SOPHOCLES, ANTIGONE 44 ff.

BY

R. D. DAWE

In Mnemosyne 1971, 293-5 S. L. Radt has published what he believes to be a refutation of my brief note on Soph. Ant. 44 ff., published in PCPhS 1968, 18. Like Mazon I insisted that the sense must be "c'est mon frère — et le tien, que tu le veuilles ou non", and in order to get this sense, which the Greek at present seems not to offer, proposed ἵναλ μή θέλης. Radt believes that the sense is "ich werde auf jeden Fall meinen Bruder begraben, und falls du nicht dazu bereit sein solltest, auch deinen". In view of the position of the concessive clause, sandwiched between σὸν and ἀδέλφον, and the fact that only one brother is in question, many people, I imagine, will have no difficulty in rejecting this interpretation out of hand. But since, as Telemachus remarks, it is always the newest song that is held most in honour, it may be worth while refuting Radt's refutation. The arguments he employs are these:

1. θέλω is a less likely verb to use than θεύλωμαι in the sense I require.
2. ἵναλ θέλης can only refer to the future, and on the Mazon-Dawe view εἶ θέλεις would be required. Radt describes this as a "ganz konkrete Tatsache".
3. "Der Zusammenhang verlangt als Ergänzung zu θέλης zweifellos θάπτειν". This is another "ganz konkrete Tatsache".
4. ἵναλ is unsuitable, because it always denotes "dass der Sprechende das Eintreten des angenommenen Falles für äusserst unwahrscheinlich hält".
5. In footnote 1 on p. 294 Radt's exclamation mark, used in place of more traditional forms of criticism, is apparently meant to denote disbelief in my statement that σ' might very well be an interpolated gloss.

I take these arguments in sequence:

1. There is no lexicographical support for the assertion that
we would expect a negatived \( \beta\nu\lambda\omega\mu\nu \) rather than a negatived \( \theta\ell\omega\ ) to give the sense I desiderate. So far as it goes the lexicographical evidence would rather support the opposite assertion, but since in any case the same verb is used with no difference in meaning in both Radt’s version and mine, it is difficult to see why Radt should advance this as an argument.

2. \( \gamma\nu \ \theta\ell\zeta\gamma\zeta\ ) : it is well known that Greek is much more precise than English in its tense usage: e.g. \( \epsilon\delta\epsilon\zeta\alpha\mu\nu\nu \tau\omicron \varepsilon\rho\gamma\theta\epsilon\nu \) in stichomythia becomes in English “I accept what you say” (present tense). Sophocles can use \( \epsilon\zeta\nu + \theta\ell\omega \) in a case where the futurity is immediate, and again the English idiom would demand a present. For example at Oed. Tyr. 216 ff.:

\[
\alpha\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\zeta: \ \& \ \delta' \ \alpha\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\zeta, \ \tau\dot{\alpha}u\ \epsilon\zeta\nu \ \theta\ell\zeta\gamma\zeta \ \epsilon\tau\eta
\]

\( \chi\lambda\omega\nu \ \delta\epsilon\chi\varepsilon\theta\omicron\omicron\ \tau\eta \ \nu\sigma\nu\ \omicron \ \upsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\zeta, \)

\( \dot{\alpha}l\kappa\iota\eta \ \lambda\beta\omicron\omicron\ \alpha\nu \ \kappa\alpha\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon \ \kappa\kappa\omega\nu. \)

The words to which Oedipus refers are those which follow immediately and without a break on what he is saying at that very moment. The same idiom as that now before us is found in stichomythia at Oed. Tyr. 341, and at Eur. Or. 1333: \( \tau\omicron\zeta; \ \omicron\delta\delta\epsilon\nu \ \omicron\delta\delta\alpha \) (present) \( \mu\lambda\lambda\lambda\nu, \ \gamma\nu \ \omicron \ \mu\nu \ \lambda\gamma\zeta\zeta\zeta. \) At Andr. 689 \( \gamma\nu \ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\theta\upsilon\mu\mu\zeta\zeta\zeta, \) the anger is felt already, but it will not receive its expression until the answering speech is made. In our Antigone passage the future is correct, for \( \epsilon\iota \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \mu\nu \ \theta\ell\zeta\zeta\zeta \) would imply that Ismene had already unequivocally refused to recognise that she owed a sister’s duty to Polynices 1).

3. To say that the supplement with \( \theta\ell\zeta\gamma\zeta \) is “zweifellos \( \theta\acute{a}p\acute{a}t\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu \),” and to count this as a “quite concrete fact” is a wholly illegitimate \textit{petitio principii}. Radt accepts v. 46 as genuine; but he will surely have to delete it if he wishes to insert mentally a \( \theta\acute{a}p\acute{a}t\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu \) into a

1) The ramifications of this construction are more extensive than is generally recognised, and the exact nuance is not always easy to pin down. Much harder than Andr. 45 to explain would be Eur. Med. 1362, \( \gamma\nu \ \omicron \ \mu\nu \ \gamma\gamma\epsilon\alpha\lambda\zeta\zeta, \) where the condition described is the present condition, foreseen in the past (1355). Hel. 1037 \( \gamma\nu \ \tau\epsilon \ \beta\epsilon\pi\iota\omicron \ \lambda\gamma\nu \) also defies any such simple analysis as \( \gamma\nu \ + \ \text{subj.} \ = \ \text{‘general’ or ‘future’}, \) for the advice in question is quite specific, and has been already given. In both of the last two cases the tone may be “in a case where...”