ἀνθηρον τε μενος. κεινος ἐπεγνω μανιαις | |
| 951 | ἄλλ' ἄ μοιριδια τις δυνασις δεινα· | ×× dd ×× // |
| 961 | ψαυων τον θεον ἐν κερτομοις γλωσσαις. | |
| 952 | ούτ' ἄν νιν ὄλβος οὐτ' Ἄρης, | 2 iambics |
| 963 | παυεσκε μεν γαρ ἐνθεους | |

| | | | |
|-----|---|------------------------------|---------------|
| 953 | $\bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad -$ | οὐ πυργός, οὐχ ἄλικτυποὶ | 2 iambics |
| 964 | | γυναικας εὖιον τε πυρ, | |
| 954 | $\bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad - \quad - \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - -$ | κελαιναὶ ναεὶς ἐκφυγοῖεν. | ba. cr. ba.// |
| 965 | | φιλαυλοὺς τ' ἠρεθίζε Μουσας. | (3 λiambics) |

This first strophic pair is built largely of elements already encountered in previous odes, and follows a familiar pattern. The rhythm is aeolo-choriambic, until it shifts to iambics for the last period (like 586–93 = 598–603, and 973–6 = 985–7). The aeolic cola consistently begin with a ‘base’ of two anceps (here always long), and most of them conclude with a double-long too. Sometimes this takes the form of an orthodox pherecretean or adonean (i.e. ... –υυ–//), but three times the double-long forms an unusual dragged extension, and marks period-end (947 = 958, 948 = 959, 951 = 962; cf. 104 = 121, 786 = 796, Dale 1968: 149–50), often with strong punctuation, with the effect of emphasizing the heavy, ‘imprisoning’ force of the words (947 κατεζεύχθη, 958 ἐν δεσμῶι, 951 δεινά).

The Aeolic expansion mostly takes the form of repetition of the central choriamb (‘asclepiad’, cf. n. on *Metre* of 604–25). The 3-colon final period closely resembles 848–52 = 867–71 (cf. too 586–93 = 598–603, 880–2, and 973–6 = 984–7); and here again the iambics convey a gloomy mood.

Strophe and antistrophe β

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 967 | $\bar{\upsilon} \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad (?) \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad -$ | πὰρὰ δὲ Κυάνεων πέλαγαι (?) διδυμὰς ἄλος | $\underline{\underline{\upsilon\upsilon}} \times D_2 \times \times //$ |
| 978 | | κατὰ δε τακομενοὶ μελεοὶ μελεὰν παθὰν | |
| 969 | $\bar{\alpha} \quad \bar{\tau} \quad \bar{\alpha} \quad - \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \{ \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad \bar{\upsilon} \quad - \quad \} \quad \bar{\omicron} \quad \bar{\theta} \quad \bar{\rho} \quad \bar{\eta} \quad \bar{\iota} \quad \bar{\kappa} \quad \bar{\omega} \quad \bar{\nu}$ | ἄκται Βοσποριαὶ { } ὄθηρικῶν | –x D x e |
| 980 | | κλαῖον, ματρὸς ἔχοντες ἀνυμφεῦτον γονάν. | |
| 970 | $\bar{\Sigma} \quad \bar{\alpha} \quad \bar{\lambda} \quad \bar{\mu} \quad \bar{\delta} \quad \bar{\eta} \quad \bar{\sigma} \quad \bar{\sigma} \quad \bar{\omicron} \quad \bar{\iota} \quad \bar{\nu} \quad \bar{\alpha} \quad \bar{\gamma} \quad \bar{\chi} \quad \bar{\iota} \quad \bar{\pi} \quad \bar{\tau} \quad \bar{\omicron} \quad \bar{\lambda} \quad \bar{\iota} \quad \bar{\varsigma} \quad \bar{\alpha} \quad \bar{-}$ | Σάλμυδησσός, ἰν’ ἀρχιπτόλις Ἄ- | –x dd |
| 981 | | ἄ δε σπερμα μὲν ἀρχαιογονῶν | |

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------------------------|
| 971 | $\bar{\rho}\eta\varsigma \bar{\delta}\iota\sigma\sigma\bar{o}\iota\sigma\iota \bar{\Phi}\iota\nu\bar{\epsilon}\iota\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ | choriambic dim.? |
| 982 | $\dagger\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\sigma\prime\dagger \acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha\nu,$ | |
| 972 | $\bar{\epsilon}\iota\delta\bar{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\tau\bar{o}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\bar{\kappa}\bar{o}\varsigma$ | chor. ba.// |
| 983 | $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\bar{o}\rho\bar{o}\iota\varsigma \delta\prime \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\bar{o}\iota\varsigma$ | (aristophanean) |
| 973 | $\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omega\theta\bar{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\xi \acute{\alpha}\gamma\bar{\rho}\iota\alpha\varsigma \delta\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\varsigma$ | ia. cr. ba.// |
| 984 | $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\eta \theta\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\alpha\tau\rho\omega\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$ | (3 ia. _λ) |
| 974 | $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\bar{o}\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\bar{o}\rho\bar{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{o}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\bar{o}\nu \kappa\upsilon\kappa\lambda\bar{o}\iota\varsigma$ | ia. trimeter |
| 985 | $\text{Boreas } \acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\pi\pi\bar{o}\varsigma \acute{o}\rho\theta\bar{o}\pi\bar{o}\delta\bar{o}\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho \pi\alpha\gamma\bar{o}\nu$ | |
| 975 | $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\chi\theta\bar{\epsilon}\nu\tau\bar{o}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\phi\prime \acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha\tau\eta\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma$ | ba. cr. ba. |
| 986 | $\theta\epsilon\omega\nu \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\prime \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha \kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\prime \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$ | (3 _λ ia. _λ) |
| 976 | $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\epsilon\rho\kappa\iota\delta\bar{o}\nu \acute{\alpha}\kappa\mu\alpha\iota\sigma\iota\nu.$ | ia. cr. ba.// |
| 987 | $\text{Μοιραι } \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\iota\omega\nu\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\bar{o}\nu, \acute{\omega} \pi\alpha\iota.$ | (3 ia. _λ) |

Again, the metre starts out aeolo-choriambic, and then shifts to iambic. The first two aeolic cola are of glyconic shape ($\times - \cup\cup - \cup -$), with ‘dactylic’ expansion ($\times\times - \cup\cup - \cup\cup - \cup -$, West 1982: 32, 64, 118; cf. 134–5 = 148–9, 582 = 594); but the resolution of the first syllable of the stanza provides a new twist. The third colon (970 = 981) reverts to the ‘choriambic’ expansion ($\times\times - \cup\cup - - \cup\cup -$) found in the preceding strophic pair and in earlier odes (139–40 = 152–3, 606 = 617, etc.); and the aeolics conclude with a typical pendant clausula (972 = 983; cf. 607 = 618, 790 = 800, etc.).

The reading and colometry of 971 = 982 are uncertain (cf. 970–1, 981–2nn.), esp. because $\Phi\iota\nu\bar{\epsilon}\iota\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma/(\acute{\epsilon}\rho)\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu$ could be either $-\cup\cup-$ (as e.g. 1135 $\Theta\eta\bar{\beta}\acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha\varsigma$) or $---$ (= syncopated ia. colon, $-\substack{\wedge \\ \wedge} - -\cup - -\substack{\wedge \\ \wedge} -$). Possibly the previous colon ends after $\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\varsigma$ (. . . $-\cup\cup - -$), and 971 should be taken as $\bar{\delta}\iota\sigma\sigma\bar{o}\iota\sigma\iota \bar{\Phi}\iota\nu\bar{\epsilon}\iota\delta\bar{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$, i.e. iambic + spondee (= cretic_λ). In general, the iambs are similar to those of 952–4 = 963–5, except for the flurry of resolutions in 974 = 985 (where the initial resolution echoes that of 967 = 978): in 985 the light syllables of $\acute{o}\rho\theta\acute{o}\pi\bar{o}\delta\bar{o}\varsigma$ may further enhance the sense of a

Boread's swiftness (the equivalent syllable in the str. is not resolved). See too 589 = 600, 880–1.

944–54 Danae was daughter of Akrisios, king of Argos. When he learned from an oracle that he would be killed by his daughter's son, he shut her up in a room or tower, inaccessible to men. Zeus's golden rain, however, entered the room and impregnated her. When a son, Perseus, was born, Akrisios shut him and his mother in a wooden chest and set it adrift; but it was rescued, and Perseus later returned and (accidentally) killed Akrisios. The story was often told in literature, including twice by S., in his lost *Akrisios* (frs. 60–76 Radt) and *Danae* (frs. 165–170 Radt); a vivid fragment of Simonides' *Danae* is preserved (*PMG* 543); see too Apollod. 2.4.1.

944–5 Lit. 'The body of Danae also endured to give up the heavenly light in a bronze-fastened room.' For the periphrasis Δανάας ... δέμας, cf. *Tr.* 908, and in.; for ἀλλάσσω in this sense, cf. *A. Prom.* 967, *LSJ s.v.* II.1. The word-order is convoluted, in the high manner of lyric narrative (cf. 117–26, 594–603, 960–2).

ἔτλα: cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.382ff. τλή μὲν ... τλή δέ ..., in a similar context.

χαλκοδέτοις | αὐλαῖς: apparently a 'room' (poetic pl.; contrast 785–6 αὐλαῖς) with bronze doors or bolts. In some versions, the whole room (or 'tower'; cf. 953) is of bronze (Paus. 2.23.7 χαλκοῦς θάλαμος, Horace, *Odes* 3.16.1 *turris aenea*).

946–7 τυμβήρει θαλάμωι: cf. 255 τυμβήρης with n., 804 θάλαμον with n., 891–2.

κατεζεύχθη 'she was confined' (cf. 955 ζεύχθη), again blending nuptial with funereal associations (477–8, 826–7nn.).

949–50 'And yet <she was> highly esteemed by reason of her birth (cf. 834–8n., on Niobe), and she was treasurer for Zeus's golden-flowing seed (γονάς = poetic pl.)', cf. Pind. *I.* 7.5. With τίμιος, ἦν must be understood, cf. 834. (Wieseler supplied γ' ἦν, rather than καί, for the missing syllable after καίτοι. But, although καίτοι ... γε is common, γε never follows immediately after καίτοι in tragedy: *GP* 564.)

ταμειύεσκε: appropriate for receiving gold and ultimately dis-bursing it, but also for a wife's 'management' of the household (cf.

Ar. *Lys.* 493-5); cf. too 1152 ταμίαν. For the (rare) iterative imperf. form, cf. A. *Pers.* 656, A. fr. 305 Radt, and 963 below.

951-4 'But a strangely powerful kind of thing (τις) is the power of fate: neither wealth, nor war, not tower, not ships can escape it . . .'; (for similar point and phraseology, Bacchyl. fr. 24 θνατοῖσι δ' οὐκ αὐθαίρετοι οὔτ' ἄλβος οὔτ' ἄκαμπτος Ἄρης οὔτε παμφθέρσης στάσις, ἀλλ' ἐγχρίμπτει . . . ἅ πάνδωρος αἴσα; cf. too *Aj.* 128-32). These emblems of (futile) power and resourcefulness are all quintessentially male, and much less applicable to Danae than to Akrisios – or to Kreon and his city: in both cases the attempt to suppress a marriageable woman's sexuality brings fatal consequences. For δεινά, cf. 959, and 332 with n.; for δύνασις = δύναμις, cf. 604-5. πύργος, standing for a city's military defences, may recall too the tower-prison in which (in some versions) Danae was confined; and the word can also mean the 'women's quarters' of a house (LSJ *s.v.* 1.3).

οὔτ' . . . οὔτ' . . . οὐ . . . οὐχ . . . : cf. 249-50n.; here the variation is less abrupt, because of the symmetrical pairings. (For the universalizing doublets, 'wealth/war' and 'tower/ships', cf. *Aj.* 130-2, *OT* 56 οὔτε πύργος οὔτε ναῦς, and see 39-40, 334-41nn.)

955-65 The second example is Lykourgos, son of Dryas, whose story in its various versions was also well known, esp. in the tragedians. He tried unsuccessfully to prevent Dionysos from bringing his new cult into Thrace. (Apparently, like Pentheus at Thebes, he did not realize at first that Dionysos was a god; cf. 960-1.) For a punishment, either he was blinded (*Hom. Il.* 6.130-43), or he was imprisoned in a cave on Mt Pangaion, and then torn apart by horses; in some versions, he was earlier driven mad and killed his own son, Dryas (*Apollod.* 3.5.1). Vase-paintings show him murdering his wife and son (*LIMC s.v.* 'Lykourgos'), and the first play of A.'s popular *Lykourgeia* tetralogy, *The Edonians* (A. frs. 57-67 Radt) probably dealt with this stage of the story. Here we are told only that 'he was confined . . . cooped up in a rocky prison' (955, 958): this is the overt link with Danae and Ant. (cf. 947 κατεζεύχθη), and no child-murder is explicitly mentioned. But the references to Lykourgos' 'quick temper' (955 ὀξύχολος, 956 κερτομίσις ὄργαῖς) and 'madness' (959 μανίας, 960 μανίαις) may allude to the killing (959-60n.), in which case we

may recognize a deeper link with Kreon and Haimon (cf. 751–67, and 1301–5; see W-Ingram 1980: 101–4, who also suggests that the reference to Lykourgos as ‘son of Dryas’ (955) may put us in mind of his son, also named Dryas).

955–7 ζεύχθη κτλ. ‘was confined-and-tamed (cf. 947) ... by Dionysos, as a result of his taunting temper’. (For the dat. ὄργαῖς, cf. 389–91, 690–1, 1219–20 with nn.; for ἐκ, cf. 63–4n.) ὄξύχολος and ὄργαῖς may call to mind Kreon and Ant. respectively.

959–60 ‘Thus (i.e. in prison) the dreadful, frothing strength of his madness drips out of him’; or ‘he leaks out the ... strength ...’: ἀποστάζει could be transitive or intransitive (cf. LSJ *s.v.*, and FJ&W on A. *Supp.* 578 δακρῦων ἀποστάζει ... αἰδῶ); its heavy, dragged rhythm underlines the sense (n. on *Metre*). This may be an oblique reference to Lykourgos’ killing of his child; but it could only be recognized as such if this feature of the myth was well known already (955–65n.). For ἀνθηρόν (lit. ‘foaming’, ‘blossoming’, hence ‘exuberant’), cf. *Tr.* 998 τόδε ... μανίας ἄνθος (with Easterling’s n.), A. *Pers.* 821 ὕβρις ... ἔξανθοῦσα, Padel 1992: 134–7. Word-order conveys the progressive dissipation of energy: from 955 ὄξύχολος, via 958–9 κατάφαρκτος ἐν δεσμῶι, and ἀποστάζει ..., finally to 960 μένος – followed instantly (in *asyndeton*) by the moment of ‘recognition’ (κείνος ἐπέγνω). This process will be repeated later, in the person of Kreon (cf. 1095 ἔγνωκα).

960–2 ‘He came to recognize the god, as in his frenzy he was violating <Him> with taunting tongue.’ ψαύω probably should not be taken directly with τὸν θεόν (cf. 546–7, 857–8nn.); instead, we should admit a more convoluted word-order. The plural γλώσσαις is strange; but cf. S. fr. 929.3–4 Radt πολλήν γλώσσαν ἐκχέας μάτην, 956 ὄργαῖς (and also Hom. *Il.* 5.419 κερτομοίσις ἐπέεσσι Δία Κρονίδην ἐρεθίζων, in light of 965 ἠρέθιζε). It is not clear whether Lykourgos’ madness was the cause of his punishment, or was itself the punishment (perhaps ‘he recognized from his madness ...’, with μανίας dat. of cause; cf. 690–1, 956). Probably the former, since madmen rarely ‘recognize’ the truth.

963–5 ‘For (γάρ explaining μανίας) he was trying to stop the god-possessed women and the Dionysiac fire’ (i.e. the Mainads’ torches; cf. 1128, 1150–2, and E. *Ba.* 307: Dionysos is ritually hailed with the cry εὐοῖ (cf. 1135), and at *OT* 212 has the epithet εὔιος, as

here). For the iterative *παύεσκε*, cf. 950 *ταμειύεσκε* with *n.*; for *μὲν* ... *τε*, see 1162–4*n.* Is Kreon comparably ‘mad’ in trying to suppress the godly Ant. (cf. 578–9, 769) and his Eros-possessed son (cf. 790) (W-Ingram 1980: 101–4)?

965 The Muses are frequent companions of Dionysos (like other groups such as Nymphs, Thyiads, etc.; cf. 1150–1*n.*), and the *aulos* is his favourite instrument; cf. Paus. 1.2.5, Burkert 1985: 222–5. Or *μούσας* could be metonymy for ‘music’ (122–3*n.*).

966–87 The third example, occupying both str. and ant., is of Kleopatra and her sons, the Phineidai. Kleopatra’s father was Boreas, the North Wind (984–6), her mother Oreithyia, of the Athenian family of Erechtheids (981–2*n.*). Her story (probably) goes as follows: after marrying Phineus, a Thracian king, she bore him two sons; but later he divorced her and remarried (either Idaia, daughter of Dardanos, or Eidothea, sister of Kadmos; cf. 972 *δάμ-αρτος* with *n.*). Kleopatra was imprisoned, and the two children were blinded by their stepmother (972–6) and/or their father. The subsequent fate of these characters is uncertain and/or variable: but in some versions Phineus himself is blinded as punishment. The myth was well known to an Athenian audience; S. himself wrote at least one play entitled *Phineus* (frs. 704–17*a* Radt), and also dealt with the story in his *Tympanistai* (frs. 636–45 Radt); see Pearson 1917: 2.311–15.

Unfortunately these two stanzas are even harder to interpret than the first two, both because of textual corruption, and because of the allusive style, which omits several key incidents and keeps shifting the narrative focus, in the manner of Bakchylides’ or Horace’s odes. The str. concentrates on the blinding of the children by a ‘fierce wife’ (973): Kleopatra is not mentioned (but cf. 971–3*n.*), nor is their father. Then in the ant., the children’s grief and pain are merged with those of their (still unnamed) mother (978–80), whose royal and divine ancestry becomes the chief focus (981–6). So what is the connection between this family and Ant.’s situation? The sufferings of Kleopatra’s children only faintly recall Ant.’s (or Haimon’s) at Kreon’s hands (though perhaps the children’s curses on their tormentors (972–4) recall Ant.’s words at 927–8, and presage Kreon’s punishment for his impieties; cf. W-Ingram 1980: 105–8). Nor does Kleopatra herself appear to resemble Ant., other than in the (prob-

able) fact of her imprisonment and her lack of children. (For S-Inwood's suggestions (1989b) for a closer connection, see 971–3, 980nn.) As things stand, with so much uncertain and open to disputed interpretation, any links we make must be tentative: and we cannot tell whether this uncertainty was shared by the original audience.

966–76 Lit. '⟨Extending out⟩ from the Dark? Ocean Rocks? of the double sea [= the Hellespont and the Black Sea] ⟨are⟩ the shores of Bosporos, ⟨and⟩ Thracian Salmydessos, where Ares, neighbour to the city, saw the accursed, blinding wound ⟨inflicted⟩ on the two sons of Phineus by his wild wife, ⟨a wound⟩ destructive-of-sight for the vengeance-seeking circles of eyes struck by ⟨her⟩ bloody hands and by the points of the shuttles.' The connection with the previous story is not explained, though the Phineidai were neighbours to Lykourgos in Thrace (966 παρά . . . , cf. 970 ἀγχίπολις). There is no mention of imprisonment; and the mother (Kleopatira) of Phineus' sons (by his first marriage, and hence(?) object of the stepmother's jealousy) is not mentioned until 980, at which point she becomes the chief focus.

967 †πελαγέων πετρῶν† is impossible: it gives too many syllables (cf. 978); παρά + gen. in this sense is unparalleled; and the two gen. pl. nouns are incompatible. πετρῶν is best removed (probably a gloss). Then we might choose between (i) Jebb's πελάγει 'by the waters of the Kyaneai, ⟨the waters⟩ of the double sea' (though the pair of genitives is still awkward); or (ii) Pearson's παρά δὲ κυανέαιν σπιλάδοιν 'by the two dark rocks' (rather far from the MSS). The Κυάνεαι (sc. Νῆσοι or Πέτραι; but often omitted, e.g. Hdt. 4.85) are a pair of little islands at the entrance from the Black Sea into the Thracian Bosporos, near Byzantium. (In mythology, these are the *Symplegades*.) Alternatively, (iii) Lloyd-Jones's ἀκτῆι Βοσπορίαι (dat. sing., governed by παρά), retaining κυανέων πελαγέων (1957: 23–4): 'by the Bosporos-shore of the dark waters of the double sea'.

968–70 Three syllables are missing in 968 (to correspond with the antistrophe). We can only guess what they contained. 'The shores of Bosporos' and 'Salmydessos' appear both to be subjects of the (unexpressed) verb in 966–70 (unless we read ἀκτῆι, dative; see previous n.), so a connective is desired. Most MSS have ἦδ' after Βοσπόριαι (ἦδέ = 'and', in epic and lyric), but the hiatus is unlikely.

970-1 ἀγχίπολις Ἄρης: Ares' home is traditionally in Thrace, so he is a 'neighbour' to Salmydessos (a city on the Black Sea, 60 miles north-west of the Bosphoros), and therefore 'witnessed' the crimes committed there. Some MSS read ἀγχίπολις, which yields closer metrical response in 971 to the ant. (982), but at the cost of introducing an improbable resolution in the first longum of the choriamb (cf. 981-2n.).

971-3 Lit. 'the wound blinded against the two sons (dat. of (dis-)advantage) . . . by the wild wife' (τυφλώω ἔλκος = 'I inflict a blinding wound', cf. *Aj.* 55 ἔκειρε φόνον). The names of Kleopatra's two sons are variously given (see Pearson on S. fr. 704 Radt = schol. *Ap. Rhod.* 2.178-82, *Apollod.* 3.15.3, etc.). In some versions, their stepmother accused them of trying to rape her: but there is no trace of this here, and the reason for her ferocity is not specified; nor is her name (Eidothea/Idaia, cf. 966-87n.). In S.'s *Phineus*, it appears that Phineus himself blinded his sons, at the instigation of Idaia (fr. 704 Radt), and was in due course blinded in return (fr. 705.6 Radt); but here he is not mentioned at all (cf. 974-5n.). S-Inwood (1989b) suggests that δάμαρτος could even refer to Kleopatra herself (since there is no direct mention in this Song of any stepmother or remarriage), in which case ἀγρίας would have even more point (980n.).

ἀρατόν 'accursed', perhaps in the sense of 'bringing a curse with it' (cf. next n., and 927-8, 1304-5); or else merely 'destructive'.

974 ἀλαστόροισιν . . . κύκλοις: eyes may be 'avenging' because they witness the horrible deed and await the time when it will be punished (cf. 970-2 Ἄρης . . . εἶδεν, and 972 ἀρατόν); and the 'etymological' word-play with ἀλαόν enhances the sense that the blinding requires vengeance. In some versions, Phineus, when he discovered what his new wife had done to his sons, killed her; or the sons exacted vengeance themselves (*Anth. Pal.* 3.4, *Diod. Sic.* 4.43-44).

975-6 'Smashed by means of bloody hand and shuttle-point' (poetic pl.) = hendiadys. The loom is the archetypal symbol of female domestic activity and of wifely loyalty (contrast 973 ἀγρίας δάμαρτος); its shuttle has an extremely sharp point, like a large knitting needle. Elsewhere in tragedy, blinding is performed with brooch-pins, whose associations are more ornamental and sexual (*E. Hek.* 1170, *S. OT* 1269). ἀραχθέντων is the most likely correction

of the unmetrical and nonsensical MS reading; ἀράσσω recurs in similar context at *OT* 1276.

This is the half-way point in this story (also the moment of pause between stanzas): and its intention, and that of the whole Song, seems here at its most elusive and fluid. Though the narrative is horrifically vivid (cries for vengeance, a bloody woman's hand wielding a shuttle, children's eyes pulped ...), the identities and motivations remain shadowy – as do their connections with Ant. or Kreon.

978 κατὰ ... τακόμενοι 'wasting away' (perhaps in prison, and presumably unto death – but these details are either irrelevant, or too well known to fifth-century Athenians to need mentioning). For κατατήκομαι, cf. *El.* 187, and 828, 906.

980 κλαῖον (= ἔκλαιον) κτλ. 'They wept for their suffering, having ill-wed birth from their mother'; but we hear also, 'They wept for the suffering of their mother ...' For ἔχοντες ... γονάν (= γεγονότες), cf. *OC* 972 οὔτε βλάστας ... πατρός, οὐ μητρός εἶχον.

ἀνύμφευτον = δυσνύμφευτον, presumably because Kleopatra was divorced and/or imprisoned by her husband, and replaced by the cruel Idaia/Eidothea (966–87n.). (For the transfer of the epithet from μητρός to γονάν, cf. 793–4, 863–5nn. Some prefer to emend to ἀνυμφεύτου.) The phrase may recall too Ant.'s 'unmarried' status emphasized at 813–16, 867, 876 etc. S-Inwood even suggests (1989b) that, to the Chorus, Ant., in choosing to die and thus deny her potential children their chance at life (cf. 904–15n.), has made herself into a 'wild wife' (of Hades) (973): she and Kleopatra are both virtual child-killers (cf. 971–3n.).

981–2 The Erechtheids were (mythologically) the indigenous royalty of old Athens. Kleopatra's mother was Oreithyia, Erechtheus' granddaughter, who was taken off to Thrace as a bride by Boreas, the North Wind (cf. 984 θυέλλαισι). If the MS ἄντασ' (= ἤντησε) is correct, it involves a peculiar use of ἀντάω (? 'belonged to the Erechtheids, with regard to her birth', with σπέρμα acc. of respect); easier would be αὔχησ' (Blaydes) or αὔχασ' (Dindorf), 'she boasted birth from the E.' (though imperfect would be more natural). But since the metre here is also one syllable shorter than the strophe (if ἀγχιπτολις is read in 970; see n.), a larger change may be called for:

perhaps ἐξαύχασ' (= ἐξηύχησε, cf. 390, *Ph.* 869), or ἦν ἄνασσα (Wilamowitz, LJ&W, 'she was by birth a queen of the E.').

983–6 Kleopatra had been raised to be swift and proud, a 'child of gods' (θεῶν παῖς, cf. 962–3), before being confined and abused. The 'remote cave' (983) in which she was raised may be the one (on Mt Haimos, in Thrace) to which Boreas first took Oreithyia (*Ap. Rhod.* 1.213ff., Callim. *Hymn Del.* 62–5; cf. S. *Tympanistai* fr. 637 Radt).

Βορεάς 'daughter of Boreas' (a 'Boread'), as the accent shows.

ἄμιππος 'equal to a horse (in speed)'. All Boreas' sons and daughters have wings.

ὄρθόποδος: perhaps little more than ὄρθιου, 'steep'; but the swift movement 'over the hill' contrasts with her later confinement (cf. 987 ἔσχον). The resolution of the long syllable (not matched in the strophe) may accentuate this sense (see n. on *Metre*).

986–7 **κἀπ' ἐκείναι . . . ἔσχον** '(the Fates) assailed her too' (sc. 'just as they do you', cf. 944–50) = ἔπεσχον ἐκείνηι in tmesis. For intransitive ἐπέχω in this sense, see LSJ *s.v.* ιιιβ.

988–1114 Scene Six (Fifth *Episodion*)

Teiresias arrives, and in a long *rhēsis* (998–1032) informs Kreon of the monstrous consequences of the denial of burial to Pol.: augury and sacrifices are awry, and altars are choked with carrion from the corpse. He advises Kreon to admit his error and stop abusing the dead. Kreon resists, and accuses Teiresias of conspiring against him (1033–62), whereupon the prophet, in a second *rhēsis*, angrily denounces Kreon, predicts the death of his son, and departs (1064–90). A short dialogue ensues, in which Kreon, now full of anxiety, asks the Elders' advice (1095–9) and they propose the release of Ant. and burial for Pol. (1100–2). Kreon hurries off towards the cave, determined to undo what he has done.

Teiresias, old, blind, and decrepit, is a figure of unassailable authority and insight (as if representing the 'age-old Fates' of 987; Müller 1967: 227), and he performs the role of a trusty and benevolent advisor (993, 1058n.), free of any personal or political bias. (In this play, as in *E. Ba.*, his association with Apollo is ignored.) The vivid details of his narrative, and the logic of his advice, are, or

should be, immediately compelling; and they serve to vindicate Ant.'s arguments (1113–14n.) – though too late for her to hear the vindication. Likewise, the gods' displeasure, previously only hinted at (278–9, 415–22, 421nn.), is now made overwhelmingly clear. So Kreon's initial refusal to budge (1033–47), and his accusations that someone has paid Teiresias to fabricate his report (1035–9, 1055, 1061–3), further undermine his claims on our sympathy. Yet within moments of Teiresias' departure, Kreon meekly acquiesces to the Chorus' advice to 'yield' (1096, 1102), thus showing that despite his outbursts of temper he is at bottom a sensible and well-meaning leader – unless his reaction is to be regarded merely as 'bending', 'yielding' under the pressures of selfish fear (1091–1114n.). Paradoxically, the fact that Kreon does thus (belatedly) make an effort to prevent the catastrophe establishes him as a more ordinary kind of individual, a man of obviously 'subheroic' nature, in comparison to the intransigence of other Sophoklean heroes – a characteristic that may both lower and raise him in our estimation (Introd. §§5(b), 5(f)).

Athenian attitudes to prophets, divination, and oracles in the fifth century were various and inconsistent. Many people, perhaps most, were pious believers, despite individual well-known cases of fraud and charlatanry (1033–47n.). A few sceptics explicitly rejected *manteis* and oracles, though even rationalists such as Protagoras tended to accept divination. In serious literature, relations between political–military leaders and prophets are often represented as being strained (e.g. Agamemnon vs Kalchas in the *Iliad* and *A. Ag.*; Oidipous vs Teiresias in *S. OT* 316–462; Hdt. *passim*); and in such contexts conventionally it is the prophet who knows best. The figure of the 'Warner', whose advice and/or predictions of trouble are ignored or misunderstood, is often used to point ironic and pathetic contrasts with the misguided main character(s).

The structure of this, the key scene of reversal in the play (Introd. §§3, 5(a)), repeats that of the Haimon-scene: first, a stormy confrontation, as home truths are directed against the furious Kreon; then the angry departure of Kreon's opponent, followed by a short dialogue between Kreon and the Elders, in which they take the initiative in persuading him to adopt a better policy. Everything that Kreon has done or attempted in the first part of the play is now to be undone – if possible. But the pacing of the scene (as well as

the dramatic conventions of prophecy and irony) already suggests that his change of mind comes too late (1091–1114n., Schwinge 1962: 88–93).

988–90 Teiresias is led in by a young boy, up one of the side-entrances. His self-announcement is brief and sudden, in contrast to the normal choral introduction (526–30n.).

Θήβης ἀνακτες: addressed to the Chorus (cf. 843, 940, and *OT* 911 χώρας ἀνακτες = Chorus), whose voices have just died away. Teiresias ignores Kreon, both because he cannot see who is present, and perhaps also as a first step towards the ‘demotion’ of Kreon to a mere co-ruler (1023–32, 1091–1114, 1257–1353nn.). In what follows, the Chorus actually take no part, as Kreon quickly intervenes.

δύ’ ἐξ ἐνός κτλ. ‘... the two of us looking by <the agency of only> one; for this is the <way of> travelling for the blind, by means of a guide’ (cf. 1014). The close bond between seer and guide (another dual: cf. 2–3n.) seems again to isolate Kreon.

991–7 A quick stichomythia establishes Teiresias’ credentials, and prepares Kreon for disturbing news. As with the Elders (155–74), Kreon begins by assuring the old man of his good opinion based on past performance (993–5; cf. 1091–4), and of his own openness to advice (992–3; cf. 278–83; also 635–8).

992 διδάξω ... πιθοῦ: an unusually peremptory opening, esp. with the emphatic ἐγὼ ... καὶ σύ (cf. 1031–2, 1099, and 726–7n.).

993–5 οὐκουν πάρος γε ... ἀπεστάτων ... ‘Well, certainly in the past I did not depart from your thinking’ (321n.). The imperf. tenses imply long-term policy-making; but Teiresias’ later claim (1058) to have helped Kreon ‘save the city’ and gain power suggests a specific event; cf. 164–9, 1035–6, 1160–4.

994 δι’ ὀρθῆς ‘along a straight course’ (cf. 162–3, 188–90nn.). We may understand ὀδοῦ, but more likely the ‘abstract’ fem. adj. is an independent use (cf. 1307 ἀνταίαν, Fraenkel on *A. Ag.* 916, Moorhouse 1982: 13–14).

995 ὀνήσιμα is governed by both verbs: ‘I am able to testify to the benefits <you have provided>, having experienced <them>.’

996 φρόνει βεβῶς αὖ νῦν ‘Take note that once again you have set foot ...’ (participle after verb of knowing).

ἐπὶ ξυροῦ τύχης ‘along the razor of fortune’. The ‘razor’s edge’ is proverbial, for a moment of crisis (*Hom. Il.* 10.173 ἐπὶ ξυροῦ

ἴσταται ἀκμῆς, E. *Hkls* 630, and Kannicht on E. *Hel.* 897). The addition here of τύχης is unusual: Jebb suggests it adds ‘dignity and solemnity’.

997 τί δ’ ἔστιν; ὥς . . .: the question is repeated from 991, indicating Kreon’s mounting anxiety; then ὥς introduces an exclamation, ‘How I shudder at what you are saying!’ (cf. *El.* 1112). For the slightly disruptive mid-line caesura, cf. 76–7, 407nn.

998–1032 Teiresias’ long *rhēsis* (a virtual ‘messenger-speech’, cf. 249–77, 407–40, 1192–1243, *Introd.* §3, pp. 15–17; also 1278–1316) provides the clinching condemnation of Kreon’s policy – and implicit confirmation of the correctness of Ant.’s act of burial, though there is no mention of her. The speech is built in four sections. The first two describe Teiresias’ own observations: birds behaving abnormally (999–1004); failed burnt sacrifice (1005–11). Then he generalizes the symptoms, and offers his diagnosis (1015–22): Kreon’s policy is to blame, as carrion from the corpse is clogging the city’s altars, the gods are rejecting all sacrifices and prayers, and bird-calls are unintelligible. The concluding section focuses on Kreon himself, and proposes a remedy (1023–32): admit your mistake, don’t be stubborn, don’t continue to assail the dead. The whole speech, developing in long sentences of vivid description (999–1002, 1006–11, 1016–22), through gnomic warnings (1023–8), to brusque, enjambed phrases of urgent remonstrance (1029–32), is immensely powerful – a voice from another dimension – and its language is sonorous and elevated, with many trimeters made up of just four or five words; see further 1006–11, 1019–22nn.

998 γνώσηι . . . σημεία: keynotes for this speech (cf. 1001 ἀγνώτα, 1004 ἔγνω, 1004 οὐκ ἄσημος, 1013 ἀσήμων, 1021 οὐδ’ . . . εὐσήμους; also 1001–2n.). The ‘signs of the <prophetic> art’ are obscure to ordinary people, but unmistakable to one who ‘pays attention’ (κλυών: either aorist, or present κλύων, is possible.); cf. 252, 1178, 1209, 1258.

999–1000 ἐς . . . θᾶκον . . . ἴζων ‘as I took my place on the ancient seat of augury’. Birds were regarded as intermediaries between heaven and earth, and divination from their positions, flight, perching-patterns, and cries (ὄρνιθοσκοπία, Latin *avi-spicium* = *auspicium*, *avi-gurium* = *augurium*) was widely practised; cf. *Ar. Birds* (esp. 719–21), *A. Prom.* 488–92 with Griffith’s nn., *Xen. Anab.* 6.1.23, Burkert 1985:

112. In the second century CE, Pausanias reports seeing ‘the *oiōnoskopeion* of Teiresias’ near Thebes (9.16.1).

λιμήν ‘haven’ or ‘gathering-place’ (LSJ *s.v.* π.1 and 2); cf. van Nes 1963: 167–8.

1001–2 ‘I heard ... <them> shrieking (κλάζοντας in apposition, as if ὄρνιθας had preceded) in ugly, unintelligible frenzy’; contrast 1021 εὐσήμους, 1004 οὐκ ἄσημος; also 1209 ἄσημα. Non-Greek (‘barbarian’) speech is sometimes termed ‘swallow-tittering’ (A. fr. 450 Radt χελιδονίζειν, *Ag.* 1050, *Hdt.* 2.57).

1003 φοναῖς: a scholiast takes this as an adjective, ‘with murderous (talons)’; but the adj. φονός is not attested elsewhere (cf. *Pind. P.* 4.250 τὰν Πελίου φονόν = ‘the murderess of P.’). Alternatively, dat. pl. of φονή, ‘in bloody assaults’ (cf. 696).

1005 ἐμπύρων ἐγευόμην ‘I began to make trial of burnt offerings’ (cf. *Tr.* 1101 μόχθων ἐγευσάμην, LSJ *s.v.* γεύω π.3). Close observation of sacrifice (i.e. of σφάγια, ἔμπυρα, ἱερά: hence ἱεροσκοπία = Latin *haruspicium*) was another common method of divination (see A. *Prom.* 493–9, Burkert 1985: 112–14). A red-figure kalyx-krater by the Kleophon Painter (*ARV*² 1144, 14) may be an illustration of the following sacrifice-narrative (M. H. Jameson in *Greek tragedy and its legacy*, edd. M. Cropp et al. (Calgary 1986), 59–65).

1006–11 When the fuel all around the altars was ignited (1006 παμφλέκτοισι), the offerings (θύματα, cf. 1010–11n.) should have flared up in the flames: but instead the fuel merely smouldered as ‘embers’ (1007 σποδῶι), while the fat from the meat oozed onto them and ‘smoked and sputtered’ (1009 ἔτυφε, ἐνέπτυε, with onomatopoeia), and the gall-bladders (1010 χολαί) burst messily into the air: a vivid and repulsive description, with the failed sacrifice suggestive of the putrescent corpse of Pol. (esp. 410 μυδῶν / 1008 μυδῶσα, 906/1008 ἐτήκετο). The details pile up in a single paratactic sentence containing six main verbs, the last five connected by καί.

1007 Ἥφαιστος ‘fire’ (metonymy and personification; cf. 122–3 with n.), but suggesting also divine disapproval (cf. 1019–21).

1009–10 In ἱεροσκοπία, the gall, various kinds of bile, and liver-lobe were regarded as the most informative in their colour, disposition, and mode of burning (Burkert 1985: 113, cf. A. *Prom.* 495).

1010–11 ‘And the streaming thighs lay bared of the lard that had covered them.’ It was customary to wrap fat around the thigh-bones, and burn these for the gods, who would enjoy the rich smoke (κνῖσα) that resulted (Hom. *Od.* 3.456, A. *Prom.* 496). In this case, all the fat melted without catching fire: hence (1012–13) no divination from the flame was possible.

πιμελής: a prosaic word, found nowhere else in poetry.

1012–13 Lit. ‘Such failing prophecies, from non-signifying sacrificial rites, I learned from this boy here’ (for πάρα, cf. 193n.); cf. 1005 ἐμπύρων, A. *Prom.* 498 φλογωπά σήματα. ‘The failing of the sign is in itself a sign’ (Kamerbeek). For φθίνοντ’, cf. *OT* 906 φθίνοντα . . . θέσφατα. It would be possible to punctuate with a comma after 1012 πάρα, with 1013 in apposition (Bruhn).

1015 ‘And the city suffers this disease as a result of *your* policies!’, τῆς σῆς emphatic, cf. 1052, 1073. ταῦτα is internal (‘adverbial’) acc. with νοσεῖ (63–4n., 1073). For φρενός, cf. 993, 1063 (and φρονέω, 996, 1023, 1031, 1051, *Intro.* §5(d)(iii)).

1016–18 βωμοί are built-up ‘altars’ (Burkert 1985: 87–8); ἐσχάραι are ‘hearths’ or ‘barbecue-pits’, level with or below the ground, esp. appropriate for sacrifices to heroes or chthonian deities (Burkert 1985: 199–200).

παντελεῖς ‘absolutely all’ (LSJ *s.v.* παντελῶς); contrast 1163 with n.

1017–18 ‘. . . <are> filled up by birds and dogs with carrion from the ill-fated fallen son of Oidipous’, a grim echo of the earlier threats (29–30 οἰωνοῖς . . . βορᾶς, 205–6; cf. 1040–1). The surfeit of genitives seems to enhance the sense of over-fullness.

1019–22 As he goes on to explain the cause of these hideous effects, the prophet’s language becomes even more august: θυστάδας, ἀπορροιβδεῖ, ἀνδροφθόρου are rare, elevated words, and the rhythmic build-up of the four-line period is striking, with the ‘mid-line’ caesura of 1021 (cf. 997) followed by a resounding four-word trimeter (1022; cf. 998–1032n.).

καίτ’ ‘And consequently . . .’

θυστάδας λιτάς ‘the prayers that accompany burnt sacrifice’, cf. A. *Th.* 269 θυστάδος βοῆς.

οὐδ’ . . . εὐσήμους . . . βοάς: cf. 1001 ἀγνώπα . . . φθόγγον, 1004 ἄσημος, 1013 ἀσήμων, and 998n. ἀπορροιβδεῖ is found nowhere else in Classical Greek (only Nonnos 2.257); cf. 1004 ῥοῖβδος.

βεβρω̄τες . . . λιπος: the plural is peculiar, as if ὄρνιθες had preceded: there is no close parallel in tragedy for such a shift. Comparable is, e.g., *Ph.* 356–7 στρατός | . . . πᾶς ἡσπάζετ', ὀμύντες . . ., but στρατός is often used as a collective noun, unlike ὄρνις. Cf. too 259–60. (But the supposition of Müller, Brown, and others that 1020 θεοί are meant to be co-subjects of βεβρω̄τες is unlikely; so is Reeve's excision of 1021.) The 'fat of the blood' = 'the fatty, glistening blood' (cf. (?) *Ag.* 1428); Blomfield's conjecture, λίβος ('stream'), is unnecessary.

1023–32 The narrative is finished (with 1021 echoing 1001–2, in ring-composition; cf. 998–1032n.): it is time for advice. In a forthright, but almost paternal, manner (1023 τέκνον), Teiresias warns Kreon to 'think what all this means' (ταῦτα φρόνησον, cf. 1025–6 οὐκέτι . . . ἄβουλος, 1031 εὔ φρονήσας, and 49, 95nn.), to acknowledge and rectify his 'mistakes' (1024 τὸ ἐξαμαρτάνειν, 1025 ἀμάρτη; cf. 743–4, 914, 925–6, 1250, 1260–2; and cf. 1242 ἀβουλίαν with n.). The sentences are short, and mostly enjambed, and the language is now simpler (998–1032, 1019–22nn.), more plainly moralistic. Teiresias' gnomic references to 'human nature' (1023–7), together with his insistence on 'learning from advice' (1031–2), 'yielding' (1029) and avoiding 'foolishness' (1028), recall the words of the young Haimon (710–23; esp. 1031–2/713) – and produce a similarly furious response in Kreon.

1025–6 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀμάρτη: τις is to be supplied from what follows, 'When someone has gone wrong, he is no longer a thoughtless or luckless man if he . . .', virtually a general rel. clause: the omission of ἄν is not unusual, cf. 323n., *OT* 316–17, *Tr.* 1009 (*GMT* §540, Smyth §2327a, K–G II 449 n.4); see too 710–11n. For ἀνολβος, cf. 1265, *Aj.* 1156.

1027 ἀκείται 'seeks a remedy', cf. *OC* 1269–70 τῶν γὰρ ἡμαρτημένων ἄκη μὲν ἔστι, *Aj.* 362–3, *Hom. Il.* 13.115. For πεσῶν, cf. 1045–6.

ἀκίνητος 'stubborn', 'sluggish', as at *Ar. Frogs* 899 ἀκίνητοι φρένες, though the word can have positive force, 'steadfast' (e.g. Plato, *Apol.* 412a). It recurs in a different sense at 1060. The variant ἀνίητος ('incurable') would redundantly continue the medical metaphor.

1028 'It is stubbornness, you know (sc. rather than error itself), that earns the charge of stupidity' (cf. 470): i.e. the 'self-willed' per-

son who never budes (cf. 1029n., and 705–6, 929–30) is a greater fool than the one who makes a mistake but then tries to correct it. Kreon still has the opportunity to extricate himself from disaster. αὐθαδία ('pleasing oneself', i.e. paying no attention to others) picks up 1027 μηδ' ἀκίνητος and 1026 ἄβουλος. The word and concept are typical of Sophoklean hero(in)es (cf. 819–22, 875, 929–30n., A. *Prom.* 1034–7; also 1242–3n., *Introd.* §5(c)).

1029–30 ἀλλ' εἶκε τῶι θανόντι: a striking paradox (cf. 524–5). For the difficulty of 'yielding' / 'giving way', cf. 471–2n, 677–80, 712–18, 1096–7nn.

μηδ' ὀλωλότα κτλ. '... and do not keep on stabbing one who is already done-for. What prowess <is there> in re-killing one who is already dead?' (ἐπι- = 'in addition', cf. 1288). For the image, cf. Hektor's corpse at *Hom. Il.* 22.371–5. The undignified associations are reinforced both by κεντέω, which is often used of merely irritating or ineffectual 'pricking', and by the implied negation of ἀλκή (cf. ἀναλκις, ἀνάλκεια).

1031–2 In conclusion, Teiresias reassures Kreon of his 'good will', as well as his 'good advice' (cf. 992–5): εὖ φρονήσας can mean both. His language recalls that of Haimon earlier (710–11, 723); also Ant.'s (κέρδος, cf. 462, 221–2n.). For the opt. λέγοι, cf. 670 [666] στήσειε with n. For the rare *synapheia*, with elision (δ') between trimeters (only in S., not A. or E.), cf. *OT* 29 with Dawe's n., and 409–10. (Some editors follow the MSS in printing δ' as first word of line 1032.)

1033–47 Kreon rejects Teiresias' advice, denounces prophets in general, and accuses 'everyone' (1033) of conspiring against him for the sake of 'profit' (1035–9n.): but no alleged pollution will scare him into burying the body. Although Kreon does not single out Teiresias for direct abuse until 1059 (cf. 1053–4n.), his tone is angry and insulting. This speech, and the ensuing stichomythia, delay the denouement only a few minutes; but by showing us once more Kreon's suspiciousness and quick temper, they set the seal on his downfall. For, even if in 'real life' some *manteis* were found to be untrustworthy, in tragedy Teiresias will not err (any more than the Soothsayer in *Julius Caesar*, or the Ghost of Hamlet Sr), and the man who shouts insults at him must be doomed (cf. *OT* 316–462, E. *Ba.* 328–69).

1033–4 'You are all shooting at me (ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε), like archers at

a target' (objective gen. of 'aim', as with *στοχάζομαι*, *τυγχάνω*, *κτλ.*). *ὥστε* = *ὥς* or *ὥσπερ*, cf. 586, 1085. By *πάντες* (and the plurals of 1037–9), Kreon seems to mean both 'all you prophets' and 'all you citizens' – including Ant. and Haimon, and perhaps even the Elders (whose posture and gestures might be eloquent here). This paranoid (and typically 'tyrannical', 295–303n.) reaction may be reinforced by the echoes between Teiresias' rhetoric and Haimon's (991–7, 1023–32nn.).

1034–5 The text is uncertain, but the MS reading is probably sound: lit. '... and I am not even un-worked-against in <the area of> prophecy by you'. The passive force of *ἄπρακτος* is unusual, as is the use of the gen. with it, but the word seems apt here: *πράσσω ἐπί τινι* can mean 'work/plot against someone', and *πράσσω* with a direct personal obj. can mean 'treat someone (well/badly, etc.)', or, with an impersonal obj., 'deal', 'barter' (cf. *Aj.* 445–6 and next n.). Possible alternatives include *μαντικῆς ἄτρωτος* ('unwounded by prophecy', Pallis), or perhaps *μαντικῆι ἀπρακτος ὑμῶν* ('unassailed by prophecy from you').

1035–9 Kreon's mercantile language plays sarcastically on Teiresias' mention of *κέρδος* (1032, cf. 1037 *κερδαίνετε*, and 1047, 1055, 1061, 1063; see 221–2n.): he feels himself 'bought and sold' by corrupt prophets, in the pay of rival politicians (cf. 293–303). His indignation builds in sonorous doublets, with *homoioteleuton*: 1036 *ἔξημπόλημαι κάκπεφόρτισμαί*, 1037 *κερδαίνετ'*, *ἔμπολάτε*, 1037–9 *Σάρδεων | ἤλεκτρον ... Ἰνδικὸν | χρυσόν*.

1035–6 '... and by the race of them (sc. 'prophets') I have been traded away and exported long ago!', i.e. in exchange for 'imported' foreign goods/cash (1037 *ἔμπολάτε*): the *ἐκ-* prefixes may also suggest 'thoroughly', 'completely'. Kreon may have in mind a particular previous experience with Teiresias (*πάλαι*, cf. 993–5, 1058nn.). Here too, the reading has been questioned, but is probably sound: the word-order *τῶν δ' ὑπαὶ γένους* is unusual, but not unduly harsh, though we might omit *δ'* (with Brunck and one MS), to make *τῶν* into a relative (cf. 1086n.).

1037–9 'Electrum' was a natural alloy of gold and silver, found on Mt Tmolos near Sardis, and used in Lydian coins and votive offerings (e.g. *Hdt.* 1.50). 'Indian gold' was believed (mistakenly) by the Greeks to be a major component of the wealth of the Persian

Empire (Hdt. 3.94). The standard Attic currency was silver, mined locally at Laureion (cf. 295–6n.). For the imperatives, cf. 1168–71n.

1039–41 ‘But you shall not cover that man in a grave, not even if Zeus’s eagles are ready to snatch him up and carry him as food to Zeus’s throne!’ – wild and impious hyperbole (cf. 486–7n.), in implicit rejection of Teiresias’ account in 1016–18. The eagle was traditionally the bird of Zeus (Hom. *Il.* 24.310, Pind. *P.* 4.4).

1042–3 οὐδ’ ὧς κτλ. ‘Not even then will I allow ...’ (picking up 1040 οὐδ’ εἰ θέλουσι ...). The construction is: οὐδὲ ... μὴ ... παρήσω (τινὶ) θάπτειν κείνον, τρέσας τοῦτο μίσημα. (οὐ μὴ + fut. indic. = emphatic refusal, as e.g. *El.* 1052, *OC* 177; more often, with aor. subj.) Kreon is sure that there is no ‘pollution’ to fear (cf. 773–6, 889).

1043–4 ‘No human being has the power to stain the gods.’ Here, immediately after Teiresias’ (to us, utterly convincing) narrative, the claim is hollow and unpersuasive. (It echoes Ant.’s earlier assertion about human vs divine power, 452–5; but also reaffirms Kreon’s claims about the city’s gods, 282–8, 304.) In other contexts, however, we do find this radical idea more seriously entertained (Eur. *Hkls* 1232 οὐ μαιίνεις θνητὸς ὧν τὰ τῶν θεῶν, cf. Parker 1983: 145–6).

1045–7 ‘Even very (πολλά adverbial) clever people suffer ugly falls, when they express ugly ideas in fine speeches for the sake of profit.’ (For δεινοί, cf. 332; for καλῶς λέγειν, cf. 496 καλλύνειν.) Kreon’s conclusion sarcastically echoes Teiresias’ at 1031–2, and his generalization (βροτῶν ...) parodies those of 1023–8.

1048–63 In a brusque stichomythia, Kreon and Teiresias taunt one another, until the prophet is impelled (1064ff.) to reveal the full horror of what lies in store. The tit-for-tat exchange is enhanced by the spill-over of syntax between lines (37–48n, Mastronarde 1979: 54–9).

1048–50 φεῦ: sad and indignant, cf. 86, 323nn. Then the construction carries over from 1048 to 1050: lit. ‘Doesn’t anyone know, doesn’t anyone consider ... by how great <a margin> the best of possessions <is> good counsel?’ (cf. 683–4, 720–1; also 1347, 1353). Kreon maintains the one-line stichomythia, but his tone is disruptive: ‘<Consider> what? What is this universal truth that you mention?’ (πάγκοινων responding to 1024 κοινόν). For τί χρήμα; (perhaps slightly colloquial), cf. *Aj.* 288, *A. Prom.* 298 with Griffith’s n.

1052 Kreon's foolishness and the city's pollution are linked (νόσου πλήρης, cf. 1015n.; also 1017 πλήρεις, 732n.).

1053–4 Kreon is trying not to 'vilify' Teiresias directly (cf. 1033–47n.); but Teiresias points out, 'Yet you are in fact <vilifying me> ...' (καὶ μὴν adversative, cf. *GP* 357.8; κακῶς understood from 1053).

1055–6 The slanging continues: 'The whole breed of prophets is money-loving' (cf. 221–2, 295–6nn., 1035–9), 'And the <breed> born from tyrants loves profiting-through-shame.' For αἰσχροκέρδειαν, cf. *E. And.* 451 (of the Spartans), otherwise only in prose; see too 1047, and *Aj.* 1349, *Hom. Il.* 1.122. Since Kreon is not a tyrant's son, some prefer Hartung's τὸ δ' αὖ τυράννων ... ('the breed of tyrants too ...').

1057 'Don't you realize that, whatever you say, you are saying it to your king?' (poetic pl.). ἄν (= ἄ ἄν) λέγῃς = 'all the bad things' (cf. 1053–4 κακῶς ... λέγεις). LJ&W accept the alteration to οὖς ψέγεις ('... that the person you are reviling is ...'), which is more explicit, but an unnecessary change. In either case, Kreon's insistence is on the recognition of his own status (484–5, 639–80nn.). ταγός, ταγή, κτλ. (found nowhere else in S.; once in E., seven times in A.) are mainly used of non-Greek rulers; cf. 7–8n., and 629 τάλιδος.

1058 'Yes, I know; for it was through me that you saved this city and now have control of it.' The reference is (to us) obscure, yet seems quite specific: see 993–5, 1302–3nn. For the periphrastic perfect, cf. 21–2n.

1060 'You will incite me into declaring the things <hitherto> undisturbed (= 'unrevealed') within my heart'; cf. 1027 ἀκίνητος, and *OC* 624, 1526. For διὰ in this sense, cf. 639, *A. Th.* 593, *E. Ba.* 203.

1061 'Go ahead, disturb (= 'reveal') them – only not by speaking for profit!' (cf. 221–2n.).

1062 'Do I really seem <to have spoken> so (i.e. for profit) up until now, with regard to you?' For γὰρ ... καί, cf. 770, 90n. For τὸ σὸν μέρος, cf. *OT* 1509, *Tr.* 1215. Others punctuate as a statement, 'Indeed, I think it will be so (= without profit) as far as you are concerned' (Brown). But this misses the tone of γὰρ ... καί, and of ἦδη.

1063 Cf. 1035–9 with n.; and, for φρένα, cf. 993, 1015n.

1064–90 In a solemn *rhēsis*, Teiresias predicts that Kreon will soon have to 'surrender in return a corpse from [his] own entrails'

(1066–7), and that his whole family will be devastated (1078–9); and so he departs. The warning is couched in rolling periods (1064–71, 1081–3, 1087–90) and sonorous compounds, with many of the lines in 1064–86 comprising only four or five words. Although he is angry, his voice is that of the representative of divine order and retribution (1068–76), rather than of personal retaliation (contrast the shriller tone of *OT* 408–62), as is underlined by the regularity of end-stopping and avoidance of enjambment; cf. too 1068–71n.

1064–5 ἀλλ' εὖ γέ τοι κάτισθι: menacing (cf. 473–4n.); hence μή instead of οὐ ('prophetic warning', Campbell 1879: 149; also 1094n.).

μή ... τελῶν '... (know well) that you will not complete many more racing circuits of the sun (i.e. 'days') ...', participle after verb of knowing. (The meanings and accentuation of τρόχους/τροχούς were disputed in antiquity, as they are still: see LSJ *s.v.* β, and Kamerbeek; also 252.) Some editors emend to ἥλιον τελεῖν ('that the sun will not complete ...'; for the infin., cf. 473–4): possible, but unnecessary.

1066–7 '... before you yourself from your own flesh-and-blood will have given up one corpse in exchange for corpses'. ἐν οἷσι (after τρόχους) = ἐντὸς ὧν ('in the course of which ...'), cf. *OC* 618–20 νύκτας ἡμέρας τ' ... | ἐν αἷς ... διασκεδῶσιν. For the fut. perf., cf. *OT* 1146, Aerts 1965: 33. ὄμοσπλάγχχνους is not unusual in poetry for a mother's 'womb' (511 ὄμοσπλάγχχνους, cf. A. *Th.* 1031, Pind. *O.* 6.43; also Homeric γαστήρ), but the image of a child born 'from the entrails' of the father is novel and striking. Kreon has only one (ἐνα) surviving son (626–7 with n.).

1068–71 The paradoxes are antithetically paired (living/dead, up/down: two lines each), with forceful anaphora (ἔχεις μὲν ... ἔχεις δὲ ...); cf. 823–33, 850–2nn. For the first time, Teiresias unmistakably refers to Ant. (1067–9); but his vague and oracular language (1067 νεκρῶν, 1068 τῶν ἄνω, 1069 ψυχῆν) still treats her as merely the inverse of other more significant 'corpses' (1067, 1071).

1068–9 ἀνθ' ὧν 'in return for the fact that ...' The echo of 1067 ἀντίδους might suggest νεκρῶν as antecedent to ἀνθ' ὧν, but the syntax of 1068 seems eventually to rule this out.

ἔχεις ... βαλῶν = βέβληκας (cf. 21–2n.); here the form also enables the anaphora. τινα must be supplied with τῶν ἄνω (partitive gen.): 'You have hurled down below <one> of those <from> above'

(cf. 890n.). καταβάλλω can mean ‘kill’, or ‘throw in prison’, or ‘abandon’.

ψυχὴν ‘a living spirit’ (cf. 175–7n.).

ἀτίμως . . . κατώικισσας has political overtones, almost ‘you disenfranchised and resettled . . .’ (cf. 25n., 852 μέτοικος with n.). The MS variant κατοικίσσας (aor. part.) could be right (the two couplets then balance more exactly, with ἔχεις in each case the sole main verb). If so, Dawe’s substitution of γ’ for τ’ (or else removal of the particle altogether) is necessary. But the difference is slight.

1070–1 ‘You are keeping ⟨up⟩ here a corpse that belongs to the gods below’ (κάτωθεν = κάτω, cf. 521n.).

ἄμοιρον ‘without its due share’, cf. *OT* 248 ἄμορον βίον, *E. Pho.* 610: perhaps heard at first with θεῶν (‘with no share in the gods below’), but the three alpha-privative adjectives combine better if all are used absolutely. For ἀκτέριστον, cf. 204, 1207; for ἀνόσιον, cf. 1083, also 74 ὄσια, and Mastronarde on *E. Pho.* 493.

1072–3 ὧν οὔτε σοὶ μέτεστι οὔτε . . . ‘with which neither you nor the upper gods have any business’ (cf. 48n.).

βιάζονται τάδε ‘they are being violated by you in this way’ (τάδε, cf. 1015n.). The subject is most naturally taken as the corpses; but it could be the upper gods, in parenthesis.

1074–5 Lit. ‘From these things, late-ruining maimers lie in ambush for you, the Avenging Spirits of Hades and the ⟨upper⟩ gods.’ For τούτων (gen. of source or cause), cf. *Hom. Il.* 21.412 μητρὸς Ἐρινύς, and 931 τούτων, 1177 φόνου (different is 603). The Erinyes are often ‘slow’ to get started (contrast 1104), but always inescapable (*A. Ag.* 58 ὑστερόποινον . . . Ἐρινύν); for λοχῶσιν, cf. *El.* 489–91 ἄ . . . κρυπτομένα λόχοις . . . Ἐρινύς. λωβητῆρες is a rare and forceful word, though λώβη, λωβάομαι are not uncommon in *S.* (cf. 54, 792), denoting physical or psychological ‘ruin’; for the masc. termination (with fem. Ἐρινύες), cf. *El.* 850 ἴστωρ, *A. Ag.* 111.

1076 ληφθῆναι: expegetic, as if after ὥστε (and supplying σε from 1074), ‘(. . . so that you) be caught in these same evils’; cf. 64 ἀκούειν.

1077 ‘Look closely, whether . . .’ (indirect q.); cf. 41, 1216–18.

κατηργυρωμένος: lit. ‘overlaid with silver’, hence ‘bribed’ (cf. 1035–9, and 295–303); see next n.

1078–9 ‘The passing of just a short time will reveal for your

house (ethic dat.; or 'in your house', locative) wailings of men and women' (or 'for men and women' – the ambiguity is effective). For the asyndeton, ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν, cf. Ar. *Frogs* 157, A. *Pers.* 404, K-G II 346. For τριβή in this sense, cf. 577; but the original sense of the word also operates here, maintaining the metaphor of 1077 κατηγορωμένος: the 'rubbing' (τριβή) of a coin or other object against a touchstone will 'reveal' (φανεῖ) if base metal lies under the gold or silver surface (175–7n.). Some editors punctuate οὐ . . . τριβή as a parenthesis, and take κωκύματα as subj. of φανεῖ (understanding 1077 ταῦτα as obj.): 'wailings . . . will reveal (this) – soon!' (lit. '⟨there will⟩ not ⟨be⟩ a passage of much time', cf. E. *Hipp.* 908 οὐπω χρόνος παλαιός with Barrett's n.); but this is clumsier, and loses the *double entendre*.

1080–3 Teiresias now asserts that 'all the cities' (sc. that supplied troops for the Argive attack on Thebes) are angry at Kreon for his refusal of burial to their soldiers. This important element of the story has not previously been mentioned (cf. 9–10n.); but from the epic *Thebais*, and many other sources, every Athenian knew the story of Theseus' intervention to force Kreon to bury the Argive dead, and of the victorious Epigonoι (Introd. §2). Teiresias' prophecy here makes an appropriate context for this sequel to be briefly mentioned, in order to emphasize the disastrous consequences of Kreon's mistakes, now and in the future. (For comparable examples of story-elements or predictions introduced only late in a play, even at the cost of some inconsistency, cf. Kalchas' warning in *Ajax* 748–83, or the question of bow vs person at *Ph.* 839–41/1054–6; see too Roberts 1988). That no mention of these foreign dead is made later, when Kreon rushes to bury Pol. and rescue Ant. (1196–1205), is not surprising – indeed, if the issue *were* raised again, the sequel would be pre-empted. Some editors have deleted 1080–3, regarding the lines as incompatible with the rest of the play, and unintelligible as they stand: but, while it is true that 1084–6 could follow easily from 1079, such an interpolation would be hard to account for, and seems unlikely. For particular problems involving details of expression, see nn. below.

1080 ἐχθραὶ . . . συνταράσσονται 'are getting stirred up in hostility'. This minimal emendation (Reiske) gives more normal syntax than the ἐχθραί (predicative) of the MSS. The συν- prefix may suggest a 'confederacy' such as that of the Epigonoι.

πᾶσαι . . . πόλεις: sc. of the Argive alliance. Earlier, the emphasis was on Argos alone (100–26); but Parthenopaios came from Tegea, Tydeus from Kalydon, and other towns near by might have contributed troops.

1081 If the text is sound, ὄσων must refer to πόλεις, '(cities) from which the mangled bodies . . .' This usage of σπαράγματα (= σώματα ἐσπαραγμένα) is strained, but not impossible; cf. 1022. (It would be easier with Frederking's ὄσαις.) LJ&W suggest a lacuna between 1080 and 1081, containing a mention of 'corpses', to which ὄσων would refer.

καθήγησαν 'sanctified <the bodies>', i.e. by 'burying' them in their stomachs: the macabre trope becomes almost conventional: [A.] *Th.* 1020–1 ὑπ' οἰωνῶν . . . ταφέντ' ἀτιμῶς, *S. El.* 1487, and Gorgias Β 5a.13 DK ἔμψυχοι τάφοι (= 'vultures'). (The variant καθήγησαν is equally possible; see LSJ s.v. καταγίζω, lit. 'dedicate', hence often 'cremate'.) See too 29–30, 203–6, 697–8.

1083 ἐστιοῦχον ἐς πόλιν: whether we are meant to think of 'the city containing the ἐστίαί of those on whose flesh the bird has fed' (Jebb), or the 'state-hearth' on each city's acropolis (Kamerbeek), or both (Campbell), the 'unholy smell' (cf. 1071 ἀνόσιον) carried by the birds is contaminating the sacred fires on which each community's health depends. Emendation of πόλιν, to a word meaning 'flame' (e.g. Blaydes' φλόγα, or Dawe's ψόλον) or 'house' (e.g. Blaydes' δόμον), in order to avoid the repetition after 1080 πόλεις, is unnecessary.

1084–6 Lit. 'Such arrows at the heart, like an archer, have I shot with anger against you – for you are paining <me> – unerring <ones>, whose heat you will not outrun!', responding to 1033–4. In 1084, the MS variants σοι and σου are equally possible.

καρδίας: objective gen., cf. *E. Hek.* 235 καρδίας δηκτήρια.

βέβαια: although the derivation (βαίνω) implies 'steadfast', 'set', the adj. has a wide range (e.g. *E. Hkls* 1092–3 πνέω . . . βέβαια, of 'regular' breathing); so here 'a steady stream of arrows'.

τῶν used as relative (= ὧν) is rare in ia. trim. (cf. 606 τάν with n., 1035–6n.).

θάλλπος: for the (literal or metaphorical) 'burning pain', 'inflammation', of a wound, cf. *Tr.* 1082, *A. Prom.* 650 ἡμέρου βέλει τέθαπται (with Griffith's n.).

ὑπεκδραμη: cf. *E. Pho.* 873 θεοῦς ὑπεκδραμούμενοι, and East-

erling on *Tr.* 167; also 455 ὑπερδραμεῖν with *n.* The prophet's warnings, like the gods' laws, cannot be escaped.

1087–90 In this four-line 'cap' to the *rhēsis* (207–10n.; cf. 762–5), Teiresias turns to his guide (1087 παῖ), and begins his exit, relegating Kreon to dismissive third-person references (1088 οὗτος . . .).

τὸν θυμὸν . . . ἀφῆι echoes 1084–5. Teiresias will not stay to face any retaliatory 'shots of temper' from Kreon: someone else (his 'younger' relatives) can endure these (cf. Haimon at 765).

1090 ὦν: for ᾄς, by attraction ('train his mind to be better than the wits he is displaying now'). The MSS have ἦ, which is syntactically impossible, unless we take τὸν νοῦν τῶν φρενῶν together ('a better mind within his breast than now he bears', Jebb), an unlikely expression (though cf. 176, and Hom. *Il.* 18.419 ἐν μὲν νόος ἐστὶ μετὰ φρεσίν).

1091–1114 Teiresias' words have struck home. Kreon is shocked and confused (1095); his resistance crumbles and, for the first time, he appeals for advice (1099). The Elders propose that he rescue Ant. and bury Pol., and he immediately agrees, and hurries off.

This is a surprising and agonizing reversal. It is rare for a major tragic character (esp. in *S.*) to change her/his mind so completely, and Kreon's efforts at restitution are sincere and prompt – though, with Teiresias' predictions still ringing in our ears, we can be sure that they come too late (even if we may half hope for a miracle). Although some have found the collapse of Kreon's resolve here weak and contemptible, even hypocritical, in contrast to the intransigence of a true Sophoklean heroine (e.g. Whitman 1951: 90 'puny'), it seems perverse not to recognize the pathos in his sudden 'coming to his senses' (1095 ἔγνωκα, cf. 960), and resultant readiness to listen (already evident in 770–1). Whether he is motivated now by personal fear for his family, or by his sense of political and religious responsibility, or both, he comes (back) into focus now as a well-meaning man (cf. 162–210n.) who has blundered horribly, and now wishes to make amends. Why should he – and even more, why should Ant. and Haimon – not be spared?

The Chorus' newly assertive role is also striking. Traces of this were already perhaps detectable in 766–80, but now they show real decisiveness and authority (esp. 1107), emerging at last as the advisers that Kreon should have sought all along (159, 211–14nn.) – a small

but encouraging sign that in future the city will be more reliably governed (1257–1353, 1326–53nn., Introd. §5(f)).

The irregular structure of this short dialogue is effective in bringing out the urgency and unexpected shift of direction. There is no stichomythia, no regular pattern to the exchanges, no gradual build-up. After Teiresias' final *rhēsis*, formalities are abandoned, and the decision comes swiftly.

1091–4 The 4-line response (echoing 766–7) underlines Teiresias' warnings: he has never been wrong in the past (cf. 993–5).

1092–3 'Ever since I have worn this white hair, instead of black, all over <my head> ...', cf. Sappho fr. 58.13–14 γῆρας ... τρίχες ἐκ μελαίναν (and 159n., 281). For ἐξ ὄτου, cf. 12n.; and for the switch from 1st p. pl. to sing. (ἐγώ ...), cf. 734n.

1094 λακεῖν: λάσκω is often used of inspired utterance (*Tr.* 822–4, *A. Ag.* 1426, *Cho.* 35, 39). For the infin. after ἐπιστάμεσθα, see 293–4n. οὐ would then be more normal; but μή here may emphasize the speaker's vehemence ('we know and warn you ...'), rather than the mere fact (cf. 1064–5n.).

1096–7 Lit. 'To yield is terrible; but <that I> standing-and-resisting <should> smite <my> proud spirit with ruin – this too is terrible.' For the dangers of θυμός, cf. 718, 1088; for Ἄτηι, cf. 4n. The text of 1097 has been disputed, but is probably sound. As Jebb suggests, ἐν δεινῶι πάρα combines two idioms, (i) πάρεστιν = 'is at hand' (often found in S. of bad circumstances, *Aj.* 432 πάρεστι ... αἰάζειν, *El.* 959 πάρεστι ... στένειν), and (ii) ἐν δεινῶι (ἔστιν) = 'it is a matter of terror', cf. *El.* 383 νῦν γὰρ ἐν καλῶι φρονεῖν ('Now is a good time to think'), *E. IA* 969. As an alternative, we could adopt Deventer's Ἄτη πατάξαι ... πάρα 'Ruin is at hand to smite (my) resisting spirit.'

The rare combination ... τε ... δὲ ..., rather than μὲν ... δὲ ..., is used esp. when two different persons are involved (Easterling on *Tr.* 286); but here (as at *El.* 1098–9) there is no obvious point to it (*GP* 513.6, *A. C. Pearson, CQ* 24 (1930) 162).

1098 The MSS have εὐβουλίας δεῖ ('there is need for good counsel'), which leaves λαβεῖν as an awkward kind of exegetic infin. ('counsel for us to take'); cf. 216n. The variant Κρέον (for λαβεῖν) would be very flat after παῖ Μενοικέως (though cf. 156, 211–12nn.). Simplest is emendation to εὐβουλίαν.

1099 Kreon's diction and syntax are as plain and direct as they could be; the rhythm is heavy and broken. His desire for advice is now heartfelt (contrast 163–74, 211–14n.), and his authoritarianism has evaporated; cf. 1105–6n.

1100–1 The *koryphaios* thinks first of the living Ant. (κόρην μὲν . . . , cf. 1111–12), then of the corpse. Most members of the audience will share these priorities: can Ant. be saved? (But contrast 1172–5, 1196–8nn.) προκειμένωι suggests both 'lying exposed', and 'laid out' in funerary πρόθεσις (900–3, 1246–9nn.).

1102 καὶ . . . ἐπαινείς 'Do you really recommend this . . .?' (for καὶ, cf. 554n.). δοκεῖ is a necessary correction of the MS δοκεῖς, which would mean 'you intend'.

1103–4 συντέμνουσι κτλ. 'The swift-footed Harms of the gods (= the Furies) cut fools off (sc. from completing their course)'; for ποδώκεις, cf. *Aj.* 837 Ἐρινῦς τανύποδας, 843 ταχέϊαι Ἐρινῦες, and 1074–5n.

1105–6 '<It is> hard, but I do retract from my heart's <resolve> to keep on doing <as I have been>.' For the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction (257–8n.), cf. E. *Pho.* 1421 μόλις μὲν, ἐξέτεινε δ' εἰς ἦπαρ ξίφος, Ar. *Clouds* 1363. τὸ δρᾶν could be regarded as internal acc. after ἐξίσταμαι (cf. Dem. 20.10 οὐδένα κίνδυνον ἐξέστησαν, *Ph.* 1252 οὐδὲ . . . πείθομαι τὸ δρᾶν), or as epexegetic (= ὥστε μὴ δρᾶν), cf. 63–4, 1076nn. Kreon's decision is painful, but commendably swift. οἴμοι signals his moment of capitulation (cf. 86, and 1048 φεῦ with n.), and the feeling of defeat is enhanced by the short, broken sentences (cf. 1099, 1102).

ἀνάγκη . . . δυσμαχητέον: cf. *Tr.* 492 θεοῖσι δυσμαχοῦντες (also 126).

1107 μηδ' ἐπ' ἄλλοισιν τρέπε: tmesis (= ἐπίτρεπε ἄλλοις), 'Don't entrust this to others!'; direct and assertive (1091–1114n.).

1108 'I am going just as I am, like this' (cf. 1235), potential opt. with ἄν expressing resolve (69–70n.).

ἴτ' ἴτ': urgency is conveyed by repetition, and by metrical resolution, cf. 760, 887, 1230 (but rare at this position, esp. with word-division).

1109–10 οἱ τ' ὄντες οἱ τ' ἀπόντες: polar expression for 'every-one, wherever you are' (39–40n.). ὄντες = παρόντες, cf. *El.* 305–6.

ἄξινας here apparently = 'pickaxes', since they will be used both to lop branches and heap up earth (1201–4).

εἰς ἐπόψιον τόπον 'to that place you can see over there', i.e. the hill on which Pol.'s body is lying (411-12, 1197-8). Ant.'s rock-tomb is in a hillside adjacent to it (773-4, 1215-18n.).

1111-12 ἐγὼ δ' ... αὐτός ... : hitherto Kreon has given orders for others; now he will act in person, to try to undo the damage that he has caused (cf. 1260). ἔδησα ... ἐκλύσομαι ('I myself imprisoned her .. and I shall release her') could be taken metaphorically too ('I caused the tangle, and I shall untie it ...'), cf. 39-40n.

1113-14 δέδοικα ... μὴ ... ἦι ... 'I suspect that it is ...', cf. Oidipous' similar conclusion about Teiresias (OT 747) δεινῶς ἄθυμῶ μὴ βλέπων ὁ μάντις ἦι. (The indicative is more common, as implicitly at 278-9.) Kreon's language echoes Ant.'s from 454-5: now, belatedly, he has learned what she was teaching. The closing words are ironically appropriate both to himself ('... to go through life preserving the established laws') and to Ant. ('... to end one's life ...'); cf. 175-7.

1115-54 Sixth Song (Fifth *Stasimon*) of the Chorus

As Kreon and his attendants hurry off down the side-entrance on their way to the hills, the Chorus sing an excited and optimistic hymn to Dionysos, whose 'mother-city' Thebes is (1122, 1137-9). They request that he appear now (1149), to 'purify' the city of its 'violent disease' (1140-1, 1144).

The Song is a kletic hymn (cf. 100-61n.), and follows closely the conventions of that genre (Burton 1980: 132-4, Henrichs 1990: 264-9, Ditmars 1992: 155-6): address and epithets (1121 ὦ Βακχεῦ, 1115ff. πολυώνυμε κτλ.), birth (1115-17), haunts and attributes (1117-36), reminder of past connection with Thebes (1137-9), present appeal for help (1140-2 νῦν δὲ ... μολεῖν, 1149 προφάνηθι). The structure of the ode enhances the mood of expectation, as the first two stanzas, devoted to honorific address and lacking any main verb, build up to the direct appeal (1140ff., with the main verb finally at 1142 μολεῖν), expanding further into an extended description of Dionysos, with his retinue of 'fire-breathing stars' and 'raging' Bacchantes, sweeping across the sea and mountains on his way to the rescue.

As patron-god of Thebes (cf. 153-4n.), but well-known too in Attika as 'purifier' (καθάριστος, cf. 1144) and (esp. by the name Iakchos, 1152) as an associate of Demeter who may bring eternal sal-

vation to the dead through Eleusinian and other rituals (1118–21, 1146–8nn.), he is aptly included here (as at 153–5); and the Song is a brilliant evocation of his far-ranging, liberating spirit, as the Chorus pour out fervent expressions of hope, relief, and gratitude. The effect is sharply ironical, inasmuch as the audience is aware that Kreon's attempt at rescue will surely fail, and that the Chorus' hopes are misguided. Similar odes of cheerful expectation, immediately preceding news of catastrophe, occur at *Ajax* 693–718, *Tr.* 633–62, *OT* 1086–1109, and this technique both increases the pathetic impact of the announcement of the bad news, and also serves to emphasize the puniness of the Chorus' attempts to understand and control the action unfolding around them. In each case the Chorus have shown themselves fairly normal and reasonable people, yet their inability to recognize what we see staring us in the face starkly underlines the weakness of merely human intellects and endeavours. Here in particular, the intermittent hints of violence and 'madness' (1141–2 βιαίως . . . νόσου, 1153 μαινόμεναι, and cf. 1139, 1146nn.) remind us, if we need reminding, of Dionysos' irrational and destructive power (cf. 955–65, and Müller ad loc., W-Ingram 1980: 110–15, Segal 1981: 200–6); but the Chorus are oblivious to such sinister resonances.

A second level of ironies of a different kind has also been detected by some, though they are at most no more than hints (P. Vicaire, *REG* 81 (1968) 358–65, Henrichs 1990: 264–9): the references to Demeter and Iakchos, and the use of quasi-mystical, 'salvationist' language (1118–21, 1146–54), may point to the arrival into the Underworld of Ant. and Haimon, and suggest a kind of personal 'redemption' for them in mitigation of the harshness of their deaths. Yet even if such mitigation is felt, it is muted, at best, in comparison with the overpowering sense of danger and impending catastrophe that surrounds the song: whatever 'arrival' (1142) and 'appearance' (1149–50) Dionysos may make, he will not be attended by any of the brilliant dances of celebration that the Chorus envisage.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

1115 πολυώνυμε, Καθμείας ἀγάλμα νυμφας uu chor. ia. ba.//
 1126 σε δ' ὑπερ δилоφου πετρας στεροψ ὀπωπτε

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1117 | καὶ Δίος βαρυβρέμετα | choriambic dim. |
| 1128 | λιγνυς, ἐνθα Κωρυκίαι | |
| 1118 | γένος, κλυτὰν ὄς ἀμφεπείεις | 2 iambs |
| 1129 | στείχουσι Νυμφαὶ Βακχίδες | |
| 1119 | Ἰτάλιαν, μέδεις δὲ | chor. ba.// |
| 1130 | Κασταλίας τε ναμα. | (aristophanean) |
| 1120 | παγκοίνοις Ἐλευσινίας | choriambic dim. |
| 1131 | καὶ σε Νυσαιῶν ὄρεων | |
| 1121 | Δηοῦς ἐν κόλποις, ὦ Βακχεῦ, | 4 spondees |
| 1132 | κισσηρεῖς ὄχθαι χλωρα τ' ἄ- | (chor. dim. – ?) |
| 1122 | Βακχᾶν ματροπόλιν Θηβᾶν | glyconic// |
| 1133 | κτα πολυσταφυλὸς πεμπτεῖ | |
| 1123 | ναίετων παρ' ὕγροισ | dodrans B |
| 1134 | ἀμβροτῶν ἐπέων | |
| 1124 | Ἴσμηνοῦ ρέιθροις, ἄγριου τ' | choriambic dim. |
| 1135 | εὐάζοντων Θηβαίας | |
| 1125 | ἐπι σπόραι δρακόντος. | ia. ba.// |
| 1136 | ἐπισκοποῦντ' ἄγυιαι. | (2 iambs _λ) |

The aeolics of this stanza contain more variations and irregularities than those of previous odes, but none the less fall into the same general category of 'aeolo-choriambic', with a sprinkling of iambs mixed in. The general effect is of unsettled, pulsing energy: heavier

and less regular than the First Song, but more vigorous and less contemplative than the Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth.

The first colon opens with 'rising' double-shorts, and could be classified as a kind of 'dragged enoplian' ($\cup\cup - \cup\cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - -$) or as 'acephalous dactylo-epitrite' ($\wedge\cup\cup - \cup\cup - \times - \cup - \cup - - = \wedge D \times e \times e \wedge$). In either case the affiliation to aeolics remains clear (Dale 1968: 191 n. 3). Thereafter the regular aeolic base returns ($- \times$ for glyconics, $- \times - \times$ for choriambic dimeters), and the pace slows, with an unusual string of long syllables in 1121 = 1132 (possibly a contracted choriamb ($- \cup -$, cf. n. on 1137 = 1146 below), or syncopated iambics), and a 'dragged' rhythm in 1122 = 1133 (cf. 104 = 122, and also 1115 = 1126, 1137 = 1146).

In 1115 = 1126, if the MS word-order is retained in the strophe ($\nu\acute{\upsilon}\mu\phi\alpha\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$), we have inexact responsion, i.e. syllaba anceps, which would commit us to the dac.-ep. analysis. In 1123 = 1134, $-\cup - \cup\cup -$ represents an inversion of the common dodrans ($-\cup\cup - \cup -$, the core element of glyconic; cf. 807 = 824, 842 = 861); but here it seems almost equivalent to an abbreviated choriambic dimeter ($- \times \wedge\wedge - \cup\cup -$), cf. 136 = 150. In 1123-4, the MS $\pi\alpha\rho' \acute{\upsilon}\gamma\rho\acute{\nu}\nu \dots \acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\theta\rho\nu$ gives improbable metre (*brevis in longo* at the end of 1123, i.e. pause after successive cola; and an irregular resolved first longum of the choriamb in 1124: $---\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup-$ responding to a regular choriamb in 1135: $---\cup\cup-$); see 1122-4n. (For 1135 $\Theta\eta\beta\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma$ scanned as $-\cup\cup-$, cf. 971-982.)

Strophe and antistrophe β

| | | |
|------|---|-----------------|
| 1137 | $\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu} \bar{\epsilon}\bar{\kappa} \bar{\pi}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu} \bar{\tau}\bar{\iota}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$ | choriambic dim. |
| 1146 | $\acute{\iota}\omega \pi\upsilon\rho \pi\nu\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu\tau\omega\nu$ | |
| 1138 | $\cup - \cup - \cup\cup -$ $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\nu \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$ | choriambic dim. |
| 1147 | $\chi\omicron\rho\alpha\gamma' \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\omega\nu, \nu\upsilon\chi\iota\omega\nu$ | |
| 1139 | $- \cup - \cup - \cup -$ $\mu\alpha\tau\rho\iota \sigma\upsilon\nu \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\nu\iota\alpha\iota$ | cr. ia.// |
| 1148 | $\phi\theta\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\epsilon,$ | |

- 1140 $\bar{\text{κα}}\bar{\text{ι}}\ \bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{ν}},\ \bar{\text{ὠ}}\bar{\text{ς}}\ \bar{\text{β}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ς}}\ \bar{\text{ἐ}}\bar{\text{χ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}$?choriambic dim.?
 1149 $\bar{\text{πα}}\bar{\text{ι}}\ \bar{\text{Δ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ς}}\ \bar{\gamma}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{θ}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}},\ \bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{φ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\eta}\bar{\theta}'$,
- 1141 $\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{δ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ς}}\ \bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ς}}\ \bar{\text{ἐ}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ι}}\ \bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{υ}},$ glyconic (resolved)
 1150 $\bar{\text{ὠ}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ξ}},\ \bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ς}}\ \bar{\alpha}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\alpha}\ \bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ς}}$
- 1142 $\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ν}}\ \bar{\text{κ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{θ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ω}}\bar{\text{ι}}\ \bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ὀ}}\bar{\text{δ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\ \bar{\text{Π}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ν}}$ ia. penth.|chor.|cr.
 1151 $\bar{\text{Θ}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ν}},\ \bar{\alpha}\bar{\text{ί}}\ \bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\ \bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\text{ι}}\ \bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{χ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ι}}$ ($\times\ e\ \times\ d\ e$)
- 1144 $\bar{\text{ὑ}}\bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\ \bar{\text{κ}}\bar{\text{λ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{ν}}\ \bar{\eta}\ \bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ὀ}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{ν}}\bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\alpha}\ \bar{\text{π}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{θ}}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}.$ choriambic dim. ba.
 1152 $\bar{\text{χ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ρ}}\bar{\text{ε}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{υ}}\bar{\text{σ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\ \bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}\ \bar{\text{τ}}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\text{μ}}\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\text{ν}}\ \bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\text{κ}}\bar{\text{χ}}\bar{\text{ο}}\bar{\text{ν}}.$ ($\times\ e_{\lambda}\ \times\ d\ \times\ e_{\lambda}$)

Despite some irregularities (and textual problems), this strophic pair too conforms broadly to the prevailing pattern for this play: aeolic seasoned with iambic. The ponderous opening colon (contrasting with 1115 = 1126) may be interpreted, in the light of what follows, as containing a rare instance of contracted choriamb (cf. E. *IT* 1126, and above 1121 = 1132?; West 1982: 61, 117). The reading and colometry of 1140 = 1149 are uncertain; but this colon too seems to end with a choriamb (cf. 1138 = 1147). In 1141 = 1150, a long syllable of the glyconic is resolved ($\times\times - \text{υ}\text{υ}\text{υ}\text{υ}\text{υ}-$: also rare, cf. West 1982: 116). Then, in 1142 = 1151, the choriamb is preceded by an 'iambic penthemimeral' base, more reminiscent of dactylo-epitrite than of standard aeolics ($\times - \text{υ} - \text{υ}$, cf. 838 = 857); but 1143 = 1152 reverts to the normal base (the same as that of 103 = 120 – though a dac.-ep. analysis is still possible, i.e. $\times -_{\lambda} - \text{υ} = \times e_{\lambda} \times$).

Overall, the rhythms, as well as the language, of this appeal to Dionysos echo those of the earlier prayer at 150–4, adding resonance (whether reassuring, or ominous) to the mood of joy and relief.

1115 πολυώνυμ: cf. Theokr. 15.109 πολυώνυμ ϵ καὶ πολύναιε (Aphrodite), E. *Ion* 1074 πολύμυμον (Dionysos). Over 60 cult-titles are attested for Dionysos (cf. 1121n., 1144 καθαρσίωι with n., 1152). If gods are not correctly named, they may not listen (cf. 100–61n.): so

prayers begin with names and epithets, tailored to the place and occasion; or else, as here, with a catch-all phrase ('What shall I call you . . .?', '... however you like to be named'; cf. *A. Ag.* 160–1).

1115–16 Καδμείας ἄγαλμα νύμφας: cf. 704 ἄγαλμα with n. Dionysos is son of Zeus and Theban Semele, daughter of Kadmos and Harmonia (hence 1122 ματρόπολιν). The MS νύμφας ἄγαλμα is metrically possible, but Hermann's transposition gives exact resonance with 1127, and corresponds better with the cadence of 1125 = 1136; see n. on *Metre*.

1117 Διὸς βαρυβρεμέτα: honorific epithets (esp. compound adj.) are characteristic of hymnic style (100–3, 153–4, 781, 1115–54nn.). This epithet has particular point, for Zeus visited Semele (fatally) in his full glory, complete with thunder and lightning (cf. 1127, 1139, and Ovid, *Met.* 3.298–309).

1118–21 κλυτὰν ὃς ἀμφέπεις . . .: the rel. pronoun, as often, leads from invocation to attributes ('Our Father, which art in heaven . . .', cf. 110–16n.; also 1126 σέ, 1137 τάν). κλυτός is a standard epithet for heroes, gods, or cities.

Ἴταλίαν . . . Ἐλευσινίας: acknowledging the wide range of Dionysos' activity, and thus exalting his power. S. Italy was famous for its wine-production, as well as for 'salvationist' Dionysiac cults of the dead (Henrichs 1990: 267–9); so Unger's ingenious emendation of Ἴταλίαν to Ἰκαρίαν (a wine-producing deme near Marathon, known as the first place in Attika to receive Dionysos) is unnecessary. At Eleusis, there is no definite trace of the cult of Dionysos as such; but aspects of divinity associated with him, esp. under the names Zagreus, Orpheus, and Iakchos (cf. 1154) are prominent there (Burkert 1985: 287, 296–300, F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens* (Berlin 1974) 46–69). The short iota (Ἐλευσινίας, responding to 1131 [Νυ]σαιῶν ὄρεων), is paralleled at *H. Hymn Dem.* 105, 266.

παγκοίνοις . . . | Δηοῦς ἐν κόλποις: Deo = Demeter, cf. *H. Hymn Dem.* 47 πότνια Δηώ (with Richardson's n.). The primary reference is to the 'hospitable folds' of the (hill-girt) Thriasian Plain around Eleusis (cf. *Ar. Frogs* 373 ἐς τοὺς εὐανθεῖς κόλπους λειμώνων), where the Mysteries drew huge crowds each year, and initiation was 'open to all'. But the phrase also suggests the 'receptive bosom' (or 'universal womb') of Demeter, for she (or her daughter, Kore =

Persephone) is sometimes hailed as mother of Iakchos (Arrian *Anab.* 2.16.3); and there may be ironic undertones of the ‘all-receptive’ goddess of the Underworld (810–11, *El.* 138 ἐξ Αἶδα παγκοίνου λίμνας, cf. 893–4, 1152 ταμίαν).

1121 ὦ Βακχεῦ: cf. 153–4 Βάκχιος, with n. (and 1152 Ἰακχον). The name ‘Dionysos’ is not used in this ode.

1122–4 Although he ranges far, from Italy to Attika, Thebes is Dionysos’ true home: ‘mother-city of Bacchantes’ because of Semele (1115–16), and because it was the first city to accept his cult (cf. *OC* 707 ματροπόλει). For the R. Ismenos, cf. 104 Διρκαίων, with n. In what follows, the reading and metre are uncertain, but the general sense is clear. ναιετῶν (Dindorf) corrects the unmetrical MS ναίων (ναιετάω is rare in tragedy; but cf. *Tr.* 635 παραναιετάοντες). Then most of the MSS read παρ’ ὕγρον . . . ῥέεθρον, which is metrically flawed (see n. on *Metre*): Triclinius’ παρ’ ὕγρων . . . ῥέεθρων is an easy alteration, but such a gen. with παρά is unexampled (cf. 966–7n.). Emendation to dat. pl. (Hartung, Blaydes) solves both problems, though the corruption is hard to explain. (See further 1134n.)

1125 ἐπὶ σπορᾷ δράκοντος ‘at the sowing <place> of the dragon’, from whose teeth Kadmos harvested the Spartoi (cf. 125–6 δράκοντος, 110–16n.).

1126–30 Dionysos ranges the slopes of Mt Parnassos above Delphi, where in alternate years a Panhellenic torch-festival (τριετηρίς) was held, with nocturnal celebrations by both women and men (so 1129 Νύμφαι): cf. 1150–4 with nn., *E. Ion* 716–17, *Ba.* 306–7, and Paus. 9.10.1.

σὲ δ’ . . . στέροψ ὄπωπε | λιγνύς κτλ. ‘The flashing smoke-flame has seen you . . . and <so has> the stream of Kastalia’, lyric periphrasis and personification for ‘You are often visible in the light of the smoky pine-torches . . .’ (cf. 1132–3 ἄκτὰ . . . πέμπει, 1134–5). For the pronominal ‘cap’ (σέ), cf. 1118 ὄς with n. στέροψ (a unique form; cf. Hes. *Th.* 140) recalls Zeus’ encounter with Semele (cf. 1117 βαρυβρεμέτα, 1139 κεραυνία), and suggests Dionysos’ destructive power.

ὑπὲρ διλόφου πέτρας: immediately behind the sanctuary of Apollo two peaks rise some 2,000 feet, with a chasm between them (the *Phaidriades* = ‘Gleaming Rocks’, *E. Ion* 86–8, *Pho.* 226–8): hence the tradition of ‘twin-peaked Parnassos’ (*E. Ba.* 306–7 ἔτ’ αὐτὸν ὄψηι κάπὶ Δελφίσιν πέτραις | πηδῶντα σὺν πεύκαισι δικόρυφον

πλάκα), though in fact, behind them to the west, the pastoral uplands (on which the Dionysian festivities took place) keep rising for miles to the summit.

Κωρύκται . . . Νύμφαι: the Korykian (lit. 'Wallet') Cave lies in the uplands. It is very large (c. 300 ft by 200 ft by 40 ft), and, like most caves, was sacred to the Nymphs; cf. *A. Eum.* 22–3, and *BCH Suppl.* 7 (1981), 9 (1984). The MS word-order (Νύμφαι στείχουσι) gives impossible metre (cf. 1118).

Κασταλίας τε νᾶμα: sc. ὄπωπέ σε. 'The Kastalia is a stream which flows from a fissure in the high cliffs above Delphi. It issues near the eastern-most of the two peaks (1126ff.) . . . and bounds in cataracts, down a precipitous channel, to Delphi, where its water was used for all sacred purposes. Below Delphi it joins the Pleistos (*A. Eum.* 27)' (Jebb).

1131–6 'Nysa' is a name of uncertain meaning, applied to more than a dozen places around the world (often, as here, mountains), as the home or origin for *Dio-nysos*: e.g. *Hom. Il.* 6.133 (Thrace), *H. Hymn Dion.* 1.8–9 (Aithiopia). Here the Euboian Nysa may be meant, i.e. the green hills on the island's NW coast (1133 ἄκτά), looking across to Boiotia (cf. 1145 πορθμόν). The lush description suggests the god's bursting vitality, in contrast to Thebes' diseased 'streets' (1136 ἀγυιάς, cf. 1141) and Ant.'s barren prison-tomb.

κισσῆρεις ὄχθαι: 'The κισσός was to Dionysos what the δαφνή was to Apollo' (Jebb). For ὄχθη of a 'slope', 'hillside' (usually 'river-bank'), cf. *Pind. P.* 1.64.

ἄ|κτά πολυστάφυλος: Euboia was famous for its wines, and the same epithet is applied to a Euboian city at *Hom. Il.* 2.537.

πέμπει: for the sing., cf. 830 λείπει with n.; for the personification, cf. ὄπωπε with n. πέμπω, πομπή are often used of a ceremonial 'escort' or 'procession'.

ἀμβρότων ἐπέων | εὐαζόντων: gen. absolute, 'as the divine chants resound with the cry "euhoe!"' (Brown). The expression is bold, since εὐάζειν is normally applied to a *person* who 'shouts euhoe' (*E. Ba.* 68, 1034; cf. 964); it is tempting therefore to emend to ἐπετών or ἐπετᾶν ('as your followers cry . . .', cf. *Pind. P.* 5.4 πολύφιλον ἐπέταν, *Ap. Rhod.* 3.666). But bold tropes may be expected in this dithyrambic context (and cf. *Plato, Rep.* 463d φῆμαι . . . ὑμνή-

σουσι περὶ τὰ ὄτα). The MS reading finds an echo too in Pind. *P.* 4.299 παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων.

ἐπισκοποῦντ' 'as you watch over ...', cf. 1148 ἐπίσκοπε with n. (For the prosody *Θηβαίας*, cf. n. on *Metre*.)

1137–9 'which you and your mother hold in the highest honour of all cities'. τάν (= rel. pronoun, cf. 606 τάν with n.) refers back to the noun implied by *Θηβαίας*, with ὑπερτάταν proleptic (474–6n.).

ματρὶ . . . κεραυνίαι: cf. 1117 βαρυβρεμέτα, 1127 στέροψ with nn.

1140–5 καὶ νῦν . . . μολεῖν: a typical form of request in 'kletic' hymns: 'O you who always do / once did this-and-that . . . [= 1115–39], now come (again) and do it for us!' (cf. 153–4, 1114–52nn., *OT* 163–6). For the infin. as imperative, cf. 151 θέσθαι with n.

βιαιάς ἔχεται | . . . ἐπὶ νόσου 'the whole city is held in a state of violent sickness'. The language recalls Teiresias' warning at 1015–18; cf. too 7 πανδήμωι πόλει. This usage of ἐπὶ is unusual (cf. 996, *OC* 746, Moorhouse 1982: 111–2); but S.'s use of prepositions is exceptionally free (Campbell 1879: 1 26–9). Musgrave's ὑπό would ease the difficulty; but the corruption would be hard to explain.

καθαρσίωι ποδί: traditional epithets of Dionysos include καθάρσιος, ἀκείσιος, ἀλεξίκακος (cf. 1027 ἀκείται). Around Delphi and Parnassos, where his cult was combined with that of Apollo, these functions of 'Healer' might be especially popular. But κάθαρσις can be painful (cf. 284 δυσκάθαρτος, W-Ingram 1980: 113–16).

πορθμόν: if Euboia is meant in 1131–3, then this must be the Euripos, the narrow (and often turbulent) 'straits' which must be crossed to get from there to Boiotia and Thebes.

1146–8 For Dionysos–Iakchos as 'chorus-leader of the stars' and 'supervisor of night-voices', cf. the Initiates' song at Ar. *Frogs* 341–2 Ἰακχ' ὦ Ἰακχε, | νυκτέρου τελετῆς φωσφόρος ἀστήρ, and E. *Ion* 1078–81, *Ba.* 485–6 (also above, 152–4). The phrase πῦρ πνεόντων is striking in this context, and perhaps a little sinister (W-Ingram 1980: 113–14); ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπισκοπέω are common terms for tutelary gods (cf. 1136, and LSJ *s.vv.*). Overall, the combination of almost mystical images suggests unusually fervent faith in Dionysos' cosmic power.

1149–50 παῖ Διὸς γένεθλον: an unusual expression, = παῖ Διὸς γεγώς. In the strophe, the colon begins with two long syllables (1140

καὶ νῦν . . .): if exact responson is wanted, a plausible emendation would be παῖ Δῖον γένεθλον (Seyffert), or παῖ Ζηνὸς γένεθλον (Bothe); but the second syllable may be anceps. Schubert's (and LJ&W's) more radical step, of deleting παῖ, necessitates also emending 1140.

προφάνηθ': a common 'kletic' word (Alkaios fr. 34.3, *OT* 163) for the 'epiphany' of a helping divinity; cf. 102–4 φανέν . . . ἐφάνθης.

ὄναξ: a correction of the MS Ναξίασις, which does not respond metrically to the str. (1141) and introduces irrelevant mythology (Ariadne) and geography (if Dionysos is coming from Parnassos or Euböia).

1150–1 σαῖς . . . | Θυῖαισιν: these 'Thyiads' could also be called 'Mainads', or 'Bacchantes', or 'Lēnai' (Burkert 1985: 166, 290–1). Here perhaps they are imagined as immortal Nymphs (cf. 1129, *OC* 678–80, and ?1134–5; also 950n.); in 'real life', they would be human followers (1126–30n.). The spelling, accentuation, and scansion of Θυῖα(ι)σιν are uncertain. The MS Θυῖάσιν (dat. pl. from Θυῖας, -άδος) is metrically improbable, since – υ υ – should not correspond to υ – υ – (1143). The obvious change is to Θυῖαισιν (from 1st decl. Θυῖαι), unless S. wrote the old Attic form of the dat. plural, Θυῖασιν (with long 2nd syll.).

περιπόλοις: a lyric variation of the more normal προπόλοις, προσπόλοις, or ἀμφιπόλοις (on which see Burkert 1985: 173–4, *OC* 680).

1151–4 πάννυχοι | χορεύουσι κτλ.: cf. 152–3. Here 'night-long dances' could refer to Dionysos' Delphic cult (1126–30n.); but the epithet ταμίαν ('dispenser', 'controller') and the cult-title Ἰακχον recall also (esp. for an Athenian audience) the Eleusinian mysteries and the gifts of death and eternal life that Dionysos–Iakchos is thought to dispense (cf. 1118–21n.). ταμίας can mean 'master' of anything (at Pind. *I.* 6.57 the poet is ταμίης κώμων), but is esp. applied to Zeus and to human kings (Plato, *Rep.* 379e ὡς "ταμίης" ἡμῖν Ζεὺς "ἀγαθῶν τε κακῶν τε τέτυκται"); cf. 949–50n.

1155–1256 Scene Seven (Sixth Epeisodion)

A Messenger arrives, and announces Haimon's death to the Chorus (1155–79). Kreon's wife, Eurydike, suddenly enters, and demands to

Ant. off earlier (cf. 1196–8), and is surely one of those who accompanied Kreon at 1114 (cf. 1108–10). This makes him a sympathetic witness to the downfall of the most distinguished and successful man in Thebes (1161–4). He introduces his account with a series of general statements, on the vicissitudes of fortune (1156–60), on Kreon's past happiness (1161–4), and on the value of pleasure, now lost (1165–71): only a bare half a line (1165) announces the disaster itself. Kreon's ruin is thus presented, not as punishment for egregious error, but as a typical example of human vulnerability: cf. 'Solon' in *Hdt.* 1.32, Friis Johansen 1959: 68, Jones 1962: 166–77.

1155 δόμων is to be taken with both Κάδμου and Ἀμφίωνος (257–8n.). Kadmos was the founder of Thebes (1124–5n.), and its acropolis was known as the Καδμεία. Amphion (823–33n.), with his brother Zethos, later built the city's walls (*Ap. Rhod.* 1.740ff.).

1156–60 The Messenger begins with a series of gnomic comments on the mutability of human fortune; cf. Simonides, *PMG* 521 ἄνθρωπος ἔων μὴ ποτε φάσηις ὃ τι γίνεται, | μηδ' ἄνδρα ἰδῶν ὄλβιον ὅσον χρόνον ἔσσειται | ὠκεία γὰρ οὐδὲ τανυπτερύγου μύϊας [= 'long-winged fly'] | οὕτως ἅ μεταστάσις, and *Aj.* 131–2 ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν | ἅπαντα τάνθρώπεια, *Tr.* 129–31. The lines run smoothly, without enjambment.

1156–7 'There is no human being's life, in whatever state it might be (στάντα = καταστάντα, cf. 1160), that I would ever praise or blame', i.e. οὐκ ἔστι τοιοῦτος ἀνθρώπου βίος ὅποιον ... (For the attraction of βίον into the case of the relative, cf. *OC* 56, 907; also 3–6 above.) We may hear also, 'I would never praise anyone's life as being settled ...': for this sense of στάντα ('fixed', 'constant'), cf. *S.* fr. 871 Radt 'Just as the moon waxes and wanes, its face never remaining constant (στῆναι) in one shape for two nights at a time, so is my fate always changing ...'

1158–9 The insistence on the ups and downs of 'fortune' (τυχ- four times in two lines) contrasts with Kreon's earlier claims that he, with the gods' help, was capable of maintaining a straight and steady course (162–3n., and 1164 ἠϋθυνε). For καταρρέπει (here transitive), cf. ἐπιρρέπειν at *Theognis* 157, *A. Ag.* 251, *Eum.* 888, and *OT* 961 (ῥοπή). ἀεί here (as often) = 'at any given moment'.

1160 'And <there is> no prophet concerning present circum-

stances for mortals' (i.e. as to whether they will continue). For μάντις in this informal sense, cf. 631, 1212 (but also 1178).

1161 Κρέων γάρ . . . ποτέ: the particular case confirms the general rule, as Kreon was viewed as a model of political and familial success.

ὡς ἐμοί 'as far as I could tell', 'in my eyes', cf. *Aj.* 395, *OC* 20, 76.

1162–4 σώσας μὲν . . . | λαβῶν τε . . . | ἡῦθυνη: the variation (for σώσας μὲν . . . λαβῶν δὲ . . ., following ἦν ζηλωτός) produces a slight anacolouthon, but is not difficult. The combination μὲν . . . τε . . . is not unusual in tragedy; cf. 962–3, *Tr.* 1012, *GP* 374–6 (also 1199–1205).

ἐχθρῶν '(saved this land) from its enemies' cf. 8, 10, 1058nn.

παντελεῆ μοναρχίαν 'complete, sole dominion', a very strong expression, though it does not seem to be pejorative here; cf. 735–9. (At 1016, παντελεῖς has a different sense.)

ἡῦθυνη: cf. 178 with n., and contrast 1158–9n.

θάλλων εὐγενεῖ τέκνων σπορᾶι: Kreon had two sons (1302–3n.). The language ironically recalls Haimon's at 703–4.

1165–7 ἀφείται πάντα 'All <this> is lost' (perf. passive, ἀφίημι), cf. *Hdt.* 8.49 ἢ γὰρ Ἀττικὴ ἀπέιτο ἤδη, *E. El.* 379.

ἡδοναί | ὅταν προδῶσιν ἀνδρός 'When a man's pleasures give out . . .'; for this intransitive use of προδίδωμι, cf. Xenophanes fr. 1.5 West οἶνος . . . ὃς οὔποτε φησι προδώσειν, *Hdt.* 7. 187.1. Seyffert was led to this reading by the L schol. (οὐ νομίζω ζῆν ἐκείνον τὸν ἀνδρα ὃν ἄν προδῶσιν αἰ ἡδοναί); but the MS tradition is confused. Jebb, Dawe, and others follow the majority of MSS, τὰς γὰρ ἡδονὰς ὅταν προδῶσιν ἀνδρες ('when men lose their pleasures . . .'); others follow Athenaios' quoted version, αἰ γὰρ ἡδοναί . . . ἀνδρας ('when pleasures fail men . . .'). But in both of these latter cases the sing. τοῦτον in 1167 is awkward (harsher than 707–9; see Campbell 1879: 1.31). Line 1167 is actually omitted by all MSS, but survives in the quotations of Athenaios and Eustathios.

1168–71 πλούτει τε . . . | καὶ ζῆ . . . : ('hypothetical' imperatives, cf. 1037, *Hom. Il.* 4.29: K–G 1 236–7, Smyth §1839) 'Go on, pile up wealth in your house if you like, live with a tyrant's display – but if the enjoyment of these things is missing, I wouldn't buy the rest from anyone for a shadow of smoke, compared with pleasure!' καπ-

νοῦ σκιᾶς is gen. of price; the expression is almost conventional (cf. *Ph.* 946, *A. fr.* 390 Radt, *Ag.* 839). ἀνδρί = τινί, dat. of reference, cf. *Ar. Ach.* 812 πόσου πρίωμαί σοι τὰ χοιρίδια; *Frogs* 1229. For πρὸς in this sense, see LSJ *s.v.* C.III.4. The sentiment recalls Simonides, *PMG* 584 (= *Athenaios* 12.512c) τίς γὰρ ἄδονᾶς ἄτερ θνατῶν βίος ποθεινὸς ἢ ποία τυραννίς; κτλ. ('Without pleasure, what life of mortals, what monarchy, is desirable? Even the gods' life wouldn't be enviable without it!').

1172–9 In a short stichomythia – just three lines of questioning, and three of response – the Chorus elicit from the Messenger the bare facts: Haimon is dead, by suicide; Kreon is to blame; Teiresias' prophecy has come true.

1172–5 βασιλέων '... (this grief) of the royal household ...'

τεθνᾶσιν: neither Chorus nor audience can be sure to whom the plural refers. But the Chorus ask only about a single killer and single (male) corpse (1174 τίς ... τίς δ' ὁ κείμενος; cf. 1175 Αἴμων); likewise οἱ ζῶντες (1173) is immediately recognizable as poetic pl. for 'Kreon'. Nobody on stage is much concerned about Ant. (Intro. §5(e) p. 54, (g) pp. 61–3).

αἴτιοι θανεῖν (= τοῦ θανεῖν) '... <are> responsible for <their> death'.

αὐτόχειρ could mean 'by his own hand', or 'by a kinsman's hand' (cf. 56 αὐτοκτονοῦντε, 49–52n., 1315); hence the Chorus' question. The word-play (Αἴμων ... αἰμάσσεται) here seems to sum up the final 'meaning' of Haimon's life (cf. 659, 111n.). For the chiasmic arrangement of 1174–5, see Mastronarde 1979: 41–2.

1177 πατρὶ μῆνίσας φόνου 'in anger at his father for the killing <of Ant.>' (cf. 633, 751); for the gen. of source, cf. 931 τοῦτων, 1074–5.

1178 ἄρ' ὀρθὸν ἤνυσας 'you proved (your words) valid after all', cf. *OT* 506, 853 (and for ὀρθόν, 162–3, 1192–5nn). The *apostrophē* to Teiresias (cf. 572) adds pathos, at this moment of 'recognition' (Intro. §5(a)).

1179 ὡς ᾧδ' ἐχόντων: neuter gen. absolute (cf. *Aj.* 981, *A. Pers.* 170), 'In view of < matters > being like this, it is < time > (πᾶρα = πάρεστι) to be planning the rest' (i.e. what to do next).

1180–1256 Suddenly Kreon's wife, Eurydike, enters by the main

palace door, explaining that she has overheard the news (1183–91). The Messenger delivers a full narration of Haimon's death (1192–1244), whereupon she returns silently indoors.

There has been until this moment no mention of Kreon's wife or Haimon's mother, and there is no expectation of seeing her. The mythological tradition seems generally to have attached little significance to this figure, and the name 'Eurydike', and this role for her, may well be S.'s own inventions. (At [Hes.] *Shield* 83, Kreon's wife is named Henioche.) Her arrival is a complete surprise – yet it is logical and appropriate, after Teiresias' predictions (esp. 1079 γυναικῶν . . . κωκύματα), for she represents the central and most intimate element in Kreon's domestic world, and thus demonstrates aptly the consequences of violated φιλία. All other arrivals, except those of Ant. and Ismene, have come by the side-entrances, and have involved characters engaged in the 'outside' world of war, politics, and civic ritual: but Eurydike bursts through the door onto the stage as a sudden eruption from inside, from the house's dark and private recesses (1181 ἐκ δωμαίων, cf. 1186–8, 1248–9, 1293 ἐν μυχῶς, *Introd.* §4), which can no longer be hidden and kept silent; and as she returns there, bent on suicide, we are made conscious of the irreparable damage done to the whole household.

Eurydike herself is completely innocent of wrong-doing or -thinking: her sufferings are due entirely to the political and erotic aspirations of her husband and son. (So too, it appears, their first son was lost because of Kreon's civic-mindedness and dedication to duty, cf. 1302–5.) Her role on stage is short, her words few (though additional short speeches of hers are reported at 1301–5, 1312–16): in fact, she has almost the smallest speaking part in Greek tragedy (after Pylades in *A. Cho.*, and various minor servants). But it is to her that the Messenger primarily directs his narrative (cf. 1192–6), and the agonized presence of this mother and wife, reacting with gesture and body-language – and then with eloquently silent departure (1244–56) – adds another dimension of pathos to the catastrophe.

1180–2 καὶ μὴν . . .: cf. 526–30n. The arrival is unheralded and unexpected, and the straightforward identification of her by name and relationship (δάμαρτα) may indicate that this is a character otherwise unfamiliar to Athenian audiences. A queen would nor-

mally be attended by two or three female servants (1189), unless she has left them behind in her anxiety and confusion (Taplin 1977: 79–80). For the resolution in Εὐρύδικην, cf. 11 Ἀντιγόνη with *n*.

1182 ‘She is here either because she has heard concerning her son, or by chance.’ For the genitive (‘gen. of connection’, Smyth §1380–1), cf. *OC* 307 κλυών σου (‘hearing about you’), *El.* 317 τοῦ κασιγνήτου τί φῆις; For πάρα (= πάρεστι) used of an entering character, cf. *OC* 549–50 καὶ μὴν ... ὄδε ... Θησεύς πάρα. So Brunck’s change to περᾶι (‘she is coming’, cf. 386) is unnecessary.

1183–91 Eurydike would not normally step outside her house to address men of the city (cf. 18–19n.), so she explains that she just happened to be on her way out when she overheard the news. Although initially overcome with shock (1189–90), she has come out now to hear fuller details.

1183–4 ὦ πάντες ἀστοί: addressed to the Messenger and the Elders (cf. 988); so too 1190 εἴπατε.

πρὸς ἔξοδον στείχουσα ‘as I was on my way to the door ...’

1184–5 Lit. ‘... so that I might come-in-supplication (ἰκοίμην) as addresser of prayers to the goddess Pallas’, a most respectable reason for a woman to venture out in public. Presumably she was intending to propitiate the angry gods (cf. 1019–20); cf. Iokaste at *OT* 919, and Klytaimestra at *El.* 637. At *OT* 20–1, mention is made of two temples of Pallas at Thebes. For προσήγορος + (double) objective gen., cf. 435, Smyth §§1413, 1331.

1186–8 ‘I was just releasing the bolts of the gate <so that it could be> pulled back (ἀνασπάστου proleptic, 474–6n.), when the voice of family disaster struck through my ears.’ τε ... καί are here used in parataxis, where subordination (temporal clause) would be normal; cf. *GP* 515 and (without τε) *OT* 717–19, *GP* 293. The ‘historical’ present tenses add to the vividness of the narrative (Smyth §1883).

1189 κάποπλήσσομαι ‘I fainted’. This rare verb occurs nowhere else in this sense (though ἐκπλήσσομαι is common); but cf. ἀπόπληκτος (*Ph.* 731, *Hdt.* 2.173).

1191 This could be a generalization (‘I’ve been through all kinds of trouble before ...’), like Deianeira’s at *Tr.* 436–69; but it may refer more specifically to the death of Megareus (1302–3n.).

1192–1243 The Messenger’s long narration, like a miniature epic, is vivid and suspenseful, full of confrontation, direct speech, and

shocking description. As Kreon's personal 'guide' (1192 ἐγὼ ... παρών, 1196 ἐγὼ ... ποδαγὸς ἐσπόμεν, cf. 1214 πρόσπολοι), he has been an active participant in the events, and his frequent use of the 1st p. plural during the first half of the speech (1199 αἰτήσαντες, 1201 λούσαντες, 1202 συγκατήγομεν, 1204 χώσαντες, 1205 εἰσεβαίνομεν, 1220 ἠθροῦμεν, 1221 κατείδομεν) tends to identify his own perspective (and hence that of the audience also) closely with that of his master. But then, at the critical point of his narrative, his own perspective largely gives way to Kreon's (1206–8n.), for the most direct and pathetic effect.

1192–5 As often, a few lines of generalities introduce the *rhēsis* (cf. 388–91, 1155–60; see too 1242–3): in effect, 'The truth, the whole truth ... that's the best policy.' The conventionality both authenticates this reporter as an eyewitness (1192), and mitigates the incongruity of requiring a victim's mother to listen to so many horrific details (as does Eurydike's assurance at 1191). Likewise, the Messenger's expression of devotion (1192 φίλη δέσποινα, perhaps a little more than merely conventional) seems to apologize for the pain he is about to inflict (cf. 1246–9).

καὶ παρών 'having been present in fact myself ...' ('imperfect-present' participle, cf. 166 σέβοντας); for καί, see *GP* 321–3, 90n. Alternatively, καὶ ... καί may be coordinated paratactically (cf. 1112, and *El.* 680 κάπεμπόμην πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ τὸ πᾶν φράσω, *Tr.* 626).

τί ... μαλθάσσοιμ' ἄν ὦν κτλ. 'Why should I try to soothe you <with things> about which I will later be revealed a liar?' (ὦν = τούτοις ὦν, as often.) For the poetic pl. (φανούμεθα) after sing. in 1194, cf. 734n.

ὀρθὸν ἀλήθει' αἰεί: a safe gnomic foundation for a painful narrative. For previous efforts to establish something 'straight and upright' (ὀρθόν), cf. 162–3, 1158–9nn. For the neuter, cf. *OC* 592 θυμὸς ... οὐ ζύμφορον, and Smyth §2502d.

1196–8 Kreon first went to bury Pol.'s body, and then to release Ant., a reversal of the order originally suggested (1100–1n.). This brief postponement of Ant.'s release turns out to be (perhaps) fatal; and some critics have regarded this as another foolish mistake on Kreon's part. But, in moving promptly to correct the original and chief source of the pollution that Teiresias has described, Kreon can hardly be held responsible for a death that (as far as he is aware)

should not be at all imminent. He has no way of knowing that Ant. will accelerate her own death.

ποδαγός ἐσπόμην: the Messenger acted as ‘guide’ (for the Doric touch, cf. 715 νάσς), because Kreon might not know exactly where to find Pol.’s corpse or Ant.’s tomb. The former lay outside the city at ‘the highest part of the plain’ (πεδῖον ἐπ’ ἄκρον), cf. 411–12. (This seems more likely than ‘at the furthest edge ...’, as LSJ and others take it, since Pol. traditionally fell near the Seventh Gate, and there has been no mention of moving his corpse. Or perhaps S. is inconsistent here.) For the location of Ant.’s prison-tomb, see 773–6, 1204ff.

νηλεές: here with passive sense, ‘unpitied’ (cf. *OT* 180).

κυνοσπάρακτον: cf. 206, 1017, 1202; but contrast 257–8, 697–8 – a mysterious inconsistency.

1199–1205 The funeral of Pol., so controversial and long delayed, is now described in due order, with a single, stately period: five subordinate clauses; no line of more than six words, and two five-syllable verbs at line-end, with *homoioteleuton* (see next n.); only two lines end-stopped (lightly). So far, things sound measured and under control.

τὸν μὲν . . . συγκατήθομεν: answered, not by a δέ clause, but by 1203–5 καὶ . . . αὔθις . . . εἰσεβαίνομεν (cf. 165–7 τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτ’ αὔθις . . ., and 1162–4n.). The asymmetry reflects the discrepant outcomes of the two procedures; cf. 1203–5n.

ἐνοδῖαν θεὸν | Πλούτωνά τ’: cf. S. fr. 535.2 Radt τῆς εἰνοδίας ‘Εκάτης, Theokritos 2.36. ‘The names Hekate and Hades are euphemistically avoided’ (Brown). ‘Hekate is the goddess of pathways, *Enodia*, esp. of cross-roads and the offerings laid there. . . .’ (Burkert 1985: 171, with further refs.). Here, as in the Persephone story (*H. Hymn Dem.* 22–61), her ‘good will’ and that of Plouton are requested in order to secure the safe return of ‘the Maiden’ (1204 κόρης = Ant.) from the ‘bridal chamber of Death’ (1205, cf. 806–16, 1118–21nn.).

εὐμενεῖς: predicative (cf. 823 λυγροτάταν, with n.), ‘to (become) kindly (and) check their tempers’; in contrast to 1070–6, 1103–4.

ἐν νεοσπᾶσιν θαλλοῖς . . . συγκατήθομεν ‘we collected up (συγ-, cf. LSJ *s.v.* συγκατακαίω) and burnt him (1199 τὸν μὲν) – what was left of him, that is (δῆ) – amidst branches that we had newly plucked’. ἐν = both ‘amidst’, ‘on,’ and ‘with’, ‘by means of’ (since

they provided the flames); cf. 1003 ἐν χηλαῖσιν, 764. The grisly, yet matter-of-fact, details seem to overshadow 1201 ἄγνόν.

τύμβον ὀρθόκρανον: in Homer (and sometimes in the fifth century too), the bones were collected after the funeral pyre burned down, and a mound of earth was heaped up over them. The burial-mound is 'holding its head up straight' (cf. 1, 441 κάρα with nn.; and 162–3n.) because Pol. is now where he 'belongs' (οἰκείας) and is no longer 'disenfranchised' (22, 77; cf. 514–16, 1068–71). The narrative turns now to the second goal of the expedition (αὔθις), the rescue of Ant.

λιθόστρωτον . . . νυμφεῖον: this 'marriage-chamber' has only a rocky floor for a bed, instead of a bridal couch strewn with flowers and soft coverlets (LSJ *s.vv.* στόρνυμι, στρώματα), cf. 806–16n.

πρὸς . . . | νυμφεῖον . . . εἰσεβαίνομεν: some editors have objected to the combination of πρὸς and εἰς, and have wanted to emend (cf. 1215–18n.). But word-order and the imperfect tense help the transition from 'on our way to . . .' to 'into . . .'

1206–8 ὀρθίων κωκυμάτων: first of the many predicted by Teiresias (1079); as yet, their source is undetermined (1209–10n.).

ἀκτέριστον ἀμφὶ παστάδα: lit. 'near the unhallowed portico', i.e. the cave: an oxymoronic kenning, since παστάς (from *παρ-στάς) means properly 'colonnade', 'gallery' (Hdt. 2.148.6, 2.169), but comes to be associated esp. with the bridal θάλαμος (Theokr. 24.46, cf. E. *Or.* 1371). For ἀκτέριστον, cf. 1071, 203–4n.

Κρέοντι: hitherto, the narrative has been presented from the perspective of the Messenger-guide (1196 ἐγὼ . . .), together with the other attendants (1st p. plural verbs, 1199–1205), one of whom now (1207 τῆς) picks up the sounds and conveys them to their 'master' for interpretation (1207 σημαίνει, cf. 1209 ἄσημα, 1212 μάντις). In what follows (1209–43), however, the perspective is primarily Kreon's (1209 τῷ δὲ . . ., 1226 ὁ δὲ . . ., 1231 τὸν δὲ . . .), and it is through his eyes (even, intermittently, his voice: 1211–18, 1228–30) that we experience the climactic events (cf. 1192–1243n.).

1209–10 Lit. 'As he draws nearer, indecipherable <sounds> of wretched shouting surround <him>.' For 1209 ἄσημα, cf. 998, 1001–2n., and 1212 μάντις with n. περιβαίνειν usually denotes 'mounting' a horse or 'planting one's feet' in battle; the bold usage here may be derived from Hom. *Od.* 6.122 ἀμφήλυθε θήλυς αὐτή (also *Od.*

12.369), cf. *OC* 1477 ἀμφίσταται διαπρύσιος ὄτοβος (in lyric), *Ar. Frogs* 154. For the double comparative, cf. *A. Th.* 673 μάλλον ἐνδικώτερος (Smyth §1084).

1211–18 Enjambment, short paratactic or asyndetic sentences, exclamations, and rhetorical questions, all add to the sense of urgency, even panic (1219 ἀθύμου), in Kreon's reported speech.

1212–13 μάντις: cf. 1160n., 1209 ἄσημα. The process of decipherment, through which Kreon comes to recognize his son's voice (1218 συνήμι) and what it signifies, grotesquely recalls Teiresias' mantic activity at 998–1004.

δυστυχεσάτην . . . τῶν παρελθουσῶν: cf. 100–3n.

1214 παιδός με σαίνει φθόγγος: asyndeton, and the emphatic position of παιδός, mark this moment of ghastly recognition. For σαίνει ('greets me', 'excites my attention'), cf. *E. Hipp.* 862–3 τύποι . . . οἶδε προσσαίνουσί με (with Barrett's n.), *E. Rhés.* 55 σαίνει μ' ἔννυχος φρυκτωρία, *OC* 319–20. (Similar is the use of προσγελάω at *A. Eum.* 253, *S. Ichneutai* fr. 314.298, and Latin *arrideo*.)

1215 ὠκεῖς: predicative, cf. 823 λυγροτάταν with n.

1215–18 Lit. 'Standing right by the tomb, look, after you enter through the stone-torn seal(?) of the mound into the <tomb's> actual mouth, <and see> whether I <really do> hear Haimon's voice.' The topography of the tomb has given rise to much discussion. If a coherent scenario is to be envisioned, it would seem that Ant. has been put into a ready-made chamber-tomb (*tholos*) of Bronze Age type, cut into the side of the hill, the approach to which would typically be an unroofed cutting (*dromos*) some 10 to 20 metres long and sloping downwards to the 'mouth' (στόμιον) of the chamber proper. (Many tombs of this kind are still in evidence about the Greek countryside, and they must have been familiar to S.'s audience.) The whole structure, half natural (within the rock and earth, like a cave), and half artificial (dug down, hollowed out, and with a mound on top), could thus be regarded as both subterranean (774, 885, 889, 920, 1068) and yet 'heaped-up' (848 τυμβόχωστον, 1216 χώματος). Once Ant. was inside, a stone wall must have been quickly erected to seal off the mouth (cf. 848 ἔργμα with n.); from this Haimon had 'ripped apart' some stones (1216) to get inside, shortly before the arrival of Kreon and his attendants.

The chief problem with this scenario is the phrase ἄρμόν λιθο-

σπαδῆ, since ἀρμός (from the *ἀρ- root, cf. ἀραρίσκω, ἄρμα, ἄρμονία, κτλ.) normally means ‘joint’, ‘fastening’, which seems hard to reconcile with the σπα- root of λιθοσπαδῆς. Perhaps ἀρμός here is the ‘(stone) facing’ (sc. that ‘sealed up’ and ‘fastened’ the burial mound), now ‘with stones ripped-out’ from it. A wall may be ‘fitted together with stones’ (Hom. *Il.* 16.212 ὅτε τοῖχον ἀνήρ ἀράρηι πυκνιοῖσι λίθοισιν), so perhaps the ‘fitting-together’ (ἀρμός) can be ‘stone-torn’ (λιθοσπαδῆς) to dismantle the wall? Of alternatives, Lloyd-Jones’s conjecture ἀγμόν is ingenious (‘a stone-ripped shattering of the burial-mound’); but elsewhere this word means ‘a broken-off piece’ of something (E. *IT* 263, *Ba.* 1094 = ‘a crag’, Hippokrates in περὶ Ἀγμῶν = ‘a fractured bone’), not ‘a hole torn out’.

στόμιον: the doorway leading from the *dromos* into the burial-chamber (= 1220 τυμβεύματι). Kreon is to be imagined as still standing at the top of the *dromos*, listening to the wails from within.

ἢ θεοῖσι κλέπτομαι ‘... or whether I am being deluded by the gods’ (sc. ‘and it is not Haimon’s voice at all’). For the (rare) dat. of the agent with pres. indic. passive, cf. 504–5n.

1219–20 ‘At these commands from our dispirited master, we began to look.’ (For the combination of dat. of cause with ἐξ + gen. of agent-source, cf. 955–7n., though there the passive verb goes more closely with the ἐκ phrase.) The reading is doubtful, but the general sense is not. With τάδ’ (the MS reading), κελευσμάσιν lacks the expected article or demonstrative pronoun to combine with ἐξ ἀθύμου δεσπότητος (cf. 95 τὴν ἐξ ἐμοῦ δυσβουλίαν). So τοῖσδ’ should probably be read; or else κελευσμάτων (J. Burton, retaining τάδ’), ‘We began to look for these things, as a result of the orders of our master’; or we could replace ἐξ with οὖν (Heath). Others have suspected deeper corruption, perhaps a lacuna.

1220 λοισθίωι τυμβεύματι ‘in the furthest part of the burial-chamber’; cf. 1215–17n.

1221–5 After the long build-up of anticipation, listening, and searching (imperf. tenses at 1205 εἰσεβαίνομεν, 1220 ἠθροῦμεν), at last the tableau of discovery is described (aor. κατείδομεν). The first glimpse takes in a pair of victims (τὴν μὲν ... τὸν δὲ ..., contrast 1240); but the ensuing description focuses primarily on Haimon, still alive, and bent on hurting his father. Ant.’s work is done: her corpse functions now only to provoke her fiancé’s reactions (1223–5n.).

1221–2 κρεμαστήν αὔχενος: as the search-party first sees them, Ant. is still ‘hanging by her neck’ (for the gen., cf. Ar. *Plout.* 309–11 σὲ . . . τῶν ὄρχεων κρεμῶμεν = ‘we’ll hang you by the balls’, Hom. *Il.* 17.288–9 τὸν . . . ποδὸς λάβε, Smyth §1346), while Haimon is ‘pressing against her, his arms round her middle’ (1223–5n.). At the end of the scene (1234–40), Ant.’s body is lying on the floor of the tomb. Since there is no mention during the intervening lines of Haimon’s freeing the body from the noose and laying it down, some critics have inferred that already at 1221–5 it is to be imagined as lying there with Haimon stretched out next to it. But this would require an implausible sense for κρεμαστήν (‘dead from hanging by the neck’), and also probably emendation of 1222 καθημμένην (‘tied’, ‘attached’) to καθεμμένην (‘lowered’). With 1220–3 as they stand, we should assume that Haimon takes the body down later while he grieves over it (or else we should just not worry about how it gets to the floor).

Ant. had been condemned to die slowly by starvation. Her decision to hasten her own end is natural enough, given her assertive and independent-minded nature, and her conviction that she has been abandoned by all. The method she employs, suicide by hanging, as well as being the most readily available (and following the example of her mother, cf. 53–4), underlines her virginal status (cf. 773–6n.), as her body is not penetrated (contrast 1282–3, 1301nn.; and cf. Loraux 1987: 7–17, 31–2, 38).

βρόχῳ μιτώδει σινδόνης ‘by <means of> a thread-woven noose of silk’. Instead of a rope, Ant. has used part of her clothing – perhaps her veil (κάλυμμα) or girdle (both symbols of wedding/funeral). σινδών (perhaps from ἴνδ-) can mean any fine, smooth-textured cloth, such as silk or linen.

καθημμένην ‘fastened’ (sc. to a roof-beam, or to whatever else in the rocky chamber the garment could be attached).

1223–5 τὸν δ’: Haimon had presumably broken into the tomb in order to join, and die with, his beloved Ant., though his motives are never made explicit and can only be guessed (cf. 751, 763–6, 1235 with nn.): the Messenger can report only what he saw. (But suggestions that Haimon intended to rescue her or to kill her – even that he *did* kill her (Adams 1955) – find little support in the text; cf. 1228–30n.)

ἄμφι μέσσηι περιπετῇ: active, ‘falling around/embracing <her>

round her waist' (as perhaps *Aj.* 907 περιπετοῦς, *A. Ag.* 233). The Ionic -σσ- of μέσσηι (rare in tragedy, but found again at 1236) is metrically convenient, and also perhaps provides a touch of 'epic' flavour for the messenger speech (cf. 115–16, 415–22, 417–18, 1240–1nn.; but also 86 πολλόν).

προσκεείμενον 'pressing up against <her>' (cf. 1243, 94n.); not 'lying beside her' (LSJ), for Ant. is not on the ground (1221–5n.) and πρόσκειμαι does not appear to be used in that sense.

εὐνῆς . . . τῆς κάτω φθοράν 'the ruination of <his> marriage-bed down below'. The phrase suggests both 'the loss of his bride' in death, and 'the corruption of his marriage-bed', as if Hades (with Kreon's connivance, cf. πατρός ἔργα) has seduced and stolen his fiancée; for this sense of φθορά, cf. LSJ *s.v.* φθορά 4, φθείρω 1.3, διαφθείρω 1.2, διαφθορά 1.3.

λέχος 'marriage', cf. 573. Because this repeats the sense of εὐνῆς in the previous line, Bergk emended to λάχος ('his miserable fortune'), perhaps rightly (cf. 1240–1, 1302–3nn.). LJ&W suggest deleting the whole line. It is striking (at least, to modern sensibilities) that there is no expression of commiseration for Ant.'s sufferings: she is simply εὐνή and λέχος, the object – once desired, now ruined and lost – of Haimon's aspirations, and hence now the source of his uncontrollable rage; see next n., and *Introd.* §5(e)(iii).

1226–36 The account of the confrontation between father and son is rapid and shocking. Kreon sees Haimon, starts to approach him, and begs him to come back out of the chamber; but Haimon spits in his father's face, draws his sword, and then, as Kreon runs away, turns it on himself. The focus is entirely on the two men: Haimon's fury has become reckless and homicidal, while the once-autocratic Kreon is now begging (1230) and dodging (1233–4). Ant. continues, as a corpse, to be the catalyst for their conflict: yet she herself is not addressed, perhaps not even mentioned, by either of them (text and interpretation are disputed: cf. 1226–7, 1228–30nn.).

1226–7 ὁ δ' ὡς ὄρᾱι σφε: the subject (ὁ δέ) must be Kreon. The object (σφε) could be sing. (= Haimon) or pl. (= Haimon and Ant.; cf. 44n.), and there is no need to exclude either: but the primary reference is clearly to his son, his overriding concern throughout and chief focus of the preceding three lines. Line 1227 αὐτόν confirms this.

ἔσω | χωρεῖ πρὸς αὐτόν 'he advanced inside <the chamber> towards him ...' Ant.'s body is lying at the back of the chamber (1220), already a 'resident of the world below' (852, 1069). Kreon approaches from the passage, and tries to draw Haimon back out, through the 'mouth' of the cave (1217), into the daylight world of the living (1230).

αὐτόν is the reading of all the MSS. But some critics have argued that here, and in 1228–30, Kreon does show a concern for the dead Ant., and that αὐτώ ('the two of them', Broadhead) or αὐτούς (Broadhead) should be read, or even αὐτήν (Ledbetter). The choice of reading is important: an expression by Kreon here of his feelings towards Ant. (pity, remorse, dismay, remonstrance) would go some way towards mitigating an audience's disapproval of him, and might compensate somewhat for the lonely and abandoned feelings to which Ant. previously gave voice (876–82, 913–28). Earlier, Kreon insisted, 'I myself imprisoned <her> and I shall myself be present to free <her>' (1112, in response to 1100–1); and 1228–9 might appear to address Ant. rather than Haimon or, ambiguously, to address each separately (1228–30n.). The case for emendation is thus quite strong. However, αὐτόν should probably be retained, for Haimon has been the prime concern of Kreon's search party, and one would expect the four 2nd p. sing. verbs in Kreon's brief speech to be addressed to the same individual. Once he has heard the 'wails' signifying Ant.'s death (1206 κωκυμάτων, cf. 1224–5), Kreon's concern for her release seems to have been superseded by anxiety for Haimon's safety (cf. 751, 766, 1066–7, 1078–9). (Against αὐτώ, it may also be doubted whether Haimon and Ant. qualify for the dual, which elsewhere in this play is reserved for brothers and sisters; cf. 2–3n. Conversely, of course, if αὐτώ or αὐτούς is adopted, it should be taken as a strong affirmation of this couple's claims: the Messenger, and implicitly Kreon too, now acknowledges them as a true 'pair'.)

1228–30 Kreon's short reported speech is preceded by a 'groan' (1226 οἰμώξας, cf. 1224–5) and accompanied by further 'shrieks' or 'wails' (1227 ἀνακωκύσας, cf. 1206, and 1079). The three lines represent his last, desperate appeal to his son to give up his suicidal course. Punctuation, enjambment, and rhythm contribute to the agitated mood, with five main verbs in three trimeters of short exclamatory and interrogative clauses (cf. too 1230 ἰκέσιος with n.).

ὦ τλήμον, οἶον ἔργον εἴργασαι: τλήμον is here perhaps both 'daring' and 'wretched' (LSJ *s.v.* 1.2 and 2.1; cf. 39n.); οἶον is exclamatory ('What a thing you have done!'), as e.g. *Tr.* 994–6, *OT* 1317. The 'act' that Haimon has committed is presumably that of breaking into the chamber and interfering with the execution; but it may be a mistake to be too precise – Kreon may also be wondering about Haimon's role in Ant.'s death (cf. 1223–5n.).

Could this exclamation (and the two questions that follow) be addressed to Ant., rather than to Haimon? At first glance, this alternative is attractive, for the 'deed' that Ant. has perpetrated (suicide) is certainly more concrete, and the 'destruction' that she has suffered (1229 διεφθάρης) more complete than Haimon's (see G. Ledbetter, *CQ* 41 (1991) 27–8). This interpretation stands or falls with replacement of αὐτόν in 1227 by αὐτῷ, αὐτοῦς or αὐτήν (see 1226–7n.). If one of these is adopted, Kreon shows remarkable concern for the woman whom he has previously suppressed so vehemently (unless, with Broadhead, we see this merely as bitter remonstrance against her for jeopardizing the life of his son). In any case, the element of uncertainty, even ambiguity (Haimon, or Ant., or both?) is dramatically effective, for even if αὐτόν is retained, with Haimon as addressee, Kreon's words apply so well to Ant. too that she cannot be completely excluded from our consideration. Thus, even as Kreon remonstrates with his son about his crazy actions, he reminds him (and us) of Ant.'s, and his own, ultimate responsibility.

τίνα νοῦν . . . ἐν τῷ συμφορᾷς . . . : addressed to Haimon, these questions are entirely natural: 'What did you think you were doing? What were the circumstances that made you lose <your mind>?' (For the partitive gen., ἐν τῷ (= τίνι) συμφορᾷς, cf. *Aj.* 314 ἐν τῷ πράγματι, *E. Hel.* 1195 ἐν τῷ δὲ κείσαι συμφορᾷς); If addressed to Ant., however, they would be less appropriate ('In what circumstances did you die?'), for these circumstances are all too obvious (unless συμφορᾷ could imply the 'unlucky outcome' that thwarted her rescue?).

διεφθάρης: addressed to Haimon, this must mean either 'you were ruined' (by joining the condemned woman) or 'you were destroyed in your mind' (with νοῦν understood again, cf. *E. Hel.* 1192 διέφθαρσαι φρένας, *Hom. Il.* 15.128 μαινόμενε, φρένας ἠλέ, διέφθορας). Earlier, Kreon and the Chorus commented on Haimon's

‘madness’ (633, 790); and his present conduct seems to confirm this diagnosis.

ἔξελθε, τέκνον κτλ.: here the reference is unambiguous, as Kreon seeks to persuade his son to leave the chamber of death. Nor does the style of address suggest that he is addressing Haimon for the first time: there is no expressed contrast between ‘you ...’ and ‘you ...’; rather, the asyndeton in 1230 seems to be resumptive and conclusive, and τέκνον is naturally taken as referring to the subject of the previous two lines.

ικέσιός σε λίσσομαι: predicative, cf. 823–5n. (and for the agitated resolution, 1108n.). Whether Kreon ‘extends his right hand in supplication’ (Jebb), or ‘has no time to make a formal gesture ...’ (Brown), is impossible to determine. In any case this is a complete reversal of his earlier attitude towards his son.

1231–7 The rapid sequence of events is recounted in a typical *tour de force* of messenger narration, using two long periods, the first ending abruptly in mid-line (1234 ἤμπλακ’), the second building up to Haimon’s final embrace of Ant. at line-end (1237 προσπτύσσεται). The tension and impact are enhanced by extensive subordination, enjambment, postponement of verbs, and alliteration (esp. π, τ in 1231–2, 1234, 1237–8, κ, ξ in 1232–3).

1232–3 πτύσας προσώπωι ‘spitting in (Kreon’s) face’, a gesture of extraordinary, almost sub-tragic, ferocity (and a strange echo of 653 πτύσας). The regular construction would be εἰς πρόσωπον, but cf. Kallim. fr. 687 κόλποισιν ἐπιπτύουσι γυναῖκες (and 1239 παρειᾶι). One genteel scholiast quaintly suggests, “‘Looking contemptuously with his expression”, not literally “spitting at” his father.’

διπλοῦς κνώδοντας ‘the double edges’, i.e. ‘his two-edged (sword)’. Others prefer, ‘double-hilted’ or ‘cross-hilted’.

1233–4 ‘But as his father rushed out in flight (ἐκ ... ὄρωμένου in tmesis, cf. 420n.), Haimon missed him (with the sword).’ The attempt at parricide is further proof of Haimon’s demented state (cf. 751n.).

1235 αὐτῶι χολωθείς: because he failed to kill his father? Because he tried? Because he failed to rescue Ant.? Any (all) of these motives are plausible.

ὥσπερ εἶχ’ ‘just as he was ...’, i.e. ‘immediately’, cf. 1108 ὡς ἔχω.

ἔπενταθείς: sc. ἔγχει; ‘tensing himself over <the sword>’, cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἐντείνω.

1236 ‘... he planted the sword, half its length, in his side’, cf. Pind. *P.* 10.51 ἄγκυραν ἔρεισον χθονί. (μέσσον is predicative; for the Ionic form, cf. 1223n.) ἔγχος = ξίφος (cf. 1232), as often in tragedy (*Aj.* 95, 286–7).

1236–7 ἔς δ’ ὕγρον | ἀγκῶν’ . . . προσπτύσσεται: a conflation of (i) ‘he took the maiden into his arms’, and (ii) ‘he clung to the maiden’ – as if Haimon began by attempting (i), and relapsed into (ii). Nothing is gained by adopting the variant παρθένον. ὕγρον seems to mean ‘flaccid’, ‘weak’ (cf. E. *Pho.* 1439 ὕγρὰν χέρα, in similar context). For προσπτύσσεται, cf. *Tr.* 767–8 προσπτύσσεται πλευραῖσιν . . . χιτῶν, and 886 περιπτύξαντες. For the alliteration (π, φ), cf. 1231–6n. Now Haimon turns his back on his father and the light of day (cf. 1230), to embrace his Underworld ‘bride’ (cf. 1240–1).

1238 ‘And, panting, he spurted a quick stream of bloody drops onto her white cheek.’ The sexual associations are strong (esp. after ἔς . . . ἀγκῶνα . . . παρθένω), as the fatal ‘marriage’ is finally consummated (cf. 1240–1). The line recalls A. *Ag.* 1389–90 κάκφυσιῶν ὄξειαν αἵματος σφαγῆν | βάλλει μ’ ἐρεμνῆι ψακάδι φοινίας δρόσου (again, of a dying husband), and some editors have emended to make it even closer: κάκφυσιῶν ὄξειαν ἐμβάλλει ῥοῆν . . . : satisfactory sense and easier syntax result (esp. for the dat. παρειᾷ), but the imagery is weakened, and the changes (which have little MS support) are not needed. For ἐκβάλλει ῥοῆν παρειᾷ (= ἐπὶ παρειᾷς or ἐς παρειάν), cf. 1232 προσώπω, E. *Pho.* 876.

1240–1 ἐν γ’ (Heath) is the most likely correction of the unmetrical ἐν of most MSS. The variant εἰν, an epic form not found in tragic dialogue, might be admissible in a messenger speech (cf. 1223 μέσσηι, 1236 μέσσον); but γε is appropriate here, ‘At least he received his marriage rites in Hades’ halls (sc. if not here on earth)’, cf. 750. For τέλη, cf. 1205, 806–16n.; possibly an allusion to Eleusinian rites may be detected too (cf. 1118–21n., *OC* 1050–3), as if Haimon and Ant. have found a kind of salvation in death.

1242–3 The Messenger concludes gnominically, as he began (ἐν ἀνθρώποισι, cf. 1156 ἀνθρώπου βίον, and 1192–5n.). His moral (the dangers of ἀβουλία) is already familiar from Teiresias’ warnings

(1025–8, 1050–2, 1098): now it gains new bite, with ἀνδρί referring equally to Haimon and to Kreon (Introd. §3, pp. 20–1). The construction is proleptic (δείξας ... τὴν ἀβουλίαν ὄσωι ... κτλ.), cf. 310–11. For πρόσκειται, cf. 1223, and 94n.

1244–56 As the narrative ends, the Chorus-leader points out in surprise that Eurydike has disappeared indoors. Elders and Messenger speculate: does her wordless departure mean trouble, or merely that she is keeping her grief private? The Messenger hopes for the best, the Elders (newly wise, cf. 1091–1114n.) suspect the worst. The Messenger goes to investigate.

Eurydike's silent departure is similar to Deianeira's at *Tr.* 813ff. (where the Chorus ask as she leaves, τί σίγ' ἀφέρπεις;); cf. too *OT* 1071ff., where Iokaste utters an ominous final couplet before sweeping out. Unlike these two women, however, Eurydike is not herself in any way responsible for the calamity she has just learned of; but her suicidal intent must none the less be obvious to any theatre audience (cf. 1301–5n.). The Messenger's rather obtuse observations, together with the Chorus' reserved responses, thus provide, not only a few moments of dramatic irony, but also a reminder of the gulf that exists between male and female mentalities. These stalwart citizens think first of the proprieties of lamentation (1246–9n.): no word of pity or concern for a mother's feelings.

1244–5 **πάλιν** | **φρούδη**: either **πάλιν** ('back again') or **πάλαι** ('just now', cf. 278–9) is possible.

ἔσθλὸν ἢ κακόν: polar expression for 'of any kind', cf. 39–40n.

1246–9 Lit. '... I am nourished by the hopes that, after hearing of her child's sufferings, she will not approve city-directed [= public] lamentations, but under her own roof inside will assign the family's grief to the domestic slave-women to bewail.' Traditionally, Greek lamentation was (and is) antiphonal, with one person (usually a woman close to the deceased) taking the lead, and others responding, more or less articulately, in unison (*Hom. Il.* 24.718–804; Alexiou 1974). So here, Eurydike's role will be 'to set forth (1249 προθήσειν, cf. 1100–11n.) the lament for the slave-women to moan' (στένειν epeexegetic, cf. 216 βαστάζειν). Ostentatious lamentation in public could be socially disruptive, and in fifth-century Athens displays of grief and funerary opulence were strictly limited (*Plut. Solon* 21.4–5, Foley 1992): the πρόθεσις had to be performed indoors, and

only by the women of the immediate family (cf. 1249 *δμῶαῖς, οἰκεῖτον*). The Messenger hopes that Eurydike (as might be expected of the wife of the civic-minded Kreon, cf. 1250) will observe (Athenian-style) propriety.

If γόους is the correct reading in 1247, the construction is elliptical, equivalent to ... οὐκ ἀξιώσειν γόους γοᾶσθαι ἐς πόλιν (cf. *Tr.* 49–51). An easy alteration, perhaps correct, is γόου ('she will not consider her son's sufferings worthy of city-wide lamentation'). For ἀξιώσειν, cf. 637–8.

1250 'For she is not devoid of good sense, so as to go wrong'; i.e. the bad news will not drive her to do anything rash. The line recalls Eurydike's assurance at 1191 (οὐκ ἄπειρος κτλ.).

1251–2 The Chorus are less optimistic: 'I don't know: in *my* view, for sure ...' (δ' οὖν, cf. 688n.). The triple repetition of ἦ τ' ἄγαν σιγή, χῆ μάτην ... βοή, 1256 τῆς ἄγαν ... σιγῆς (with ἄγαν, μάτην used adjectivally, an unusual idiom) emphasizes the extraordinary – hence ominous – suspense created by inappropriate silence.

1253–6 ἀλλ' εἰσόμυσθα 'But I *shall* know <soon> ...!' (poetic pl., as 1255 παραστείχοντες shows), answering 1251 οὐκ οἶδα (*GP* 7).

μή τι καὶ ... καλύπτει '... whether perhaps she is not in fact (καί, cf. 90, 772nn., *GP* 298–9) holding something back and concealing it ...' (κατάσχετον proleptic, 474–6n.). For μή + indicative, cf. 278–9n. (The sequence of κ/χ sounds here may be merely accidental.)

δόμους παραστείχοντες '... once I enter the house' (for this sense of the prefix παρα-, cf. *LSJ s.v. παρέρχομαι* III.2).

The Messenger hurries off into the palace, now no less anxious than the Elders (1255 εὖ γὰρ οὖν λέγεις) as to what he will find.

1257–1353 Scene Eight: Final Scene (*Kommos* and *Exodos*)

Kreon and attendants return up the side-entrance, carrying the body of Haimon. As Kreon laments and bitterly blames himself, he is soon joined by the returning Messenger, who comes out of the palace to announce the bloody suicide of Eurydike; her body too is brought on-stage. The play ends with Kreon abjectly acknowledging the ruin of his life, and the Chorus reiterating the value of piety and good sense.

The epirrhematic structure of this second *kommos* (cf. 801–82) is elaborately symmetrical:

choral anapaests (1257–60); *two pairs of lyric stanzas* from Kreon (1261–1300: str. α & str. β; ant. α & ant. β), interspersed with 1 ia. trim. from Chorus (1270), 6 lines of ia. trim. dialogue between Messenger and Kreon (1277–83), 1 ia. trim. from Chorus (1293), and 6(?) lines of ia. trim. from Messenger (1301–1305); *two more pairs of lyric stanzas* from Kreon (1306–46: str. γ & str. δ; ant. γ & ant. δ), again interspersed with regular numbers of ia. trim.: 2 + 1 + 2 = 5 (1312–16); 2 (1327–8); 2 + 1 + 2 = 5 (1334–9); *choral anapaests* (1347–53).

Although the scene brings no unexpected events or news, it does drive powerfully home the totality of Kreon's downfall, esp. through the characteristic tropes of lyric lament: exclamations (ἰὼ, ὦ, ὦμοι, αἰαῖ, οἴμοι, φεῦ), repetitive word-play (esp. *polyptoton* and *homoio-teleuton*), asyndeton, etc. – and doubtless through highly expressive music, dance, and gesture too. As the tableau of corpses is presented, one on each side of Kreon, his wails and self-recriminations present an absolute contrast to his earlier *machismo*: and, to the extent that we identified with him earlier as a confident, well-intentioned civic leader and father, we now share his misery and recognize that such reversal, and degradation, could happen to any of us (Introd. §5(g)). The solo voice, wailing, groaning, and calling out to the deceased, with responses from a surrounding group of townspeople, recalls the antiphonal lament of traditional Greek funerary practice. Usually the 'leader of the lament', and the responding chorus too, would be female or foreign (Alexiou 1974, cf. G. Holst-Wahrhaft, *Dangerous voices* (New York 1991) 98–126); but here the solo voice is that of the chief citizen (cf. 1257, 1278–80n.), his public downfall and self-abasement now complete.

At the same time, the Chorus, with their brief, orderly responses, render Kreon's lyric effusions metrically and politically less disturbing (and less permanent), by reason of the very symmetry and propriety of their comments. While Kreon sings in agitated dochmiac metre, accompanied by the evocative sounds of the *aulos*, the Elders and the Messenger maintain a more sober tone, with their chanted anapaests and spoken trimeters. Thus the prevailing mood

at the end is one of misery and humiliation on the part of the ruling family, isolation for Kreon in particular, but for the community at large, a readiness to accept the present and move on into the future, a little wiser and more resilient than before; see 1091–1114n., Introd. §5(f).

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α and β

(1257–60 Recitative anapaests from Chorus)

| | | |
|------|--|---------------------------|
| 1261 | $\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ω}}, \overset{\cup}{\text{φ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}} \overset{\cup}{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{φ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{η}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}$ | ××// 2 dochmiacs |
| 1284 | $\bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ω}}, \bar{\text{ι}}\bar{\text{ω}} \overset{\cup}{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{Ἄ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{η}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}},$ | |
| 1262 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}} \overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{᾽}},$ | dochmiac |
| 1285 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{᾽}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}} \overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{᾽}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ὀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}};$ | |
| 1263 | $\bar{\text{ὦ}} \overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}} \overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}$ | 2 cretics |
| 1286 | $\bar{\text{ὦ}} \overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{γ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{γ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}} \overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}$ | |
| 1264 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{β}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἐ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{φ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}}.$ | 2 dochmiacs// |
| 1287 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ψ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{χ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{η}}, \overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}} \overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{γ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}};$ | |
| 1265 | $\bar{\text{ὦ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἐ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{β}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}} \overset{\cup}{\text{β}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}.$ | 2 dochmiacs |
| 1288 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ί}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}, \overset{\cup}{\text{ὀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{᾽}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{᾽}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἐ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ξ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}.$ | |
| 1266 | $\bar{\text{ἰ}}\bar{\text{ω}} \overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}, \overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ξ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}} \overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}},$ | 2 dochmiacs// |
| 1289 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{φ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{η}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}}, \overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}, \overset{\cup}{\text{τ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{᾽}} \overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ὺ}} \overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{γ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}},$ | |
| 1267 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ί}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ί}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}},$ | 2 sp. (or ia.)// |
| 1290 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ί}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ί}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}},$ | (or <i>extra metrum</i>) |
| 1268 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{ἐ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}}, \overset{\cup}{\text{ἀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{η}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}},$ | dochmiac |
| 1291 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{φ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{γ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἐ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{π}}\overset{\cup}{\text{᾽}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ὀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ω}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}$ | |
| 1269 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{ἐ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ὺ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}} \overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{δ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{β}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{λ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ς}}.$ | 2 dochmiacs// |
| 1292 | $\overset{\cup}{\text{γ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{υ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}} \overset{\cup}{\text{ἀ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{φ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{κ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ε}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}}\overset{\cup}{\text{σ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{θ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{α}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ι}} \overset{\cup}{\text{μ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ρ}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ο}}\overset{\cup}{\text{ν}};$ | |

(1270 = 1293 Iambic trimeter from Chorus/Messenger)

| | | |
|------|--|-------------------------|
| 1271 | οἴμοι, | spondee// |
| 1294 | οἴμοι, | (<i>extra metrum</i>) |
| 1272 | ἔχω μαθῶν δειλαιος· ἐν δ' ἔμωι κάραι | iambic trimeter |
| 1295 | κακὸν τοδ' ἄλλο δευτερον βλεπω ταλας. | |
| 1273 | θεὸς τοτ' ἄρα τότε με μεγά βάρους ἔχων | 2 dochmiacs// |
| 1296 | τις ἄρα, τις με ποτμος ἐτι περιμενει; | |
| 1274 | ἔπαισεν, ἐν δ' ἔσεισεν ἀγριαῖς ὁδοῖς, | iambic trimeter |
| 1297 | ἔχω μεν ἐν χειρεσσιν ἀρτιως τεκνον, | |
| 1275 | οἴμοι λακπατητον ἀντρεπων χαραν. | dochmiac + |
| 1298 | ταλας, ταν δ' ἐναντα προσβλεπω νεκρον. | 'hex. dochmiac' |
| 1276 | φευ φευ, ἰω πονοι βροτων δυσπονοι. | 2 dochmiacs// |
| 1300 | φευ φευ, ματερ ἀθλια, φευ τεκνον. | |

(1277–83 = 1301–5 Six iambic trimeters from Messenger and Kreon)

Strophe and antistrophe γ and δ

| | | |
|------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1306 | αἴαι αἴαι, | iambic// (or <i>extra metrum</i>) |
| 1328 | ἰτω ἰτω, | |
| 1307 | ἀνεπταν φοβωι. τι μ' οὐκ ἀνταιαν | 2 dochmiacs |
| 1329 | φανητω μορων ὁ καλλιστ' ἔχων | |
| 1308 | ἔπαισεν τις ἀμφιθηκτωι ξιφει; | 2 dochmiacs |
| 1330 | ἔμοι τερμιαν ἀγων ἀμεραν | |
| 1310 | δειλαιος ἔγω, αἴαι, | dochmiac// |
| 1331 | ὑπατος· ἰτω ἰτω, | |

1276 = 1300). As usual, the exclamations also admit a wide latitude concerning prosody, hiatus, and correption. Frequent repetition and *polyptoton* add further to the quasi-ritual intensity (1261 φρενῶν δυσφρόνων, 1276 πόννοι δύσπονοι, 1266 νέος νέωι, 1310–11 δειλαίος ... δειλαίαι, 1319–22 ἐγὼ ... ἐγὼ ... ἐγὼ ... ἄγετε ... ἄγετε ..., 1328, 1331 ἴτω ἴτω, etc.).

For the most part, the runs of dochmiacs continue in *synaphoeia* (i.e. without break or pause), in periods of between two and six cola. The rate of exact respension between strophe and antistrophe (i.e. avoidance of — corresponding to ∪∪) is higher in strophic pairs α and γ than in β and δ; but this may not be significant.

The dochmiac is a highly emotional metre, and, because of its affinity with iambics, is well suited to interchanges such as these between characters in varying degrees of distress. Thus the ia. trimeters from the Messenger and Chorus (probably spoken, rather than chanted, or sung; cf. Dale 1968: 86, 208), and the introductory and closing anapaests from the Chorus, both blend sympathetically with Kreon's *aulos*-accompanied lyrics, while also casting into relief the solitariness of his lament.

1257–60 καὶ μὴν κτλ.: 526–30n.

διὰ χειρὸς ἔχων: Kreon may be carrying his son's body himself, as this line and 1298 suggest (but cf. 916n., and 1345). More likely, it is borne by the attendants, with Kreon perhaps holding the head or hand as he walks next to them.

εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν: cf. *OC* 1556, and 880 θέμις with n. Hitherto, the Elders have been reluctant to criticize their king (278–9, 332–75, 1091–1114nn.). Now at last they speak out more bluntly to blame him; but they still maintain their cautious, correct manner.

μνημ' ἐπίσημον: Haimon's corpse is a 'conspicuous (or 'clearly stamped', cf. 998n.) monument' to Kreon's ruin.

οὐκ ἄλλοτρίαν | ἄτην (in apposition to μνημα) 'nobody else's folly' but Kreon's own (cf. 1187 οἰκείου κακοῦ); for ἄτην, cf. 4, 582–65nn.

αὐτὸς ἁμαρτών: cf. 1023–32n., and 875, 1111–12nn.

1261–9 Kreon echoes the Elders' verdict (1261 ἁμαρτήματα), and proclaims his own foolishness (cf. 95, 1023–32, 1242–3nn.).

1262 στερεά ‘stubborn’, cf. 473–6, 1026–8, and *Aj.* 926 στερεόφρων.

1263–4 ὦ . . . βλέποντες: addressed to the Chorus, as representatives of all Thebes (cf. 155ff., 937–43, 988, 1155), and – like the audience – as ‘spectators’ of all that has happened (Introd. §5(f), pp. 55–8). For the jingle, κτανόντας (father) / θανόντας (son), cf. 1266n.

1265 ἀνολβα βουλευμάτων: a kind of partitive gen. (cf. 1209 ἄσημα . . . βοῆς), but suggesting also an exclamatory gen. (as it were: ὦμοι ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων, ὡς ἀνολβά ἐστιν); cf. too 1025–6.

1266 νέος νέωι ξὺν μόρωι ‘young, and by an untimely death’ (Jebb); but νέωι may also suggest ‘novel’, ‘unusual’ (schol. καινοπρεπεῖ), and perhaps even ‘a young man’s <death>’ (cf. 726–9, 766–7; also 1283). For the ritualistic *polyptoton*, cf. 1263–4, 1257–1353nn.

1268 ἀπελύθης ‘you were dismissed’ sc. ‘from life’, as at 1314 (a sense for ἀπολύω otherwise found only in later Greek).

1270–2 The theme of ‘learning too late’ is common in tragedy (cf. 1270–2, *Tr.* 934, *OC* 1264, *E. Ba.* 1345, all with ὄψέ: see too 925–8, 1353). For the periphrastic perfect (ἔχω μαθῶν), cf. 21–2n.

1272–4 Two constructions, and two images, seem to be merged: (i) ‘a god leaped onto my head’ (cf. 1345–6 with n., *OT* 263; for ἐν in this sense, see LSJ *s.v.* 1.8); (ii) ‘god struck me’. θεός is unspecific, but must refer both to the power that formerly (τότε) impelled Kreon to lose his mind, and to the present source of his cruel punishment (cf. 1074–6, 1104, 1199–1200, and 1260 ἄτην).

μέγα βάρος ἔχων ‘with all his weight (= σφόδρα βαρὺς ὢν, Jebb; cf. 300–1). The word-order of several MSS, μέγα βάρος μ’ ἔχων, is defended by Jebb and others, but seems impossible, if με is to be object of ἔπαισεν.

1274–5 ‘. . . hurled me (ἐν δ’ ἔσεισεν = tmesis, 420n.; cf. too 583) into wild paths, overturning my happiness <so that it has become> trampled’ (λακπάτητον proleptic, 474–6n.); cf. *A. Eum.* 110 λάξ πατούμενα, *Cho.* 643. For the syncopation (*apokopē*) of ἀνατρέπων, cf. 467 ἠνσχόμεν, *Tr.* 528, *OC* 1070. The language suggests a chariot careering off-course, as a result of an assault on the driver (cf. *E. Hkls* 779–80, *A. Pers.* 163–4); contrast 140, 162–3, 477–8nn.

1278–1316 The Messenger comes back out of the palace, to re-

port Eurydike's death. No full-scale 'messenger speech' is required this time (1192–1243n.), since the news is already expected; instead, the few narrative details are interspersed between Kreon's lyrics, as part of the epirrhematic exchange. Some MSS call this character 'Εξάγγελος ('Reporter of Events Indoors'), or Οικέτης ('Domestic Servant'): but he is obviously the same individual as the first Messenger ('Ἄγγελος, cf. 1253–6 with nn.).

1278–80 Once again the Messenger leads up to his crushing news with careful generalities (cf. 1155–60). The syntax and rhetorical antitheses are convoluted, though the gist is clear: the troubles (κακά) that Kreon already 'holds in his hands' (ἔχων, expanded in τὰ μὲν πρὸ χειρῶν τάδε ..., i.e. Haimon's corpse) are matched by new ones that he 'has in store in the palace' (κεκτημένος, expanded in τὰ δ' ἐν δόμοις ..., i.e. Eurydike's corpse). Unscrambled, the construction would run as follows: ὡς ἔοικας ἦκειν ἔχων τε κακά καὶ κεκτημένος (κακά) – τὰ μὲν πρὸ χειρῶν τάδε φέρων, τὰ δ' ἐν δόμοις τάχ' ὀψόμενος. The presence of ἔοικας has apparently attracted ὀψόμενος into the infinitive. (For the exclamatory ὡς ἔοικας ..., cf. 1270.)

The MS reading presents two anomalies: (i) the combination ἦκειν καὶ ὄψεσθαι (where one verb would normally be subordinated as a participle; but see Jebb for parallels), and (ii) the asymmetry of τὰ μὲν ... φέρων, τὰ δ' ... ἔοικας ... ὄψεσθαι. Of attempts to eliminate both, simplest is Hartung's φέρειν, followed by ἦκων (Brunck, so that τὰ μὲν ... φέρειν balances τὰ δ' ... ὄψεσθαι); or we could just adopt ἦκων, while retaining (ii). Another possibility is φέρεις (Brunck, curing (ii) only). But neither anomaly is intolerable, and change is unnecessary.

1281 'What still worse calamity is there now, to follow upon <existing> calamities?' ἐκ is a certain correction of the nonsensical MS ἦ, cf. Hom. *Il.* 19.290 δέχεται κακὸν ἐκ κακοῦ, *Tr.* 28, *OT* 1364–5.

1282–3 **παμμήτωρ** 'completely a mother'; she had nothing to live for after her sons' deaths (cf. *OT* 930 παντελής δάμαρ, opp. *El.* 1154 μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ); cf. too 1301n.

νεοτόμοισι πλήγμασιν: cf. *Tr.* 1130 τέθνηκεν ἀρτίως νεοφαγῆς (and 1266n.) The sword is the characteristic mode of suicide in tragedy for wives and mothers, esp. in response to the violent death of child or husband, as a kind of 'self-sacrifice' or atonement: e.g. Dei-

aneira in *Tr.*, Iokaste in *E. Pho.* 1456–9, and cf. Loraux 1987: 13–17, 23–4. (See further 1236–7, 1301–5, 1301nn.; and contrast 1221–2n.)

1284–5 *δυσκάθατος . . . λιμὴν*: the ‘haven’ of Hades (cf. 810–11, 893–4) is especially ‘hard to cleanse’ for Kreon because he has caused the bloody deaths of his own φίλοι (contrast 775–6, 1143); cf. van Nes 1963: 168–71.

1286–8 ὦ . . . | *προπέμψας*: addressed to the Messenger (= 1289 παῖ), ‘You who have brought with you these evil tidings for me’ (sc. ‘from indoors’, cf. LSJ *s.v.* προπέμπω π).

1288 ‘You <took> a man <who was already> crushed, <and> did <him> in again!’, cf. 1029–30.

1289–92 ‘What new, bloody death now – my wife’s – do you say lies piled on top of death (sc. Haimon’s)?’ σφάγιον here is probably adjectival, with μόρον. The verb ἀμφικείμεσθαι may suggest the image of one corpse ‘entwined’ with another (cf. 1240), or of both deaths being ‘wrapped’ around Kreon (μοι) like a harness or clothes (LSJ *s.v.* ἀμφιτίθημι). The reading in 1289 is uncertain: the MS τίνα λέγεις μοι νέον λόγον; does not respond metrically to 1266. Enger’s τίν’ αὖ . . ., with the omission of λόγον (Triclinius), gives us the two dochmiacs we need and does away with the weak repetition from 1287.

τί φῆς, παῖ: corresponding to ἰὼ παῖ in the strophe. There (and at 1340) the appeal is to his ‘son’, here he is addressing the Messenger (‘slave’ or ‘young man’, cf. *OT* 1008). Some have found this discrepancy inappropriate, and emended to (e.g.) τί φῆς; τίνα λέγεις νέον μοι λόγον (see previous n.).

1293 The palace door opens, and Eurydike’s body is brought into view. It is unclear whether the Messenger or the Chorus speaks this line: probably the former (cf. 1314n.), though the Chorus spoke 1270, the corresponding line in the strophe (cf. 1281 = 1303). More important dramatically is the question, how the body was conveyed into the audience’s view: was it carried by attendants, or rolled in on the *ekkyklēma*, a low platform wheeled through the central door to ‘reveal’, by theatrical convention, an interior scene (Taplin 1977: 442–3)? Most commentators opt for the *ekkyklēma* here, presenting a tableau of Eurydike slumped over the courtyard altar (cf. 1301): comparable tableaux of violent death occur at *Aj.* 344, *El.* 1458. But S.’s technique in those passages is to have someone proclaim, ‘Open the doors, and look . . .!’, whereas here we have the opposite, ‘You can

see <her>; <she> is no longer in the recesses of the house.’ So probably her body is carried in, and placed near Kreon, on his other side from Haimon’s. (If the *ekkyklēma* was indeed used, this line is unusual for its acknowledgement of the artificiality of the stage conventions.)

1298 τὰν δ’ . . . νεκρόν ‘and now I see *her* in front of me, dead’. This makes a sharper contrast than τὸν δ’ (‘I see the other corpse . . .’).

1301–5 The Messenger describes Eurydike’s dying posture, and her bitter final words, as if he had witnessed them. She chose to die ‘at the altar’ (1301 βωμῖα), presumably that of Zeus *herkeios* in the inner courtyard, symbolizing the integrity of the family (cf. 487; also 1184–5n.). Her death thus completes the ruination of Kreon’s *oikos*, and her final words amount to a virtual curse on her husband for causing the death of both their sons (1303–5, cf. 1312–13, 927–8).

One line is probably missing, since the speech should be six lines long, to match 1278–83 (though symmetry is not quite exact: we have no contribution from Kreon, as at 1281). The obvious place to mark the lacuna is after 1301, which is itself corrupt.

1301 † ἡ δ’ ὀξύθηκτος . . . περίξ†: the MS reading is impossible, since ἡ and ἦδε cannot both be right, ὀξύθηκτος (‘sharp-edged’) can hardly be used of a person, and περίξ, though an acceptable tragic word (‘all around’), cannot combine with adjectival βωμῖα to mean ‘embracing the altar’. Since the next line is missing, no emendation can be much more than a guess. Arndt’s is plausible: ἡ δ’ ὀξυθήκτωι βωμῖα περι ξίφει . . . (‘At the altar, over a sharp-edged sword, she [. . . fell]’); cf. 1309, and *Aj.* 828. In using the same instrument (sword, or sacrificial knife) as was used on both sons, and making herself a ‘victim’ like them (cf. 1291 σφάγιον, 1240–1 τέλη), she proves herself ‘all-mother’ (1282n.).

1302 λύει κελαινὰ βλέφαρα ‘she released her eyes into darkness’ (proleptic, 474–6n.), cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.296 λύθη ψυχὴ τε μένος τε, *OC* 1720–1 ἔλυσεν τέλος . . . βίου, E. *IT* 692.

1302–3 τοῦ πρὶν θανόντος Μεγαρέως: from this passage, and from the hints at 993–5, 1058, 1312–13 (and cf. 1191, 1250), it appears that S.’s audience must be familiar with a version of the Theban myth in which Teiresias had predicted, at a moment of crisis, that Kreon’s elder son could guarantee Thebes’ safety – and Kreon’s successful rule – by dying for the city: when the son did die (by

whatever means), Kreon was held to some degree responsible (1303–5, 1312–13). This version may have been contained in the epic cycle, or (e.g.) in Stesichoros (Introd. §2, pp. 5–7). In A. *Th.*, one of the Theban champions is Μεγαρεύς, Κρέοντος σπέρμα, τοῦ Σπαρτῶν γένους . . . , and it is asserted that he will either ‘repay his debt to the soil by dying’ or win a glorious victory (*Th.* 474–9). In E. *Pho.* 930–1018, Teiresias reveals that, for the city to repel the Argives, a descendant of the ‘Sown Men’ must die: the only three living Spartoi are Kreon and his two sons, and, since Haimon (in that play) is already married, it is his younger brother, named Menoikeus (like his grandfather, cf. *Ant.* 156, 211), who gallantly commits suicide to save his city (so too Statius, *Theb.* 10.650–826): this is probably E.’s own invention (Mastronarde 1994: 28–9). Whether or not we are entitled to regard E.’s Menoikeus and S.’s Megareus as the same person (as the scholiasts do, here and at E. *Pho.* 988), thematically the stories are almost identical (‘allomorphs’), and each performs essentially the same function.

κενὸν λέχος ‘her bed, empty of Megareus . . . and also of Haimon here’. The MS κλεινὸν λέχος is absurd. Some prefer to emend to κλεινὸν λάχος (‘the glorious fate of Megareus . . .’), but this strikes too cheerful a note, and does not suit Haimon’s situation at all (αὔθις δὲ τοῦδε).

1304–5 λοίσθιον ‘finally’, adverbial; cf. *Aj.* 468.

σοὶ κακὰς | πράξεις ἐφουμνήσασα: lit. ‘singing evil-doings at you’, i.e. both blaming (‘charging you with evil actions’) and cursing (‘invoking evil fortunes on you’). For this perverted ‘hymn’ accompanying her ‘sacrifice’, cf. 658–9 (also 927–8). Her suicide, like *Ant.*’s and Haimon’s, is an act, not merely of despair, but of retaliation, against the ‘child-murderer’ (παιδοκτόνῳ); cf. 1312–13n.

1307 ἀνέπταν φόβῳ ‘I flutter with dread’ (sc. at the curses), a ‘dramatic’ aorist (Smyth §1937), cf. *Aj.* 693 ἔφριξ’ ἔρωτι, *OC* 1466.

1307–8 ἀνταίαν: sc. πληγὴν; ‘(. . . strike me) right in the chest’, cf. *OC* 544 δευτέραν ἔπαισας, and *El.* 195–6; also 994n. Like many mentions of suicide, or requests to be killed, in tragedy, Kreon’s outburst is hyperbolic and momentary, not meant literally (cf. E. *Alk.* 228–30, A. *Prom.* 582–3).

1310–11 Metre and reading are uncertain: αἰαῖ is a conjecture for the MS φεῦ φεῦ, which does not respond with 1331 ἴτω ἴτω.

συγκέκραμαι δῦαι ‘I am dissolved by misery’; or perhaps ‘I have been mixed into misery’ (like water in wine), cf. *Aj.* 895 οἴκτωι συγκεκραμένην, *Ar. Plout.* 850–3, *A. Cho.* 744–6 with Garvie’s n.

1312–13 ‘Yes (γε), you were indicted by the woman who lies here dead, as bearing the blame for this death and for that one too’ (i.e. Haimon’s and Megareus’; μόρων = poetic plural, cf. *El.* 205). ἐπισκήπτω/-ομαι, ἐπίσκηψις are legal terms in Athens, for the first stage in a prosecution.

1314 ‘And how exactly (καί, cf. 772n.) did she set about dispatching herself?’ (inceptive imperfect). The MSS have κάπελύσατ(ο), but a passive form of the verb is needed (cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἀπολύω, and 1268 ἀπελύθης, with n.), and the scholiast seems to have read the imperf. (τίνι τρόπῳ ... ἐλύετο ... εἰς φονάς;). It is possible (as Campbell suggests) that this line is spoken by the Chorus, rather than Kreon (so too 1293, even 1281; cf. 1293n.). But the tension is maintained better by uninterrupted contact between Kreon and the Messenger; see further 1326–53n.

1315–16 παίσασ’ ... αὐτόχειρ αὐτήν: cf. 1172–7, esp. 1175 αὐτόχειρ. The ἥπαρ (not always as specific as ‘liver’; rather ‘guts’, ‘belly’) is a common target of such sword-thrusts (*Tr.* 930–1, *E. Or.* 1063 παίσας πρὸς ἥπαρ, with Willink’s n.); cf. too 1236.

ὅπως | ... ἦισθετο ‘when she learned ...’ (LSJ *s.v.* ὅπως A.1.7).

1317–18 Lit. ‘These <events> will never <pass> out of my responsibility <and> fit anyone else <instead>.’ Kreon will have to live with the blame for ever. For ἀρμόσει (intransitive), cf. *OT* 902, *El.* 1293 (also 570).

1319 ἐγὼ σ’ ἔκανον: this additional σε was inserted by Hermann to cure the hiatus of the MS ἐγὼ ἔκανον.

1320–4 ἀγέτέ μ’ ... κτλ. ‘Take me at once, lead me off, out of the way ...!’ (cf. Oidipous at *OT* 1340–1). The entourage (attendants, corpses, Kreon himself) begins to depart down one of the side-entrances (with the Chorus probably exiting by the other), a movement that recalls Ant.’s departure to execution – as does Kreon’s language (cf. 885–7 οὐκ ἄξεθ’ ὡς τάχιστα καὶ ... | ἄφετε μόνην ἐρῆμον κτλ.; also 773–80). Or they may escort Kreon into the palace (Rehm 1994: 68). In 1322, τάχιστ’ (Erfurd) is needed for the metre, instead of the MS τάχος (requiring *brevis in longo*, ταχῶς).

1325 ‘... one who no more exists than a non-person!’, a striking expression of loss and emptiness (cf. 567, 1167, 1170; also 234n., *Tr.* 1107–8). μή perhaps connotes generic nothingness (493–4n., and cf. *Aj.* 1114, 1231 with Stanford’s n., Moorhouse 1982: 338–9).

1326–53 From here on, although the MS attributions are confused, it must be the Chorus who interact with Kreon; the Messenger has presumably joined the exit-procession. It is usual for the last words in a tragedy to be delivered by the Chorus; and in this case, with the collapse of their ruler, the Elders have taken over as the chief representatives of the community (1091–1114, 1257–1353nn.). It is they – dull, conventional, but safe – who now define what needs to be done, and in what order (1334–5); they who reformulate Kreon’s words of dismay into less threatening maxims (1326–7, 1335); and they who preach the final moral (1350–3).

1327 ‘Briefest is best, when troubles are in the way’: tritely sententious. τάν ποσιν κακά responds to 1322 ἐκποδών (cf. 1339), while κέρδη, κέρδος (1326) may recall Kreon’s misguided assertions at 1035–9 (cf. too 221–2n.).

1328–31 ‘Let it come, let it appear, that fairest of fates [lit. ‘of fates, the one that is doing finest’] for me, supreme, the one that brings my last day!’ The MS μόρων ... ἐμῶν (‘of all my fates’) makes no sense (esp. since μόρος in tragedy always means ‘death’); ἔχων is the simplest correction, and makes easier syntax for κάλλιστα. For τερμίαν, cf. *OC* 89 χώραν τερμίαν (of Oidipous’ ‘final destination’); the word is found nowhere else.

1334–5 ‘That (sc. your death) lies in the future. It is about the present that one should be doing something; for these matters are taken care of by those who should take care of them.’ τῶνδ’ is usually taken to have the same referent as ταῦτα, i.e. the prospect of death for Kreon in the (near) future, with ὅτοισι meaning ‘the gods’ (cf. 1337–8). But, with no pronoun to limit χρῆ πρόσσειν, and τῶνδ’ standing close to τῶν προκειμένων, we may also understand, ‘You and/or we must take care of the present: that’s our job.’ Through this bland vagueness, and their brisk, flat expressions, the Chorus maintain an emotional distance from the wailing figure before them, and remind him (and the audience) that life must go on.

1336 ‘But I summed up (συγκάτ-, cf. 1202) in my prayer (= 1328–

32) those things that I desire' (i.e. death). For solitary μέν, cf. 11n.: the implied contrast is with affairs of 'the present', in which Kreon has no further interest.

1337 'Then don't make any prayers at all!' (sc. 'if all you desire to pray for is death').

1339 ἄγοιτ' ἄν 'Please take <me> away!', cf. 80–1, 1320–4nn.

μάταιον: both 'rash' and 'useless'.

1340–3 Kreon addresses both corpses in turn, too distraught to face either. The MS text is amiss (esp. metrically) in several places, but the corrections are mostly straightforward: κατέκανον (κατακαίνω) for κατέκτανον; deletion of repeated ὅς in 1341 and of ὅπαι in 1343; αὖ τάνδ' ('and you also, here, . . .') for the incomprehensible αὐτάν in 1341; and Musgrave's neat πᾶι κλιθῶ ('(I don't have) anywhere to lean for support') for πᾶι καὶ θῶ.

1343–6 Once so sure of the 'straightness' of his course as ruler of the city (162–3n.), Kreon finally sees everything 'askew' (λέχρια, used metaphorically only here), his 'head' assailed by a fate as unbearable as that contemplated by Ant. in the opening lines (1 κάρα, cf. 2–6, 594–600, and 1203, 1272–4).

τὰν χεροῖν, τὰ δ' ἐπὶ κρατί μοι . . .: the contrast is between 'the visible circumstances and the invisible hand of fate' (Campbell), and perhaps too between 'Haimon, here in my arms' and 'Eurydike' . . . ; or 'things at hand' vs 'the future'.

εἰσήλατο: ἄλλομαι occurs with similar force at *OT* 263 νῦν δ' ἐς τὸ κείνου κρᾶτ' ἐνήλαθ' ἢ τύχη, 1311 (and cf. above, 1272–4n.).

1347–53 As Kreon is led away by his attendants, the Chorus close the play with a conventional anapaestic cap, extolling the merits of 'good sense' (φρονεῖν) and 'piety' (μηδὲν ἄσεπτεῖν). Though this familiar 'lesson' (1353 ἐδίδαξαν) may be small recompense for the pain suffered by Ant., Haimon, Eurydike, and Kreon, the persistence of a stolid, communal voice is an important element in the texture of this final scene. Kreon is shattered, his family and that of Oidipous virtually obliterated; but the mundane life of normal Thebans continues (Introd. §5(f)).

τὸ φρονεῖν: cf. 1353, 1242–3n., Introd. §5(d)(iii).

εὐδαιμονίας | πρῶτον ὑπάρχει 'is laid down as the first principle of happiness' (or 'of the good life').

μηδὲν ἄσεπτεῖν: an indirect vindication of Ant. (cf. 943n.).

μεγάλοι δὲ λόγοι . . . τῶν ὑπεράυχων: cf. 127–33 with n. (and for the word-order, cf. 944–5).

πληγὰς . . . | ἀποτείσαντες ‘by paying (or ‘after paying’) the price in blows . . .’

γῆραι . . . ἐδίδαξαν ‘in old age (they) teach good sense’ (gnomic aorist): i.e. people (like Kreon himself) learn only (too) late, after/through suffering (175–7, 925–6, 1270–2 with nn.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, S. M. 1955 'The *Antigone* of Sophocles', *Phoenix* 9: 47–62
- Aerts, W. J. 1965 *Periphrastica* (Amsterdam)
- Alexanderson, B. 1966 'Die Stellung des Chors in der *Antigone*', *Eranos* 64: 85–105
- Alexiou, M. 1974 *The ritual lament in Greek tradition* (Cambridge)
- Anouilh, J. 1958 *Five plays*, vol. 1 (*Antigone* first produced in French 1944; Eng. tr. L. Galantière, New York)
- Bain, D. 1981 *Masters and servants in Greek tragedy* (Manchester)
- Beckerman, B. 1970 *The dynamics of drama* (New York)
1990 *Theatrical presentation* (New York)
- Belsey, C. 1985 *The subject of tragedy* (London)
- Benardete, S. 1975 'A reading of Sophocles' *Antigone*, I, II, III', *Interpretation* 4: 148–96, 5: 1–55, 148–84
- Bennett, S. 1997 *Theatre audiences* (2nd ed., New York)
- Benveniste, E. 1966 *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, vol. 1 (Paris)
- Blundell, M. W. 1989 *Helping friends and harming enemies* (Cambridge)
- Bowra, C. M. 1944 *Sophoclean tragedy* (Oxford)
- Bradley, A. C. 1905 *Shakespearean tragedy* (London)
- Bradshaw, A. T. von S. 1962 'The Watchman scenes in the *Antigone*', *CQ* 56: 200–11
- Brown, A., ed. 1987 *Sophocles: Antigone* (Warminster)
- Bruhn, E. 1899 *Anhang*, to F. W. Schneidewin & A. Nauck, eds., *Sophokles* (Berlin)
- Bundy, E. L. 1961 *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley)
- Burkert, W. 1985 *Greek religion* (tr. J. Raffan, Oxford)
- Burton, R. W. B. 1980 *The chorus in Sophocles' tragedies* (Oxford)
- Buxton, R. G. A. 1995 *Sophocles* (Greece & Rome New Surveys, Oxford)
- Cameron, A., & Kuhrt, A., eds. 1983 *Images of women in antiquity* (London)
- Campbell, J. K. 1964 *Honour, family, and patronage* (Oxford)
- Campbell, L., ed., 1879 *Sophocles: the plays and fragments* (2nd ed., Oxford)
- Cole, A. T. 1988 *Epiploke: rhythmic continuity and poetic structure in Greek lyric* (Cambridge, MA)

- Coleman, R. 1972 'The role of the Chorus in Sophocles' *Antigone*', *PCPS* 18: 4-27
- Coray, M. 1993 *Wissen und Erkennen bei Sophokles* (Basel)
- Cropp, M. 1997 'Antigone's final speech (Sophocles, *Antigone* 891-928)', *G&R* 44: 137-60
- Csapo, E., & Slater W. J., eds. 1995 *The context of ancient drama* (Ann Arbor)
- Dale, A. M. 1968 *The lyric metres of Greek drama* (2nd ed., Cambridge)
- Dalfen, J. 1977 'Gesetz ist nicht Gestetzt. ...: Die Sprache der Personen in der sophokleischen *Antigone*', *WS* 90: 5-20
- Davidson, J. F. 1983 'The parodos of the *Antigone*: a poetic study', *BICS* 30: 41-51
- Dawe, R. D. 1973-8 *Studies on the text of Sophocles* (3 vols., Leiden)
- De Marinis, M. 1987 'Dramaturgy of the spectator', *The Drama Review* 31.2: 100-14
- Diller, H., ed. 1967 *Sophokles* (Wege der Forschung 95, Darmstadt)
- Ditmars, E. van N. 1992 *Sophocles' Antigone: lyric shape and meaning* (Pisa)
- Dodds, E. R. 1951 *The Greeks and the irrational* (Berkeley)
- Dollimore, J. 1989 *Radical tragedy: religion, ideology and power in the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries* (2nd ed., Brighton)
- Dover, K. J. 1960 *Greek word order* (Cambridge)
- 1974 *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford)
- duBois, P. 1988 *Sowing the body* (Chicago)
- Earp, F. R. 1944 *The style of Sophocles* (Cambridge)
- Easterling, P. E. 1977 'Character in Sophocles', *G&R* 24: 121-9
- 1978 'The Second Stasimon of *Antigone*', in R. D. Dawe *et al.*, eds., *Dionysiaca* (Cambridge) 141-58
- 1984 'Kings in Greek tragedy', in J. Coy and J. de Hoz, eds., *Estudios sobre los generos literarios II* (Salamanca) 33-45
- 1988 'Women in tragic space', *BICS* 34: 15-26
- Ehrenberg, V. 1954 *Sophocles and Pericles* (Oxford)
- Elam, K. 1980 *The semiotics of theatre and drama* (London)
- Else, G. F. 1976 *The madness of Antigone* (Heidelberg)
- Ewans, M., ed. and tr. 1998 *Antigone, by Sophocles* (London)
- Farnell, L. R. 1896-1909 *The cults of the Greek states* (5 vols., Oxford)
- Fish, S. 1980 *Is there a text in this class?* (Cambridge, MA)
- Foley, H. 1992 'The politics of tragic lamentation', in A. Sommerstein *et al.*, eds., *Tragedy, comedy and the polis* (Bari) 101-43

- 1995 'Tragedy and democratic ideology', in B. Goff, ed., *History, tragedy, theory* (Austin) 131-50
- 1996 'Antigone as a moral agent', in M. S. Silk, ed., *Tragedy and the tragic* (Oxford) 49-73.
- Friis Johansen, H. 1959 *General reflection in tragic rhesis* (Copenhagen)
- Gardiner, C. P. 1987 *The Sophoclean chorus* (Iowa City)
- Garland, R. 1985 *The Greek way of death* (Ithaca)
- Garner, R. 1990 *From Homer to tragedy* (New York)
- Gellrich, M. 1988 *Tragedy and theory: the problem of conflict since Aristotle* (Princeton)
- Goheen, R. F. 1951 *The imagery of Sophocles' Antigone* (Princeton)
- Goldhill, S. 1986 *Reading Greek tragedy* (Cambridge)
- 1990 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', in Winkler & Zeitlin 1990: 97-129
- Gould, J. 1980 'Law, custom and myth: aspects of the social position of women in Classical Athens', *JHS* 100: 38-59
- 1996 'Tragedy and collective experience', in M. S. Silk, ed., *Tragedy and the tragic* (Oxford) 217-43
- Green, A. 1979 *The tragic effect* (tr. A. Sheridan, Cambridge)
- Griffith, M. 1995 'Brilliant dynasts: power and politics in the *Oresteia*', *CA* 14: 62-129
- 1998 'The King and Eye: the rule of the father in Greek tragedy', *PCPhS* 44: 20-84
- Guthrie, W. K. C. 1971 *The sophists = A history of Greek philosophy*, III (Cambridge)
- Hamilton, R. 1978 'Announced entrances in Greek tragedy', *HSCP* 82: 63-82
- Hansen, M. H. 1991 *The Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes* (Oxford)
- Harrison, A. R. W. 1968-71 *The law of Athens* (2 vols., Oxford)
- Heath, M. 1987 *The poetics of Greek tragedy* (London)
- Henrichs, A. H. 1990 'Between country and city: cultic dimensions of Dionysus in Athens and Attica', in M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde, eds., *Cabinet of the Muses* (Atlanta) 257-77
- Hester, D. A. 1971 'Sophocles the unphilosophical', *Mnem.* 24: 11-59
- Hunter, V. J. 1994 *Policing Athens* (Princeton)
- Iser, W. 1978 *The act of reading* (Baltimore)
- Jacoby, F. 1913 art. 'Herodotos', in *RE Suppl.* II

- Jauss, H. R. 1974 'Levels of identification of hero and audience', *New Literary History* 5.2: 283-317
- Jens, W., ed. 1971 *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie (Poetika Beiheft 6, Munich)*
- Johnson, P. J. 1997 'Woman's third face: a psycho-social reconsideration of Sophocles' *Antigone*', *Arethusa* 30: 369-98
- Jones, J. 1962 *On Aristotle and Greek tragedy* (London)
- Kamerbeek, J. C., ed. 1978 *The plays of Sophocles: S. Antigone* (Leiden)
- Katz, M. A. 1994 'The character of tragedy: women and the Greek imagination', *Arethusa* 27: 81-103
- King, H. 1983 'Bound to bleed', in Cameron and Kuhrt 1983: 109-27
- Kirkwood, G. M. 1958 *A study of Sophoclean drama* (Ithaca)
- Kitto, H. D. F. 1956 *Form and meaning in drama* (London)
- Kitzinger, R. 1976 *Stylistic methods of characterization in Sophocles' Antigone* (diss. Stanford University)
- Knox, B. M. W. 1957 *Oedipus at Thebes* (New Haven)
1964 *The heroic temper* (Berkeley)
- Kurke, L. V. 1991 *The traffic in praise* (Ithaca)
1995 'Herodotus and the language of metals', *Helios* 22: 36-64
- Lacan, J. 1992 *The ethics of psychoanalysis, 1959-1960: the seminar of Jacques Lacan book VII*, ed. J. A. Miller (tr. D. Porter, New York)
- Lada, I. 1993 'Empathic understanding: emotion and cognition in classical dramatic audience-response', *PCPhS* 39: 94-140
- Lesky, A. 1972 *Greek tragic poetry* (3rd ed.; tr. M. Dillon, New Haven 1983)
- Linforth, I. M. 1961 *Antigone and Creon* (University of California Publications in Classical Philology 15, Berkeley)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1957 'Notes on Sophocles' *Antigone*', *CQ* 9: 12-27
- Long, A. A. 1968 *Language and thought in Sophocles* (London)
- Loroux, N. 1986 'La main d'Antigone', *Metis* 1: 165-96
1987 *Tragic ways of killing a woman* (tr. A. Forster, Cambridge)
- MacKay, L. A. 1962 'Creon, Coriolanus, and Hegel', *TAPA* 93: 166-74
- Maitland, J. 1992 'Dynasty and family in the Athenian city-state', *CQ* 42: 26-40
- Mastrorade, D. J. 1979 *Contact and discontinuity: some conventions of speech and action on the Greek tragic stage* (Berkeley)

- ed., 1994 *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge)
- Moorhouse, A. C. 1982 *The syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden)
- Müller, G., ed. 1967 *Sophokles Antigone* (Heidelberg)
- Murnaghan, S. 1986 'Antigone 904-920 and the institution of marriage', *AJP* 107: 192-207
- Nes, D. van 1963 *Die maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos* (Groningen)
- Neuburg, M. 1990 'How like a woman: Antigone's "inconsistency"', *CQ* 40: 54-76
- Nussbaum, M. C. 1986 *The fragility of goodness: luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy* (Cambridge)
- Ober, J. 1989 *Mass and elite in democratic Athens* (Princeton)
- Ober, J., & Strauss, B., 1990 'Drama, political rhetoric, and the discourse of Athenian democracy', in Winkler & Zeitlin 1990: 237-70
- Ostwald, M. 1969 *Nomos and the beginnings of the Athenian democracy* (Oxford)
- 1986 *From popular sovereignty to the sovereignty of law* (Berkeley)
- Oudemans, Th. C. W., & Lardinois, A. P. M. H. 1987 *Tragic ambiguity: anthropology, philosophy and Sophocles' Antigone* (Leiden)
- Padel, R. 1983 'Women: model for possession by Greek daemons', in Cameron and Kuhrt 1983: 3-19
- 1992 *In and out of the mind* (Princeton)
- 1995 *Whom the gods destroy* (Princeton)
- Parker, R. 1983 *Miasma* (Oxford)
- Parry, H. 1978 *The lyric poems of Greek tragedy* (Toronto)
- Pearson, A. C. 1917 *The Fragments of Sophocles* (3 vols., Cambridge)
- Pelling, C. R., ed. 1990 *Characterization and individuality in Greek literature* (Oxford)
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1988 *The dramatic festivals of Athens* (2nd ed., rev. by J. Gould & D. M. Lewis, Oxford)
- Podlecki, A. J. 1966 'Creon and Herodotus', *TAPA* 97: 359-71
- Pohlsander, H. A. 1964 *Metrical studies in the lyrics of Sophocles* (Leiden)
- Pritchett, W. K. 1971-9 *The Greek state at war* (3 vols., Berkeley)
- Rehm, R. 1994 *Marriage to death* (Princeton)
- Reinhardt, K. 1979 *Sophocles* (4th ed., 1947; tr. H. D. Harvey, Oxford)
- Robert, C. 1915 *Oedipus* (Berlin)

- Roberts, D. H. 1988 'Sophoclean endings: another story', *Arethusa* 21: 177-96
- Rohdich, H. 1980 *Antigone – Beitrag zu einer Theorie des sophokleischen Helden* (Heidelberg)
- Rose, P. 1992 *Sons of the gods, children of earth: ideology and literary form in ancient Greece* (Ithaca)
- Rosivach, V. J. 1983 'On Creon, Antigone, and not burying the dead', *RhM* 126: 193-211
- Schwinge, E. R. 1962 *Die Stellung des Trachinierinnen im Werk des Sophokles* (Göttingen)
- 1972 'Die Rolle des Chors in der sophokleischen *Antigone*,' *Gymnasium* 78: 294-321
- Scodel, R. 1984 *Sophocles* (Boston)
- Scott, W. C. 1996 *Musical design in Sophoclean theater* (Hanover)
- Seaford, R. 1987 'The tragic wedding', *JHS* 107: 106-30
- 1990 'The imprisonment of women in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 110: 76-90
- 1994 *Reciprocity and ritual: Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state* (Oxford)
- Seale, D. 1982 *Vision and stagecraft in Sophocles* (Chicago)
- Segal, C. P. 1964 'Sophocles' praise of man and the conflicts of the *Antigone*', *Arion* 3: 46-66
- 1981 *Tragedy and civilization: an interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge)
- Seidensticker, B. 1982 *Palintonos harmonia: Studien zu komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie* (Göttingen)
- Showalter, E. 1985 'Representing Ophelia: women, madness and the responsibilities of feminist criticism', in P. Parker and G. Hartman, eds., *Shakespeare and the question of theory* (New York) 77-94
- Silverman, K. 1983 *The subject of semiotics* (Oxford)
- Sinclair, R. K. 1988 *Democracy and participation in Athens* (Cambridge)
- Slater, P. R. 1968 *The glory of Hera* (Boston)
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1989a: 'Assumptions and the creation of meaning: reading Sophocles' *Antigone*', *JHS* 109: 134-48
- 1989b 'The fourth stasimon of Sophocles' *Antigone*', *BICS* 36: 141-65
- 1990 'Sophocles's *Antigone* as a "Bad Woman"', in F. Dieteren & E. Kloek, eds., *Writing women into history* (Amsterdam)

- Steiner, G. 1984 *Antigones* (Oxford)
- Stevens, P. T. 1945 'Colloquial expressions in Aeschylus and Sophocles', *CR* 39, 95-105
- Taplin, O. P. 1977 *The stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford)
- Turner, V. 1969 *The ritual process* (Chicago)
- Vernant, J.-P., & Vidal-Naquet, P. 1981 *Tragedy and myth in ancient Greece* (1965; Eng. tr. J. Lloyd, Brighton)
- Vickers, B. 1974 *Towards Greek tragedy* (London)
- Waldock, A. J. A. 1951 *Sophocles the dramatist* (Cambridge)
- Webster, T. B. L. 1969 *An introduction to Sophocles* (2nd ed., London)
- West, M. L. 1982 *Greek metre* (Oxford)
- Whitman, C. H. 1951 *Sophocles* (Cambridge, MA)
- Wilamowitz, T. von 1917 *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Berlin)
- Wiles, D. 1997 *Tragedy in Athens* (Cambridge)
- Winkler, J. J., and Zeitlin, F. I., eds. 1990 *Nothing to do with Dionysos?* (Princeton)
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1980 *Sophocles: an interpretation* (Cambridge)
- Wohl, V. J. 1998 *Intimate commerce: exchange, gender, and subjectivity in Greek tragedy* (Austin)
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1986 'Thebes: theater of self and society in Athenian drama', in J. P. Euben, ed., *Greek tragedy and political theory* (Berkeley) 101-41
- 1996 *Playing the other* (Chicago)
- Zimmermann, C. 1993 *Der Antigone-Mythos in der antiken Literatur und Kunst* (Tübingen)

INDEXES

Numbers prefixed 'p.' refer to pages of the Introduction; other references are to line numbers in the Commentary.

I. Subjects

- Acheron 814-16; *see also* Hades
Adrastus pp. 5-6, p. 8; 869-70
agōn p. 13; 315-31, 376-440, 626-780, 760-1
Aischylos (*Edonians*) 955-65; (*Eleusiniotai*) pp. 6-7, p. 31; 409-12; (*Seven against Thebes*) pp. 6-7; 100-61, 582-625, and *passim*
alliteration 103, 122-3, 125, 134, 153-4, 336-7, 355-60, 655-8, 750, 780, 895-6, 1231-7
anapaests, for arrivals and departures p. 13; 526-30, 626-30, 929-43, 1347-53
anaphora 199-201, 781-800, 806-16, 891-2, 898-9, 1068-9
anastrophe of preposition 193, 931-2
Antigone, character of p. 20, pp. 34-6, p. 42, pp. 52-3; 1-99, 69-77, 427-8, 448, 471-2, and *passim*
aphaeresis 83
Aphrodite *see* Eros
Ares 100-61, 140, 938, 966-76, 970-1
Argives p. 5, p. 8; 15, 100-54, 106-7, 117-26, 141-7, 869-70, 1080-3; *see also* Adrastus, Kapaneus
Aristotle (*Poetics*) p. 12, p. 16, pp. 26-8, p. 34, p. 49; 801-943, 904-15, 1155-1256; (*Rhetoric*) 453-5, 904-15
article, as relative pronoun 606-10, 635-8, 826, 1035-6, 1084-6
asyndeton 69-77, 72, 249-50, 355-60, 1211-18, 1257-1353
Bakchos *see* Dionysos
Boreas 966-87, 981-2, 983-6
burial, (im)proper pp. 5-8, pp. 29-33; 26-36, 205-6, 256, 773-6, 801-5, 823-33, 826-7, 900-3, 1068-71, 1199-1205, 1215-18
caesura, mid-line 76-7, 407, 518, 722-3, 997, 1019-22
Chorus, characterization and role of pp. 11-12, pp. 17-19, p. 24, p. 35, p. 37, p. 57, p. 61, pp. 65-6; 100-61, 211-14, 278-9, 376-83, 504-5, 681-2, 770, 817-22, 843, 1091-1114, 1257-60, 1326-53, 1347-53
chronology, problems of p. 16; 1-99, 100-3, 289-94, 773-6
comic elements p. 37, p. 55; 223-331, 223-36, 327-31, 388-400, 437-40
curses 427-8, 921-8, 1304-5
Danae 944-87, 944-54, 951-4
date of *Antigone* pp. 1-2, p. 13
Death *see* Hades
Delphi 1126-30, 1140-5; *see also* Parnassos
Demeter 1115-54, 1118-21; *see also* Eleusis, Persephone
Deo *see* Demeter
Dikē, personified 451-2, 853-6
Dionysos p. 48, p. 63, p. 66; 100-61, 153-4, 944-87, 955-65, 963-5, 965, 1115-54, 1115-16, 1122-4, 1140-5, 1146-8; Theater of pp. 21-5; *see also* staging

- Dirke 104, 842-7, 844
 Doricisms 100-3, 809, 1196-8
 dual, use of 2-3, 170-2, 488-9, 531-5, 561-2, 769, 1226-7
- ekkyklēma* 1293
 Eleusis 1115-54, 1118-21, 1151-4, 1240-1; *see also* Persephone
 enjambment 4-6, 27, 67-8, 198-206
 epic cycle, Theban p. 6, p. 9; 100-61, 1080-3
 epic-Ionic elements 115-16, 250-2, 308, 415-22, 417-18, 508-9, 604-5, 618-19, 623, 710-11, 845-6, 1240-1
 Epigonoï p. 6; 173-4, 1080-3
 Erechtheus, family of 981-2
 Erinyes 601-3, 1074-5, 1103-4
 Eriphyle 130
 Eros p. 48, pp. 65-6; 617, 781-800, 787-90, 791-4, 799-800
 Eteokles pp. 5-8, p. 10; 23-30, 196-7, 508-25, 898-9
 etymological play 111, 300-1, 658-9, 1172-5
 Euripides (*Antigone*) p. 9; (*Phoinissai*) p. 5, p. 7, and *passim*
 Eurydike, character of p. 9; 1155-1256, 1180-1256
 Freud, Sigmund p. 60
 future middle, used for passive 93, 210, 230, 637, 691, 726
- gnōmē*, uses of pp. 36-7; 162-210, 175-7, 188-90, 221-2, 280-314, 313-14, 323, 473-96, 620-1, 1156-60, 1192-5, 1242-3, 1327, 1347-53
 Goethe, W. 904-15
 Guard, character of p. 37, pp. 55-7; 223-331, 407-40; *see also* comic elements
- Hades p. 47; 72, 361-4, 519, 542-3, 1199-1205; marriage to p. 52, pp. 63-5; 575, 653-4, 791-800, 801-5, 806-16, 893-4, 1199-1205, 1236-7
- Haimon, character of p. 9, pp. 64-5, 683-723, 683-7, 791-4
 Hegel, G. W. F. p. 49
 Hekate 1199-1205
 Hektor, corpse of p. 30
 Herodotos p. 1; 904-15
homoioteleuton 69-77, 355-60, 1035-9, 1199-1205, 1257-1353, 1263-4
 hymnic form and style pp. 17-18; 100-61, 110-16, 148-64, 781-800, 1115-52, 1115, 1140-5, 1149-50
hyperbaton 2-3, 113, 722-3, 750
- Iakchos, *see* Dionysos
 imagery: for characterization pp. 36-7; 473-96; nautical 162-3, 334-41, 389-91, 586-90, 663-6, 715-17; animal 117-26, 289-94, 477-8, 347-52, 423-8, 531-5, 785-6; athletic 100-61, 140; technological p. 36; 353-64, 473-96
 incestuous desires p. 33, p. 50, p. 63; 73-6, 863-5, 898-9
 infinitive: for imperative 150-1, 1140-5; epexegetic 63-4, 216, 1076, 1105-6
 Iokaste p. 5, p. 8; 53-4, 1221-2
 Ion of Chios p. 10
 irony, tragic pp. 20-1
 Ismene, character of pp. 8-9, p. 54, pp. 62-3; 1-99, 1-10, 42, 49-68, 61-3, 491-4, 526-81
 Ismenos (or Hismenos?) p. 9; 1122-4
- Kapaneus 127-33, 131-3; *see also* Argives
 Kastalia 1126-30
 Kleopatra 944-87, 966-87, 971-3, 980, 983-6
 knowing, terms for pp. 41-3; 300-1, 471-2, 686, 721, 724-5, 998
kommos pp. 13-14, p. 17; 801-82, 1257-1353
 Korykian Cave 1126-30
 Kreon, character of p. 20, pp. 34-43; 162-210, 187-8, 221-2, 280-314, 473-96, and *passim*

- Labdakos and Laios, family of pp. 4-9, p. 33, p. 50; 2-3, 49-50, 165-9, 486-7, 582-625, 594-5, 856-71, 823-5, 857-8, 860-2; *see also* incestuous desires
- Lacan, Jacques pp. 60-3, p. 65
- lamentation 28, 423-4, 1078-9, 1246-9; *see also* burial, *kommos*
- Lykourgos 944-87, 955-65, 960-2
- madness pp. 42-3; 137, 582-625, 632-4, 762-5, 790, 959-60, 963-5, 1115-54, 1228-30
- marriage p. 52, pp. 63-5; 575; *see also* Hades
- Megareus p. 5; 1302-3, 1312-13
- Menoikeus p. 5, p. 9; 156, 1302-3
- messenger speeches p. 17, p. 22; 223-331, 249-77, 998-1032, 1155-1256, 1155-71, 1192-1243, 1206-8, 1231-7, 1278-1316; *see also* *rhēsis*
- money 175-7, 294, 295-302, 295-6, 302-3, 1037-9, 1055-6, 1077; *see also* Greek words, *svv.* κέρδος, νόμισμα
- Muses *see* nymphs
- Niobe 823-33
- nymphs p. 63; 965, 1126-30, 1150-1
- Nysa 1131-6
- oaths 264-7, 304-5, 487, 663-6, 758-9
- Oidipous 2-3, 49-52, 857-8, 900-3; *see also* Labdakos
- Parnassos 1126-30
- perfect tense, periphrastic 21-2
- Perikles pp. 1-2, p. 48; 162-210, 188-90, 909-10
- Persephone p. 63; 893-4, 1118-21, 1199-1205; *see also* Eleusis
- Pherekydes of Athens p. 8, p. 10
- Phineus 944-87, 966-8, 971-3, 974
- plot: contents of pp. 8-11, p. 16; structure of pp. 14-17, pp. 20-2, pp. 26-8
- Plouton *see* Hades
- polar expression 39-40, 334-41, 442-3, 450-70, 670-1, 781-800, 785-6, 819-22, 951-4, 1109-10, 1244-5
- Polyneikes pp. 5-8, p. 10; 110-12, 130, 198-206, 284-8, 508-25, 898-9, 1199-1205; *see also* burial
- priamel 332, 582
- prodelision *see* *aphaeresis*
- production *see* staging
- quasi-caesura *see* mid-line caesura
- rhēsis*, structure and style of 162-210, 376-440, 407-40, 450-70, 891-928, 998-1032, 1064-90
- Semele 1115-16, 1117
- staging pp. 21-5, and *passim*
- Stesichoros p. 6
- stichomythia* 37-48, 45-6, 77-99, 84-7, 323, 526-81, 572-6, 726-65, 1048-63, 1172-9
- stoning 35-6
- suicide, modes of 1221-2, 1236-7, 1282-3, 1301, 1307-8, 1315-16
- synizesis* 33, 95-6, 96-7, 156
- Tantalos 823-5, 834
- Teiresias, character of p. 10, p. 17, p. 53, p. 58; 988-1114, 1023-33
- Thebes: topography of 104, 411-12, 1215-18; *see also* Dirke, Ismenos; as maternal/paternal city 199-201, 842-7, 937-43, 1122-4
- Theseus p. 6
- tnesis 420, 427-8, 1274-5
- torture 264-7, 304-12, 308-9
- tyranny p. 3, p. 33, pp. 54-8; 162-210, 178-83, 478-9, 506-7, 670-1, 734-9, 737-8, 1053-6, 1162-4
- universalizing doublets *see* polar expression

- women: place of pp. 21-3; 18-19, 578-9, 842-7, 1184-5, 1246-9, 1301-5; subjection/subjectivity of pp. 61-3; 51-4, 61-3, 221-2, 477-8, 484-5, 523, 578-9, 648-52, 677-80, 842-7, 937-43, 1183-91, 1244-56, 1257-1353, 1282-3, 1301-5
- yield, (un)willingness to 471-2, 626-780, 712-14, 718, 988-1114, 1029-30, 1028, 1096, 1105-6
- Zeus pp. 46-7; 2-3, 127-47, 184, 304, 450, 486-7, 613-14, 658-9, 1039-41, 1117

2. Greek Words

- ἄγος 256, 521
 ἀδελφός 1, 192, 486
 ἄμαρτ- 558, 913-14, 1023-32, 1025-6, 1261-9
 ἀρέσκω 89, 499-501
 ἄτη (ἀτάσμαι, ἀτήριον) p. 42; 4, 17, 531-5, 582-625, 615-25, 1257-60
 αὐτο- 1, 49-52, 55-7, 306-7, 511, 513, 863-5, 900, 915, 1172-5, 1315
 γάρ, interrogative 729-30
 δαί 318
 δῆλος, δηλώω 20, 241-2, 320, 471-2
 ἐκβολή 249-50
 εὐβουλία *see* φρονεῖν
 εὐσέβεια pp. 39-40; 74, 165-9, 199-201, 280-314, 300-1, 508-25, 514, 632-4, 639-80, 730, 744-5, 780, 872-4, 921-8, 923-4, 943, 1347-53, 1349-50
 θάλαμος 801-5, 946-7
 Θυῖαι 1150-1
 καθάρσιος 1140-5, 1284-5
 κείμαι 73, 94, 484-5, 1223-5
 κέρδος 221-2, 310, 461-4, 1031-2, 1035-9, 1327
 κήρυγμα 7-8, 447-55
 κοσμέω 395-6, 677-80, 729-30
 κοκκύω, κώκυμα 28, 423-4, 1078-9, 1206-8, 1226-7
 μέτοικος 839-52, 850-2, 867-8, 1068-9
 μηχανή 365-7
 νέατος 627, 806-16
 νόμος, νόμισμα 59-60, 191, 295-6, 450-70, 451-2, 453-5, 508-25, 908, 1113-14
 οἶδα 71, 300-1, 447, 477-8
 ὀργή p. 43; 355, 471-2, 766-7, 875, 929-30
 ὀρθο- 83, 162-3, 635-8, 674-5, 994, 1178, 1203, 1343-6
 πανουργ- 73-6, 213, 300-1
 πειθαρχία p. 48; 663-6, 672-6
 σεβ- *see* εὐσέβεια
 σπλάγχνα 511, 1066-7
 σύγκλητος 159-60
 σφε 44, 515-17, 772, 1226-7
 ταμίας 949-50, 1151-4
 ὕβρις 480-3, 839-41
 ὑπερβαίνω, ὑπερδραμεῖν 449, 453-5, 667-9
 φίλος pp. 40-1, p. 48; 9-10, 73, 187-8, 208-10, 511-25, 516-22, 522, 523, 524-5, 898-9, 904-15
 φρονεῖν, φρόνημα pp. 41-3; 49, 370-5, 383, 458-60, 510-11, 683-7, 707-9, 721, 1348-53
 ψυχή 175-7, 227-30, 930

