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 Parodos of Sophocles' *Antigone*

Benj. Ide Wheeler

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 05 / June 1904, pp 243 - 245

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990140, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990140

How to cite this article:

Benj. Ide Wheeler (1904). The Parodos of Sophocles' *Antigone*. The Classical Review, 18, pp 243-245 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990140

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

put it out of mind; a parenthesis usurps the place of the main sentence. It is studied carelessness, to resemble the irregularity of actual speech, like the 'nominativus pendens' which Aeschylus is so fond of using.

Frag. 258 καὶ ψευδόδειπνα . . . ἐρρυσιασ οἶον MS. ἐρρυσιάσθη Kaibel: ἐρρυσιάσθη as ἀφῆρέθη?

In *Soph. fr.* 234. 7 δέιλη δὲ πᾶσα τέμνεται βλαστομένη | καλῶς ὁπώρα no alteration of

βλαστομένη seems probable, unless it was κλαστομένη i.e. κλασταζομένη: see *Ar. Eq.* 166 schol. and κλάσις, Phot. κλᾶν ἀμπελόν: τὸ τέμνειν.

Soph. fr. 612 One may suspect that Sophocles said not πολύκουνον Ἀμφιτρίταν but πολυκύμον' Ἀμφιτρίταν, the epithet of the sea in Solon, Empedocles and a fragment in Suidas πολυκύμονος θαλάσσης: cf. *Hom.* γ 91, μ 60.

W. HEADLAM.

THE PARODOS OF SOPHOCLES' *ANTIGONE*.

THE choral passages of Sophocles particularly in the *Antigone* are distinguished by an elaborate harmonic arrangement of ideas and figures, which however delicately presented or suggested, betrays to careful inspection a highly conscious and almost artificial analysis. In marked contrast hereto, the current interpretations of the parodos of the *Antigone* yield a lack of balance in the ideas, a confusion of the imagery, and an absence of all unity of plan. The belief that all this is the fault of the interpretations and not of the parodos instigates the writing of this paper.

Leaving out of account the final anapaestic system, which heralds the appearance of Creon, the subject matter of the ode proper is set forth in seven stanzas, four strophes (or antistrophes) with three alternating anapaestic systems. The first stanza (i.e. the first strophe) welcomes the beams of the rising sun, dispelling the terrors of the night, bringing peace to the battle-leagured town, —'fairest light that e'er shone on Thebes of the seven gates, at last hast thou appeared. O lid of golden day.' The seventh stanza (i.e. the second antistrophe), brings the echo hereto in the personal embodiment of *Nike* who advances 'smiling to greet Thebe of the many chariots,' appointing men to forget the battle and strife. In the first, the beams of the sun are driving the white-shielded Argive foe 'a headlong fugitive, prodding him on with ever tightening bit.' In the last, *Nike* as counterpart and exponent of the glad some sun sends the folk of Thebes in festal procession to the temples of their gods. The ἦλθε Νίκα repeats the ἀκτὶς ἀελίου μολοῦσα, as the τῇ πολυαρμάτῳ ἀντιχαεῖσα Θήβα reflects τὸ κάλλιστον ἑπταπύλῳ φανέν Θήβα.

Framed between these two stanzas, which

reveal the spiritual attitude of the song and yield the atmosphere of the picture,—which voice the exceeding joy of light out of darkness and of victory out of impending defeat,—stands the body of the ode, the five central stanzas, which tell the story of the battle itself. The battle is presented in its three phases, the onslaught of the foe, the even-matched struggle, the sudden discomfiture and rout of the Argive at the moment when his triumph seemed sure. The story is not told, however, as a continuous narrative, but is fashioned rather as a thrice-told tale. Stanzas two and three tell it all,—onslaught, struggle, and rout,—under the figure of the conflict between the white-winged eagle and the serpent. Then stanzas four and five tell it again, onslaught, struggle, and rout, but under another figure, and introduce the second tale as an explanation or epexegetis of the first. Of this epexegetis the particle γάρ of line 127 is the symbol. Thereupon again stanza six begins the tale, this time without figure and in the directer language of fact: 'For seven captains at the seven gates arrayed, equals matched against equals,' but again introducing it as epexegetis of the preceding with the particle γάρ of line 141. Three times under three forms or figures the onslaught has been set forth, each time with use of an anapaestic system.

The third form of the statement, namely that of stanza six, which as we have seen, reaches at last the plain language of fact, lays its stress on the even matching of strength against strength, man against man; it is 'seven against seven,' 'equal against equal'; yea, with one of the pairs the contest is even matched to the extent of πατὴρ ἐνὸς μητρὸς τε μῆας, and therefrom arises no issue of victory; with them the battle remains drawn; forever evenly matched

(δικρατεῖς—κοινοῦ—ἄμφω). For the others there is a decision, as shown by the πάγχαλκα τέλη, the symbols and prizes of victory (cf. Pindar, *Olym.* 11, 67; *Isthm.* 1, 27.) left in the hands of the arbiter Zeus.

Returning now to the first form of the story, that contained in stanzas two and three, I believe there can be no doubt that the imagery suggested by the words is that of a self-consistent picture, namely, the picture of a contest between the eagle representing Argos and the serpent representing Thebes. The Thebans are the δρακοντογενεῖς. The eagle comes from without; flies over to the land. It comes in noisy and defiant onset, shrill screaming (δέξια κλάζων) for, lo, it was from out of the wrangling strifes of Polyneices that it had taken wing. Over the snake as genius of the place and symbol of home, over the roof-trees of Thebes (ὑπὲρ μελάρων) it poises itself, and its blood-thirsting beak yawns before the seven-gated mouth of its prey. But before it could glut its jaws with Theban blood, before Hephaestus could lay his grip on the coronet of towers,¹ it was gone, scared away by the din that Ares raised. That the imagery of metaphor is here, and that it is presented according to a self-consistent picture, there can be no doubt; but it is only a pattern glimmering through the fabric, sketched in golden threads. So we shall find it to be in the second form of the story, though there the pattern is still more dimly sketched.

This second form of the story is presented in stanzas four and five. The parallelism with the first form, *i.e.* stanzas two and three, is unmistakeable. The onset of the antagonist is loud and defiant; there are the 'boasts of a haughty tongue' (μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους), 'the pride of rattling gold' (χρυσοῦ καναχῆς ὑπεροπλίας), 'the snorting blasts of hostile winds' (ἐπέπνει ῥιπαῖς ἐχθίστων ἀνέμων). Defeat overwhelms the foe just as he is 'hasting to raise the cry of victory' (νίκην ὀρμῶντι ἀλαλάσαι). Zeus is here too the arbiter, the supreme βραβεύς, whose will allots defeat and victory. Ἥφαιστον (l. 123) returns as the πυρφόρος (l. 135). Ares appears as the helper of Thebes at the crisis; μέγας Ἄρης δεξιόσκιρος at the end of stanza five echoes and exactly parallels the πάταγος Ἄρεος at the end of stanza three. Of the picture of eagle and serpent there is, however, no longer a trace;

that having served its purpose, has faded away, and another takes its place. The scene shifts to the stadion and the contest assumes the form of the four-horse chariot race. We can hear the shouts of the charioteer in the lead, the rattle and clank of harnesses and trappings, the snort of the steeds. Already the foremost chariot is making the last turn to the goal βαλβίδων ἐπ' ἄκρων, and its driver is impatient to raise the claiming cry of victory (νίκην ὀρμῶντι ἀλαλάσαι), when the competing team in which great Ares is the right trace-horse (δεξιόσκιρος) surges against him and pushing him and his aside (στυφελίζων), hurls him from his car to the earth (ἀντιτύπα δ' ἐπὶ γῆ πέσσε πανταλωθεῖς), and scatters all in confusion and ruin (εἶχε δ' ἄλλα τὰ μέν, ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις ἐπενόμα).

That the effect of the picture lingers on even in the seventh stanza is betrayed by the appearance of Nike advancing with smiles of congratulation to meet the victorious Thebes, Thebe of the many chariots. It is not a Nike like that of Paeonius, which the poet has here in mind, but the type familiar to us from the vase-paintings, the cupid-like Nike who with the fillet as badge of victory in her hand flits down to greet and decorate the victorious charioteer (*e.g.* Reinach, *Peintures*. Millin Pl. ii, 60; ii, 72, cf. also Millin i, 43, 45 and Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, Fig. 2137; Panofka, *Cabinet Pourtalès*, Pl. 33, *Arch.-Zeit.* 1867, Pl. 226).

If the interpretation here offered for stanzas four and five may appear from internal evidences possible and even probable, it is raised to what we must consider a demonstrated certainty, as certainty goes in things so human as these, by reference to the full-drawn picture of the four-horse chariot race of the Pythian games, which the same artist has left us for comparison in the pages of the *Electra* (ll. 696-760). The two passages differ in their character, and especially in their use of scenes and incidents taken from the chariot race, as widely as in their date of composition. One uses the material delicately in suggestive metaphor and as decoration, the other introduces it directly in narration. And yet it appears, if our interpretation of stanzas four and five be correct, that in both similar features and similar incidents dominate the poet's attention as characteristic of the event. There is the shout of the drivers and the clatter of the cars: 'And all with one accord shouted at their horses and shook the reins with both hands; the whole course was filled

¹ We can scarcely avoid the conviction that δυσχείρωμα (l. 126) was coined to echo στεφάνωμα (l. 122); through the din raised by the fighters on the towers the στεφάνωμα became the eagle's δυσχείρωμα (στεφανῶν: χειρώω), instead of its easy prey.

with the din of clattering cars.' And there is the snorting of the horses as they come on: 'And all in confused mass plied their goads and spared not, each that he might pass the wheels of his rivals and the snorting of their steeds, for alike at their backs and at their advancing wheels the breath of the horses foamed and cast its spray.' Here too the right trace-horse (δεξιόσειρος) as δεξιὸν σειραῖον ἵππον plays a distinguished part, though mentioned, I believe, nowhere outside of these two passages in all Greek literature. Here too

chariots collide and are scattered in ruin about, 'till the whole arena of Crisa was strewn with the wreck of chariots.' And then at the last and as the supreme incident, just as the foremost driver was making the last turn to the goal with victory all but in his grasp, he is thrown from his car with all the swing of the Antigone's τανταλωθείς and dashed to the ground (cf. ἀντιτύπα δ' ἐπὶ γῆ, *Antigone*, 134).

BENJ. IDE WHEELER.

FURTHER ADVERSARIA UPON THE FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES.

(The numeration is Nauck's 1889.)

Sophocles frag. 186 :

φιλεῖ γὰρ ἡ δύσκλεια τοῖς φθονουμένοις
†νικᾶν ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς ἢ πὶ τοῖς καλοῖς πλέον.

Both sense and construction require
ν ἐικεῖν.

Fr. 256 :

εὐδαίμονες οἱ τότε γέννας
ἀφθίτου λαχόντες †θείου.

For θείου I suggest αἰοῦς (which became ΕΟΥΣ). The genitive γέννας is causal with εὐδαίμονες.

An original -os- form of αἰών, parallel to the -on- form, is indicated by (1) the accus. αἰῶ, (2) the locative αἰές. It should also be remembered that αἰών is sometimes a feminine noun, and the schema αἰών : αἰοῦς is therefore no more extraordinary than ἀηδών : ἀηδοῦς. Both ἀηδοῦς and εἰκοῦς occur only once, and each is in tragedy.

Fr. 365 :

οὔτοι ποθ' †ῆξει τῶν ἄκρων ἄνευ πόνου.

Read οὔτοι τι θίξει (or rather θίξη). The error was from uncials and was complicated by itacism. (ΤΙΘΙΞΗΙ became ΠΟΘΙΞΗΙ and this became ποθ' ῆξει.)

Fr. 366 :

ἦν μὲν γὰρ οἶδς μαλλός, ἦν †δ' ἀμπέλου
σπονδή.

Read ἦν δ' ἀπ' ἀμπέλου.... (cf. Eupolis ap. Ath. 52 D οἶνόν τε πίνειν Ναξίων ἀπ' ἀμπέλων.)

Fr. 367

τοῖς μὲν λόγοις τοῖς σοῖσιν οὐ τεκμαίρομαι,
οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ †λευκῷ λίθῳ λευκῇ στάθμῃ.†—

Read ἢ λευκῷ ἢ λίθῳ λευκῇ στάθμῃ.
[I had written ἢ ἢ λευκῷ λίθῳ κ.τ.λ. For the absence of even quasi-caesura see Appendix to Aesch. *Cho.* 150. But I welcome the suggestion of Dr. Postgate that ἐν is better placed after λευκῷ. The loss was also somewhat easier from that position and the metre is improved.]

Fr. 376 :

ἄμοχος γὰρ οὐδεῖς, ὁ δ' ἦκιστ'
ἔχων μακάρατος.

The sense requires

ὁ δ' ἦκιστ'
ἔχων <κακῶς> μακάρατος.

Fr. 461. 3 :

εἶδον στρατὸν στεῖχοντα παραλίαν †πέτρων.

So Harpocration, but Athenaeus has ἄκραν. Neither word seems very likely in the case of a marching army, and the discrepancy is best explained by assuming πλάκα as the common source. Parallel phrases are not very convincing in a simple case like the present, but we may compare the παράκτιον πλάκα of Phrynichus fr. 5.

Fr. 463 :

κημοῖσι πλεκτοῖς πορφύρας †φθείρει γένος.

Rather θηρῶ. The schol. on Ar. *Eq.* 1150, who quotes the passage, paraphrases with λαμβάνουσι, as does Hesychius. The same error occurs in frag. *adesp.* 484.