

Recent considerations of Sophocles' *Antigone* devote scant attention to the discourses of honor interwoven throughout the play. Although the remarks of Knox (1964: 91-3) and Hester (1971: 21-2) are cited occasionally in passing (e.g., Whitehorne 1983: 139, Neuberg 1990: 70), scholarly movement away from firmly heroic readings (e.g., Knox, Patzer 1978, Whitman 1982) has resulted in the abandonment of this particularly rich furrow. In this talk I demonstrate (1) the integral role played by *timê* in the text and narrative of the *Antigone*; (2) that honor is not a heroic fetish but a concern of every character, of every aspect of the 'cultural order'; and (3) that these Sophoclean negotiations over honor may contribute to our broader understanding of honor in democratic Athens.

I begin by describing Sophocles' use of *timê*-vocabulary. The frequency of such vocabulary within the *Antigone* – some twenty-four instances, including two *hapax legomena* – is unparalleled even within the honor-laden Sophoclean corpus. Besides their mere frequency, these words are concentrated within those programmatic passages (e.g., ll. 21-2, 76-9, 208-10) that set out characters' identities, perspectives, and disagreements. The attestations of *timê* within the contested ll. 904-920, for example, must inform debates over both the authenticity of the text and Antigone's consistency.

With these foundations established I turn to consider the socio-political aspects of *timê*. Rather than simply being an interest of Antigone or Creon, honor, in its diverse forms, is something with which every character explicitly engages. Every individual and institution – the entirety of what Zeitlin (1986: 125) calls the Theban 'cultural order' – is familiar with and involved in negotiating these discourses of honor. These social, negotiatory aspects are brought out by discussing a series of passages from across the play: the sisterly debate in the prologue evidences their recognition of, and contrasting views of, the complex dictates of honor (1-99); Creon bases his authority on his exclusive adjudication of (dis)honor (162-210); Antigone, arraigned by her uncle, subversively refuses his appropriation of honor (441-525); Ismene – whose repeated recourse to *timê*-vocabulary deserves particular attention – and Haemon subtly draw on the rhetoric of honor in their familial appeals (536-76, 631-765). After Antigone has departed, resolutely restating her thoughts on honor (891-928), Tiresias' exchanges with Creon reveal the ascendancy not of *timê*, but of *kerdos* in the thoughts of the newly-minted tyrant (988-1090). This consideration of selected passages demonstrates that, while the heroic echoes of Antigone's words and actions must not be disregarded, there is far more to honor in the *Antigone*.

I conclude by moving from the Sophoclean stage to the *polis* of the audience. As Ferrario (2006) has described, this play enjoyed a remarkable reception and *nachleben* in democratic Athens. By examining honor within the play, the play within the honor-laden festival ceremonies, and these ceremonies within the *polis* they commemorated, the negotiatory and socio-political aspects of honor can, as witnessed on stage, come to inform our understanding of the discourses of honor within Athens. Although honor should never be seen, either in tragedy or in history, as an interpretive panacea, on both the theatrical and world stages it remains a negotiable source of identity, motivation, and dispute.