e-ISSN 2724-1564

Lexis
Num. 41 (n.s.) – Giugno 2023 – Fasc. 1

Evils Full of *atē*: Sophocles, *Antigone* 1-6

Marco Catrambone
Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italia

Abstract The article proposes two solutions for the textually controversial incipit of Sophocles' *Antigone*. In line 4, the corrupt οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ can be emended to οὔτ' ἄτης πλέων, an almost forgotten correction once tentatively proposed by Campbell. In lines 2-3, the syntax of Antigone's question appears sound. Firstly, ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ; in line 3 is a question governed by ἆρ' οἶσθ', with subject understood (Ζεύς). Secondly, ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν in line 2 is a pre-posed topicalized clause, with verb understood (τελεῖ or ἐστί), offering the background information from which the ὁποῖον-question takes its cue.

Keywords Sophocles. Antigone. Textual criticism. Word order. Incipits.

Edizioni Ca'Foscari

Peer review

Submitted	2022-10-07
Accepted	2023-03-29
Published	2023-03-04

Open access

Citation Catambrone, M. (2023). "Evils Full of *atē*: Sophocles, *Antigone* 1-6". *Lexis*, 41 (n.s.), 1, 7-34.

DOI 10.30687/Lexis/2724-1564/2023/01/001

1 A Vexed Incipit

ὦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα
ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν
ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;
οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὔτ' †ἄτης ἄτερ†
οὔτ' αἰσχρὸν οὔτ' ἄτιμόν ἐσθ', ὁποῖον οὐ
τῶν σῶν τε κἀμῶν οὐκ ὄπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν.

The five lines[1] following the title-character's memorable incipit[2] in *Antigone* are often called the worst *crux* in the extant Sophocles (Renehan 1992, 335). The general sense of Antigone's words is sufficiently clear: "Did not the two of us experience all sorts of god-sent evils coming from Oedipus? There is nothing painful, ruinous, shameful, or dishonouring that I have not seen of my evils and yours". Although hyperbolically and tautologically, lines 2-6 aptly introduce the new issue, still ignored by Ismene: Creon's κήρυγμα forbidding the burial of Polynices (7-10).

The sequence is afflicted by two major problems, which will be addressed in the present contribution: (1) the obscure ἄτης ἄτερ in 4; (2) the meaning and syntax of Antigone's question in 2-3.

2 The *Crux* of ἄτης ἄτερ (l. 4)

In a sentence exceptionally crowded with negatives (Austin 2006, 113-14), the phrase οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ communicates the opposite of what is required by the surrounding adjectives. The anomaly was noticed by Didymus of Alexandria (schol. Soph. *Ant.* 4-5; text from Xenis 2021, 40):

Δίδυμός φησιν ὅτι ἐν τούτοις τὸ "ἄτης ἄτερ" ἐναντίως συντέτακται τοῖς συμφραζομένοις· λέγει γὰρ οὕτως, "οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν οὔτε ἀλγεινὸν οὔτε ἀτηρὸν οὔτε αἰσχρὸν ὃ οὐκ ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς", "ἄτης ἄτερ" δέ ἐστι τὸ "ἀγαθόν".

This study was completed within the project "Ambiguity and Politeness in Sophocles" directed by Luigi Battezzato and funded by Scuola Normale Superiore: it draws on material from my doctoral dissertation on politeness strategies in Sophocles' rapid dialogues (Catrambone 2019). I am grateful to Luigi Battezzato and Donald Mastronarde for their comments on earlier drafts.

1 Text of the MSS. Sophocles is cited from Finglass 2011; 2007; 2018 (*Ajax*, *Electra* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*) and Ll-J/W (*Antigone*, *Trachiniae*, *Philoctetes*, *Oedipus Coloneus*), Aeschylus from West 1998, tragic fragments from *TrGF*, all other texts from the editions recorded in the *TLG*.

2 See Jebb 1888, 8; Steiner 1984, 206-10; Griffith 1999, 120; Rutherford 2012, 71-2, Catrambone 2019, 431-2.

In the paraphrase given by the scholiast, ἄτης ἄτερ is replaced with ἀτηρόν, an attractive (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1484, *Eum.* 1007) but metrically impossible solution, which no emendation can successfully restore.[3] Brunck (1786-89, 2: 407) proposes the unattested ἀτήριον, assuming its existence from couples of adjectives such as ἀλιτηρός-ἀλιτήριος, ἔντοπος-ἐντόπιος, ἐπώνυμος-ἐπωνύμιος, etc.[4] But there is no safe ground to print it. The same applies to Dindorf's οὔτ' ἀτήσιμον, another conjecture restoring a non-existent (and linguistically ill-construed) cognate of ἄτη.[5]

Defenders of οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ unconvincingly assume that the οὔτε preceding ἄτης ἄτερ must have negative force, in contrast to all other οὔτε in this passage, which merely resume οὐδέν (thus Hermann).[6] This forces us to accept the counterintuitive conclusion that Sophocles meant the opposite (οὔτ' οὐκ ἄτης ἄτερ) of what he wrote (οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ).[7] Emendations restoring a different negative than οὔτ' before ἄτης ἄτερ (e.g. οὐ δ', οὔδ' or οὐκ) ruin the repetition of οὔτε to no avail.[8] Different attempts have been made to defend the *paradosis*, i.e. (1) by considering ἄτερ as an adverb (= χωρίς, ἑκάς, etc.),[9] (2) by construing ἄτης ἄτερ ("away from ruin") strictly with οὔτ' αἰσχρόν οὔτ'

3 See οὔτ' ἀτηρὸν αὖ (Brunck; αὖ is the wrong adverb), οὔτ' ἀτηρὸν ἔν (Vauvilliers 1781, 2: 43; οὔτ' ἔν not equivalent to οὐδέν), οὔτ' ἀτηρὸν ὦδ' (Hartung 1850, 26; misplaced emphasis on ἀτηρόν), οὔτ' ἀτήρ' ἅπερ (Semitelos 1887, 95; a plural would be oddly inserted amid singular forms), οὔτ' ἀτηρὸν οὔτ' | ἄτιμον οὔτ' οὖν αἰσχρὸν (Blaydes 1859, 448; οὖν illogical).

4 Griffith 1999, 121 dubiously supports ἀτήριον on account of Sophocles' fondness for -ήριος adjectives (*contra*, Chantraine 1933, 43-5 notes a lower frequency than Aeschylus and Euripides) and the relevance of ἄτη (equally restored by other emendations).

5 Dindorf 1867, 17: ἀτήσιμος should supposedly derive from non-existent *ἄτησις. See also οὔτ' ἀτηφόρον (Blaydes 1859, 448).

6 See Erfurdt, Hermann 1830, 14-15: "nihil laetabile, nec sine flagitio, neque quod non esset turpe atque inhonestum, vidi". But (1) οὐτ' ἀλγεινόν ("laetabile") and οὐτ' αἰσχρόν ("quod non esset turpe") are inconsistently translated; (2) οὐδέν … ἐσθ' ὁποῖον … οὐ, in which οὐδέν … οὐ cannot cancel each other, is removed.

7 Similar objections apply to the proposals made by Schütz 1890, 202-6 (strong punctuation after ἄτερ, with οὔτ' … οὔτ' in 4 taken as οὐκ … οὐδ'), Coulon 1939, 13-15 (οὔτ' is wrongly placed by Sophocles, but would have gone unnoticed except by the attentive reader), Mazon 1951, 11-12 (Sophocles, forced to avoid οὔτ' οὐκ, opted for οὔτ' without noticing its different force).

8 See οὐ δ' Ἄτης ἄτερ (Vauvilliers 1781, 2: 43), οὐδ' ἄτης ἄτερ (Maas in Bruhn 1913, 50, approved by Kamerbeek 1978, 38), οὐκ ἄτης ἄτερ (Kranz 1913, 304-6).

9 Thus Triclinius, paraphrasing οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ as (1) οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ ὄν or (2) οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ ἐστίν (cf. also Schneidewin 1849, 34: "nihil nec triste nec aerumnosi abest quicquam"). Neither (1) nor (2) can however be extracted from the Greek, and (2) would even require explicit ἐστί.

ἄτιμον;[10] (3) by taking οὐτ' ἄτης ἄτερ as parenthetical.[11] All three rest on questionable linguistic grounds, whereas the emphatic polysyndeton marked by οὔτε definitely suggests that all four items in Antigone's list should be understood as syntactically coordinated.[12] The most perceptive defence of the *paradosis* is probably the one offered by Austin (2006, 108-13):[13] having (correctly) discarded the unlikely hypothesis of a slip by the playwright himself,[14] Austin assumes that line 4 οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ included a polar expression ("there is nothing, either painful or without disaster"), in which the second element (οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ) is "not a genuine alternative, but a foil, added for the contrast, to put maximum weight and emphasis on the first" (Austin 2006, 112). Austin compares Ismene's replies at 11-12 ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδεὶς μῦθος, Ἀντιγόνη, φίλων | οὔθ' ἡδὺς οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸς ἵκετ' and 16-17 οὐδὲν οἶδ' ὑπέρτερον, | οὔτ' εὐτυχοῦσα μᾶλλον οὔτ' ἀτωμένη, as well as Eur. *Ion* 1350 ἔχει δέ μοι τί κέρδος ἢ τίνα βλάβην:, Soph. *Ant.* 1108-9 ἴτ', ἴτ' ὀπάονες, | οἵ τ' ὄντες οἵ τ' ἀπόντες, *El.* 305-6 τὰς οὔσας τέ μου | καὶ τὰς ἀπούσας ἐλπίδας διέφθορεν. But a vital difference exists between all these parallels and *Ant.* 4-5: in all other examples, the polar expression occurs in isolation so that its identification is very quick and transparent; in the *Antigone* passage, by contrast, the polar expression would be part of a longer list of negative qualifications, all connected to the relative ὁποῖον … οὐκ ὄπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν in 5-6. Accepting Austin's text, Antigone would say that "there is nothing painful or good [i.e. without disaster] […] that I have not seen of my evils and yours" – a rather illogical and meaningless statement.

Emendation is required. Since ἄτη is central to the play,[15] any correction that removes it will hardly do.[16] The same applies to emendations replacing ἄτη with stems of similar spelling, e.g. οὔτ' ἀτημελές

10 Thus Seidler (in Erfurdt, Hermann 1830, 11-12): "nihil enim nec triste, nec absque noxa [or "neque culpa vacans": Zehlicke 1826, 17] vel turpe vel ignominiosum est". But no guilt is at stake for the sisters or Oedipus.

11 Thus Boeckh 1843, 3: "Denn nichts ist schmerzlich, nichts – des unheilvollen Gräuls nicht zu gedenken – nichts entehrend, schimpflich nichts, was ich in deiner Noth und meiner nicht gesehn". But one would have to take οὔτ' not with ἄτης ἄτερ but as proleptic to οὔτ' αἰσχρόν. Wecklein's punctuation (1878, 7), οὐδὲν γὰρ ὧδ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐδ' – ἄτης ἄτερ – | οὔτ' αἰσχρὸν […], is artificial.

12 Schwab 2010, a forceful defence of Seidler's interpretation, fails to respond to this objection.

13 Elaborating on Könnecke 1916, 642-6.

14 See the remarks in Jebb 1888, 244.

15 12 occurrences in the play in addition to this passage. On *atē* in *Antigone*, see especially Cairns 2013, 2014a.

16 See e.g. οὔτ' ἄγης ἄτερ (Coray in Lévesque 1795, 3: 261; Wunder 1846, 6), οὔτ' ἄκους ἄτερ (Ast 1804, 529; Welcker 1861, 310-12). Full list in Jebb 1888, 246, on numbers 2 and 4-5.

(Müller 1967, 29).[17] Among those emendations retaining ἄτη,[18] the best two are owed to Porson and Hermann. Porson (1815, 218) proposes οὔτ' ἄτης ἔχον, assuming that a supralinear gloss ἀτηρ᾽ (= ἀτηρόν) displaced ἔχον but was later corrupted to ἄτερ.[19] However, in the parallels cited in support of Porson's view – Soph. *OT* 709 μάθ' οὕνεκ' ἔστι σοι | βρότειον οὐδὲν μαντικῆς ἔχον τέχνης, Pl. *Phdr.* 244e (ἡ μανία) ἐξάντη ἐποίησε τὸν ἑαυτῆς ἔχοντα πρός τε τὸν παρόντα καὶ τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον – and in other potential *loci similes*,[20] the relation between the genitive and its head noun is of active (often desirable) possession, which clearly does not work for ἄτη. Furthermore, the use of the genitive implies *incomplete* participation to ἄτη, which would be inconsistent and anti-climactic within Antigone's utterance at 4-6.

Hermann proposes οὔτ' ἄτης γέμον ("replete with ruin"), recorded in Ll-J/W's OCT apparatus.[21] Although γέμον goes nearer the truth, the parallels for γέμω + genitive do not support Hermann's conjecture:[22] in all examples, the noun governing γέμω is an individual or collective host or container (i.e. a person, a city, a ship, a temple, a vase, etc.) passively suffering the effects of the content with

17 Neither of the two proposed translations – "neglected" and "neglectful" – fits the context, however. See also οὔτ' ἀτάσθαλον, "reckless" (Brunck: unattested outside epic and Ionic texts), ἄατον (Johnson 1746, 2: 166; it means "insuperable": cf. Apoll. Soph. 1.14-17 Bekker, citing *Od.* 21.91 and 22.5).

18 A few produce bad Greek or wrong content: οὔτ' ἄτης ἄπερ (Sallier 1751, 66; Bothe 1827, 8-9) restores an unparalleled partitive genitive while also introducing a plural amid singulars (οὔτ' ἄτης ὅπερ, proposed by Bergk 1858, lxviii, solves only the latter problem); οὔτ' ἄτης ἄπο (Heath 1762, 2: 43) leaves the meaning of the *paradosis* unaffected; οὔτ' ἄτης μέτα (Anonymous Londinensis 1722) wrongly adds a comitative nuance; οὔτ' ἄτης πέρα (Wecklein 1869, 50) is unparalleled (δεινὰ καὶ πέρα δεινῶν in Dem. 54.11, D.H. 7.43.2, etc. is different) and, like οὔτ' ἄτης, ἄταρ (Ellis 1893, 37-8), ruins the accumulation of οὔτε (Ellis also leaves ἄτης hanging). Changing ἄτης and ἄτερ solves nothing: οὔτ' ἄτην φέρον (Brunck) and οὔτ' ἄτην ἄγον (Donaldson 1848, 133-4) inappropriately replace the abstract ἄτη with the material factors producing it; οὔτ' ἄτῃ σαγέν, "loaded with ruin" (Musgrave 1800, 1: 456) restores a non-existent aorist passive (attested is only ἐσάχθην).

19 Jebb 1888, 243 challenged Porson on the ground that marginal glosses were not in use in the earlier Alexandrian Age. But advances in the field of papirology make this view obsolete: see McNamee 2007.

20 See *LSJ* s.v. II.2.b, listing examples of εὖ (καλῶς, ὑγιεινῶς, etc.) ἔχειν + non-partitive genitives ("be well off for a thing"); see further Diggle 1981, 35; Moorhouse 1982, 57, 74.

21 The problem is not discussed in Ll-J/W, *So.*, but Hermann's γέμον is accepted in Lloyd-Jones 1994, 2: 4.

22 See Aesch. *Ag.* 613 ὁ κόμπος, τῆς ἀληθείας γέμων, 1012 δόμος | πημονᾶς (or πλησμονᾶς) γέμων, Soph. *OT* 4 πόλις [...] θυμιαμάτων γέμει, Soph. *Phil.* 876 ἀλλ' εὐγενὴς γὰρ ἡ φύσις κἀξ εὐγενῶν, | ὦ τέκνον, ἡ σή, πάντα ταῦτ' ἐν εὐχερεῖ | ἔθου, βοῆς τε καὶ δυσοσμίας γέμων, fr. 275.6 αἱ δὲ λήκυθοι | μύρου γέμουσι, Eur. *Andr.* 1093 ὁρᾶτε τοῦτον, ὃς διαστείχει θεοῦ | χρυσοῦ γέμοντα γύαλα, *HF* 1245 γέμω κακῶν, fr. 106 γέμουσαν κύματος θεοσπόρου, 627.2 εἰσὶ διφθέραι μελεγγραφεῖς | πολλῶν γέμουσαι Λοξίου γηρυμάτων, 689.3 ὄμμα γὰρ πυρὸς γέμεις, 781.48 φλόγα μὲν οὐχ ὁρῶ πυρός, | γέμοντα δ' οἶκον μέλανος ἔνδοθεν καπνοῦ. See also Bacchyl. 2.4, Hdt. 8.118.2 (+ ὥστε and genitive absolute), Thuc. 7.25.2, Hermipp. fr. 5.2 K.-A., Ar. *Plut.* 811, Men. fr. 691 K.-A. etc.

which it is filled (regularly expressed in the genitive). But Antigone did not face anything that was suffering from ἄτη: she met ἄτη itself.

Recent proposals assume larger corruptions and add more problems. Dawe, after initial hesitation (Dawe 1979, 1985 *app. crit. ad locc.*: "nulla emendatio arridet"),[23] emends (1996, 2) οὔτ' … οὔτ' … at 4 to οὐκ … οὐδ' … (making line 4 a free-standing sentence) and deletes 5 ("genuinum versum expulisse videtur"). The corrections lack justification, and the second half of 5 is unassailable. Willink (2000, 662-5 = 2010, 307-10) defends ἄτης ἄτερ,[24] but variously corrects 4-5 as οὐδὲν γὰρ οὖν ἀλγεινὸν οὐδ' ἄτης ἄτερ, | οὐδ' αἰσχρὸν οὔτ' (οὐδ' Kovacs) ἄτιμον, ἔσθ' ὁποῖον οὐ | […] οὐκ ὄπωπ' ἐγώ. No parallel is given for (οὐδέν …) οὐδ' … οὐδ' … οὐδ' … οὔτ', and the text introduces a pedantic explanation of Antigone's evils: "painful, *hence* ruinous, *yet neither* shameful *nor* dishonouring".

Though neither ἔχον nor γέμον are acceptable, Porson's and Hermann's minimalist approach seems recommendable. As Didymus rightly saw, ἄτης ἄτερ is something of a polar error probably caused by the high number of negatives in the sentence. All that needs replacement is, therefore, ἄτερ.

A plausible restoration is οὐτ' ἄτης πλέων: "There is nothing painful, or full of *atē*, or shameful, or dishonourable, that I have not seen of my woes and yours". It was firstly proposed by Campbell, yet tentatively and with no justification whatsoever (1879-81, 1: 460: "Qy. ἄτης πλέων?"). The adjective πλέων provides the requisite meaning, restores appropriate linguistic register, and produces a distinctively "tragic" wording. 21 out of the 25 examples of πλέως in tragedy occur with abstract genitives denoting emotions, mental dispositions, or other conditions: see Aesch. *Pers.* 603, *PV* 696, Eur. *Med.* 263, 903, *Her.* 473, *El.* 25 (φόβου), Eur. *Alc.* 727, Soph. *El.* 607 (ἀναιδείας), *PV* 42 (θράσους), 953 (φρονήματος), Soph. *Aj.* 1112 (πόνου), *Ant.* 726 (ἐπιστήμης), Eur. *Ion* 601 (ψόγου), Eur. *Hel.* 745 (ψευδῶν), Soph. *Phil.* 39 (νοσηλείας), 1074 (οἴκτου), Eur. *Ba.* 449 (θαυμάτων), Eur. *Ba.* 456 (πόθου), Soph. *OC* 1162 (ὄγκου). Especially relevant are Soph. *Aj.* 745 ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τἄπη μωρίας πολλῆς πλέα and 1150 ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄνδρ' ὄπωπα μωρίας πλέων, in which μωρία ("delusion") comes close to ἄτη ("harm", "calamity").[25] In all but two examples πλέως occurs, as here, at line ending.

23 Dawe, *STS* 3: 99 calls both this ἄτερ and the one at Eur. *Erechtheus* fr. 360.44 "mysterious".

24 See also Agosto 2018, 970-2, proposing οὖσ' ἄτης ἄτερ, which impossibly inserts a concessive feminine participle οὖσα (i.e. Antigone) into a sentence with neuter subject and predicates.

25 Cairns 2012 and Sommerstein 2013 emphasise "harm" as the core meaning of ἄτη in Homer and Aeschylus respectively. As Cairns 2014a, 37 notes, while in Homer and Aeschylus *atē* denotes "a particular kind of harm, mental impairment, that causes further harm to a person's life", this meaning is not usual in the corpus of Sophocles and

Items qualifiable as πλέως include people (*PV* 42, 696, Soph. *Aj.* 1150, *Ant.* 721, *El.* 607, *Phil.* 1074, Eur. *Med.* 263, 903, *Her.* 473, *Ba.* 449), speeches (*PV* 953, Soph. *Aj.* 745, *OC* 1162, Eur. *Hel.* 745), old age (Eur. *Alc.* 727), households (Soph. *El.* 1405), cities (Eur. *Ion* 601), rags (Soph. *Phil.* 39), hairlocks (Eur. *Ba.* 456) and (most importantly) circumstances: see Aesch. *Pers.* 603 ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἤδη πάντα μὲν φόβου πλέα, Eur. *El.* 25 ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτ' ἦν φόβου πολλοῦ πλέων. At Soph. *Aj.* 307, καὶ πλῆρες ἄτης ὡς διοπτεύει στέγος, | παίσας κάρα 'θώυξεν, the genitive ἄτης is governed by πλήρης, a synonym of πλέως (Ajax sees the hut "full of disaster").

The phrase οὔτ' ἄτης πλέων may have been erroneously paraphrased as ἄτης ἄτερ ("without ruin") regardless of the broader context, and ἄτης ἄτερ may have subsequently displaced the correct reading ἄτης πλέων, giving rise to the incorrect οὔτ' ἄτης ἄτερ. The adjective ἀτηρόν cited in the scholium may well have been a suitable paraphrase for the original ἄτης πλέων. Thus restored, *Ant.* 4-6 closely mirror *OT* 1283-5: νῦν δὲ τῇδε θἠμέρᾳ | στεναγμός, ἄτη, θάνατος, αἰσχύνη, κακῶν | ὅσ' ἐστὶ πάντων ὀνόματ', οὐδέν ἐστ' ἀπόν.

3 The Syntax and Meaning of Antigone's Question (ll. 2-3)

The general meaning of these lines is, once again, clear enough: "Is there any evil stemming from Oedipus that we have not experienced in our lives?". The matter of contention is how syntax conveys this content. Two minor issues need advance clarification:

1. τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν. This is commonly referred to the evils unintentionally caused by Oedipus' birth, which range from the parricide of Laius to the mutual slaughter of Eteocles and Polynices (thus e.g. Jebb 1888, 9). Dawe (*STS* 3: 99) nevertheless replaces the suspicious ἀπ' with ἐπ' ("the ills that were current *in the time of Oedipus*"; original emphasis), but the change is unpromising. Kovacs (1992, 11), in his attempt to replace the transmitted Ζεύς with 'Ερινύν, unnecessarily restricts τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν to Oedipus' curse upon his sons. Agosto (2018, 959-63) goes a step further, taking τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν as κακῶν τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου ("the evils coming from the <sons> of Oedipus") – which produces impossible syntax.[26] The vulgate

Euripides, in which the term denotes "states of affairs (harm, ruin) rather than states of mind (delusion)".

26 See also Earle 1903, 3, who however prints τοῖς ἀπ' Οἰδίπου at 2 and refers κακῶν to ὁποῖον.

interpretation is superior:[27] τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν may allude to the summary of Oedipus' κακά given at Aesch. *Sept.* 778-91.

2. νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν. *Schol. Soph. Ant.* 2 Xenis, Jebb (1888, 9) and others[28] take it as dative, an assumption corroborated by the usage pattern of τελέω.[29] Many others, including Ll-J/W,[30] favour the genitive absolute, yet with inconclusive arguments:[31] Müller (1967, 29) takes the genitive ἔτι ζώσαιν to imply that the sisters cannot survive any longer and Antigone is ready to die, but this meaning cannot be inferred from the Greek. Dawe (*STS* 3: 99) condemns the whole phrase, demanding for a clear contrast between the sisters and the earlier generations, which Kovacs (1992, 10-11) dubiously identifies with the one between the *surviving* sisters (ἔτι ζώσαιν = "not yet dead") and all other *deceased* members of Oedipus' lineage.[32] But no comparison between the living and the dead is at stake: 2-6 only make clear that the sisters have been spectators to all their family's disasters.

A far more serious problem concerns the syntax of 2-3. The paraphrase and interpretation of the passage given by schol. Soph. *Ant.* 2 (Xenis 2021, 40) are unclear:

> τὸ "ὅ τι" ἀντὶ τοῦ "ὅ". ὁ δὲ νοῦς· "ἆρά γέ ἐστι (τι) τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίποδος κακῶν, ὁποῖον οὐχὶ ὁ Ζεὺς ἔτι ζώσαις ἡμῖν τελεῖ;" ὡς εἰ ἔλεγεν "ἆρα ἔχει τι ὁ Ζεὺς τούτων τῶν κακῶν μεῖζον ποιῆσαι εἰς ἡμᾶς;" εἶπεν δὲ διττῶς, πρῶτον μὲν "ὅ τι" ἔπειτα δὲ "ὁποῖον", ἀρκοῦντος θατέρου.

27 Jebb 1888, 9 cites Soph. *Phil.* 1088 λύπας τᾶς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, to which add *OT* 417 ἀμφιπλὴξ μητρός τε κἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς … δεινοποὺς ἀρά, *El.* 100, 1464, *OC* 1628. See further Moorhouse 1982, 100.

28 See Hermann in Erfurdt, Hermann 1830, 12; Campbell 1879-81, 1: 459; Agosto 2018, 961 fn. 13.

29 See (with Zeus) *Od.* 2.34, 15.112, Alc. fr. 361 Voigt, Pind. *Isth.* 6.42, Aesch. *Pers.* 225, *Ag.* 1487-8 τί γὰρ βροτοῖς ἄνευ Διὸς τελεῖται;, *Ch.* 385, Soph. *Phil.* 1381, *OC* 648, Eur. *IT* 464, but datives are ubiquitous.

30 See Schaefer 1818, 515; Zehlicke 1826, 11; Seidler in Erfurdt, Hermann 1830, 12; Wex 1829-31, 1: 97; Boeckh 1843, 209; Ll-J/W, *So.* 115 ("in our lifetime"); Lloyd-Jones 1994, 2: 5 ("while we still live").

31 (1) Since Zeus cannot fulfil anything for the dead, it would be superfluous to say that he does so *for people who are alive*; (2) with the dative, Zeus would be blamed for the sufferings he has inflicted, whereas with the genitive the issue would be one of chronological coincidence. *Contra,* note that (1) the redundancy of ζώσαιν is unremarkable (see e.g. 515 ὁ κατθανὼν νέκυς) and (2) Antigone does not challenge Zeus' power, but merely complains for the disadvantages (5 τῶν σῶν τε κἀμῶν … κακῶν) resulting from the accomplishment of his will (3 τελεῖ).

32 Another wrong reason for emending Ζεύς to Ἐρινύν (see below).

The words τὸ "ὅ τι" ἀντὶ τοῦ "ὅ" imply that ὅ τι is being taken as a relative indefinite, whereas εἶπεν δὲ διττῶς, πρῶτον μὲν "ὅ τι" ἔπειτα δὲ "ὁποῖον" entails that ὅ τι and ὁποῖον are grammatically analogous (i.e. relative or, more likely, interrogative).

Brunck (1786-89, 2: 407) takes ὅ τι to be interrogative and ὁποῖον to be relative, but his translation "ecquid nosti calamitatum ab Oedipo ortarum, quod nobis in vita non adhuc conficiat Jupiter?" circumvents the difficulty that Ζεύς must be the subject of both ὅτι … κακῶν and ὁποῖον … τελεῖ.[33]

Hermann (in Erfurdt, Hermann 1830, 9-10) writes ὅ τι as ὅτι (conjunction) and assumes that two constructions have been mixed here: he compares Soph. *OT* 1401-3 ἆρά μου μέμνησθ' ὅτι | οἷ' ἔργα δράσας ὑμιν εἶτα δεῦρ' ἰὼν | ὁποῖ' ἔπρασσον αὖθις, but recent editors of the play now reasonably print ἔτι for ὅτι.[34] The main obstacle to Hermann's interpretation is that ὅτι and ὁποῖον cannot introduce the same subordinate clause. Wunder (1846, 5) tries to remove the problem by taking ὁποῖον οὐχί as a vivid substitute for οὐδέν, and Zehlicke (1826, 7-11) adds that ὅτι is a pleonasm and that ὅτι lost its semantic autonomy when occurring in the stock phrase οἶδα ὅτι/ὡς.[35] Parallels are however unsatisfactory.[36]

Boeckh (1843, 206-9),[37] followed by many scholars,[38] takes ὁποῖον οὐχί ("of what kind not…?"), the indirect form of ποῖον οὐχί, as equivalent to ὁποιονοῦν ("whatever", "of any kind"). But indirect interrogatives never replace direct forms in the given parallels, and none features ποῖος or ὁποῖος.[39] It is equally impractical to take ὁποῖον as

33 Brown 1987, 21, following Brunck, translates "Do you know of any evil, among those which stem from Oedipus, that Zeus is not bringing to pass …". But in the note *ad loc*. he endorses Jebb's explanation (see below).

34 Thus Ll-J/W 175; Finglass 2018, 591. Even if ὅτι were correct, οἷα and ὁποῖα ought better to be taken as exclamatory (Boeckh 1843, 207).

35 Cf. Erfurdt, Hermann 1830, 11: "nec tamen falsum erit ὅτι, immo aliquantum praestare videtur, praesertim quum usitatissimum sit interpositum mediae orationi οἶσθ' ὅτι".

36 See Soph. *Ant*. 276 and 758 (parenthetical οἶδ'/ἴσθ' ὅτι); Soph. *Ant*. 1063, OT 848, *Phil*. 253, 567, *OC* 1583 (ὡς + subordinate clauses). Further refutation in Bonitz 1857, 13-14.

37 See Boeckh 1843, 5: "Weisst du, dass Zeus der Leiden uns von Oedipus *keins* unvollendet schon bei unserm Leben lasst?".

38 Campbell 1879-81, 1: 459; Coulon 1939, 9-11; Kamerbeek 1978, 37-8 (though Kamerbeek prefers ὅ τι). Schneidewin 1854, 35-6 later accepts this view, comparing Pl. *Mx*. 244b, Andoc. 1.5.29 (though both passages feature ὡς … οἷα).

39 See Dem. 18.48 εἶτ' ἐλαυνομένων καὶ ὑβριζομένων καὶ τί κακὸν οὐχὶ πασχόντων, [Dem.] 47.43 δεομένων τούτων ἁπάντων καὶ ἱκετευόντων καὶ τίνα οὐ προσπεμπόντων;, Eur. *Pho*. 878-9 ἀγὼ τί οὐ δρῶν, ποῖα δ' οὐ λέγων ἔπη | ἐς ἔχθος ἦλθον παισὶ τοῖσιν Οἰδίπου;, Soph. *OC* 1133-5 πῶς σ' ἂν ἄθλιος γεγὼς | θιγεῖν θελήσαιμ' ἀνδρὸς ᾧ τίς οὐκ ἔνι | κηλὶς κακῶν ξύνοικος;, Soph. fr. 959.4 ὅπου τίς ὄρνις οὐχὶ κλαγγάνει;. *OC* 1133-5 is the only passage that features a question within a question, though the two are clearly ordered and separated within the sentence. In *Ant*. 2-3, the expectation of a yes/no

direct interrogative (unattested in tragedy) and therefore ὁποῖον οὐχί as parenthetical,[40] for three reasons: (1) τελεῖ lacks an object (it cannot be ὁποῖον), (2) the structure of 2-6 requires οὐχί to modify τελεῖ, (3) the syntactical properties of ὁποιονοῦν cannot be transferred *tout court* to ὁποῖον οὐχί, even if semantic overlap existed.[41]

Seidler restores ὅ τι, arguing for an emphatic double question.[42] Parallels include τίς πόθεν...; (*Il.* 21.150, *Od.* 1.170, etc.), πῶς τί τοῦτο...; (Pl. *Tht.* 146d5, 208e11, *Sph.* 261e3, *Plt.* 297c5, *Ti.* 22b6), and Eur. *Hel.* 873 τί τἀμὰ πῶς ἔχει θεσπίσματα; (Diggle adds a question mark before θεσπίσματα, taking πῶς ἔχει; as parenthetical), 1559 πῶς ἐκ τίνος νέως ... ἥκετε;, *Her.* 661-2 ἀτὰρ τί χώρᾳ τῇδε προσβαλὼν πόδα | ποῦ νῦν ἄπεστι; *Alc.* 213 ἰὼ Ζεῦ, τίς ἂν πᾷ πόρος κακῶν γένοιτο ...;, *IA* 356 τίνα <δὲ> πόρον εὕρω πόθεν;, and Soph. *Ant.* 401 ἄγεις δὲ τήνδε τῷ τρόπῳ πόθεν λαβών;. In all cases, however, direct interrogatives are involved (which better motivates vividness),[43] and the two questions are always of different nature. At *Ant.* 2-3, by contrast, ὅ τι and ὁποῖον should introduce two indirect questions with identical meaning.[44]

A modified version of Seidler's view, firstly proposed by Schneidewin,[45] assumes that Antigone begins with ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς οὐ τελεῖ; and then shifts to ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὁποῖον οὐχὶ (Ζεὺς) τελεῖ; out of excitement. Differently from Seidler's interpretation, ὁποῖον would here repeat and amplify ὅ τι as a "steigernde Anapher".[46] Schwab

question ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι ...; is confusingly frustrated by ὁποῖον οὐχί, which would turn it into an open question.

40 Boeckh 1843, 208-9 apparently does so, comparing the (rare) substitution of ὅπως for πῶς and of ὁπότερος for πότερος in direct questions (see Heindorf 1802, 25).

41 Kvičala 1864, 413 takes ὁποῖον as attribute of ὅ τι, "whatever it may be", but the parallels – Pl. *Ti.* 86b (ὁπότερον), *Resp.* 509a (ὁπότερον), *Hipp. mai.* 282d (ἥστινος), Xen. *Oec.* 8.19 (ὁποῖα) – indicate that some other word (e.g. a copula) would be needed to produce this meaning.

42 "Ubi enim cum vi quadam interrogatur, Graeci non raro et in recta et in obliqua oratione binas ponunt voces interrogativas sine copula" (Seidler in Erfurdt, Hermann 1830, 10). The view is endorsed by Wex 1829-31, 1: 95-6; Reisig in Wex 1829-31, 2: 67; Hartung 1850, 26.

43 The single example in *oratio obliqua* offered by Seidler – Soph. *Ant.* 1341-3 σέ τ' αὖ τάνδ', ὤμοι μέλεος, οὐδ' ἔχω ὅπᾳ | πρὸς πότερον ἴδω, πᾷ κλιθῶ – is invalid: ὅπᾳ (wrongly added under the influence of following πᾷ) ruins the dochmiac sequence and must therefore be deleted (thus Seidler 1811, 54, followed by all subsequent editors).

44 See further Zehlicke 1826, 2-7.

45 Schneidewin 1849, 33-4. Even if rejected by its proponent (in 1854), the explanation is accepted by Lehrs 1862, 299-300; Kaibel 1897, 11 fn. 1; Uhle 1905, 8; Jäkel 1961, 38; Griffith 1999, 120 (though he also considers Jebb's view: see below); Austin 2006, 109-10.

46 Zinsmeister (1914) assumes anaphora, too, but he takes both ὁποῖον and ὅ τι as relative: this requires mentally supplying τι before ὅ τι – an unlikely possibility for an audience, since they would more easily understand ὅ τι as indefinite.

(2006) forcefully defends this view,[47] but he has no parallels to offer.[48]

Lastly, Bonitz, Jebb and others[49] defend the transmitted text with ὅ τι by assuming a nominal construction ὅ τι (ἐστίν) ὁποῖον introducing Ζεύς … οὐχί … τελεῖ, with ὅ τι interrogative and ὁποῖον relative: "Do you know what [ὅ τι = τί] of the evils stemming from Oedipus is that Zeus does not fulfil for us while we are still alive?". For the omission of ἐστί, Bonitz cites Thuc. 3.39.7 τίνα οἴεσθε ὄντινα οὐ βραχείᾳ προφάσει ἀποστήσεσθαι…; and 3.46.2 ἐκείνως δὲ τίνα οἴεσθε ἥντινα οὐκ ἄμεινον μὲν ἢ νῦν παρασκευάσεσθαι, to which one may add Soph. *Ichneutae* fr. 314.333 ἴσθι τὸν δα[ί]μον', ὅστις ποθ' [i.e. ἐστίν] ὅς | ταῦτ' ἐτεχνάσατο – οὐκ ἄλλος ἐστὶν κλ[οπεὺς] | ἀντ' ἐκείνου. In all three passages, however, the relative and its antecedent stand close to each other, which makes the mental supplement of ἐστί much easier. Conversely, Ζεύς, the subject of ὁποῖον οὐχί … τελεῖ;, stands outside the clause boundaries and seems equally to belong to ὅ τι … τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν.

Jebb (1888, 8-9) provides a lengthy justification for his proposal, but his attempt to explain the twisted syntax can be judged unsuccessful:

> In the indirect form, it is simplest to say οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι οὐ τελεῖ; and we certainly could not say, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι [ἐστὶν] ὁποῖον οὐ τελεῖ, if ὅ τι came immediately before ὁποῖον. Here, however, the separation of ὅ τι from ὁποῖον by Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν makes a vital difference. The sentence begins as if it were to be, ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς οὐ τελεῖ; But when, after an interval, ὁποῖον comes in, the Greek hearer would think of the direct form, τί ὁποῖον οὐ τελεῖ; and so his ear would not be offended. This, too, suggests the answer to the objection that Ζεύς ought to follow ὁποῖον. Certainly, Eur. *I.A.* 525, οὐκ ἔστ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ὅ τι σὲ κἀμὲ πημανεῖ, would be parallel only if here we had ἆρ' οἶσθα, Ζεύς (without ὅ τι). Nor could we have (e.g.) ἆρ' οἶσθ' ἥτις Ζεὺς τῶν νόσων ὁποῖαν οὐ τελεῖ; But, since ὅ τι might be *acc.*, Ζεύς seems to follow it naturally; and when, afterwards, the sentence takes a shape which makes ὅ τι *nom.*, the ear does not return on Ζεύς as on a misplaced word, because the whole is felt as = τί Ζεὺς ὁποῖον οὐ τελεῖ;.

47 Schwab's supporting arguments – intonation, cross-linguistic differences, inclination of Ancient Greek toward pleonasm, metrical constraints, the need for pathos, scholars' rigidity in matters of Sophocles' syntax – do not counter the objections.

48 On this weakness, see Rijksbaron in Willink 2000, 666 [= 2010, 311] fn. 19. I was unable to find parallels for τίς + ποῖος occurring within the same question. Further refutation in Bonitz 1857, 16-17.

49 See Bonitz 1857, 17; Wolff and Bellermann 1885, 11-12; Jebb 1888, 8-9, 241; Dawe, *STS* 3: 99 (on his second thoughts, see below).

As Jebb admits, if ὅ τι and ὁποῖον were contiguous, one or the other would suffice. But the fact that ὅ τι *might* be accusative does not make Ζεύς "follow it naturally". Indeed, the intertwining of Ζεύς … κακῶν prevents the identification of the nominal construction ὅ τι (ἐστί) ὁποῖον,[50] which in turn obliges any reader or audience to revise the initial hypothesis that ὅ τι is accusative. Budelmann (2000, 49 fn. 1) nevertheless accepts Jebb's reconstruction, listing *Ant.* 2-3 among those examples of what he calls "changes of direction", in which "one or more words are left without construction" – a form of anacoluthon, though Jebb's interpretation requires no such thing: in the potential parallels, however, either the syntactical shift is more transparent, or the aborted sentence is resumed by *verbatim* repetition.[51]

A substantial number of emendations were advanced in nineteenth-century scholarship (Blaydes alone produced fourteen) to smooth the syntax. None of these proposals is, however, persuasive. Easier corrections of ὅ τι leave the hyperbaton of Ζεύς unresolved and/or add more problems.[52] Corrections of ὁποῖον are of quite various kinds. Blaydes proposes ἢ ποῖον (which restores two questions fully inconsistent with 4-6) or τὸ λοιπόν ("for the future"; but ὅπωπ' in 6 shows that Antigone refers to the past).[53] Dindorf (1867, 17) replaces ὁποῖον with the participle ἐλλεῖπον ("which of the evils from Oedipus that remains"), comparing 584-5 ἄτας | οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει γενεᾶς ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἕρπον: Müller (1967, 28-9) supports ἐλλεῖπον with the argument that Antigone's death would thus be alluded at both 2-3 and 584-5. Toti (2012, 18-28) similarly proposes ἐπεῖγον, "which of the evils from Oedipus that hastens (to fulfil itself)", interpreting ὅ τι … ἐπεῖγον as a kind of personification. But a participle governed by interrogative ὅ τι is unparalleled. Agosto (2018, 964-6) restores ὁμοῖον, making it a modifier of νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν ("on us *alike*"), but (1)

50 See the references cited in Schwab 2006, 27 fn. 33.

51 *Tr.* 1233-6 (hanging τίς γάρ ποθ' at 1233, resumed by 1235 τίς ταῦτ' ἄν … ἕλοιτο;), 1238-9 (hanging ἀνήρ, followed by ὡς ἔοικεν + infinitive), *OT* 60-1 (hanging νοσοῦντες, shift from personal to impersonal construction), 159-63 (hanging κεκλόμενος, shift from third to first person; Ll-J/W remove it by accepting Blaydes' αἰτῶ at 163), 758-62 (ἀγροὺς without preposition, resumed in κἀπὶ … νομάς), *Phil.* 497-9 (change of subject), 547-52 (shift from personal to impersonal construction; Reiske's πλέω for πλέων at 547, accepted by Ll-J/W, removes it).

52 See ἆρ' οἶσθά τι (Bothe 1827, 7-8), ἆρ' οἶσθά γ' ὅ and ἆρ' ἔστ' ἔτι (Blaydes). Meineke's ἆρ' οἶσθα δή (1861, 2-3) solves the hyperbaton, but wrongly introduces δή, unattested with ἆρα (*teste* Denniston 1954) and not amenable to either evidential or emphatic/affirmative function.

53 Further proposals by Blaydes questionably assume that ὁποῖον should be a gloss to ὅ τι: (1) τοῦ πατρὸς (a superfluous qualification for Οἰδίπου); (2) ὕψιστος (a superfluous attribute of Zeus); (3) τῶνδ' οὐδέν (deictic pronoun misplaced); (4) οὐδὲν τάχ' (which produces a mismatch between question and answer). The rewriting ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν | μέλλει τὸ λοιπὸν νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖν; further complicates matters.

ὁμοῖον is unparalleled in Sophocles,[54] (2) the equal status of the sisters as victims of Oedipus' κακά is already sufficiently conveyed by the duals νῷν … ζώσαιν.

Some scholars restore ἐστί. Blaydes (1859, 447-8) and Paley (1882, 16-17) propose ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν | οὐκ ἔσθ' ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ζώσαιν τελεῖ;.[55] But this removes the essential ἔτι (which could hardly have displaced οὐκ ἔσθ'), making 2-3 too similar to 4-6.[56] Schmidt (1880, i-iv) suggests ἆρ' ἔσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν | ἔοικεν οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖν;, but this produces an inappropriately hedging tone on Antigone's part (see ἔοικεν), in contrast to her bold style throughout the scene.

Transpositions are equally unhelpful. Heimsoeth's rewriting (1865, 1: 211) ἆρ' οἶσθά πού τι τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν | ὁποῖον οὐ Ζεὺς νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ; requires the transposition of Ζεύς and several emendations, but the hedging που resulting from this text is out of place in Antigone's utterance; Blaydes' ἆρ' οἶσθα τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν ὅτι | Ζεὺς οὐδὲν οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ; and ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὁποῖον τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν | Ζεὺς οὐχὶ μέλλει νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖν; require too many changes without providing any convincing account of how the confusion originated. Nauck (in Schneidewin and Nauck 1886, 156) emends to ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ | ὁποῖον οὐχὶ τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν;: this gives rise to a rather different question ("What evils does Zeus send to us that do not come from Oedipus?") that fails to match Antigone's answer.

Ll-J/W (*So.* 115) dismiss earlier proposals and initially print ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν – | ἆ, ποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;. This requires line-ending aposiopesis plus Antigone's self-resumption via the interjection ἆ: "Do you know what Zeus of the evils coming from Oedipus … ah, which one does not he fulfil for us who are still alive?". Following harsh criticism by reviewers,[57] Ll-J/W (*ST* 66-7) change ὅ τι to ὅτι,[58] which replaces the annoying similarity between the aborted and the revised question with an even sharper anacoluthon: Antigone now starts with a yes/no question, "Do you know that Zeus fulfils all sorts of evils?", and ends with a yes/no-question, "Do you know which evil Zeus does not fulfil?".

54 At 586, Seidler's deletion of ὁμοῖον should be accepted to fix responsion (see Ll-J/W, *So.* 128-9, with references). Sophocles normally uses ὁμοίως (8×).

55 Other attempts by Blaydes are even less felicitous, i.e. οὐκ ἔσθ' ὁποῖον νῷν ἔτ' οὐ ζώσαιν τελεῖ; and οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ τι νῷν οὐκ ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;, implying "to us who are *no longer* alive" (or οὐ wrongly placed).

56 This is probably why Paley deletes 4-6.

57 See Brown 1991, 325, Dawe 2002-03, 8 = 2007, 354 and the reviewers cited in Ll-J/W, *ST* 66 (an exception is Renehan 1992, 362).

58 The earlier proposal is imputed to "carelessness".

Serious problems undermine Ll-J/W's solution, including some inconsistencies in translation and punctuation not properly addressed by the editors:

1. a single ἄ in iambic contexts is attested at Soph. *OT* 1147 ἄ, μὴ κόλαζε, πρέσβυ, τόνδ', *Phil.* 1300 ἄ, μηδαμῶς, μή, πρὸς θεῶν, μὴ 'φῇς βέλος, Eur. *Alc.* 526 ἄ, μὴ πρόκλαι' ἄκοιτιν, ἐς τότ' ἀμβαλοῦ, *HF* 629 ἄ, οἵδ' οὐκ ἀφιᾶσ' ἀλλ' ἀνάπτονται πέπλων | τοσῷδε μᾶλλον, *Hel.* 445 ἄ, μὴ πρόσειε χεῖρα μηδ' ὤθει βίᾳ, *Ba.* 810 ἄ | βούλῃ σφ' ἐν ὄρεσι συγκαθημένας ἰδεῖν;, Aristoph. *Ran.* 759 ἄ, *Plut.* 127 ἄ, μὴ λέγ', ὦ πόνηρε, ταῦτ'.[59]
   In all but one example ἄ occurs sentence-initially and in turn-beginning position.[60] A partial exception is Eur. *HF* 629, in which ἄ occurs sentence-initially yet not at turn-beginning: in this passage, ἄ nevertheless marks a new move by Heracles, who is trying to stop his children from holding on to his garments after trying unsuccessfully to persuade them to enter the house. In *Ant.* 3, the usage of ἄ would be quite different: the interjection would occur in mid-sentence and without the nuance of reproof it invariably has in the parallels given above, all of which consist of prohibitions introduced by μή;[61]
2. printing ὅ τι, identical duplicates would be made of a single question, producing unnatural hesitation on Antigone's part ("What of the evils from Oedipus does Zeus … Which evils does not he fulfil?");[62] printing ὅτι, it would be unclear which question Antigone is aborting ("Do you know that Zeus of the evils from Oedipus … [does what?]", which provides an additional argument against the resulting aposiopesis (see below).[63] The problems are not remedied by Lloyd-Jones' translation "Are you aware that Zeus… ah, which of the evils that come from Oedipus is he not accomplishing while we

59 See Nordgren 2015, 96-100, with references (for a full inventory of the occurrences see 211-12). At Aesch. *Ag.* 1087 ἄ ποῖ ποτ' ἤγαγές με; πρὸς ποίαν στέγην;, the interjection occurs sentence-initially (though not turn-initially) at the beginning of an iambic trimeter following Cassandra's lyrics (1085-6 *ba ba* | *ba doch*).

60 Further occurrences are introduced by conjecture at [Eur.] *Rh.* 687 ἄ· φίλιον ἄνδρα μὴ θένῃς (Musgrave; ἆ ἄ *vel* ἄ ἄ *codd.*) and Eur. *Hipp.* 503 ἄ μή σε πρὸς θεῶν … | πέρα προβῇς τῶνδ' (Nauck; καὶ μή γε *fere codd.*) and *Ion* 361 ἄ μή μ' ἐπ' (Nauck; καὶ μή γ' ἐπ' L) οἴκτον ἔξαγ' οὗ 'λελήσμεθα (see Barrett 1964, 251, but his defence of ἄ is not unassailable). Anyway, all follow the generalisation given above.

61 See Labiano 2017.

62 For the objection, see Brown 1991, 325.

63 See Housman 1887, 241 = 1972, 1: 13: "In cases of aposiopesis it is requisite that we should be able to form a notion how the speaker was about to complete the sentence which he breaks off".

still live?",[64] which would require ἆ to follow directly after Ζεύς in the text;

3. aposiopesis followed by speaker's self-resumption rarely occurs in drama, many parallels being controversial.[65] In all its incontrovertible instances, however, aposiopesis is used euphemistically, to avoid uttering words it would not be sensible to utter under the ongoing circumstances. In our passage, given that Antigone resumes her initial question with minimal changes, aposiopesis would hardly make sense except as a manneristic expression of Antigone's distress – one which would be contradicted by the peremptory tone of her self-answer at 4-6. Early position in the play further militates against aposiopesis: incipits were especially liable to memorisation, later quotation and – as shown by the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides at Aristoph. *Ran.* 1119-250 – parodic manipulation, in which case the problem of ὀρθοέπεια took the lion's share.[66] Making linguistically imperfect incipits would have been a risk, and a consummate playwright would have tried to avoid it as much as possible.

Negative reactions followed the publication of Ll-J/W's emendation of 2-3. Griffith (1999, 120) rejects the text of the OCT, but remains undecided between Schneidewin's idea that "ὁποῖον redefines and amplifies ὅ τι" and Jebb's claim that "οἶσθα ὅ τι οὐ τελεῖ; has been conflated with τί <ἐστιν> ὁποῖον οὐ τελεῖ;". Dawe (1996, 2), too, prints a different text, ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεύς, τῶν τ' ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν | ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;: his correction is admittedly small, yet it restores the troublesome question "What is Zeus?", which is out of place in the context. Brown (1991, 325-6) assumes a two-line lacuna between 2 and 3, suggesting both lines to be part of a parallel structure but the resulting four lines – ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν | <παρεὶς ἀνατεὶ τῷ γένει στέρξει ποτέ; | ἆρ' οἶσθα πῆμα τῶν γένει προκειμένων> | ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ; – display naïve repetition of words and ideas: note the reduplication of ἆρ' οἶσθ' and γένει and the conceptual redundancy of τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν and πῆμα τῶν … προκειμένων. Kovacs (1992, 9-12), unlike Ll-J/W, blames ὅ

64 In Lloyd-Jones' Loeb (1994, 2: 5) a dash is placed before ἆ but after τῶν … κακῶν, as in the OCT; no dash is found in Ll-J/W, *ST* 66.

65 See (my reservations in brackets) Aesch. *Pers.* 211-14 (a topic diversion; no syntactical break), *Ag.* 498-9, *Ch.* 193-4, Soph. *Aj.* 384-5 (syntax complete), *OT* 1289, Eur. *El.* 1245, *Ion* 695-8 (*contra*, see Martin 2018, 319-20), *Or.* 1145, *Pho.* 903-4 (a change of topic: note δέ). On (self-)aposiopesis, see Mastronarde 1979, 52-73; Ricottilli 1984; Casanova 2007; 2008; De Poli 2008; 2017; 2020a; 2020b.

66 See Dover 1993, 29-32; Halliwell 2011, 133-6.

τι and extends the corruption to the following word, Ζεύς.[67] As Kovacs argues, the original subject of ὁποῖον … τελεῖ must have been a proleptic accusative governed by οἶσθα, which he assumes to be Ἐρινύν,[68] often portrayed as carrying out destruction on behalf of the gods.[69] Kovacs does not explain how in his view the word Ζεύς could have edged out Ἐρινύν. In support to his view, he cites two passages from the second stasimon, a section of the play which shows a clear connection to Antigone's initial words through the shared motif of *atē*.[70] Both passages, however, allude rather generically to divine agency as enforcing the destruction of the Labdacids:[71] see 594-8 ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν οἴκων ὁρῶμαι | πήματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πήμασι πίπτοντ', | οὐδ' ἀπαλλάσσει γενεὰν γένος, ἀλλ' ἐρείπει | θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν and 601-3 κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία | θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων ἀμᾷ κόνις, | λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς.[72] It is true that a φρενῶν Ἐρινύς ("an Erinys of the mind") is mentioned at 603 alongside λόγου … ἄνοια ("folly of speech"):[73] regardless of whether this Erinys is to be understood as mental derangement or (less likely) as a fully personified demonic agent,[74] such a later diagnosis by the Chorus can hardly be trans-

67 No other motivation is given besides the fact that "once we remove ὅ τι, there is no way to fit the nominative of Zeus's name into the line without absurdity" (1992, 10). Kovacs also discards ἆρ' οἶσθα δὴ Ζεύς and ἆρ' οἶσθά γε Ζεύς.

68 Several alternatives are considered and quickly dismissed by Kovacs: Ζῆνα (unmetrical), Κρονίδην (not used in trimeters), δαίμων (not in the required accusative), Φοῖβον (Apollo is not a destroyer of the Labdacids in this play), πότμον and Μοῖραν (too feeble).

69 See Kovacs 1992, 11 fn. 5, comparing *Il.* 19.87, Aesch. *Ag.* 59, 461-6 and the references to the Erinyes in Aeschylus' *Seven*. Another reason for printing Ἐρινύν is Kovacs' dissatisfaction with νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν: "Antigone speaks the way she does because the subject of τελεῖ is […] normally thought to bring death […], not pain and disgrace in life". But Antigone generically speaks of κακά (including, not coinciding with, death), nor does τελεῖ imply death.

70 On the second stasimon of *Antigone*, see Easterling 1978, Griffith 1999, 218-30, Ferrari 2010, Milo 2010, Cairns 2013, 2014a, 2014b, Gagné 2013, 363-76.

71 See Easterling 1978, 143: "the Chorus can only make sense of what has happened by seeing it all as part of a divine design".

72 On 601-3, see especially Ferrari 2010, Cairns 2014b. The arguments assembled by Ferrari and Cairns for retaining κόνις at 602 are remarkably strong, though Reiske's κοπίς, printed by all recent editors with the exception of Griffith 1999, is still endorsed by Liapis 2013, 94.

73 Cairns 2013, xii calls them two "clear paraphrases for *atē* in its subjective sense" (further references at xliii fn. 17). Whether λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς is an apposition (Ferrari 2010, 52, printing κόνις; Lloyd-Jones 1957, 18, printing κοπίς) or a double addition to 602 (Easterling 1978, 148, printing κόνις; Long 1974, printing κοπίς), it seems equally to refer to Antigone in the first place (Cairns 2013, xiv, xliv fn. 26).

74 For Ἐρινύς as a chiefly internal disposition, Dawe (1967) 108-9 cites e.g. Soph. *Aj.* 1034-5 ἆρ' οὐκ Ἐρινὺς τοῦτ' ἐχάλκευσε ξίφος | κἀκεῖνον Ἅιδης, δημιουργὸς ἄγριος, *Tr.* 893-5 ἔτεκ' ἔτεκε μεγάλαν | ἀνέορτος ἅδε νύμφα | δόμοισι τοῖσδ' Ἐρινύν, though, as Dawe admits, the parallels only imply that "Erinys is not now being visualised as a goddess like one of the Furies in *Eumenides*" (109). Winnington-Ingram (1979) 7-8 strongly objects to φρενῶν Ἐρινύς that "it waters down, if not abolishes, the personification" of the

ferred *ipso facto* to Antigone's opening reflection in 2-3, in which τελεῖ is admittedly more appropriate to Zeus than to any Erinys (see below). A closer examination of the second stasimon corroborates the impression that Ζεύς should by no means be removed from 2: to the passages cited by Kovacs, add 584-5 οἷς γὰρ ἂν σεισθῇ θεόθεν δόμος, ἄτας | οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει γενεᾶς ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἔρπον, 620-4 σοφίᾳ γὰρ ἔκ του | κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται, | τὸ κακὸν δοκεῖν ποτ' ἐσθλὸν | τῷδ' ἔμμεν ὅτῳ φρένας | θεὸς ἄγει πρὸς ἄταν and especially 604-5 τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀν|δρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι;, 608-10 ἀγήρως δὲ χρόνῳ δυνάστας | κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου | μαρμαρόεσσαν αἴγλαν and 611-14 τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον | καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει | νόμος ὅδ'· οὐδέν' ἕρπει | θνατῶν βίοτος πάμπολυς ἐκτὸς ἄτας.

Willink (2000, 665-71 = 2010, 309-15) concurs with Ll-J/W that ὁποῖον is corrupt, whereas ὅτι is defended by the parallel of Aristoph. *Av.* 1246 ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι Ζεύς, εἴ με λυπήσει πέρα, | μέλαθρα μὲν αὐτοῦ καὶ δόμους Ἀμφίονος | καταιθαλώσω …;.[75] Assuming that the textual confusion was caused by the very condensed information, Willink (2000, 667 = 2010, 312) proposes to delete ὁποῖον at 3, which he suggests might have intruded into the text under the influence of ὁποῖον in 5.[76] For the missing word in 3, Willink maintains that (a) the accusative required for τῶν … κακῶν should mean "cessation of", "relief from (evils)", (b) 2-3 should make a different point than 4-6: he therefore proposes – boldly enough, as he admits – ἄμπαυλαν (i.e. ἀνάπαυλαν, "rest"). The noun ἀνάπαυλα sporadically occurs in texts from the Classical Age (Soph. *El.* 873, *Phil.* 638, 878, Eur. *Hipp.* 1137, fr. 912.13, Thuc. 2.38.1, 2.75.3: see also παῦλα at Soph. *Tr.* 1255, *Phil.* 1329, *OC* 88), but never in the ἀμ- form, which is rarely used by Sophocles *metri gratia* with other nouns: cf. *Aj.* 416 ἀμπνοή, *OC* 1068 ἄμβασις. Though not impossible, Willink's solution is linguistically, metrically[77] and contextually unattractive: according to the straightforward interpretation of 2-6, Antigone does answer the question she herself has asked ("What is there that Zeus does not send to us? Nothing"); with Willink's text, Antigone would offer a generic complaint about Zeus ("Do you know that Zeus does not relieve us from evils?") and

Erinys which he would like to maintain in view of the "Aeschylean" features of the ode: his alternative solution, reading λόγου and φρενῶν as both governed by ἄνοια ("folly of word and mind is an Erinys"), has nothing to recommend it.

75 See Dunbar 1998, 627, adding *Av.* 1246 as a possible echo of *Ant.* 1155 δόμων Ἀμφίονος (if it is not Aesch. *Niobe* fr. 160 that is being alluded).

76 On the same grounds, Jones 1995, 237 emends ὁποῖον to θανόντος (i.e. Οἰδίπου) to "make explicit the contrast between the dead Oedipus and νῷν ζώσαιν", though this point is already made clear by νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν.

77 ἀνάπαυλαν produces first-foot anapaest, unattested in *Antigone* (see Schein 1979, 79). Willink 2000, 670 [= 2010, 315] fn. 33 also discusses and rejects the possibility of introducing words of different metrical shapes (×◡◡, ◡◡◡, or ◡◡–◡).

then repeat it with different, yet largely disconnected, words ("There is no evil that I have not seen"). Willink (2000, 670 = 210, 314) further complicates matters by adding that "the negative οὐχί is in the right place before νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν for the sense 'not *for us still living*…' (by contrast with those who are dead)". If so, 2-3 are taken to imply that Zeus has brought τῶν … κακῶν | ἄμπαυλαν ("cessation of evils", i.e. "death") to all of Oedipus" family members except to its last survivors, Antigone and Ismene.[78] Even though in the rest of the play Antigone is seen as ready to accept death for Polynices, an explicit *cupio dissolvi* would be premature here: before setting out to bury Polynices all alone, Antigone spends some time trying to convince Ismene to offer assistance. Moreover, Antigone would hardly regard τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν as "cessation from evil" rather than an evil itself.

The *paradosis* is sound, but its syntactical structure has not been properly understood because of insufficient attention to pragmatics and word order.

As noted above, the worst difficulty in 2-3 is the co-occurrence of ὅ τι and ὁποῖον: word order suggests that these cannot introduce, or belong to, the same clause. The right track has been taken by those scholars who tried to isolate two distinct clauses out of the whole ὅ τι … τελεῖ. The two clauses are as follows:[79]

1. ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν, a relative clause with verb unexpressed;
2. ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ, an interrogative clause with Ζεύς as its resumed subject.

The main axis of the sentence is ἆρ' οἶσθ' … ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῷν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;, in which ὁποῖον is surely to be taken as interrogative: this is independently suggested by the rightmost position of τελεῖ and by the general content of 4-6, which strictly respond to 3. Pronominal ὁποῖος, well-attested in indirect questions,[80] would standardly occur here in clause-initial position (Battezzato 2000, 145-6 = 2008, 85-6). Examples of evidential ἆρα suggest that this is to be understood as an assent-seeking question,[81] elicited by external evidence and de-

78 Willink 2000, 670 = 2010, 315 cites Plut. *Arat.* 54 on ἀπόλυσις κακῶν θάνατος.

79 This segmentation is corroborated by line boundaries, which nicely split the sentence into two chunks, occupying line 2 and 3 respectively.

80 See *PV* 475, Soph. *Aj.* 1354, *Tr.* 1077, *OT* 554, *OC* 561, 572, 1347, 1656, Eur. *Med.* 377 οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποίᾳ (i.e. ὁδῷ) πρῶτον ἐγχειρῶ, φίλαι, *Ion* 574, 803, *Hel.* 631 οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποίου πρῶτον ἄρξωμαι τὰ νῦν, *IA* 1605, [Eur.] *Rh.* 802.

81 See Bakker 1993, 15-23; Sicking, van Ophuijsen 1993, 101-39.

signed to seek agreement with Ismene:[82] since in her self-reply at 4-6 Antigone picks up words of her own, the question to be answered by Antigone must include at least some linguistic material embedded in the answer.

Defenders of the *paradosis* are correct that Ζεύς is the grammatical subject of ὁποῖον … τελεῖ;, but most interpretations fail to explain the harsh hyperbaton (Brunck, Jebb) or try to circumvent the problem by assuming unlikely repetitions (Seidler), interruptions (Schneidewin) or unattested uses of pronouns (Boeckh). The same is true of most emendations proposed so far, which try to get rid of one between ὅ τι (Kovacs) or ὁποῖον (e.g. Ll-J/W, Willink) or rearrange the text so that two different questions are restored (Brown, Dawe). The simplest solution is that no such hyperbaton exists: Ζεύς is both the expressed subject of the relative clause ὅ τι … κακῶν *and* the resumed subject of ὁποῖον … τελεῖ. That the ὁποῖον-clause is the only question in 2-3 rules out both the interpretation of ὅ τι as interrogative (another question word, ὁποῖον, is already there) and the existence of the conjunction ὅτι, which is incompatible with interrogative ὁποῖον.

Being positioned to the left of the question ὁποῖον … τελεῖ, the relative clause ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν provides the background information upon which Antigone's question is based. Pragmatically speaking, ὅ τι … κακῶν can be understood as a pre-posed (i.e. fronted) "topicalized" clause.[83] Topicalization is the placement of Topic constituents at the front of their clauses or sentences (i.e. in leftmost position). In 2-3, the clause introduced by ὅ τι constitutes the larger set wherefrom the interrogative clause with ὁποῖον extracts its referents (Matić 2003, 580, speaking of "extra-clausal Topics"). In less technical language, the ὅ τι-clause embeds information that is assumed to be known and taken for granted by Antigone and Ismene ("Topic" or "presupposed information", i.e. "all the evils deriving from Oedipus that Zeus sent"). In turn, the ὁποῖον-question makes a new point about the presupposed information, in this case by asking a question ("Focus" or "asserted information", i.e. "which of these evils were not sent forth to the sisters?"). A literal translation of 2-3 runs as follows: "Do you know, as for that which [= ὅ τι] Zeus <is> / <fulfils> of the evils coming from Oedipus, what [= ὁποῖον] does not he fulfil for us who are still alive?".[84] Suitably to the occa-

82 In terms of politeness, ἆρα-questions may be used manipulate the hearer's presupposition in order to show the speaker's cooperative attitude: see Catrambone 2019, §3.5.2.7.

83 On Topics and topicalization, see Dik 1995, *passim*; 2007, 136-67; Battezzato 2000, 151-3 = 2008, 91-3; Matić 2003; Allan 2014; Goldstein 2015, 121-73.

84 The lack of identical parallels may be due to the comparatively lower frequency of indirect questions. For the commoner occurrence of co-referential τίς and ὅστις, see (with neut.) Aristoph. *Pax* 1256-7, *Lys.* 21-2, *Plut.* 855, Xen. *Oec.* 7.16; (with masc./fem.)

sion (a new κακόν is on the way), Antigone connects her outraged question to the broader issue of Oedipus' doom.

For topicalized relative clauses with ὅς or ὅστις "at the head of the sentence with unexpressed neuter antecedent […] as a kind of acc. of respect announcing a topic vital to the sense of the main clause" (Mastronarde 2002, 249), see Soph. *Tr.* 350 ἃ μὲν γὰρ ἐξείρηκας ἀγνοία μ' ἔχει, *OT* 216 αἰτεῖς· ἃ δ' αἰτεῖς, τἄμ' ἐὰν θέλῃς ἔπη | κλύων δέχεσθαι […] ἀλκὴν λάβοις ἂν κἀνακούφισιν κακῶν,[85] 486 ὅ τι λέξω δ' ἀπορῶ, *Phil.* 1367 ἀλλ' ἄ μοι ξυνώμοσας, | πέμψον πρὸς οἴκους, Eur. *Med.* 453 ἃ δ' ἐς τυράννους ἐστί σοι λελεγμένα, | πᾶν κέρδος ἡγοῦ ζημιουμένη φυγῇ, 547 ἃ δ' ἐς γάμους μοι βασιλικοὺς ὠνείδισας, | ἐν τῷδε δείξω πρῶτα μὲν σοφὸς γεγώς, *Hipp.* 21 ἃ δ' εἰς ἔμ' ἡμάρτηκε τιμωρήσομαι | Ἱππόλυτον, *Ion* 380 ἃ δ' ἂν διδῶσ' ἑκόντες, ὠφελούμεθα, *Hel.* 1009 ἃ δ' ἀμφὶ τύμβῳ τῷδ' ὀνειδίζεις πατρός, | ἡμῖν ὅδ' αὐτὸς μῦθος, Aristoph. *Pax* 1268 ἀλλ' ὅ τι περ ᾄδειν ἐπινοεῖς, ὦ παιδίον, | αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐμὲ στὰν πρότερον ἀναβαλοῦ 'νθαδί, Bacchyl. 17.24 ὅ τι μ[ὲ]ν ἐκ θεῶν Μοῖρα παγ|κρατὴς ἄμμι κατένευσε καὶ Δίκας ⟦ρέπει τάλαντον, πεπρωμέν[α] ν | αἶσαν [ἐ]κπλήσομεν, Hdt. 7.133 ὅ τι δὲ […] συνήνεικε ἀνεθέλητον γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπαι, πλὴν ὅτι […], and so on.

My proposed interpretation avoids postulating disordered syntax or anomalous linguistic phenomena such as anacoluthon, aposiopesis, syntactical discontinuity, hyperbaton, anaphoric resumption and/or reduplication of interrogatives, non-standard use of pronouns. This syntax justifies the explanation τὸ "ὅ τι" ἀντὶ τοῦ "ὅ" found in the scholium, and also, perhaps, the freer paraphrase supplied for 2-3, ἆρά γέ ἐστι <τι> τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίποδος κακῶν ὁποῖον οὐχὶ ὁ Ζεὺς ἔτι ζώσαις ἡμῖν τελεῖ;. The scholiast, probably deceived by the ordering ὅ τι … ὁποῖον, wrongly took ὁποῖον as analogous to the relative ὁποῖον in 5 and simplified the problematic ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι, which he could no longer take as interrogative, into the yes/no question ἆρά γέ ἐστι <τι> … ὁποῖον οὐχὶ ὁ Ζεύς … τελεῖ;.

As for the unexpressed verb in 2, an immediate suggestion may be τελεῖ, which one could easily supply from 3. Compare especially Soph. *Tereus* fr. 590 (presumably from the play's ending) θνητὴν δὲ φύσιν χρὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν, | τοῦτο κατειδότας, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν | πλὴν Διὸς οὐδεὶς τῶν μελλόντων | ταμίας ὅ τι χρὴ τετελέσθαι, where Zeus is called "master […] of what is destined to be accomplished" (note τελέω and ὅ τι = accusative of respect). Nothing changes, however,

Soph. *Tr.* 1235, *OT* 463, Eur. *El.* 377-8, *HF* 1106-7, *Ion* 623-4, *Hel.* 435-6, *Pho.* 594-5, fr. 127.2, *Thesm.* 592-3, 871-2, *Eccl.* 1131, Thuc. 3.39.7, 3.46.2, 3.64.4, etc. The proposed interpretation is better than taking ὁποῖον as antecedent of a proleptic relative ὅ τι ("Do you know *what* [ὁποῖον] Zeus does not fulfil for us who are still alive *that* [ὅτι] he fulfils (or: is) of the evils coming from Oedipus").

85 For αἰτεῖς· ἃ δ' αἰτεῖς instead of the tautological αἰτεῖς ἃ δ' αἰτεῖς (which would remove this example from the list), see Finglass 2018, 239.

if ἐστί is supplied instead of τελεῖ: for 2-3 would mean "do you know, as for that which Zeus is [i.e. is responsible] of the evils coming from Oedipus, what does not he send to the two of us while we are still alive?".[86] Apart from the abovementioned fr. 590 from *Tereus*, compare the anapaestic closure of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, in which the recapitulation of the sufferings of Heracles' household is rounded off by a generalisation about Zeus's control over human affairs (*Tr.* 1270-8):[87] τὰ μὲν οὖν μέλλοντ' οὐδεὶς ἐφορᾷ, | τὰ δὲ νῦν ἑστῶτ' οἰκτρὰ μὲν ἡμῖν, | αἰσχρὰ δ' ἐκείνοις, | χαλεπώτατα δ' οὖν ἀνδρῶν πάντων | τῷ τήνδ' ἄτην ὑπέχοντι. | λείπου μηδὲ σύ, παρθέν', ἐπ' οἴκων, | μεγάλους μὲν ἰδοῦσα νέους θανάτους, | πολλὰ δὲ πήματα <καὶ> καινοπαθῆ, | κοὐδὲν τούτων ὅ τι μὴ Ζεύς. The final adage includes ὅ τι μὴ Ζεύς, which requires the mental supplement ἐστιν, as is possibly the case at *Ant.* 2.[88] The zero-copula clause thus restored conforms to the general formulations typically associated with (though not exclusive to) this construction.[89] For relative clauses with zero-copula construction, see (with ὅς) *Tr.* 1116, *OT* 862, *OC* 793, 1133; (with ὅστις) *Aj.* 1038, *Ant.* 209, *OT* 344, *El.* 257; (with ὅσπερ) *Tr.* 56. Under this scenario, ὅ τι is more likely predicate and Ζεύς its subject than the other way round:[90] for the predicate-subject ordering, immortalised by Pind. *Ol.* 1.1 ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, compare Soph. *Aj.* 665 ἐχθρῶν ἄδωρα δῶρα, *El.* 174 ἔτι μέγας οὐράνῳ Ζεύς, *OT* 609-10 οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον […] νομίζειν, *El.* 145 νήπιος ὃς … ἐπιλάθεται, and also (in subordinate clauses) *Tr.* 1116 αἰτήσομαι γάρ σ' ὧν δίκαια τυγχάνειν, *Phil.* 1227 ἔπραξας ἔργον ποῖον ὧν οὔ σοι πρέπον;.

Since no verb occurs in 2, there is no way to make a choice between τελεῖ and ἐστί. Both constructions highlight Zeus's general responsibility for all the present and future evils stemming from Oedipus. Antigone's question, though syntactically simpler, now becomes subtler and more poignant than in any received interpretation of 2-3. She starts from the conventional idea that Zeus controls everything that happens to humankind: compare *Il.* 1.5 Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, 15.631-2 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ τέ σέ φασι περὶ φρένας ἔμμεναι ἄλλων | ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ θεῶν· σέο δ' ἐκ τάδε πάντα πέλονται, Hes. *Op.* 668-9 ἐν τοῖς (= Zeus and Poseidon) γὰρ τέλος ἐστὶν ὁμῶς ἀγαθῶν τε

86 For the formula "somebody is something", see Gow 1952, 2: 268-9.

87 For the idea, see the parallels cited by Pearson 1917, 2: 232-3, on *Tereus* fr. 590.

88 Thus Jebb 1892, 183 and Gow 1952, 2: 268. West 1979, 112 and Davies 1991, 266-7 suggest instead ἔπραξεν, but the latter is not warranted by schol. Soph. *Tr.* 1278a^3 Xenis (2010, 258) οὐδὲν τούτων οὐδεὶς ἔπραξεν, εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Ζεύς, which may well be a freer paraphrase of 1278.

89 On nominal (= zero-copula) clauses, see S-D 2: 623-4 (references at 623 fn. 1); Guiraud 1962; Lanérès 1994; Mambrini 2019.

90 For statistical remarks on historiography, see Mambrini 2019, 105-7.

κακῶν τε, Semon. fr. 1.1-2 ὦ παῖ, τέλος μὲν Ζεὺς ἔχει βαρύκτυπος | πάντων ὅσ' ἐστὶ καὶ τίθησ' ὅκῃ θέλει, Alc. fr. 200.10 Ζεῦι̯ς ἔχει̯] τ̣έλ̣ος Κ̣ρ̣ο̣[νίδαις, Sol. fr. 13.17 οὐ γὰρ δὴ<ν> θνητοῖς ὕβριος ἔργα πέλει, | ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πάντων ἐφορᾷ τέλος, Pind. *Nem.* 10.28-30 Ζεῦ πάτερ [...] πὰν δὲ τέλος | ἐν τὶν ἔργων, Aesch. *Suppl.* 823-4 γαιάοχε παγκρατὲς Ζεῦ [...] τί δ' ἄνευ σέθεν | θνατοῖσι τέλειόν ἐστιν;, *Ag.* 1485-8 ἰὼ ἰὴ διαὶ Διὸς | παναιτίου πανεργέτα· | τί γὰρ βροτοῖς ἄνευ Διὸς τελεῖται; | τί τῶνδ' οὐ θεόκραντόν ἐστιν;, Eur. fr. 1110 Ζεὺς ἐν θεοῖσι μάντις ἀψευδέστατος | καὶ τέλος αὐτὸς ἔχει.[91] Then, Antigone asks which of those calamities that Zeus cannot help fulfilling have been escaped by the sisters: for the sentiment, compare Deianira's prayer to Zeus to be spared suffering as long as she lives (Soph. *Tr.* 303-5): ὦ Ζεῦ τροπαῖε, μή ποτ' εἰσίδοιμί σε | πρὸς τοὐμὸν οὕτω σπέρμα χωρήσαντά ποι, | μηδ', εἴ τι δράσεις, τῆσδέ γε ζώσης ἔτι.[92] On Zeus as sender of *atē*, see especially *Il.* 2.111-12 = 9.18-19, 8.236-7, 19.87-8, Aesch. *Ag.* 355-61, *Ch.* 380-5, Soph. *Tr.* 995-1002 (having sent λώβη to Heracles, Zeus is the only one who could put his ἄτη to an end).

91 For the association of Ζεύς with τελεῖν/τέλος, see also *Il.* 9.456, 15.593, 18.74, 18.116, 22.366, *Od.* 2.34, 11.297, 15.112, 17.51, 17.60, Archil. fr. 298, *Alc.* fr. 361, Pind. *Ol.* 13.115, *Pyth.* 1.67, Bacchyl. 3.25-6, Aesch. *Sept.* 116-17, *Suppl.* 524-6, 624, *Ag.* 973, 1487-8, *Ch.* 380-5, *PV* 12-13, Soph. *OC* 1079, Lloyd-Jones 1971, 82-7; West 1990, 104-5.

92 See further *Il.* 6.464-5, 24.244-6, Aesch. *Sept.* 219-22, *Ag.* 1537-40.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

Dawe, *STS* = Dawe, R.D. (1973-78). *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, 3 vols. Leiden: Brill.
K.-A. = Austin, C.F.L.; Kassel, R. (1983-). *Poetae comici Graeci*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.
Ll-J/W = Lloyd-Jones, H.; Wilson, N.G. (1992). *Sophoclis fabulae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Ll-J/W, *So*. = Lloyd-Jones, H.; Wilson, N.G. (1990). *Sophoclea: Studies on the Text of Sophocles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Ll-J/W, *ST* = Lloyd-Jones, H.; Wilson, N.G. (1997). *Sophocles: Second Thoughts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
LSJ = Liddell, H.G.; Scott, R.L. (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. Revised by Sir H.S. Jones, R. McKenzie et al. With a Revised Supplement edited by P.G.W. Glare, A.A. Thompson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
S-D = Schwyzer, E.; Debrunner, A. (1939-71). *Griechische Grammatik*, 4 Bde. München: Beck.
TrGF = Snell, B.; Kannicht, R.; Radt, S.L. (1971-2004). *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, 5 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Cited Works

Agosto, M. (2018). "Ἄτης ἄτερ: A Note on Sophocles, *Antigone* 2-6". *Mnemosyne*, 71, 958-75. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-12342442.
Allan, R.J. (2014). "Changing the Topic. Topic Position in Ancient Greek Word Order". *Mnemosyne*, 67, 181-213. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-12341050.
Anonymous Londinensis (1722). *Sophoclis tragoediae septem*. London: Tonson and Watts.
Ast, F. (ed.) (1804). *Sophokles Trauerspiele*. Leipzig: Schwickertsche Verlage.
Austin, C.F.L. (2006). "The Girl Who Said 'No' (Sophocles' *Antigone*)". *Eikasmos*, 17, 103-15.
Bakker, E.J. (1993). "Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization, and Presence in Homeric Poetry". *ClAnt*, 12, 1-29. https://doi.org/10.2307/25010981.
Barrett, W.S. (ed.) (1964). *Euripides: Hippolytos*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Battezzato, L. (2000). "Pragmatica e retorica delle frasi interrogative in Euripide: note ai fr. 125 e 255 Nauck e ad *Andr.* 366 s. (con una parentesi sul fr. 172 Nauck)". *MD*, 44, 141-73.
Battezzato, L. (2008). *Linguistica e retorica della tragedia greca*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
Bekker, I. (1833). *Apollonii Sophistae lexicon Homericum*. Berlin: Reimer.
Bergk, W.T. (ed.) (1858). *Sophoclis tragoediae*. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
Blaydes, F.H.M. (ed.) (1859). *Sophocles, with English Notes*, vol. 1. London: Whittaker.
Boeckh, A. (ed.) (1843). *Des Sophokles Antigone*. Berlin: Veit.
Bonitz, H. (1857). *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Sophokles*. Wien: Braumüller.
Bothe, F.H. (1827). *Sophoclis Antigona*. Leipzig: Hahn.

Brown, A. (ed.) (1987). *Sophocles: "Antigone"*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
Brown, A. (1991). "Notes on Sophocles' *Antigone*". *CQ*, 41, 325-39. https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880000450X.
Bruhn, E. (ed.) (1913). *Sophokles: "Antigone"*. 11th ed. Berlin: Weidmann.
Brunck, R.F.P. (ed.) (1786-89). *Sophoclis tragoediae septem. Ad optimorum exemplarium fidem emendatae cum versione et notis*, 4 vols. Strasbourg: Treuttel.
Budelmann, F. (2000). *The Language of Sophocles: Communality, Communication, and Involvement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cairns, D.L. (2012). "Ate in the Homeric poems". Cairns, F. (ed.), *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar*, vol. 12. Prenton: Francis Cairns, 1-52.
Cairns, D.L. (2013). "Introduction: Archaic Thought and Tragic Interpretation". *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, IX-LIV.
Cairns, D.L. (2014a). "Λόγου τ᾽ ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς: *atē* in Sophocles' *Antigone*". Διεθνές συμπόσιο αρχαίου ελληνικού δράματος. 12. Πάθος, μάθος: πόνος, παραφορά και διαχείρισή τους στο αρχαίο ελληνικό δράμα. Λευκωσία, 6, 7 και 8 Ιουλίου 2012. Lefkosia: Kypriako Kentro Diethnous Institoutou Theatrou, 37-54.
Cairns, D.L. (2014b). "The Bloody Dust of the Nether Gods: Sophocles, *Antigone* 599-603". Emilsson, E.K.; Maravela, A.; Skoie, M. (eds), *Paradeigmata: Studies in Honor of Øivind Andersen*. Athens: Norwegian Institute at Athens, 39-51.
Campbell, L. (ed.) (1879-81). *Sophocles*, 2 vols. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Casanova, A. (2007). "Uso dell'aposiopesi nella *Samia* di Menandro". *Prometheus*, 33, 1-16.
Casanova, A. (2008). "L'aposiopesi in Aristofane (e in Menandro)". *SemRom*, 11, 169-83.
Catrambone, M. (2019). *Tragic Conversation: Politeness Strategies in Sophocles' Patterned Dialogues* [PhD dissertation]. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
Chantraine, P. (1933). *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Champion.
Coulon, V. (1939). "Observations critiques et exégétiques sur divers passages controversés de Sophocle". *REG*, 52, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.3406/reg.1939.8233.
Davies, M. (ed.) (1991). *Sophocles: "Trachiniae"*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Dawe, R.D. (1967). "Some Reflections on Ate and Hamartia". *HSCP*, 72, 89-123.
Dawe, R.D. (ed.) (1979). *Sophoclis tragoediae*. Vol. 2, *"Trachiniae", "Antigone", "Philoctetes", "Oedipus Coloneus"*. Leipzig: Teubner.
Dawe, R.D. (ed.) (1985). *Sophoclis tragoediae*. Vol. 2, *"Trachiniae", "Antigone", "Philoctetes"," Oedipus Coloneus"*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner.
Dawe, R.D. (ed.) (1996). *Sophoclis "Antigone"*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Teubner.
Dawe, R.D. (2002-03). "On Editing Sophocles, Oxford style". *ICS*, 27-8, 347-65.
Dawe, R.D. (2007). *Corruption and Correction. A Collection of Articles*. Ed. by F. Boschetti and V. Citti. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
Denniston, J.D. (1954). *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
De Poli, M. (2008). "Per uno studio dell'anacoluto e dell'aposiopesi in Euripide: (Eur. *Alc*. 122 ss., 466 ss.; *Tr.* 285 ss.; *IT* 208 ss., 895 ss.; *Hel.* 238 ss.; *Ion* 695 ss.)". *Lexis*, 26, 125-48.
De Poli, M. (2017). "A case of aposiopesis: note on Euripides, *Iphigenia Among the Taurians* 827-836". De Poli, M. (ed.), *Euripides: Stories, Texts and Stagecraft*. Padova: Padova University Press, 79-83.

De Poli, M. (2020a). "Aposiopesis: notes on Aeschylus, *Libation-Bearers* 192-194". *Mnemosyne*, 73, 669-74. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-12342799.
De Poli, M. (2020b). "L'immaginario e il silenzio enfatico: note a Euripide, Elettra 581-584". *Dionysus ex Machina*, 11, 54-70.
Diggle, J. (1981). *Studies on the Text of Euripides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Dik, H.J.M. (1995). *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
Dik, H.J.M. (2007). *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
Dindorf, W. (ed.) (1867). *Sophoclis tragoediae superstites et perditarum fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner.
Donaldson, J.W. (ed.) (1848). *The "Antigone" of Sophocles*. London: Parker.
Dover, K.J. (ed.) (1993). *Aristophanes: "Frogs"*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Dunbar, N. (ed.) (1998). *Aristophanes: "Birds"*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Earle, M.L. (1903). "Notes on Sophocles's *Antigone*". *CR*, 17, 3-6. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X00207129.
Easterling, P.E. (1978). "The Second Stasimon of Antigone". Dawe, R.D.; Diggle, J.; Easterling, P.E. (eds), *Dionysiaca. Nine Studies in Greek Poetry by Former Pupils, Presented to Denys Page on His Seventieth Birthday*. Cambridge: Cambridge Faculty Library, 141-58.
Ellis, R. (1893). "Two Notes on Sophocles". *The Journal of Philology*, 21, 37-8. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139523745.005.
Erfurdt, C.G.A.; Hermann, J.G.J. (eds) (1830). *Sophoclis Antigona*. 3rd ed. Leipzig: Fleischer.
Ferrari, F. (2010). "La luce soffocata: Soph. *Ant.* 583-603". Belardinelli, A.M., Greco, G. (a cura di), *Antigone e le Antigoni: storia forme fortuna di un mito = Atti del convegno internazionale* (Roma, 13, 25-26 maggio 2009). Firenze: Le Monnier, 50-8.
Finglass, P.J. (ed.) (2007). *Sophocles: "Electra"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Finglass, P.J. (ed.) (2011). *Sophocles: "Ajax"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Finglass, P.J. (ed.) (2018). *Sophocles: "Oedipus the King"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gagné, R. (2013). *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
Goldstein, D.M. (2015). *Classical Greek Syntax: Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
Gow, A.S.F. (ed.) (1952). *Theocritus*, 2 vols. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Griffith, M. (ed.) (1999). *Sophocles. "Antigone"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Guiraud, C. (1962). *La phrase nominale en grec d'Homère à Euripide*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Halliwell, F.S. (2011). *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
Hartung, J.A. (ed.) (1850). *Sophokles "Antigone"*. Leipzig: Engelmann.
Heath, B. (1762). *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque relliquias*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Heimsoeth, F. (1865). *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern*. Bonn: Cohen.
Heindorf, L.F. (ed.) (1802). *Platonis Dialogi quatuor: Lysis, Charmides, Hippias Maior, Phaedrus*. Berlin: Nauck.
Housman, A.E. (1887). "On Soph. *Electr.* 564, and Eur. *I.T.* 15 and 35". *CR*, 1, 240-1. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511552717.005.
Housman, A.E. (1972). *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman, I: 1882-1897*. Ed. by J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jäkel, W. (1961). "Die Exposition in der *Antigone* des Sophokles". *Gymnasium*, 68, 34-55.
Jebb, R.C. (ed.) (1888). *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments*. Part III, *The "Antigone"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jebb, R.C. (ed.) (1892). *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments*. Part V, *The "Trachiniae"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Johnson, T. (ed.) (1746). *Sophoclis tragoediae septem*. London: Innys.
Jones, D.M. (1995). "Sophocles, *Antigone* 2-3". *CQ*, 45, 237. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838800041847.
Kaibel, G. (1897). *De Sophoclis "Antigona"*. Göttingen: Officina Academica Dieterichiana.
Kamerbeek, J.C. (ed.) (1978). *The Plays of Sophocles. Commentaries*. Vol. III, *The Antigone*. Leiden: Brill.
Könnecke, O. (1916). "Zur Antigone". *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 33, 642-6.
Kovacs, D. (1992). "Notes on *Antigone* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*". *ICS*, 17, 9-22.
Kranz, W. (1913). "Die Eingangsverse der *Antigone*". *Sokrates*, 67, 304-6.
Kvičala, J. (1864). *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Sophokles*. Wien: Gerold.
Labiano, M. (2017). "Greek Interjectional ἆ = "Stop doing that!" in Euripides". *Glotta*, 93, 36-47. https://doi.org/10.13109/glot.2017.93.1.36.
Lanérès, N. (1994). *Les formes de la phrase nominale en grec ancien: étude sur la langue de l'Iliade*. Lille; Paris: Université Charles de Gaulle Lille III; Université de Paris VII.
Lehrs, K. (1862). "Zur Litteratur von Sophokles *Antigone*". *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, 8, 297-315.
Lévesque, P.-C. (éd.) (1795). *Histoire de Thucydide*. 4 vols. Paris: Gail et Aubin.
Liapis, V.J. (2013). "Creon the Labdacid: Political Confrontation and the Doomed Oikos in Sophocles' *Antigone*". Cairns, D.L. (ed.), *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 81-118.
Lloyd-Jones, H. (1957). "Notes on Sophocles' *Antigone*". *CQ*, 51, 12-27. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838800016542.
Lloyd-Jones, H. (1971). *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.) (1994). *Sophocles*. 3 vols. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
Long, T. (1974). "Τε καί and κοπίς in Sophocles' *Antigone* 602". *RhM*, 117, 213-14.
Mambrini, F. (2019). "Nominal vs Copular Clauses in a Diachronic Corpus of Ancient Greek Historians: A Treebank-based Analysis". *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 19, 90-113. https://doi.org/10.1163/15699846-01901003.
Martin, G. (ed.) (2018). *Euripides: "Ion". Edition and Commentary*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.

Mastronarde, D.J. (1979). *Contact and Discontinuity. Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Mastronarde, D.J. (ed.) (2002). *Euripides: "Medea"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Matić, D. (2003). "Topic, Focus, and Discourse Structure: Ancient Greek Word Order". *Studies in Language*, 27, 573-633. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.27.3.05mat.
Mazon, P. (1951). "Notes sur Sophocle". *RPh*, 25, 7-17.
McNamee, K. (2007). *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
Meineke, A. (1861). *Beiträge zur philologischen Kritik der Antigone des Sophokles*. Berlin: Enslin.
Milo, D. (2010). "Sul secondo stasimo dell'*Antigone* di Sofocle". *Vichiana*, 12, 6-24.
Moorhouse, A.C. (1982). *The Syntax of Sophocles*. Leiden: Brill.
Müller, G. (ed.) (1967). *Sophokles. "Antigone"*. Heidelberg: Winter.
Musgrave, S. (ed.) (1800). *Sophoclis tragoediae septem*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Nordgren, L. (2015). *Greek Interjections. Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics*. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Paley, F.A. (1882). "On the First Seven Verses of the *Antigone*". *The Journal of Philology*, 10, 16-17. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139523639.003.
Pearson, A.C. (ed.) (1917). *The Fragments of Sophocles*. Edited with additional notes from the papers of Sir R.C. Jebb and Dr. W.G. Headlam. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Porson, R. (1815). *Tracts and Miscellaneous Criticisms of the Late Richard Porson*. Edited by T. Kidd. London: Payne and Foss.
Renehan, R.F. (1992). "The New Oxford Sophocles". *CPh*, 87, 335-75. https://doi.org/10.1086/367327.
Ricottilli, L. (1984). *La scelta del silenzio: Menandro e l'aposiopesi*. Bologna: Pàtron.
Rutherford, R.B. (2012). *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language, and Interpretation*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
Sallier, C. (1751). "Fortsetzung der Nachricht von einigen Büchern aus der königliche französische Bibliothek". *Geschichte der königlichen Akademie der schönen Wissenschaften zu Paris*, 5, 56-68.
Schaefer, G.H. (ed.) (1818). *Sophoclis tragoediae*. Leipzig: Weigel.
Schein, S.L. (1979). *The Iambic Trimeter in Aeschylus and Sophocles: A Study in Metrical Form*. Leiden: Brill.
Schmidt, M. (ed.) (1880). *Sophokles "Antigone" nebst den Scholien des Laurentianus*. Jena: Fischer.
Schneidewin, F.W. (ed.) (1849). *Sophokles. "Antigone"*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Schneidewin, F.W. (ed.) (1854). *Sophokles. "Antigone"*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Weidmann.
Schneidewin, F.W.; Nauck, A. (Hrsgg) (1886). *Sophokles. "Antigone"*. 9th ed. Berlin: Weidmann.
Schütz, H. (1890). *Sophokleische Studien: kritisch-exegetische Untersuchungen der schwierigeren Stellen in den Tragödien des Sophokles*. Potsdam: Stein.
Schwab, G. (2006). "Gegen die Anfechtung des überlieferten Wortlauts von Sophokles, *Antigone* 2-3". *ACD*, 42, 21-34.

Schwab, G. (2010). "Sophokles *Antigone* 4-6: eine konjekturlose Erklärung". *Mnemosyne*, 63, 94-109. https://doi.org/10.1163/002670710X12603307970630.
Seidler, J.F.A. (1811). *De versibus dochmiacis tragicorum Graecorum*. Leipzig: Fleischer.
Semitelos, D.C. (ed.) (1887). Σοφοκλέους τραγῳδίαι. Τόμος πρώτος: Αντιγόνη. Αθήνα: Περρή.
Sicking, C.M.J.; van Ophuijsen, J.M. (1993). *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage: Lysias and Plato*. Leiden: Brill.
Sommerstein, A.H. (2013). "*Atē* in Aeschylus". Cairns, D.L. (ed.), *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 1-15.
Steiner, G. (1984). *Antigones*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Toti, A. (2012). "Proposta di emendamento a Soph. *Ant*. 3: osservazioni per un approccio esegetico al personaggio". *GIF*, 3, 9-28.
Uhle, H. (1905). *Bemerkungen zur Anakoluthie bei griechischen Schriftstellern besonders bei Sophokles*. Dresden: Lehmann.
Vauvilliers, J.-F.d. (ed.) (1781). *Sophoclis tragoediae septem, cum interpretatione latina et scholiis veteribus ac novis*. 2 vols. Paris: Pissot.
Voigt, E.M. (ed.) (1971). *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam: Athenaeum; Polak & Van Gennep.
Wecklein, N. (1869). *Ars Sophoclis emendandi. Accedunt analecta Euripidea*. Würzburg: Stuber.
Wecklein, N. (ed.) (1878). *Sophoclis tragoediae*. Vol. 1.4, *Antigone*. 5th ed. Leipzig: Teubner.
Welcker, F.G. (1861). "Zu Sophokles". *RhM*, 16, 310-12.
West, M.L. (1979). "Tragica III". *BICS*, 26, 104-17. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-5370.1979.tb00503.x.
West, M.L. (1990). *Studies in Aeschylus*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
West, M.L. (ed.) (1998). *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheo*, 2nd ed. Stuttgart; Leipzig: Teubner.
Wex, F.C. (ed.) (1829-31). *Sophoclis Antigona*, 2 vols. Leipzig: Vogel.
Willink, C.W. (2000). "The Opening Speech of Sophocles' *Antigone*". *Mnemosyne*, 53, 662-71. https://doi.org/10.1163/156852500510958.
Willink, C.W. (2010). *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*. Ed. by W.B. Henry. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
Winnington-Ingram, R.P. (1979). "Sophoclea". *BICS*, 26, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-5370.1979.tb00491.x.
Wolff, G.; Bellermann, L. (Hrsgg) (1885). *Sophokles. "Antigone"*. 4th ed. Leipzig: Teubner.
Wunder, E. (ed.) (1846). *Sophocles. "Antigone"*. 3rd ed. Gotha; Erfurt: Hennings.
Xenis, G.A. (ed.) (2010). *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis Trachinias*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.
Xenis, G.A. (ed.) (2021). *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis Antigonam*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.
Zehlicke, J. (1826). *De aliquot Antigonae locis*. Greifswald: Kunike.
Zinsmeister, H. (1914). *Die Anfangsverse von Sophokles' "Antigone"*. Dillingen a.D.: Keller.