

From Solon to Sophocles: Intertextuality and Interpretation in Sophocles' *Antigone*

Douglas Cairns

This paper develops from my discussion of the role of traditional Greek thought, and especially the concept of *ἄτη*, in Sophocles' *Antigone* in a recent volume on *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought*. It also complements and extends a more general interpretation of the play offered in my forthcoming Bloomsbury Companion to *Antigone*.¹ Its main focus is the first and second stasima of Sophocles' play and in particular on what they, their relations with each other, and their relations with other texts, contribute to an overall interpretation.

1. The first stasimon

The first stasimon is associated above all with fifth-century accounts of progress.² This is not what I propose to discuss here, but these associations do form an important background to what I do want to focus on, because contemporary affirmations of the human potential for progress – the belief, generally speaking, that technological and cultural progress depend on the rational capacities that have allowed human beings to master their natural environment and establish civilized communities – stand in sharp contrast to what might be regarded as the traditional 'archaic' view of a decline from better to worse conditions of existence.³ What I

¹ See Cairns (2013), (2014). I am grateful to audiences in (chronologically) St Andrews, Edinburgh, Tokyo, and Heidelberg for their comments on oral versions of this paper. I am especially delighted to be able to publish this version here in *JASCA* alongside the fine and complementary study of the first stasimon by Yoshinori Sano and I am very grateful to Professor Sano for advance sight of his work. I should also like to thank Professors Anzai, Ciesko, Itsumi, Kasai, Nakatsukasa, Sano, Takahashi, and their colleagues, students, family, and friends for their splendid hospitality in summer 2013.

² The texts are assembled and analysed by Y. Sano in this volume. Among other studies see esp. Utzinger (2003); cf. Segal (1964) = (1986), 137-61; Guthrie (1969), 60-8, 79-84; Goldhill (1986), 202-5.

³ See Hes. *Op.* 106-201. Starkey (2013) takes me to task for using 'traditional' and 'archaic' interchangeably and objects 'that a traditional feature need not be specifically archaic and might not seem out of place in any period of Greek literature'. In this context, I use both terms to refer to widespread and recurrent ethical and religious notions that can be found in poetry from Homer to Aeschylus (and, of course, beyond). I call this 'archaic poetry', though periodization as such is not my concern. Since all our evidence for this complex of ideas before Sophocles comes from archaic poetry, all such traditional ideas are archaic. There are, of course, ideas that may be associated with writers of the archaic period (especially the Presocratics) that are not traditional. But I am dealing with those that are. It is true that many of these ideas continue to be traditional long after Sophocles,

shall say here will confirm (in general terms) familiar interpretations of the first stasimon, especially those that identify irony, ambivalence, and latent reference to Creon.⁴ I argue that these interpretations are reinforced by a fuller understanding of the ode's intertextuality with earlier poetry (as well as by intratextual relationships with the rest of Sophocles' play, especially its second stasimon).

As examples of human skill (τέχνη) the Chorus offer seafaring (334-7), agriculture (337-41), hunting and fishing (342-8), the taming of animals (348-52), language, thought, and law (354-6), house-building (365-60), and medicine (361-3). But there are limits: medicine cannot in the end protect us from death (Αἰδα μόνον | φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται, 361-2). And there are qualifications: skill has bad as well as good applications, bad as well as good outcomes (σοφόν τι τὸ μηχανόεν | τέχνας ὑπὲρ ἐλπίδ' ἔχων | τοτὲ μὲν κακόν, ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἐσθλὸν ἔρπει, 365-7). The limits and ambivalence of τέχνη that are explicit in these lines are implicit throughout the ode, right from its striking (and strikingly ambiguous) opening phrase (πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κτλ.). The activity of ploughing that is central to the development of agriculture involves 'wearing away the oldest (and most reverend) of the gods, earth the unwaning, the unwearying' (θεῶν | τε τὰν ὑπερτάταν, Γᾶν | ἄφθιτον, ἀκαμάταν ἀποτρύεται, 337-9).⁵ 'Thought' (φρόνημα) is 'windy' (ἀνεμόεν, 354-5), suggesting speed, but also lack of substance. Φρόνημα (a word which has already been used by Creon in lines 176 and 207 in a way that invites an audience to evaluate his way of thinking as it is tested in practice)⁶ can also mean 'pride'. Man has 'taught himself the dispositions, ὄργαι, of civic order' (ἀστυνόμους | ὄργας ἐδιδάξατο, 355-6); but ὄργη is an emotion of which Creon has already given ample evidence in his response to the news of Polynices' burial (244, 280-314), especially in his reaction to the suggestion that the deed may be the work of the gods (280: παῦσαι, πρὶν ὄργῆς καί με μεστῶσαι λέγων). Man has resources for everything (παντοπόρος, 360); he advances towards nothing that is to come without resources (ἄπορος ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἔρχεται | τὸ μέλλον, 360-1). But the notion that man is resourceful in all respects is immediately contradicted in the reference to death (361-

and thus are not confined to archaic poetry, but this is not relevant, since the issue here is what Sophocles has taken from the shared cultural background of his own and earlier periods, i.e. from traditional, archaic Greek thought. I had not thought it necessary to spell this out; but evidently it is.

⁴ For ambivalent readings of the ode, cf. Goheen (1951), 53-6; Kirkwood (1958), 205-6; Linforth (1961), 196-9; Müller (1967), 83-9; Coleman (1972), 10; Gellie (1972), 36-7; Benardete (1999), 40-9; Goldhill (1986), 204-5; Nussbaum (1986), 73-5; Ditmars (1992), 47-8, 58; Susanetti (2012), 223; contrast Knox (1979), 168-72; Brown (1987), 154-5.

⁵ Cf. Benardete (1999), 41-5; Susanetti (2012), 228-9.

⁶ See further below.

2), and the sense of being prepared for every eventuality is precisely what is described in the next stanza (365-7) as the kind of cleverness or skill that is ‘beyond hope’, yet only sometimes successful.

The ode has two especially prominent Athenian forebears: Solon 13. 43-62 W,⁷ and the opening lines of the first stasimon of Aeschylus’ *Choephoroi* (585-601).⁸

1.1. Solon 13 W

Solon’s *Musenelegie* is clearly a poem that fifth-century Athenians knew well. Bacchylides makes use of it in praising an Athenian victor at the Isthmian games in his tenth Ode (35-48). That ode is undateable: but if (as is plausible, but not certain) Bacchylides died around 452 BC and the *Antigone* was produced in the 450s or 440s, it will show a ready familiarity with Solon’s poem at Athens at a period close to that in which the *Antigone* was performed.⁹

The relevant passage of Solon’s poem, like the beginning of Ode to Man, takes the form of a *Priamel* of human skills (43-62):

σπεύδει δ’ ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος· ὁ μὲν κατὰ πόντον ἀλᾶται
 ἐν νηυσὶν χρῆζων οἴκαδε κέρδος ἄγειν
 ἰχθυόνετ’ ἀνέμοισι φορεόμενος ἀργαλέοισιν, 45
 φειδωλὴν ψυχῆς οὐδεμίαν θέμενος·
 ἄλλος γῆν τέμνων πολυδένδρεον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
 λατρεύει, τοῖσιν καμπύλ’ ἄροτρα μέλει·
 ἄλλος Ἀθηναίης τε καὶ Ἡφαίστου πολυτέχνεω
 ἔργα δαεῖς χειροῖν ξυλλέγεται βίοτον, 50
 ἄλλος Ὀλυμπιάδων Μουσέων πάρα δῶρα διδαχθεῖς,
 ἱμερτῆς σοφίης μέτρον ἐπιστάμενος·
 ἄλλον μάντιν ἔθηκεν ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων,
 ἔγνω δ’ ἀνδρὶ κακὸν τηλόθεν ἐρχόμενον
 ᾧ συνομαρτήσωσι θεοί· τὰ δὲ μόρσιμα πάντως 55

⁷ See Friedländer (1967), 191-2. The general relevance of Sol. 13 to the first stasimon is noted by Müller (1967), 87, though he does not discuss the detailed correspondences. Cf. his p. 139 on the second stasimon, with Gagné (2013), 373-6. See also Sano, in this volume, 33, 46.

⁸ Cf. Friedländer (1967), 190-1; Linforth (1961), 196; Coleman (1972), 10; Burton (1980), 96; Staley (1985), esp. 565-8; Garvie (1986), 204; Crane (1989), 105. Cf. Sano, in this volume, 33, 39-40. The link between the two texts also struck Hölderlin (Steiner (1984), 89).

⁹ On the dating of Bacchylides’ life and work, see Cairns (2010), 1-7. The date of the *Antigone* is unknown, and the indications that it belongs to the 440s much less persuasive than is sometimes supposed (see e.g. Scullion (2002) 85-6). But the general point stands regardless of the uncertainty over dating. On the afterlife of the *Musenelegie* at Athens, cf. Gagné (2013), 227, 375.

οὔτε τις οἰωνὸς ῥύσεται οὔθ' ἱερά·
 ἄλλοι Παιῶνος πολυφαρμάκου ἔργον ἔχοντες
 ἰητροί· καὶ τοῖς οὐδὲν ἔπεστι τέλος·
 πολλάκι δ' ἐξ ὀλίγης ὀδύνης μέγα γίγνεται ἄλγος,
 κούκ ἄν τις λύσαιτ' ἥπια φάρμακα δούς·
 τὸν δὲ κακαῖς νούσοισι κυκώμενον ἀργαλέαις τε
 ἀψάμενος χειροῖν αἰψα τίθησ' ὑγιῇ

60

In both cases, a summary *Priamel* is followed by a more extensive list of examples (σπεύδει δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, Sol. 13. 43; cf. πολλά τὰ δεινά, *Ant.* 332). Several examples occur in both lists.¹⁰ The first two are the same and appear in the same order in both; and the last member of each list is the same.¹¹

	Solon 13	<i>Ant.</i>
seafaring	43-6	333-7
agriculture and ploughing	47-8	337-41
medicine	57-62	361-4

Solon's list has items that the Ode to Man does not. All Solon's skills are ways of making money, whereas in Sophocles they are all ways of mastering the natural environment and developing civilized communities. One of these items in Solon's list that does not appear in the *Antigone* is seercraft (53-6 – unless we think that ὀρνίθων in *Ant.* 342-3 evokes οἰωνός at Sol. 13. 56). But it nonetheless illuminates one aspect of Sophocles' version. Like Solon's seer, Sophocles' 'man' has resources *vis-à-vis* the future (ἄπορος ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἔρχεται | τὸ μέλλον, *Ant.* 360-1); but seers have powers that ordinary men do not. According to Solon (13. 54), a seer can discern the evil that is coming to a man (ἔγνω δ' ἀνδρὶ κακὸν τηλόθεν ἐρχόμενον); but not even his skill can avert what is fated (τὰ δὲ μόρσιμα πάντως | οὔτε τις οἰωνὸς ῥύσεται οὔθ' ἱερά, 55-6). Just so, the resources of 'man' in the first stasimon of the *Antigone* are of no avail in the face of the ineluctability of death. We notice, too, an identical sequence of ideas in both cases: (a) powers with regard to

¹⁰ Cf. Sano, this volume, 33, 46.

¹¹ Crane (1989), 107, notes the third item, but not the other two.

the future (Sol. 13. 53-6 ~ *Ant.* 360-1); (b) limitations of those powers (Sol. 13. 55-6 ~ *Ant.* 361-2); (c) medicine (Sol. 13. 57-62 ~ *Ant.* 363-4).

This notion of limitation is then applied to all the examples in Solon's list (63-6): Moira brings mortals κακόν as well as ἐσθλόν (63); the gifts of the gods are inescapable (64); there is risk in every activity (65); and no one knows how things, once started, are going to end (65-6; note μέλλει in 66). With this, we can compare *Ant.* 360-2, 365-71: though man seems to advance towards nothing that is to come without resources (360-1, note μέλλον in 361), still people who put their hopes in skill and intelligence come to κακόν as well as to ἐσθλόν (365-7); there is a god that no one can escape (361-2); and intelligence can be misused, in violation of human law and divine justice (368-71).

We shall return to these topics.

1.2. Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 585-601

The other major Athenian intertext is the first stasimon of Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* (585-651), especially its first two stanzas.

πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ τρέφει	585
δεινὰ δειμάτων ἄχη,	
πόντιαί τ' ἀγκάλαι	
βρούουσι· βλάπτουσι καὶ πεδαίχμιοι	
λαμπάδες πεδάοροι	590
πτανά τε καὶ πεδοβάμονα· κἀνεμόεντ' ἄν	
αἰγίδων φράσαι κότον.	

ἀλλ' ὑπέρολμον ἄν-	
δρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι	595
καὶ γυναικῶν φρεσὶν	
τλημόνων παντόλμους	
ἔρωτας, ἄταισι συννόμους βροτῶν;	
ξυζύγους δ' ὀμαυλίας	
θηλυκρατῆς ἀπέρωτος ἔρωσ παρᾶνικᾶ	600
κνωδάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν.	

589 βλάστουσι codd., βλάπτουσι Butler

This also begins with a *Priamel*, but more than that, its opening words (πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ τρέφει δεινὰ δειμάτων ἄχρη, 585-6) are closely similar to the *Antigone*'s πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ, 332. Aeschylus' personified Ge who nurtures these terrors is recalled in the Ge who is worn down by the plough in Sophocles (Γᾶν ἄφθιτον, ἀκαμάταν ἀποτρύεται, 338-9). The first stanza of the Aeschylean ode encompasses earth, sea, and sky (585-93); in the first two stanzas of the Sophoclean one (332-45) there is a chiasmic movement from sea (πόντου), to earth (Γᾶν), to sky (φῦλον ὀρνίθων) and then back to earth (θηρῶν ἀγρίων ἔθνη) and sea (πόντου τ' εἰναλίαν φύσιν). Like the Ode to Man, the *Choephoroi*'s ode encompasses both birds of the air and beasts of the field (πτανά τε καὶ πεδοβάμονα, 591). Aeschylus' Chorus then proceeds to focus on the 'excessively daring φρόνημα of man' (594-5): ὑπέρτολμον answers to τόλμα at *Ant.* 371-2; φρόνημα (here clearly in its negative sense) occurs also at *Antigone* 355 (where the adjective ἀνεμόεις also has its counterpart at *Cho.* 591); and ἀνδρός answers to the ἀνήρ who, by *Antigone* 347, has replaced the ἄνθρωπος with whom the ode began (332-3).¹²

The climax of the Aeschylean *Priamel*, however, is the wicked ἔρωτες of women (596-8, 599-601), a point that is then illustrated by the catalogue of bad women who serve as analogues to Clytemnestra. The link between the Sophoclean ode and the preceding action of the play is not explicit until the end of the song (368-75). Ostensibly, the Chorus indicate here that the preceding reflexions on human ingenuity were prompted by the attempted burial of Polynices' body: that action required the kind of daring that demonstrates the negative side of human intelligence. The Chorus assume (as did Creon at 248) that the perpetrator is a man. The audience, however, know that it was a woman, and will see the irony not only in the reference to περιφραδῆς ἀνήρ at 348 but also in the evocation of the *Choephoroi*'s powerful ode on female crime. But in that ode, too, doubts about the φρόνημα of men were raised as a counterpoint to women's wickedness. Sophocles' ode also raises the question of whether right, in this instance, lies with the woman or the man. We know that it was a woman who performed the burial; but is that woman a criminal, as in the *Choephoroi*, or does the daring that the Chorus condemn belong to the man who sought to exert his mastery over earth, supreme of the gods (338), and over Hades (361)? How stable is his 'windy φρόνημα'? Will his ὄργαί preserve the city's laws (354-5) or will they fall foul of the 'laws of the land (or

¹² The phrase ἀνδρός φρόνημα (*Cho.* 594-5) will appear in the same form and with the same sense in the *Antigone*'s next episode, in Antigone's boast that she is not the sort to break divine law ἀνδρός οὐδενός φρόνημα δείσασα, 458-9.

earth) and the justice of the gods' (νόμους ... χθονὸς | θεῶν τ' ἔνορκον δίκαν, 368-9)? The Ode to Man responds to the confidence in his own powers that Creon manifested in his opening speech, and to characteristics that he had already begun to manifest in his interactions with the Chorus and the Guard, not only to the supposed ingenuity of the transgressor who buried the body.¹³ For an audience that is aware of them, both of the ode's major intertexts raise, from the very beginning of the Ode to Man, the issues of right and wrong that arise explicitly only in that song's final stanza (365-75). Both might be said to present those issues within a traditional, 'archaic' moral and theological framework. The Ode to Man combines these influences with a more contemporary-sounding praise of human achievement and progress, but both intertextuality and the ode's internal ambivalences suggest that its optimistic orientation is only superficial.¹⁴ It is the ode's closing emphasis on the limits and ambivalence of human ingenuity that contextualize it, within its immediate context, within the play in general, and within wider traditions of Greek thought.

2. Second stasimon

Solon's *Priamel* in the *Musenelegie* is embedded in a disquisition on the power of fate, the instability of fortune, the ambivalence of wealth, and the prevalence of ἄτη.¹⁵ Ἄτη first appears (in 68) as a consequence of the inability to foresee the outcome of one's actions: at the beginning of an enterprise nobody knows how it will turn out. One can try to achieve a good outcome, yet fall into ἄτη without realizing it, or one may be faring badly, and yet find that things turn out well (65-70):

πᾶσι δέ τοι κίνδυνος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν, οὐδέ τις οἶδεν	65
πῆ μέλλει σχήσειν χρήματος ἀρχομένου·	
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν εὖ ἔρδειν πειρώμενος οὐ προνοήσας	
ἐς μεγάλην ἄτην καὶ χαλεπὴν ἔπεσεν,	
τῷ δὲ κακῶς ἔρδοντι θεὸς περὶ πάντα δίδωσιν	
συντυχίην ἀγαθὴν, ἔκλυσιν ἀφροσύνης.	70

¹³ Cf. Else (1976), 46; also (at least in general terms), Crane (1989).

¹⁴ So in general Müller (1967), 87-8; contrast Staley (1985), 561; Crane (1989), 107.

¹⁵ For the purposes of this paper I pass over the much-discussed issue of the coherence or otherwise of Solon's argument in this poem. For a good overview, with full doxography, see Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010), 127-39; more recently, cf. Versnel (2011), 201-6.

Ἄτη then recurs in 75-6, as punishment for greed and the illegitimate pursuit of πλοῦτος and κέρδος (71-6):

πλούτου δ' οὐδὲν τέρμα πεφασμένον ἀνδράσι κεῖται·
 οἱ γὰρ νῦν ἡμέων πλεῖστον ἔχουσι βίον,
 διπλάσιον σπεύδουσι· τίς ἂν κορέσειεν ἅπαντας;
 κέρδεά τοι θνητοῖς ὤπασαν ἀθάνατοι,
 ἄτη δ' ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀναφαίνεται, ἦν ὁπότε Ζεὺς
 πέμψη τεισομένην, ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει. 75

This concludes what we have of the poem, and perhaps the entire original poem, by forming a ring with the concentration on good and bad ways of attaining wealth, on the dangers of ὕβρις and ἄτη, and on the inevitability of Zeus' punishment, even across the generations, which occupies its first 42 lines. If the first stasimon of the *Antigone* recalls Solon's poem, then it must also recall its wider ethical framework. Equally, if the first stasimon of *Antigone* reminds its audience of the first stasimon of the *Choephoroi*, then that audience will think not only of its juxtaposition of male φρόνημα and female criminality, but also of the result of women's villainous ἔρωτες, i.e. ἄται, disasters (597-8). In the relation between the Ode to Man and its intertexts, ἄτη is the elephant in the room. And ἄτη is the subject of the second stasimon.

2.1. First and second stasima compared

The second stasimon begins with μακαρισμός: happy are those whose life is free of the taste of misfortune (εὐδαίμονες οἷσι κακῶν ἄγευστος αἰὼν, 582); but εὐδαιμονία is impossible in a house that is shaken by the gods; in that case, all that remains is ἄτη (οἷς γὰρ ἂν σεισθῆ θεόθεν δόμος, ἄτας | οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει γενεᾶς ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἔρπον, 583-5). Just such a house is the House of Labdacus, whose generations of trouble are continuing in the sufferings of its surviving members, and particularly in the death penalty that (in the preceding scene) was pronounced on both Antigone and Ismene (594-603). This is the first pair of stanzas. In the second pair, the Chorus sing first that the transgression of men (and again the word is ἀνδρες, 604-5) will never overcome the power of Zeus, and of the ἄτη that appears (despite the textual uncertainty) especially to attend the rich or the successful.¹⁶

¹⁶ The manuscript text (οὐδὲν ἔρπει | θνατῶν βιώτῳ πάμπολις ἐκτός ἄτας) is emended in two main ways: in the version printed in Lloyd-Jones and Wilson's Oxford Classical Text (Lloyd-Jones's own

They then proceed to the hopes and delusions that lead men (ἄνδρες again, 616) blindly to act in ways that bring disaster (615-20), before concluding with an endorsement of the traditional wisdom that ‘sooner or later bad seems good to a man whose mind a god is leading towards disaster (ἄτη). He fares but the shortest time without ἄτη’ (620-5):

σοφία γὰρ ἔκ του	620
κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται,	
τὸ κακὸν δοκεῖν ποτ’ ἐσθλὸν	
τῶδ’ ἔμμεν ὄτω φρένας	
θεὸς ἄγει πρὸς ἄταν·	
πράσσει δ’ ὀλίγιστον χρόνον ἐκτὸς ἄτας. ¹⁷	625

The first and second stasima are linked by a series of verbal and conceptual echoes.¹⁸ In particular, their beginnings are closely parallel. They both begin with arresting, proverbial-sounding, stylized, and universalizing statements, before proceeding to a more specific case:

πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κούδεν ἄν- θρώπου δεινότερον πέλει. (332-3)	εὐδαίμονες οἷσι κακῶν ἄγευστος αἰών. οἷς γὰρ ἄν σεισθῆ θεόθεν δόμος, ἄτας οὐδέν ἐλλείπει γενεᾶς ἐπὶ πληθὸς ἔρπον. (583-5)
---	---

In the first stasimon, the first example of mankind’s ingenuity is seafaring (334-7); in the second, the divine ‘shaking’ of a house, which entails all kinds of ἄτη, is compared to a storm at sea (586-93):

τοῦτο καὶ πολιοῦ πέραν πόντου χειμερίῳ νότῳ χωρεῖ, περιβρυχίοισιν περῶν ὑπ’ οἶδμασιν (334-7)	ὥστε ποντίας ἀλῶς οἶδμα δυσπνόοις ὅταν Θρησσησιν ἔρεβος ὕφαλον ἐπιδράμη πνοαῖς, κυλίνδει βυσσόθεν κελαινὰν θίνα καὶ δυσάνεμοι στόνῳ βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλήγες ἀκταί. (587-92)
---	---

οὐδέν’ ἔρπει | θνατῶν βίωτος πάμπολυς ἐκτὸς ἄτας) the reference to wealth is clearer, but the implication is there even with Heath’s emendation, οὐδέν’ ἔρπει | θνατῶν βιότῳ πάμπολύ γ’ ἐκτὸς ἄτας, printed by Jebb and Dawe.

¹⁷ ὀλίγιστον (Bergk) for MSS’ ὀλίγοστον. Lloyd-Jones’s ὀλίγος τὸν seems to me flat by comparison.

¹⁸ See Easterling (1978), 150; Sano (this volume) 40 and n. 44.

The link is reinforced by verbal echoes of the root ποντ- (335, 345/586) and the (ominous?) word οἶδμα (337/587). Perhaps, too, the metaphorical winds that represent ἄτη (a state of mind as well as a state of affairs) in the second stasimon recall the ‘windy thought’ of the first (especially δυσάνεμοι, 591, and ἀνεμούν, 353).¹⁹ However that may be, it is clear that the sea in the first stasimon represents human achievement, but in the second its limits.

The second stasimon then moves on to the House of Labdacus, while the next point in the first stasimon is mankind’s invention of agriculture, but again the two themes are closely linked.

<p>θεῶν τε τὰν ὑπερτάταν, Γᾶν ἄφθιτον, ἀκαμάταν ἀποτρύεται, ἰλλομένων ἀρότρων ἔτος εἰς ἔτος, ἰππεῖω γένει πολεύων. (337-41)</p>	<p>ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν οἰκῶν ὀρώμαι πήματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πήμασι πίπτοντ', οὐδ' ἀπαλλάσσει γενεᾶν γένος, ἀλλ' ἐρείπει θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν. νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὑπὲρ ρίζας ἐτέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις· κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων ἀμᾶ κόνις, λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς. (593-603)</p>
---	--

Mankind wears away Earth, supreme of the gods, the immortal (ἄφθιτον), the unwearied (ἀκαμάταν), as the plough turns, ἔτος εἰς ἔτος (338-40); in the House of Labdacus woe falls on woe in a similar, incessant rhythm (πήματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πήμασι πίπτοντ'); and where Earth is ἄφθιτος and ἀκάματος, the Labdacids experience further woes over and above those of the dead (φθιτῶν, 595); in the second stasimon it is the ‘months of the gods’ (ἀκάματοι θεῶν | μῆνες, 607-8), through which the power of Zeus remains undiminished, that are ‘unwearied’. Earth is oldest and most august of the gods, but the Labdacids are the gods’ victims (θεῶν in 337 and 597, 607); and the agriculture that is a sign of human inventiveness in the first stasimon is echoed in the ‘harvesting’ (κατ' ... ἀμᾶ) of the ‘last root’ of the house of Oedipus (599-602). There is no escape (οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν, 597), just as there

¹⁹ For winds/storms as an image of psychological disturbance, see the parodos, 134-7 (of Capaneus) and esp. the Chorus’ judgement of Antigone at 929-30 (ἔτι τῶν αὐτῶν ἀνέμων αὐταὶ | ψυχῆς ὅπαι τήνδε γ' ἔχουσιν); cf. Benardete (1999), 114; Cullyer (2005), 15-18. The association of such winds with ἄτη (e.g. *A. Ag.* 819. ἄτης θύελλαι ζῶσι; cf. esp. the storm which represents Zeus’ punishment, and thus the ἄτη which follows ὕβρις, in *Sol.* 13. 11-25 W) suggests a folk etymology deriving ἄτη from ἀημι (Goebel (1877), 32-55; Francis (1983)). NB also the correspondence between 1274 (Creon has been shaken by a god) and 584 (when a house is shaken by the gods).

was no escape from death, in the first stasimon's most explicit statement of the limits of human resourcefulness (362).

The second stasimon also resembles the first in narrowing its focus from humanity in general to men in particular (ἄνδρες, 604-5, 616; ἀνὴρ, 348). This is notable in both cases, given that the event that prompts the first is what the audience know to have been the act of a woman, while the ruminations on the fate of the Labdacids in the second are prompted by a man's imposition of the death penalty upon its two surviving members, both female.

In the first stasimon, speech (φθέγμα) and thought (φρόνημα) were central to man's achievement (354-5), while in the second 'senselessness in speech and a Fury of the mind' cause the extirpation of the House of Oedipus (λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς, 603). In the second stasimon, minds can be led, by a god, towards ἄτη (ὄτω φρένας | θεὸς ἄγει πρὸς ἄταν, 623-4), for it is a law (νόμος, 613) that no mortal transgression can restrain the power of Zeus (τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀν- | δρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι; 604-5); while in the first, man's ἀστυνομοὶ ὀργαί (355-6) needed to respect both the law of the land and the justice of the gods (νόμους ... χθονὸς | θεῶν τ' ἔνορκον δίκαν) if he was to be high in his city (368-70).

In the first stasimon, man advanced towards the future (τὸ μέλλον) confident that his resources would suffice (360-1); but in the second it is the law of Zeus, the law that confirms his power and dictates that no great wealth (or nothing great) comes to mortals without ἄτη, that prevails 'now and in the future (τὸ μέλλον) and in the past' (611-12). Hope (ἐλπίς) may be no more than 'the deception of light-minded passions' (ἀ γὰρ δὴ πολύπλαγκτος ἐλ- | πὶς πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνησις ἀνδρῶν, | πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων, 615-17), so that a man comes unawares to disaster (εἰδότηι δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει, | πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῶ πόδα τις προσαύση, 618-19); with wisdom has it been said, that bad seems good to one whose mind a god is leading towards ἄτη (σοφία γὰρ ἔκ του | κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται, | τὸ κακὸν δοκεῖν ποτ' ἐσθλὸν | τῶδ' ἔμμεν ὄτω φρένας | θεὸς ἄγει πρὸς ἄταν, 620-4). Just so, in the first stasimon, man might rely 'beyond hope' on his wisdom, yet come now to bad, now to good (σοφὸν τι τὸ μηχανόεν | τέχνας ὑπὲρ ἐλπίδ' ἔχων | τοτὲ μὲν κακόν, ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἐσθλὸν ἔρπει, 365-7). His passionate aims, in the second stasimon (κουφονόων ἐρώτων, 617), may in the end be as 'light-minded' as the birds he traps in his nets in the first (κουφονόων ... ὀρνίθων, 342-3).²⁰

²⁰ Cf. Susanetti (2012) 229 on 342.

2.2. Second stasimon, Solon, and Aeschylus

Not all of these thematic and verbal correspondences are equally salient; but it does not matter much whether an audience catches all or only some of them, because all serve a single overall purpose, namely the contrast between (a) the potential of human reason and (b) its limits and failings. This contrast is inherent in the first stasimon itself, but deepened and extended by means of the interrelationship of the first and the second. In its close relation with the first stasimon, the second stasimon inevitably also has a close relation with that ode's intertexts – many of the second's echoes of the first reverberate further in the poems that are the first's main sources.

But the second stasimon also brings in aspects of those sources that were either latent or inactive in the first stasimon. This is clearly so in case of ἄτη, which is prominent in both the *Choephoroi* ode and Solon's *Musenelegie*. But it is also striking that activation of the *Choephoroi*'s reference to ἄτη also brings in its reference to ἔρωσ – as in *Choephoroi* 597-8 (and 600) ἄτη and ἔρωτες are linked at *Antigone* 617-25:

<p>ἀλλ' ὑπέρολμον ἀν- δρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι (595) καὶ γυναικῶν φρεσὶν τλημόνων παντόλμους ἔρωτας, ἄταισι συννόμους βροτῶν;</p>	<p>ἀ γὰρ δὴ πολὺπλαγκτος ἔλ- (615) πίς πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνησις ἀνδρῶν, πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων· εἰδότη δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει, πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῶ πόδα τις προσαύση. σοφία γὰρ ἐκ του (620) κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται, τὸ κακὸν δοκεῖν ποτ' ἐσθλὸν τῶδ' ἔμμεν ὅτῳ φρένας θεὸς ἄγει πρὸς ἄταν· πράσσει δ' ὀλίγιστον χρόνον ἐκτὸς ἄτας. (625)</p>
---	---

These lines encapsulate what ἄτη is – a person has an aim in acting, hopes the outcome will be good, and acts; but one never knows how things will turn out; and so we realize we have made a calamitous mistake only when disaster strikes.²¹ This is precisely Solon's characterization of ἄτη at 13. 63-70 (with verbal parallels with both the first and the second stasima in *Antigone*):

Μοῖρα δέ τοι θνητοῖσι κακὸν φέρει ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλόν,
δῶρα δ' ἄφυκτα θεῶν γίγνεται ἀθανάτων.

²¹ On the meaning of ἄτη, and in particular the focal meaning of 'harm' (βλάβη) that links its so-called 'subjective' and 'objective' senses, see Cairns (2012), 1-10; see also Sommerstein (2013).

Douglas Cairns: Solon to Sophocles

πᾶσι δέ τοι κίνδυνος ἐπ’ ἔργμασιν, οὐδέ τις οἶδεν 65
 πῆ μέλλει σχήσειν χρήματος ἀρχομένου·
 ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν εὖ ἔρδειν πειρώμενος οὐ προνοήσας
 ἐς μεγάλην ἄτην καὶ χαλεπὴν ἔπεσεν,
 τῶ δὲ κακῶς ἔρδοντι θεὸς περὶ πάντα δίδωσιν
 συντυχίην ἀγαθὴν, ἔκλυσιν ἀφροσύνης. 70

That passage, however, forms a ring with an earlier one in the same poem (Sol. 13. 33-6):

θνητοὶ δ’ ὦδε νοέομεν ὁμῶς ἀγαθός τε κακός τε
 εὖ ῥεῖν ἦν αὐτὸς δόξαν ἕκαστος ἔχει,
 πρὶν τι παθεῖν· τότε δ’ αὖτις οὐδύρεται· ἄχρι δὲ τούτου 35
 χάσκοντες κούφαις ἐλπίσι τερπόμεθα.

Compare *Ant.* 618-19:

εἰδότι δ’ οὐδὲν ἔρπει,
 πρὶν πυρὶ θεορῶ πόδα τις προσάυση.

In Solon, this limitation defines the gulf between man and god. It vindicates the power of Zeus. Solon expresses this in an elaborate chiasmus:

A 17-32	power of Zeus	ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πάντων ἐφορᾷ τέλος ... τοιαύτη Ζητὸς πέλεται τίσις ... ἀναίτιοι ἔργα τίνουσιν ἢ παῖδες τούτων ἢ γένος ἔξοπίσω
B 33-5	human ignorance	θνητοὶ δ’ ὦδε νοέομεν ὁμῶς ἀγαθός τε κακός τε, εὖ ῥεῖν ἦν αὐτὸς δόξαν ἕκαστος ἔχει, πρὶν τι παθεῖν· τότε δ’ αὖτις οὐδύρεται· (35)
B’ 63-70	human ignorance	Μοῖρα δέ τοι θνητοῖσι κακὸν φέρει ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλόν, δῶρα δ’ ἀφικτα θεῶν γίγνεται ἀθανάτων. πᾶσι δέ τοι κίνδυνος ἐπ’ ἔργμασιν, οὐδέ τις οἶδεν (65) πῆ μέλλει σχήσειν χρήματος ἀρχομένου· ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν εὖ ἔρδειν πειρώμενος οὐ προνοήσας ἐς μεγάλην ἄτην καὶ χαλεπὴν ἔπεσεν, τῶ δὲ κακῶς ἔρδοντι θεὸς περὶ πάντα δίδωσιν συντυχίην ἀγαθὴν, ἔκλυσιν ἀφροσύνης. (70)
A’ 75-6	power of Zeus	ἄτη δ’ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀναφαίνεται, ἦν ὅποτε Ζεὺς (75) πέμψη τεισομένην, ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει.

In *Antigone*, the sequence is simpler: A (power of Zeus, 604-14), B (human ignorance, 615-25).

At the same time, however, Sophocles' lines 615-19 interweave (a) an echo of the first stasimon (hope and its ambivalence at 365-7), (b) an echo of the source passage in *Choephoroi* (the ἔρωτες of *Cho.* 597), and (c) an echo of Solon 13, where the κοῦφαι ἐλπίδες of Sol. 13. 36 are recalled in the ἐλπίς that is nothing but the ἀπάτα of light-minded ἔρωτες. We should notice, too, that Solon's image of Zeus' power (at 13. 17-24, ἐξαπίνης δὲ | ὥστ' ἄνεμος νεφέλας αἶψα διεσκέδασεν | ἠρινός κτλ.) is one of a storm that begins at sea, as in both the first and second stasima in *Antigone* (334-7, 583-92).

Solon's poem deals above all with the improper pursuit of πλοῦτος and ὄλβος. Ἄτη is especially relevant in this connexion because of its regular appearance as an antonym of κέρδος (where its regular sense, 'ruin', takes on a specifically financial form).²² See especially Sol. 13. 70-6:

πλούτου δ' οὐδὲν τέρμα πεφασμένον ἀνδράσι κεῖται·
οἱ γὰρ νῦν ἡμέων πλεῖστον ἔχουσι βίον,
διπλάσιον σπεύδουσι· τίς ἂν κορέσειεν ἅπαντας;
κέρδεά τοι θνητοῖς ὤπασαν ἀθάνατοι,
ἄτη δ' ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀναφαίνεται, ἦν ὅποτε Ζεὺς
πέμψη τεισομένην, ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει. 75

Κέρδος, of course, is a substantial theme in *Antigone*; but it is one that we do not have time to explore in detail here.²³ A particular temptation of those who pursue material gain is ὕβρις – also prominent in Solon 13 and regularly linked to ἄτη by metaphors of growth and nutrition: honouring wealth with ὕβρις leads to ἄτη at Sol. 13. 11-13, and the nutritional metaphor is implicit in τίς ἂν κορέσειεν ἅπαντας with reference to the κέρδεα that lead to ἄτη at 13. 73-5. There is not much of this in the second stasimon of the *Antigone*: but at 613-14 no great wealth (or nothing great) comes to mortals without ἄτη. If the harvesting of the last root of the House of Oedipus (599-603) is an example of the ἄτη that will never leave the Labdacids alone, then we may have a latent example of the metaphor of exuberant growth, of

²² See Sommerstein (2013), 2; cf. Cairns (2012), 1 n. 2, both with references. For a clear play on ἄτη as both 'loss' (as opposed to profit) and 'disaster', see Thgn. 119 (and cf. 133, 205-6).

²³ See rather Cairns (2013), xxi-xxii, xxv, xxix, xxxi-xxxiii. Cf. Goheen (1951), 14-19.

over-fullness, and of the crop of disaster that we find (for example) in Solon 4. 34-5 W, Aeschylus, *Persae* 821-2, and *Septem* 601.²⁴

However that may be, in its relation to Solon 13, what the second stasimon does is to bring in the emphasis on the instability of human happiness, the ambivalence of wealth and prosperity, and the dangers of ἄτη in Solon's poem that were implicitly present, by virtue of their very absence, in the first stasimon. The evocation of Solon in the second stasimon strengthens conclusions about the relation between the first stasimon and its sources in Solon and Aeschylus that an attentive audience will, at least provisionally, have drawn. Ἄτη is, through these intertexts, an absent presence in the first stasimon, as well as the dominant presence in its own right in the second.²⁵

There is, however, one important aspect of Solon's *Musenelegie* that we have not yet considered: the affirmation (in lines 27-32) that Zeus' punishment never fails, even if it falls on the transgressor's children or grandchildren. This link with the second stasimon's account of the generations of suffering (suffering that is caused, perhaps, by some ὑπερβασία, 605) in the House of Labdacus takes us into different territory and a different intertext, Aeschylus' *Septem contra Thebas*.

This is a well-known intertext, so I can be brief. But the correspondences between the second stasimon of the *Antigone* and *Septem* 720-91 (which places the imminent conflict between Eteocles and Polynices in the context of the sufferings and transgressions of the House of Labdacus) are very striking.²⁶ The following table sets out those that are most relevant to the subject of this paper.

<p>Second Stasimon, 582-625: εὐδαίμονες οἷσι κακῶν ἄγευστος αἰών. οἷς γὰρ ἂν σεισθῆ θεόθεν δόμος, ἄτας οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει γενεᾶς ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἔρπον· (585) ὥστε ποντίας ἄλδος οἶδμα δυσπνόοις ὅταν Θρηῆσσησιν ἔρεβος ὕφαλον ἐπιδράμη πνοαῖς, κυλίνδει βυσσόθεν (590)</p>	<p>Aeschylus, <i>Septem</i> 720-91: κακῶν δ' ὥσπερ θάλασσα κῦμ' ἄγει, τὸ μὲν πίτνον, ἄλλο δ' αἰεῖρει τρίχαλον, ὃ καὶ περὶ πρῦμναν πόλεως καχλάζει. (758-60)</p>
--	--

²⁴ Pace Easterling (1978), 147. The link between ὑπερβασία and ἄτη in the second stasimon (605-15) recalls that between ὑπερβασία, ὕβρις, and ἄτη in the preceding episode at 480-5. See Cairns (2013), xvi-xvii.

²⁵ The relation between the first and second stasima, and between both and their intertexts, thus exemplifies what Dunn (2012) has identified as the dynamic force of Sophoclean intertextuality.

²⁶ On the specific debt to *Septem* 720-91 (with 653ff. and 875-1004), see Else (1976), 16-24 (esp. 16-18), 28; cf. Bowra (1944), 87; Ditmars (1992), 77-9. Gagné (2013) 373 is more sceptical. The *Septem* is similarly a prominent comparator for *Antigone's parodos* (100-54): see Else (1976), 35-40; Davidson (1983), 41, 43-8; Dunn (2012), 268-70; Rodighiero (2012), 108.

<p>κελαινὰν θίνα καὶ δυσάνεμοι στόνω βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλήγες ἀκταί.</p> <p>ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν οἴκων ὀρώμαι πήματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πήμασι πίπτοντ', (595) οὐδ' ἀπαλλάσσει γενεᾶν γένος, ἀλλ' ἐρείπει θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν. νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὑπὲρ²⁷ ρίζας ἐτέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις·(600) κατ' αὐτὸν νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν νεωτέρων ἀμᾶ κόνις, λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἑρινύς.</p> <p>τεᾶν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀν- δρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι; (605) τὰν οὐθ' ὕπνος αἰρεῖ ποθ' ὁ ἴπαντογήρωσ† οὐτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν μῆνες, ἀγήρωσ δὲ χρόνω δυνάστας κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου μαρμαρόεσσαν αἴγλαν. (610) τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει νόμος ὁδ'· οὐδέν' ἔρπει θνατῶν βίωτος πάμπολυς ἐκτὸς ἄτας.</p> <p>ἄ γὰρ δὴ πολὺπλαγκτος ἐλ- (615) πὶς πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνησις ἀνδρῶν, πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων· εἰδότι δ' οὐδέν' ἔρπει, πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῶ πόδα τις προσαύση. σοφία γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ (620) κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται, τὸ κακὸν δοκεῖν ποτ' ἐσθλὸν τῶδ' ἔμμεν ὅτω φρένας θεὸς ἄγει πρὸς ἄταν· πράσσει δ' ὀλίγιστον χρόνον ἐκτὸς ἄτας. (625)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ῶ</p> <p>πόννοι δόμων νέοι παλαι- οῖσι συμμιγείς κακοῖς. (739-41)</p> <p>(a) ῥίζαν αἱματόεσσαν (755) (b) [ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν] γαῖα κόνις πή μελαμπαγὲς αἶμα φοίνιον (735-6) (c) παναληθῆ κακόμαντιν πατρὸς εὐκταῖαν Ἑρινὺν τελέσαι τὰς περιθύμους κατάρας Οἰδιπόδα βλαψίφρονος (722-5) (d) νῦν δὲ τρέω μὴ τελέση καμψίπους Ἑρινύς. (790-1) (e) παράνοια συναγε νυμφίους φρενώλης (756-7)</p> <p>παλαιγενῆ γὰρ λέγω παρβασίαν ὠκύποινον (742-3)</p> <p>πρόπρυμνα δ' ἐκβολὰν φέρει ἀνδρῶν ἀλφρηστᾶν ὄλβος ἄγαν παχυνθεῖς (769-71)</p>
--	--

²⁷ For MSS' ὑπὲρ, followed by asyndeton, rather than readings/emendations which introduce a relative (ὄπερ, K/Hermann; ὑπὲρ ῥίζας ὁ τέτατο, Hermann), see Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990), 129; Ferrari (2010), 52-3. To regularize the respension with 588-9 Brunck (followed by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson) emends MSS' τέτατο to ἐτέτατο. Ferrari (2010), 53 believes that τέτατο can stand.

A number of these correspondences deserve to be taken further.²⁸ But for immediate purposes, the point is simply that the obvious links with this crucial ode in *Septem* help to reinforce two prominent aspects of the second stasimon of *Antigone*: (a) the notion of inherited suffering that is already there in the link with Solon and (b) the emphasis on irrational forces – Erinyes, on the one hand, but also various forms of mental impairment, on the other. ἄτη does not occur as such in *Septem* 720-91, but it is prominent in the immediate context (601, 687) as a significant aspect of what it means for Eteocles to face his brother in battle. The term occurs a further three times in play (315, 956, 1001); παράνοια in 756 is another word for ἄτη in its subjective sense; and βλαψίφρων, of Oedipus at 725, is a clear synonym of ἀεσίφρων/ἀασίφρων.²⁹

This trawl through Solon and Aeschylus does not exhaust the potential for identifying significant parallels with the first and second stasima of *Antigone*. A number of general similarities with particular passages of archaic poetry and Aeschylean tragedy could also be mentioned.³⁰ But in such cases we are dealing with parallels; what we have in the cases discussed above is something more specific – deliberate evocation of specific elements of well-known passages in a way that deepens an audience’s understanding of aspects of *Antigone* that are absolutely fundamental to a proper understanding of the play’s meaning.

3. ἄτη in *Antigone*

The basic point that arises from this discussion is that the cornerstones of the inherited tradition of archaic Greek ethics – and especially the notion of ἄτη – are not confined to the second stasimon, but play a major role in *Antigone* as a whole.³¹ This is not just a matter of adding, in a few localized passages, a superficial colouring of traditional moral and religious thought;³² it is rather (as the interplay

²⁸ In particular, perhaps, the way that reading *Antigone* in its relation to *Septem* confirms MSS’ κόνις against Jortyn’s κοπίς in 602; also the implications of the references to ὑπερβασία at *Ant.* 605 and παρβασία at *Septem* 744. I hope to pursue the former discussion, at least, elsewhere. Meanwhile, for a good recent defence of κόνις, see Ferrari (2010), 54-7.

²⁹ βλαψίφρων glosses ἀεσίφρων at Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* 2. 7 Bekker, Hsch. α 28, *Et. Mag.* 20. 49-50, Σ bT on *Il.* 23. 603, and qualifies ἄτη at Triphiod. 411. Other βλάβη-words, such as φρενοβλάβεια, are regular glosses for ἄτη. See Dawe (1968), 101, 105; Stallmach (1968), 44; Cairns (2012) 42 n. 100; cf. above, n. 21, and below, n. 47, on ἄτη and βλάβη.

³⁰ Many more examples in Cairns (2013).

³¹ On ἄτη in *Antigone*, cf. Else (1976), 26-7, 31, 76.

³² *Pace* the implication of (e.g.) Griffith (1999), 229, on 613-14.

between the first and second stasima already shows) an integral and important aspect of the play's design. I have argued this position at length in my introductory chapter to *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought*, and so shall not rehearse it in detail here. At the same time, however, the main points of that argument are also the main implications of the evidence as discussed in this paper, and so an element of summary is required.

The second stasimon is explicitly prompted by Antigone's own situation and especially by the transgression that she admitted and Creon condemned in the second episode. But there is also plenty of support throughout the play for the analysis that the Chorus offer in that ode of her situation and her conduct. The word ἄτη is used of her and her family;³³ her heredity is emphasized;³⁴ and she is accused of folly, insanity, and transgression throughout the play.³⁵ There is material here for an Aeschylean/Solonian picture of a family doomed by the actions of its previous generations, for the notion of the Labdacids as a house that must be extirpated if the state is to regain its health.³⁶ Given the prevalence of disruption, madness, and irrationality – qualities that are predicated of a number of characters and permeate

³³ See 4 (corrupt, but almost certainly referring to the history of ἄτη in Antigone's family), 17 (the family's ills referred to as ἀτᾶσθαι), 485 (Antigone will not defy Creon 'without ἄτη'), 863-5 (the ἄται of her parents' incest).

³⁴ See the Chorus at 379-80 ('unhappy child of an unhappy father'), 471-2 (she has inherited her father's 'raw', ὤμιόν, temperament), 856 (her ordeal is payment for some debt incurred by her father). Cf. Antigone herself at 857-67 (her father's travails, those of the entire Labdacid clan, the ἄται of her parents' incest, and the wretchedness of her own state: she goes to join them 'accursed and unwed', ἀρᾶιος ἀγάμος), 892-6 (her troubles are the latest instalment of her family's). The use of the adjective ἀρᾶιος at 867 is the only positive indication in the play that the sufferings of Antigone may have an origin in an actual curse, but such is the play's evocation of Aeschylus' Theban trilogy that this may be enough to trigger the thought in an audience's mind. For different views on this, see Lloyd-Jones (1971), 115-16; West (1999), 40-1; Sewell-Rutter (2007), 71, 114-20.

³⁵ See Ismene at 67-8 (Antigone's proposal to defy Creon's edict exhibits no νοῦς), 90 (she is 'in love with the impossible'; cf. 'hunting the impossible', 92), 99 (she is ἄνους); cf. Antigone herself at 74 (πανουργία), 95 (δυσβουλία). The reference to ἔρως in 90 relates both to the hope that, for many, represents the 'deception of light-minded passions' (ἔρως) in the second stasimon at 617 and to the Chorus-leader's statement at 220 that no one is so foolish as to be in love (ἔρως) with death (a generalization that is ironically contradicted by Antigone's behaviour). See also the Chorus on her defiance of 'the king's laws' (382), her ἀφροσύνη (383), her 'advance to the limit of daring' (853), her 'fall before the pedestal of Justice' (854-5), her self-willed παραβασία (873-4); Creon on her ἄνοια (561-2), her ὑπερβασία (663-5). But note esp. Creon's charge of ὑπερβασία, 449, and Antigone's defiance (450-70); this is a token of her inherited savagery, according to the Chorus at 471-2, and of ὕβρις, according to Creon (480-5). Cf. therefore the explicit reference to ὑπερβασία in the second stasimon at 605 and the implicit evocation of the 'archaic chain' of κόρος, ὕβρις, and ἄτη at 613-14.

³⁶ For the development of this line of argument see Else (1976).

the play³⁷ – it is possible to regard Antigone as in some way driven by forces beyond her control, perhaps as a victim of ἄτη. But this is also questionable; and it is a question that is raised by Antigone herself. This is 925-8, almost her last words in the play:

ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν οὖν τάδ' ἐστὶν ἐν θεοῖς καλὰ, 925
 παθόντες ἂν ξυγγνοῖμεν ἡμαρτηκότες·
 εἰ δ' οἶδ' ἄμαρτάνουσι, μὴ πλείω κακὰ
 πάθοιεν ἢ καὶ δρωῶσιν ἐκδίκως ἐμέ.

Antigone certainly suffers; but is this the kind of suffering that arises from error? Is it ἄτη? In lines 925-8 the results are not yet apparent; but Antigone, at least, is confident that she is not the one who has erred. Her view that the error is Creon's, and not hers, will be vindicated, she says, if what happens to him resembles what happens to her. And so it turns out, in ways with which we are all familiar – Creon becomes a 'living corpse' (a liminal figure between two worlds, like Polynices and Antigone);³⁸ he loses a son, as he came between Antigone and her brother; and he loses his wife, as he came between Antigone and Haemon. In some ways, though Creon is a descendant of the Spartoi, he becomes an honorary Labdacid: like Laius, he is confronted by a son who tries to kill him; like Oedipus, his actions cause his wife's suicide.³⁹

All of this, quite explicitly, is Creon's ἄτη. Solon's strictures regarding our inability to foresee the consequences of our actions are implicit in the substantial hostage to fortune that Creon offers in 175-7:

³⁷ Of Antigone: see esp. 603 (cf. also above, n. 35); of Creon: 765 (cf. 755); of Haemon: 633 (hypothetically; cf. 648-9), 754; cf. 790 (of the one who 'has Eros', i.e. Haemon; but NB ἐρᾶν used of Antigone at 90 and, indirectly, at 220), 1231; of Eurydice: 1254. Cf. Creon of Ismene, 491-2. Cf. the frenzy (οἴστρος) of the birds whose unintelligible cries Tiresias reports at 1001-2, and various references to the destructive power of forces such as ὄργη and θυμός (718, 766-7, 875, 955-6); also the ambivalent presence of Dionysus in the parodos, fourth stasimon, and fifth stasimon (134-7, of the madness of Capaneus; 153-4, Dionysus as leader of celebratory choruses; 955-65, Lycurgus' mad attempt to stop the god's mad women; 1116-52, invoked to come, with his frenzied female followers, and heal the city).

³⁸ See 1165-7, 1288, 1320-5; cf. Antigone on her own plight at 559-60 and 850-2, Tiresias on the anomalous liminality of Antigone and Polynices at 1068-71 (a predicament which, he predicts, awaits Creon himself, 1076).

³⁹ See Loraux (1986), 183-4; Goldhill (1986), 104-5; Zeitlin (1990), 150-1; Segal (1995), 131; Liapis (2013), 103-7. For Else (1976), 81-96, Sophocles develops this pattern by basing his characterization of Creon in *Antigone* on that of Oedipus in Aeschylus' (lost) *Oedipus*, a phenomenon that explains the similarities in characterization between the Creon of *Antigone* and the Oedipus of *Oedipus Tyrannus*, similarly based on the Aeschylean model. But this is pure speculation.

ἀμήχανον δὲ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐκμαθεῖν
 ψυχὴν τε καὶ φρόνημα καὶ γνῶμην, πρὶν ἂν
 ἀρχαῖς τε καὶ νόμοισιν ἐντριβῆς φανῆ.

175

Creon's γνῶμη has an impeccable 'archaic' pedigree,⁴⁰ but he is also using words and ideas that are then probed in both the first stasimon and the second. Almost immediately afterwards (184-6), Creon expresses his determination to speak up should he see ἄτη advancing on his fellow citizens:

ἐγὼ γάρ, ἴστω Ζεὺς ὁ πάνθ' ὄρων ἀεὶ,
 οὐτ' ἂν σιωπήσαιμι τὴν ἄτην ὄρων
 στείχουσιν ἀστοῖς ἀντὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ...

185

But ἄτη (disaster), when one is in the grip of ἄτη (delusion or error), is not the kind of thing that one sees coming. Zeus sees everything; Zeus knows (184); Creon does not. In the end, as Tiresias makes clear (1015), Creon himself is the one who threatens the city's safety. As the Chorus point out, and as he himself accepts, this is his ἄτη (1257-69):

Χο. καὶ μὴν ὄδ' ἄναξ αὐτὸς ἐφήκει
 μνημ' ἐπίσημον διὰ χειρὸς ἔχων,
 εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἀλλοτριάν
 ἄτην, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀμαρτῶν.

1260

Κο. ἰὼ
 φρενῶν δυσφρόνων ἀμαρτήματα
 στερεὰ θανατόεντ' ,
 ὧ κτανόντας τε καὶ
 θανόντας βλέποντες ἐμφυλίους.
 ὦμοι ἐμῶν ἄνολβα βουλευμάτων.

1265

ἰὼ παῖ, νέος νέφ' ξὺν μόρῳ,
 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ,
 ἔθανες, ἀπελύθης,
 ἐμαῖς οὐδὲ σαῖσι δυσβουλίας.

⁴⁰ Cf. Arist. *EN* 5. 1, 1130a1-2: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὐδοκεῖ ἔχειν τὸ τοῦ Βίαντος, ὅτι ἀρχὴ ἀνδρα δείξει, with Bowra (1944), 69; Budelmann and Easterling (2010), 299.

In his opening speech, Creon stressed the importance of good leadership and aspired to manifest what is regarded as one of the most important qualities of a good political leader, the ability to foresee how one's current situation is likely to develop.⁴¹ The first and second stasima together re-emphasize the uncertainty of the future and the limits of human beings' ability to control their own destinies. Good intentions can have bad results. In Creon's case, Tiresias is, initially, prepared to take a sympathetic view of his error (1023-4):

ταῦτ' οὖν, τέκνον, φρόνησον. ἀνθρώποισι γὰρ
τοῖς πᾶσι κοινόν ἐστὶ τοῦ ξαμαρτάνειν.⁴²

But the fact that it is Tiresias who provides authoritative confirmation of Creon's lapse into error takes us back to the first stasimon, where the issue of man's resourcefulness with regard to the future was first explicitly raised (360-1) and where the intertextual link with Solon's *Musenelegie* implied a distinction between the limited foresight of ordinary human beings and the specialist craft of the seer.⁴³

There is more to the ἄτη-sequence in Creon's case than this; and its implications are considerable. In *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought* I try to explore in detail the application of the ideas of the second stasimon to Creon and the links between ἄτη (and its partial synonym, ἀμαρτία) and the pervasive theme of wisdom and folly, as well as its links (especially *via* its antonym, κέρδος) with the themes of material *versus* other forms of prosperity, and the contribution that this dialectic makes to the play's reflexions on the nature of εὐδαιμονία. In this context, however, I want to end with just one final point – one more example of how the centrality of ἄτη to the understanding of the play is underpinned by intertextuality.

Tiresias exits at 1090, but his warnings and prophecies alarm the Coryphaeus (1091-4), and Creon shares his concern (1095-7):

ἔγνωκα καὐτὸς καὶ ταράσσομαι φρένας·

⁴¹ Already at e.g. *Il.* 1. 343-4, but see esp. Themistocles at *Thuc.* 1. 138. 3 and Pericles at 2. 62-3, 2. 65. 6 (also at *Plut. Comp. Per. Fab.* 2. 3); cf. Phormio at *Thuc.* 2. 89. 2; Nicias at 6. 13. 1. See also *D.* 18. 246. For Plato's Socrates, the ability to foresee and forestall future trouble is the mark of a good doctor, lawgiver, and beekeeper (*Resp.* 564c).

⁴² For the thought, cf. *Thgn.* 327-8; *E. Hipp.* 615, 916, 1434, *Supp.* 250-1; *Rhet. Alex.* 36. 35; and the further passages cited by Pearson (1917) on *S. fr.* 665 *Radt.* As Pearson observes, the thought is commonplace, but by no means trivial.

⁴³ Cf. Sano, this volume, 36-7, 40.

τό τ' εἰκαθεῖν γὰρ δεινόν, ἀντιστάντα δὲ
Ἄτης πατάξαι θυμὸν ἐν λίνῳ πάρα.⁴⁴

Creon must act quickly, or it will be too late: ‘the gods’ swift-footed Harms cut off the wrongheaded’ (1103-4):

ὅσον γ', ἄναξ, τάχιστα· συντέμνουσι γὰρ
θεῶν ποδώκεις τοὺς κακόφρονας Βλάβαι. 1104

As a parallel for the swift-footed Blabai one might think of the ‘swift-footed Erinys’ of *Septem* 791; but their true progenitor is the personified Ate who features in the *Iliad*’s allegory of the Litai (9. 496-514):⁴⁵

“ἀλλ' Ἀχιλεῦ δάμασον θυμὸν μέγαν· οὐδέ τί σε χορὴ
νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχειν· στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί,
τῶν περ καὶ μείζων ἀρετὴ τιμὴ τε βίη τε.
καὶ μὲν τοὺς θυέεσσι καὶ εὐχλωλῆς ἀγανῆσι
λοιβῆ τε κνίσση τε παρατρῶπῳ ἄνθρωποι 500
λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβῆη καὶ ἀμάρτη.
καὶ γάρ τε λιταὶ εἰσι Διὸς κοῦραι μέγαλοιο
χῳλαί τε ῥυσαί τε παραβλῶπές τ' ὀφθαλμῶ,
αἶ ῥά τε καὶ μετόπισθ' ἄτης ἀλέγουσι κιοῦσαι.
ἦ δ' ἄτη σθεναρὴ τε καὶ ἀρτίπος, οὔνεκα πάσας 505
πολλὸν ὑπεκπροθέει, φθάνει δέ τε πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἴαν

⁴⁴ Lloyd-Jones’s and Wilson’s text, with Lloyd-Jones’s own Ἄτης ... λίνῳ for MSS’ Ἄτη ... δεινῶ in 1097 (Lloyd-Jones 1964). Lloyd-Jones (1964), 129 translates ‘by offering resistance my anger may strike against the net of Ate’, but taking ἀντιστάντα as referring to Creon, the subject, and θυμὸν as object of πατάξαι (‘accusative of the thing set in motion’, LSJ s.v. πατάσσω, II) gives the verb its regular sense. I translate: ‘To give in is terrible, but to stand firm may be to strike one’s θυμός on Ate’s net.’ Professor Tetsuo Nakatsukasa points out to me that πατάξαι θυμὸν (with θυμός as subject) would recall the Homeric θυμός ἐνὶ στήθεσσι πάτασεν (*Il.* 7. 216); I agree that this locution may have influenced Sophocles’ choice of words here, but doubt (unless the text is more corrupt than suspected) that the sense ‘my θυμός beats’ can be made to play a role in this context. As for the paradox, repetition of the adjective δεινός in both halves of the antithesis is unlikely without a modifier in the second half, such as καί, and ‘it is a terrible prospect to strike one’s θυμός with ἄτη’ is anyhow weak. The notion of Ate’s net, on the other hand, has good Aeschylean pedigree (*Pers.* 97-9, *Ag.* 355-61; cf. *Pr.* 1071-9), on which cf. Sommerstein (2013), 6-7, 15 n. 36. For an alternative emendation, see Dawe (1968), 113-14 n. 40.

⁴⁵ Remarkably, the clear link between the two passages is (as far as I have seen) recognized only by Dawe (1968), 113-14 n. 49.

βλάπτουσ' ἀνθρώπους· αἱ δ' ἐξακέονται ὀπίσσω.
 ὃς μὲν τ' αἰδέσεται κούρας Διὸς ἄσσον ἰούσας,
 τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὤνησαν καὶ τ' ἔκλυον εὐχομένοιο·
 ὃς δὲ κ' ἀνήνηται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη, 510
 λίσσονται δ' ἄρα ταί γε Δία Κρονίωνα κιοῦσαι
 τῶ ἄτην ἄμ' ἔπεσθαι, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτίση.
 ἀλλ' Ἀχιλεῦ πόρε καὶ σὺ Διὸς κούρησιν ἔπεσθαι
 τιμὴν, ἣ τ' ἄλλων περ ἐπιγνάμπτει νόον ἐσθλῶν.”

Not only does this passage demonstrate the relation between ἄτη and ἀμαρτία – an important point if we want to understand the importance of ἄτη in *Antigone*⁴⁶ – it is also one of many passages that illustrate ἄτη’s core or focal meaning, ‘harm’. Ἄτη and βλάβη are synonyms.⁴⁷ In *Iliad* 9, ἄτη harms people (βλάπτουσ’, 9. 507), and when the ἄτη of the original offence gives way to the ἄτη of the victim who refuses reparation, that person is harmed (βλαφθεὶς, 512). The personified Ate is ‘strong and sound of foot’ (9. 505), and so can outrun the Litai (504-7); just so, the Coryphaeus’ Blabai are swift-footed and outrun the imprudent (1103-4).

Ἄτη plays a central role in the plot and thematic structure of the *Iliad*: Phoenix’s allegory in Book 9 is the fulcrum of a balance between the ἄτη of Agamemnon, which causes the quarrel and its disastrous results, and that of Achilles, which lies in his rejection of the Embassy and results in the death of Patroclus.⁴⁸ In the *Antigone*, the evocation of this passage comes at the point at which we begin to discern the balance between the sufferings that await Creon and those that he has imposed upon Antigone. This represents the fulfilment of Antigone’s wish that Creon’s ἀμαρτία should involve him in suffering as painful as her own, and of Tiresias’ prophecy that Creon will be caught in the same evils as he inflicted upon Antigone and Polynices (1074-6):

τούτων σε λωβητῆρες ὕστεροφθόροι
 λοχῶσιν Αἴδου καὶ θεῶν Ἐρινύες, 1075
 ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς τοῖσδε ληφθῆναι κακοῖς.

⁴⁶ See e.g. 925-8, fulfilled in 1259-60. See further Dawe (1968); cf. Bremer (1969), 99-134.

⁴⁷ See Dawe (1968), esp. 104-5; Stallmach (1968), esp. 1, 12-14, 24, 29, 31, 46-7, 59, 63, 80-4, 88, 94-5, 102; Padel (1995), 167-92; Cairns (2012), with further references, ancient and modern, in 1 n. 1; Sommerstein (2013).

⁴⁸ For a full defence of this position, see Cairns (2012), 26-33.

These evils come upon him after he has rejected Tiresias' advice to heal his errors by changing his mind (1023-32):

ταῦτ' οὖν, τέκνον, φρόνησον. ἀνθρώποισι γὰρ
 τοῖς πᾶσι κοινόν ἐστι τοῦξαμαρτάνειν·
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀμάρτη, κείνος οὐκέτ' ἔστ' ἀνήρ
 ἄβουλος οὐδ' ἀνολβος, ὅστις ἐς κακὸν
 πεσῶν ἀκεῖται μηδ' ἀκίνητος πέλει.
 αὐθαδία τοι σκαιότητ' ὀφλισκάνει.
 ἀλλ' εἶκε τῶ θανόντι, μηδ' ὀλωλότα
 κέντει. τίς ἀλκὴ τὸν θανόντ' ἐπικτανεῖν;
 εὖ σοι φρονήσας εὖ λέγω· τὸ μανθάνειν δ'
 ἥδιστον εὖ λέγοντος, εἰ κέρδος λέγοι.

1025

1030

Tiresias plays the role played by Phoenix in the *Iliad*, and ὅστις ἐς κακὸν | πεσῶν ἀκεῖται μηδ' ἀκίνητος πέλει (1026-7) is another allusion to the allegory of the Litai, who 'come after to heal the damage' (αἱ δ' ἐξακέονται ὀπίσσω, 507). There is also a direct relation to the first stasimon, where, as in Solon's *Musenelegie*, medicine is the final element in the *Priamel* of human skills (363-4).⁴⁹ Creon has brought illness, not cure; the skills he sought to apply have, in the words of the first stasimon, brought him to evil rather than to good (367); he begins the play 'high in the city' (ὑψίπολις, 370), but by failing to honour the laws of the land (or the laws of the earth) and the justice of the gods (368-9) he brings disaster on the city – he is ἄπολις (370).

The Blabai that the Coryphaeus fears will overtake Creon if he does not remedy his folly in time (1103-4) are prefigured in the Erinyes who, according to Tiresias, lie in wait for him (1074-6, above). The words λωβητῆρες and ὑστεροφθόροι emphasize the *harm* that the Erinyes cause. ὑστεροφθόρος occurs only here in classical Greek. But Sophocles' phrase is quoted by Eustathius on *Il.* 9. 506-7, where he notes that, in so far as they are ὑστεροφθόροι, the Erinyes of the *Antigone* resemble the Litai in Phoenix's allegory, who see to it that Ate attends anyone who rejects them:

⁴⁹ Cf. Goheen (1951), 41-4; Segal (1964) 64 = (1986) 160. NB too the juxtaposition of medicine (57-62) and seercraft (53-6) in Solon's *Priamel*; the intervention of the seer, Tiresias, with his remedy for Creon's error, further confirms seercraft's absent presence in the first stasimon as a function of its intertextuality with the *Musenelegie*.

ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι Ἐριννύες μὲν “λωβητῆρες ὑστεροφθόροι” παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ, Λιταὶ δὲ ἀνάπαλιν ἀκέονται ὀπίσω, ἤγουν ὑστερον, πλὴν καὶ αὐταί, εἰ μὴ ἀκουσθῶσιν, ὑστεροφθόροι γίνονται τῇ ὑστερον ἐπελεύσει τῆς Ἄτης, ὡς ῥηθήσεται, εἰς τοὺς μὴ ὑπακούσαντας.⁵⁰

Eustathius has seen the link between this passage of the *Antigone* and *Iliad* 9. That link is further substantiated by the way that Sophocles’ ὑστεροφθόρος so clearly recalls Aeschylus’ ὑστερόποινος, of Erinys at *Ag.* 58-9, but of Ate at *Cho.* 382-3.⁵¹ Ate and Erinys are associated;⁵² and so in *Antigone* both 1074-6 (with Erinyes) and 1103-4 (with Blabai) recall the Second Stasimon’s reference to λόγου τ’ ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς as the psychological cause behind the disaster that is extinguishing the surviving light of the House of Labdacus (599-603).

There, it was Antigone’s actions that were attributed to an Erinys. But whether or not this is accurate, Antigone’s actions do certainly have an effect on Creon, and the parallelism between her fate and his that she wished for in 927-8 is a real one. Creon has been destroyed by an Erinys, by Blabai, and by his own ἄτη – he erred his own ἄτη, no one else’s (1259-60, quoted above). But a very substantial role in his downfall was played by Antigone, one of the two ἄτα that Creon nurtured in his house (532-3).⁵³ If Antigone, partly as a result of her Labdacid heritage, is driven by λόγου τ’ ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρινύς, the same madness and the same demons come in the end to engulf Creon.

Bibliography

- Benardete, S. (1999), *Sacred Transgressions: A Reading of Sophocles’ Antigone* (South Bend IA, 1999). Originally published as ‘A Reading of Sophocles’ *Antigone*’, Parts I, II, and III, *Interpretation* 4.3 (1975), 148-96, 5.1 (1975), 1-55, and 5.2 (1975), 148-84.
- Bowra, C. M. (1944), *Sophoclean Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Bremer, J. M. (1969), *Hamartia: Tragic Error in the Poetics of Aristotle and in Greek Tragedy* (Amsterdam).
- Brown, A. L. (ed.) (1987), *Sophocles: Antigone* (Warminster).

⁵⁰ Eust. 2. 777-8 Van der Valk on *Il.* 9. 506-7; cf. 2. 760 on *Il.* 9. 454.

⁵¹ Elsewhere only at Nonnus, *Dion.* 9. 135.

⁵² Cf. Dawe (1968), 100-1, 108-9; Easterling (1978), 149; Kitzinger (2008), 38-9. Personified Ate and the Erinys are famously associated in Agamemnon’s Apology at *Il.* 19. 87-8. Cf. Sommerstein (2013), 8 on *A. Ag.* 1431-6.

⁵³ οὐδ’ ἐμάνθανον | τρέφων δὲ ἄτα κάπαναστάσεις θρόνων. The conceit of the sisters as δὲ ἄτα is repeated, in a different context, at *OC* 531.

- Budelmann, F. and P. E. Easterling (2010), 'Reading Minds in Greek Tragedy', *G&R* 57: 289-303.
- Burton, R. W. B. (1980), *The Chorus in Sophocles' Tragedies* (Oxford).
- Cairns, D. L. (2010), *Bacchylides: Five Epincian Odes (3, 5, 9, 11, and 13)* (Cambridge).
- Cairns, D. L. (2012), 'Atê in the Homeric Poems', *PLLS* 12: 1-52.
- Cairns, D. L. (2013), 'Introduction: Archaic Thought and Tragic Interpretation', in id. (ed.) *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought* (Swansea), ix-xliv.
- Cairns, D. L. (2014), *Sophocles: Antigone* (London).
- Coleman, R. (1972), 'The Role of the Chorus in Sophocles' *Antigone*', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 18: 4-27.
- Crane, G. (1989), 'Creon and the "Ode to Man" in Sophocles' *Antigone*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92: 103-1.
- Cullyer, H. (2005), 'A Wind that Blows from Thrace: Dionysus in the Fifth Stasimon of Sophocles' *Antigone*', *Classical World* 99: 3-20.
- Davidson, J. F. (1983), 'The Parodos of the *Antigone*: A Poetic Study', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 30: 41-51.
- Dawe, R. D. (1968), 'Some Reflections on *Atê* and *Hamartia*', *HSCP* 72: 89-123.
- Ditmars, E. van N. (1992), *Sophocles' Antigone: Lyric Shape and Meaning* (Pisa).
- Dunn, F. M. (2012), 'Dynamic Allusion in Sophocles', in A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles*, 263-79.
- Easterling, P. E. (1978), 'The Second Stasimon of the *Antigone*', in R. D. Dawe, J. Diggle, and P. E. Easterling (eds), *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry by Former Pupils Presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday* (Cambridge), 141-58.
- Else, G. F. (1976), *The Madness of Antigone* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse 1976. 1; Heidelberg).
- Ferrari, F. (2010), 'La luce soffocata: Soph. *Ant.* 583-603', in A. M. Belardinelli and G. Greco (eds), *Antigone e le Antigoni* (Milan), 50-8.
- Francis, E. D. (1983), 'Virtue, Folly, and Greek Etymology', in C. A. Rubino and C. W. Shelmerdine (eds), *Approaches to Homer* (Austin), 74-121.
- Friedländer, P. (1967), "πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ (Sophokles, *Antigone* 332-375)", in *Studien zur antiken Literatur und Kunst* (Berlin), 190-2. First published in *Hermes* 69 (1934), 56-63.
- Gagné, R. (2013), *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- Garvie, A. F. (ed.) (1986), *Aeschylus: Choephoroi* (Oxford).
- Gellie, G. H. (1972), *Sophocles: A Reading* (Melbourne).
- Goebel, A. (1877), 'Homerische Etymologien', *Philologus* 36: 32-63.

Douglas Cairns: Solon to Sophocles

- Goheen, R. F. (1951), *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone: A Study of Poetic Language and Structure* (Princeton).
- Goldhill, S. D. (1986), *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Griffith, M. (ed.) (1999), *Sophocles: Antigone* (Cambridge).
- Guthrie, W. K. C. (1969), *A History of Greek Philosophy iii: The Fifth-Century Enlightenment* (Cambridge).
- Kirkwood, G. M. (1958), *A Study of Sophoclean Drama* (Ithaca).
- Knox, B. M. W. (1979), *Word and Action: Essays on the Ancient Theatre* (Baltimore).
- Liapis, V. (2013), 'Creon the Labdacid: Political Confrontation and the Doomed *Oikos* in Sophocles' *Antigone*', in D. L. Cairns (ed.), *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought* (Swansea), 81-118.
- Linforth, I. M. (1961), 'Antigone and Creon', *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 15: 183-259.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1964), 'Sophocles, *Antigone* 1096-7 (and *Philoctetes* 324)', *Classical Review* 14: 129-30. Reprinted in *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: Academic Papers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 388-9.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1971), *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N. G. (1990), *Sophoclea: Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford).
- Loraux, N. (1986), 'La Main d' Antigone', *Mètis* 1: 165-96.
- Müller, G. (ed.) (1967), *Sophokles: Antigone* (Heidelberg).
- Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. (2010), *Solon the Athenian, the Poetic Fragments* (Leiden).
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1986), *The Fragility of Goodness* (Cambridge).
- Padel, R. (1995), *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness* (Princeton).
- Pearson, A. C. (ed.) (1917), *The Fragments of Sophocles, edited with additional notes from the papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and W. G. Headlam*, 3 volumes (Cambridge).
- Rodighiero, A. (2012), *Generi lirico-corali nella produzione drammatica di Sofocle* (Tübingen).
- Scullion, S. (2002), 'Tragic Dates', *CQ* 52: 81-101.
- Segal, C. P. (1964), 'Sophocles' Praise of Man and the Conflicts of the *Antigone*', *Arion* 3:46-66. Revised and expanded in Segal (1986), 137-61.
- Segal, C. P. (1986), *Interpreting Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca).
- Segal, C. P. (1995), *Sophocles' Tragic World: Divinity, Nature, Society* (Cambridge MA).
- Sewell-Rutter, N. J. (2007), *Guilt by Descent: Moral Inheritance and Decision Making in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2013), 'Atê in Aeschylus', in D. L. Cairns (ed.), *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought* (Swansea), 1-15.

- Staley, G. A. (1985), 'The Literary Ancestry of Sophocles' "Ode to Man"', *Classical World* 78: 561-70.
- Starkey, J. (2013), Review of D. L. Cairns, *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought* (Swansea, 2013), *BMCR* 2013.08.37.
- Steiner, G. (1984), *Antigones: How the Antigone Legend Has Endured in Western Literature, Art, and Thought* (Oxford).
- Susanetti, D. (ed.) (2012), *Sofocle: Antigone* (Rome).
- Utzinger, C. (2003), *Periphrades Aner: Untersuchungen zum ersten Stasimon der Sophokleischen Antigone und zu den antiken Kulturentstehungstheorien* (Göttingen).
- Versnel, H. S. (2011), *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Religion* (Leiden).
- West, M. L. (1999), 'Ancestral Curses', in J. Griffin (ed.), *Sophocles Revisited: Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford), 31-45.
- Zeitlin, F. I. (1990), 'Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama', in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to do with Dionysus? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton), 130-67. First published in J. P. Euben (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1986), 101-41.

University of Edinburgh

douglas.cairns@ed.ac.uk