

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Opening of Sophocles *Antigone*

Mortimer Lamson Earle

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 01 / February 1902, pp 3 - 5
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205210, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205210

How to cite this article:

Mortimer Lamson Earle (1902). The Opening of Sophocles *Antigone*. The Classical Review, 16, pp 3-5 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205210

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

However the fact that both omissions and additions are much more frequent in MSS. than in literary sources, and that omissions are commoner than additions, suggests that omissions are due to a graphical cause. That so many lines are strictly dispensable (they impair the poetical value of a passage but do not absolutely ruin the construction), is due to the natural diffuseness of epos and to the circumstance that additions to and expansions of a statement tend to fall within a single line.

These considerations should provide an explanation of the greatest omission in the *Iliad*, namely the Catalogue. They do not do so, however, and we have to fall back on general probabilities (Leaf, *Iliad*, i.-xii. p. 46).

Another question may be asked. Are the additions, whether in MSS., quotations, or scholia, new or old matter? do they give us new lines or are they repetitions of material actually in Homer? The answer is given by the following table:—

	MSS.	Scholia.	Quotations.
Total of Additions...	65.....	10.....	14.....
New Lines	8.....	4.....	10.....

As was to be expected, the additions in MSS. are nearly all of lines extant in Homer or other epic literature (e.g. A 265 from

τὴν σαπρίαν βίβλας μὲν ὡς ἀχρηστίαν,
 γράψας δ' ἐκαινούργησα τὴν εὐχρηστίαν.
 ἐντεῦθεν οἱ γράφοντες οὐκ ἐσφαλμένως
 μαθητῶσιν ὡς ἔοικε μαθάνειν.

Cometas' metaphors do not leave it quite clear how far his critical activity proceeded, but he evidently 'used the knife' in one sense or another, and may have justified Timon's warning to Aratus.

Hesiod), sometimes with slight variations. On the other hand the additions made by scholiasts and found in quotations contribute new matter in rather more than half the cases.

Later MSS., that is minuscules and late Papyri, taken together yield a very small percentage of novelties. In the oldest papyri (not included in this calculation) the proportion is different. The four fragments of second or third century B.C. papyrus yield 26 extra lines, of which 5 are doubtful, 13 old, and 8 new. Omitting the doubtful restorations, about $\frac{2}{3}$ of the additions are old, $\frac{1}{3}$ new.

Since the mediaeval MSS. which exist in such great numbers make comparatively few additions to the text, and these almost exclusively lines already Homeric, it may seem probable that the addition of new lines in scholia and quotations are not vulgate but equivalent to the much more numerous additions introduced by the designations *τινές*, *ἐνιοί*. These, mainly preserved by the catholic interest of the Townley scholiast, would gain in value if age and source were ascribed to them; they have not survived in MSS., and the generous endeavour of this scholiast to save the stray and the eccentric has had as little effect upon the immovable Vulgate as in the other sense the Alexandrian obelus.¹

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ There is little distinction to be drawn between MS. and MS. in the matter of additions and omissions. The Townley MS. appears to come first with eight omissions, and Ge, Mc, and O5 to follow with five; among late papyri the Syriac palimpsest adds most lines.

THE OPENING OF SOPHOCLES *ANTIGONE*.

My conjecture as to the probable original form of v. 4 *sq.* has already appeared in this *Review* (xiii, 386), and I still believe it to be right. At the same place I have also expressed my belief in the correctness of Paley's treatment of v. 3. In what follows here I wish to deal with some other matters pertaining to the correction and interpretation of this speech of Antigone's.

In the first place I can no longer believe that the words *τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν* in v. 2 are sound. Professor Semitelos was right in objecting, as others had done, to the position of the word *Ζεὺς* and to the un-

natural meaning that must be given to the phrase *ἀπ' Οἰδίπου*. We find the phrase used in the natural sense and in the same position in the verse *Ant.* 193 (*ἀστροῖσι παίδων τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου πέρι*). A simple remedy for the words, which has not, however, to my knowledge been applied by anyone, consists in changing *τῶν* to *τοῖς*. The collocation and contrast of *Ζεὺς* and *τοῖς ἀπ' Οἰδίπου* are excellent, and the *κακῶν* at the end of the verse would readily lead a careless copier to change *τοῖς* to *τῶν*. V. 2 *sq.* will thus be = *ἀρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς τοῖς ἀπ' Οἰδίπου (= τοῖς Οἰδίπου τέκνοις) κακὰ πάντα*

νῶν ζώσαν (gen. absol. = ἐν τῷ νῶ ζῆν) τελεῖ (=τελεῖν μέλλει);

Secondly, in v. 6 I cannot believe that οὐκ ὅπωπ' can be what Sophocles wrote. I venture to think that only if the words τῶν σῶν τε κάμῶν belonged rather to the antecedent than to the relative clause (and that they do not) could the repeated negative be tolerated. But ὅπωπ' is too little separated from the οὐ after ὅποιον to justify the resumption of the negation by a second οὐ (οὐκ). That Todt was right in suggesting (*Philologus* 31 [1872], p. 215) εἰσώπωπ' as the original text can, I think, be made still more plausible by a passage in the *Electra*, where Sophocles writes (417 sq.) εἰσιδεῖν πατρὸς | τοῦ σοῦ τε κάμου δευτέρα ὀμιλίαν. Here the similarity of the first half of v. 418 to the first half of *Ant.* 6 is at once apparent; and the fact that with the half verse in the *Electra* εἰσιδεῖν is associated is certainly a fair argument to urge in support of Todt's conjecture. I may add that there is, on the other hand, an argument against Morstadt's conjecture (*Beiträge zur Exegese und Kritik der Sophokleischen Tragödien Elektra, Aias und Antigone*, Schaffhausen, 1864, p. 48) φίλων for κακῶν at the end of vs. 6 in *Electra* 763, where we read μέγιστα πάντων ὧν ὅπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν. This verse seems clearly reminiscent of *Ant.* 6: the fact that εἰσώπωπ' could not be fitted in makes it invalid as a defence of οὐκ ὅπωπ'.

It has not, I think, been duly noted that the words τῶν σῶν τε κάμῶν are emphatic where they stand. That means that the evils—the κακά—of Ismene and Antigone are to be contrasted by the latter with the evils of somebody else. That somebody else is Polynices; and after the καὶ νῦν, in which the νῦν is contrasted with the ἤδη implied in εἰσώπωπ' (to accept that conjecture, though the sense is here the main point), we should expect, if we had thus far seen what Antigone were driving at—πού γνώμης εἶη—, a distinct reference to Polynices, and we should expect the tone of statement, not that of interrogation. The accepting of Reiske's τοιοῦτ' for τί τοῦτ' (which correction, I may be permitted to add, had occurred to me a good while ago before I knew that Reiske had also made it¹) preserves that tone of statement. But the accepting of τοιοῦτ' carries us farther. We must read to the end of v. 8 in the tone of statement and then suddenly appears a question, the statement not being completed. What has happened? Antigone has interrupted her-

The correction would seem (see Mr. Blaydes's *Adversaria*) to have been made also by Naber.

self. She wants to be quite sure that she is not telling Ismene something that the latter already knows. ("Ἦδη καλῶς in v. 18 is, of course, equivalent to our 'I thought not,' 'I was pretty sure you hadn't,' if my reasoning is sound thus far.) If we look on a little further, we get just what Antigone was going on to say when she interrupted herself to question Ismene; for if in v. 21 we should substitute for οὐ γὰρ τάφου νῶν the words τάφου γὰρ ἡμῶν, the tale which Antigone tells in v. 21 sqq. could be placed in immediate sequence to vv. 1-8. ὡς λέγουσι in v. 23 recalls the φασὶ of v. 7. Indeed, I venture to think that Sophocles at first composed the opening of the *Antigone* in the form I have just indicated and then, thanks to a happy δευτέρα φροντίς, improved it by inserting vv. 9-20 and changing slightly the beginning of v. 21, which had been at first v. 9.²

Before writing out vv. 1-10 as I think we should read and point them I would note the meaning that must be given to Reiske's—καὶ Σοφοκλέους κἂν οὐ μὴ θέλησι— τοιοῦτ', namely ἀλγεινὸν οὐδ' ἄτης ἄτερ καὶ αἰσχροῦ οὐδ' ἔντιμον. It may also be added that Hermann Schütz in his *Sophokleische Studien* p. 206 has strongly supported that interpretation of v. 10 which makes τοῦς φίλους = Πολυνείκη and τῶν ἐχθρῶν = τῶν Ἀργείων. Furthermore, Professor Gildersleeve has shewn that, by a peculiar form of ellipsis (akin perhaps in the case of individual words to such a phrase as ἡ τῆς βασιλείας νόσου ἀκμή = ἡ τῆς τῆς β.ν.ἀ.), the words στείχοντα τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακά may very well be taken as = στείχοντα τὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακά. But to this interesting matter of style I shall recur. The following is the form that I believe vv. 1-10 should have:—

Ἦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα,
ἀρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς τοῖς ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν
<οὐκ ἔσθ'> ὅποιον οὐχὶ νῶν ζώσαν τελεῖ;
Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐδ' ἄτης ἄτερ
οὔτ' αἰσχροῦ οὐδ' ἔντιμον ἔσθ' ὅποιον οὐ
τῶν σῶν τε κάμῶν εἰσώπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν,
καὶ νῦν τοιοῦτ' αὐ φασὶ πανδήμῳ πόλει
κήρυγμα θεῖναι τὸν στρατηγὸν ἀρτίως—
ἔχεις τι κἀσθήκουσας ἢ σε λανθάνει
πρὸς τοῦς φίλους στείχοντα τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακά;

² I may add that it may further be noted as an interesting coincidence and perhaps a confirmation of what I have just written, that vv. 1-8 + vv. 21-30 (omitting, of course, 24 and making the consequent corrections) amount to 17, the same number that Antigone's opening speech and Ismene's answer make up together, as the play now stands. Verses seem to tend markedly to fall into groups of 17 in the *Antigone*.

Before resuming the discussion of the peculiar form of ellipsis represented in v. 10, I wish to deal with another of Morstadt's conjectures because it can be very prettily and conclusively proved wrong. Morstadt repeats (*l.c.*) his conjecture that vv. 15-17 should be shared by Antigone and Ismene in this way :

ANT. ἐπεὶ δὲ φρουδός ἐστιν Ἀργείων στρατός
ἐν νυκτὶ τῇ νῦν, οὐδὲν οἶσθ' ὑπέρτερον ;
IΣ. οὐτ' εὐτυχοῦσα μᾶλλον οὐτ' ἀτωμένη.

This involves a change of the traditional text that could be readily accounted for, were there not a very good reason for maintaining that no such change is necessary—to say nothing of the fact that there is no obvious urgent reason for redistributing the traditional text. This good reason is the presence of a very elegant chiasmus,—a figure that has not, I venture to think, been sufficiently attended to in Sophocles—or other Greek stylists. In Ismene's speech as customarily read the arrangement is this: (A) Ἐμοὶ μὲν...ικερ(ο), (B) ἐξ ὅτου...χέρι, (B) ἐπεὶ δὲ...τῆ νῦν, (A) οὐδὲν οἶδ'...ἀτωμένη. Here it should furthermore be observed (1)

that ἐξ ὅτου is parallel with ἐπεὶ, (2) that οὐθ' ἡδὺς οὐτ' ἀλγεινός is parallel with οὐτ' εὐτυχοῦσα οὐτ' ἀτωμένη, and (3) that μᾶ ἡμέραι is parallel with ἐν νυκτὶ τῆ νῦν. The case for the defence is thus very plain.

To return now to the ellipsis. Professor J. H. Wright in the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, xii. pp. 137 *seqq.*, has brought together a number of examples, all of which I cannot accept, of this very interesting phenomenon, which we might call in deference to Sophoclean diction the ἀπλοῦν ἔπος (implying ἀλλὰ διπλοῦν ἔργον). Professor Wright calls it 'euphonic ellipsis.' The matter is worthy of more attention than it has received, albeit such investigations should be pursued with the extremest caution. I venture to think that we can explain in this way a troublesome place in the *Electra*, where (v. 316) we read Ὡς νῦν ἀπόντος ἰστόρει τί σοὶ φίλον. May we not understand this as for Ὡ.ν.ά. ἰστόρει εἰ τί σοὶ φίλον and write it (perhaps) Ὡ.ν.ά. ἰστόρει τί σοὶ φίλον? But sat paginae biberunt atramenti.

MORTIMER LAMSON EABLE.

ON TWO PASSAGES OF SOPHOCLES *ELECTRA*.

I.—153-163.

If we try to construe this passage according to the traditional text, vv. 153-155 can only mean: 'Not to you alone, my child, has a grief come in respect of which you surpass those that are within.' But such a remark does not square with the evident intention of the Chorus nor with the following words. Prof. Kaibel has seen the difficulty and has evaded it. His words should be quoted here. He writes (*ad loc.*): 'Hier ist πρὸς ὅτι "in Bezug auf welches Leid" (ἄχος) freilich etwas prosaisch, *zudem sollte man πρὸς ὃ erwarten.* [The italics are mine.—M. L. E.] Aber die Prosa wird man hinnehmen müssen, und in ὅτι scheint die unbestimmte Allgemeinheit des regierenden Satzes nachzuwirken ("alle Menschen haben Leid"); keinesfalls darf man determinative Relativsätze vergleichen, in denen ὅστις mit Recht steht (G. Hermann praef. OT p. viii.); der Satz ist selbstständig und lautet nicht πρὸς ὃ τι δικαίως ἂν σὺ περιττῆ εἴης. Die für den Chor undenkbare Brutalität πρὸς τί δὲ σὺ τῶν ἔνδον εἰ περισσά; hätte

niemandem einfallen sollen.' I can not but think that it is rather the 'unbestimmte Allgemeinheit' of Prof. Kaibel's theory of Greek relative clauses than that quality in the antecedent clause here that we should recognise. Yet who has thought to question ὅστις in Eur. *Med.* 220, a reading that I believe to be demonstrably wrong in the context? The fact is that a simple relative is demanded in v. 155. Such simple relative may be obtained without the change of a single letter by merely setting the proper diacritical marks. That I shall now do, as I think; and besides I will set down the whole context, as I would read it.

Οὐ τοι σοὶ μούνα, τέκνον,
ἄχος ἐφάνη βροτῶν,
πρὸς ὃ τί σὺ τῶν ἐν γένει περισσά
οἷς ὁμόθεν εἰ καὶ γοναὶ ξύνομος;
οἷα Χρυσόθεμις ζῶει καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα
κρυπταὶ τ' ἄχων ἐν ἧβαι—
ὄλβιος—ὄν ἄ κλεινὰ
γὰ ποτε Μυκηναίων
δέξεται εὐπατρίδαν Διὸς εὐφρονη
βήματι μολόντα τάνδε γᾶν—'Ορέσταν.