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Abstract

This thesis is a discussion, reconstruction, and analysis of Euripides’ lost *Antiope*. Based on metrical studies which suggest a date much earlier than its usual date of 410 or 408 B.C., I specifically focus on the possibility that *Antiope* might be part of a larger Theban trilogy, produced together with *Suppliant Women* and one other play. I begin with a thorough look at the mythological material existing before Euripides’ version of the story, as well as the tragedy’s effect on later versions. From there I provide a translation of the existing fragments arranged in the order I believe they were written for the tragedy, and a reconstruction with discussion. The latter half of the thesis I devote to reading *Antiope* as part of a trilogy. I compare the similarities between the proposed Theban trilogy with the more firmly established Trojan trilogy, and I provide a discussion on *Antiope* and *Suppliant Women*, commenting on how reading the two plays together can drastically change an analysis of either. I conclude that even if Euripides did not have “trilogy” in mind when he wrote *Antiope* and *Suppliant Women*, the connection between the two tragedies is both too important and too subtle for them to have been produced in separate years and still have been appreciated by an ancient audience.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Based on the scholion to Aristophanes’ *Frogs* 53, διὰ τί δὲ ἄλλο τι τῶν πρὸ ὀλιγοὶ διδαχέντων καὶ καλῶν, Ὕψιπυλῆς, Φοινισσῶν, Ἀντιόπης;¹ the lost play *Antiope* by Euripides was until recently believed to have been produced either in 410 or 408 B.C. together with *Hypsipyle* and *Phoenician Women*. This date does not conform to metrical patterns in Euripides’ extant works, as the resolution rate² in the remaining fragments seems too low to have been written so late in his career. Resolutions in Euripidean tragedies have long been established as one of the more reliable methods of dating Euripides’ extant plays, using the plays whose dates are surely established by their hypotheses or by the remains of their didascalic lists as a basis. Using the frequency of resolutions to date the fragmentary plays is still an uncertain business, especially as only three of them have as much as a tenth remaining.³ *Antiope*, however, provides us with the largest amount of remaining text for any of the lost plays, and the low resolution rate is quite pronounced.⁴ Zieliński’s huge study of Euripidean metre in 1925 recognized this inconsistency, and he felt that it was a problem needing to be addressed. His solution was to postulate that Euripides wrote *Antiope* earlier in his career, but produced it later in 410-

---

¹ “Why did he not mention one of the good plays produced just before [*Frogs* in 405], *Hypsipyle*, *Phoenician Women*, *Antiope*?”
² Resolution occurs in iambic trimeter when the usual formula of long/short, long, short, long syllables is “resolved” by adding a dactyl, an anapaest, or a tribrach. The early plays of Euripides have a very low resolution rate. *Alcestes*, for example, written in 438 B.C. has a resolution rate of 6%, while *Iphigenia at Aulis*, written in 407 B.C., has one of 44%. See Storey 2014, 136-8.
³ Cropp-Fick 1985, 1.
⁴ Cropp-Fick 1985, 23: *Antiope*: 50% RLI (Relative Likelihood Interval) 2.49-3.84, 10% RLI 2.05-4.50; compare to *Hypsipyle* 50% RLI 5.91-7.74, 10% RLI 5.24-8.59 and *Phoenician Women* 50% RLI 6.55-7.39, 10% 6.22-7.75.
408 B.C. Webster, like Zieliński, chose to give the scholion the benefit of the doubt, assuming in his reconstruction that Antiope was produced alongside Hypsipyle and Phoenician Women. The more recent metrical study by Cropp and Fick have again, however, called the scholion’s testimony into question, saying that the “problem is real and cannot be ignored.” They conclude that the metrical statistics from the remaining fragments are either unrepresentative of the whole play, or the scholion’s “Antiope” is corrupt for “Antigone”. The former option is extremely unlikely when we take Antiope fr. 223 into consideration, which accounts for nearly half of the remaining lines, containing 106 preserved trimetres from the end of the play, with a resolution-rate of 3.67 per cent. The existence of this fragment makes the former option unlikely, as it is difficult to assume that such an extended portion of the play is completely unrepresentative of the whole. If we allow for the latter possibility, however, the identity of the other two plays produced with Antiope becomes uncertain.

In an unpublished paper titled “Euripides’ ‘Trilogy’ of 422 B.C.” Ian Storey suggests that Antiope was produced alongside the lost Erechtheus and the extant Suppliant Women around 422 B.C. In this paper, Storey outlined the major areas where

---

5 Zieliński 1925, 219-221.
7 Collard 2004, 269. See Cropp-Fick 1985, 75. Antigone does not have an established date, but Collard and Cropp point out that the metrical criteria for the tragedy indicate that the play was produced anywhere from 420 to 406 B.C. (2008, 159). It is possible, therefore, that Antigone was produced alongside Phoenician Women and Hypsipyle, especially given the prominence of Antigone in two of the plays.
8 I have preserved Kannicht, 2004 for all the fragments.
9 Cropp-Fick 1985, 75.
10 Storey points out that Suppliant Women is the most difficult to date of the extant plays, and could have been produced any time between 424-416 B.C. Like Antiope, the metre
the three plays relate to one another, especially making note of similar terminology in the fragmentary plays’ text and their notable counterparts in Suppliant Women. I, myself, having been fortunate enough to work with Storey on this theory, would like to devote the following to a discussion of Antiope itself, the Euripidean “trilogy”, and a comparison of the Antiope to Suppliant Women. I shall begin with an analysis and reconstruction of the lost Antiope. From there I shall discuss the idea of trilogy and its three distinct forms used by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Next, I shall provide a comparison between Euripides’ more firmly established “Trojan Trilogy” and the proposed Theban one, concentrating largely on story arc and similar themes. Having established this precedence for trilogy, I shall then move on to Suppliant Women and Antiope. The many instances in which the fragments of the lost play touch on Suppliant Women not only make the two plays likely to have been performed together, but may also change our literary analysis of both. I am conscious of the fact that I have left both the second play in the trilogy and the satyr play out of this paper. Storey has argued for Erectheus as the second play, and Autolycus as the satyr play.\textsuperscript{11} Further investigation into these two plays would, no doubt, provide an excellent avenue for further study on this topic. For the purposes of this paper, however, I have decided to focus entirely on Antiope.

\textsuperscript{11} Storey 2008, 4,7.
Chapter 2: The Myth

In Euripides’ version of Antiope’s story, she is the daughter of Nycteus and is raped by Zeus, resulting in her becoming pregnant with the twin boys Amphion and Zethus. She runs away and weds Epopeus, but he is defeated and killed by her uncle Lycus, and she is brought back to the bosom of her family. She was forced to expose the boys, and then live a life of humiliation and hardship as a slave for her uncle Lycus’ wife, Dirce. The boys were saved from death by a herdsman, named and raised by him, until the return of their mother, whose identity was unknown to them. The boys, now men, eventually learn the correct story of their lineage, go on to rule Thebes, and build its famous seven-gated walls with the aid of Amphion’s music, which has the ability to make the rocks weightless. As is almost always the case of Greek myth, this is by no means the only version of the story, but it is difficult to pinpoint exactly what material Euripides was working with. What elements were established, and what were his own innovations? The vast majority of testimony we have regarding Antiope was written much later, and indeed was probably influenced in some way by Euripides’ Antiope.

The earliest remaining literary reference to the Antiope story is in the nekuida of Homer’s Odyssey. We also have two fragmentary testimonia to Hesiod’s lost Ehoiai that refer to Antiope and her sons, as well as a quotation by Pausanias of the poet Asius of Samos, who was most likely writing in the 6th Century B.C. The two most complete accounts we get of the Antiope story come from sources much later than Euripides: Apollodorus’ encyclopedia-like work Bibliotheca from the 2nd Century A.D., and Pausanias’ Descriptions of Greece, written in the same century. Apollodorus’ account
attempts to give a succinct and coherent account of the myth, without making mention of many variations. It aligns with a third complete account, Hyginus’ *Fabulae* 8, which was written a century earlier and claims to be based on Euripides.\(^\text{12}\) It is valuable when reconstructing the plot of Euripides’ *Antiope*, especially as it seems to be following a similar tradition to, or indeed is based on, the tragedy. Pausanias’ accounts are geographically themed, and quite useful in that they provide *many* variations of the story, especially as they come from different localities.

In Homer’s *Odyssey*, composed long before Euripides’ *Antiope*, Odysseus claims in Book 11 to have summoned Antiope from the Underworld. He says,

\[
\text{τὴν δὲ μετ᾽ Ἀντιόπην ἱδον, Ἀσωποῖο θύγατρα,}
\text{ἡ δὲ καὶ Δίως εὐχετ’ ἐν ἀγκοίησιν ιαῦσαι,}
\text{καὶ ρ’ ἔτεκεν δύο παιὸν, Αμφίονό τε Ζήθον τε,}
\text{oἲ πρῶτοι Θῆβης ἔδος ἐκτίσον ἐπταπύλοιο,}
\text{πύργωσάν τ’, ἔπει οὐ μὲν ἀπύργωτον γ᾽ ἔδύναντο}
\text{ναιέμεν εὐρύχορον Θήβην, κρατερῶ περ ἓοντε.}
\]

And after her I saw Antiope, daughter of Asopus, who boasts that she slept in the arms of Zeus and she bore two sons, Amphion and Zethus, who first built the seat of seven-gated Thebes and girded it, since they could not dwell in spacious Thebes unguarded, however mighty they were. *(Od. 11. 260-265)*

These six lines already give us a version of the story fundamentally divergent from Euripides’ *Antiope*. With Antiope as the daughter of Asopus, rather than Nycteus, the whole plot of the tragedy would be moot, and the characters of Lycus and Dirce

---
\(^\text{12}\) Webster 1967, 204.
irrelevant. The Asopus Homer mentions is probably the river god,\(^\text{13}\) whose daughter Aegina was also abducted by Zeus.\(^\text{14}\) Indeed, Gantz points out that Asopus “accumulates quite a number of daughters loved by various gods”.\(^\text{15}\) The Asopus river divided Plataea from Thebes, which keeps Antiope geographically rooted in Thebes, and may suggest that this is the earliest version of the story, for even though her parents change in later stories, she remains tied to Boeotia. The two references we have to the *Ehoiai* also deal directly with Antiope’s (and her sons’) connection to the area. The first fragment states, “Or like her (Antiope) whom Boeotian Hyria nurtured as a maid.”\(^\text{16}\) This fragment coincides with Homer in that Antiope’s connection to Boeotia was not always through her sister, Nycteis’, husband, Polydorus, as in the *Bibliotheca*,\(^\text{17}\) but that she herself is somehow native to it. It is impossible to tell from this testimony whether Hesiod had Asopus or Nycteus as her father, but I would suggest that it leans towards Asopus. The second fragment about Antiope regarding the *Ehoiai* deals more with her sons, stating, “Hesiod and some others relate that they built the walls of Thebes by playing on the lyre.”\(^\text{18}\) This reference is in agreement with Homer’s version, and with Euripides’, although Homer makes no reference to Amphion’s music. The quotation of Asius of Samos, preserved by Pausanias, also calls Antiope Ἀσωποῦ κούρη ποταμοῦ βαθυδινής ἐνος.\(^\text{19}\) The very little we have from the earliest traditions regarding Antiope, therefore, says that she is the daughter of Asopus. The exception comes from the *Cypria*,

\(^{13}\) Pausanias gives us another option, King Asopus, which will be discussed later.
\(^{14}\) Apollod. 1.85.
\(^{15}\) Gantz 1993, 219.
\(^{16}\) fr. 95, scholiast on Homer, *Iliad* ii. 469.
\(^{17}\) More on this later.
\(^{18}\) Palaephatus, 52 c.42.
\(^{19}\) Paus. 2.6.4; Bernabé 1987, fr. 1(1 K), pg. 127; Davies 1988, fr. 1, pg. 89.
most likely dating to the 7th Century B.C., which makes reference to Epopeus’ ruin after he seduced the daughter of Lycurgus, whom Gantz believes may be an error for Lycus, and the daughter obviously Antiope.20

We now jump ahead several hundred years to the 2nd Century A.D., long after Homer, Hesiod, and Euripides, to Apollodorus and Pausanias. According to Apollodorus and his Bibliotheca, Antiope is the daughter of Nycteus, a former king of Boeotia. She is raped by Zeus and becomes impregnated with his two sons Amphion and Zethus. Her father does not believe that a divinity has sired the unborn twins and wishes to punish her for her unchastity.21 She flees him and weds Epopeus of Sicyon. This proves too much for Nycteus, who dies of what we can assume is grief as a result of his daughter’s flight, after he entreats his brother Lycus to punish Antiope and Epopeus.22 Lycus succeeds in killing Epopeus, and brings Antiope back to Thebes as a slave for his wife, Dirce. The version in Apollodorus is very similar to what Hyginus says in Fabulae 8, which claims to be based on Euripides.23 Euripides’ account of the myth no doubt had a great deal of influence on its later development, but due to the lack of evidence regarding Euripides’ own influences, we cannot really be sure what innovations were his. It is unlikely that he himself introduced Nycteus as her father, but not entirely impossible.

---

20 Gantz 1993, 484.
21 This is common in tragedy, and is later used in New Comedy, specifically Menander. Samia pokes fun at the myth of Danae, in which Zeus impregnated her as a golden shower. Demeas, trying to defend his son, asks Niceratus, the father of the debauched daughter in this case, if he is familiar with the myth of Danae (587-590), and then asks if Niceratus’ roof has any leaks (592). See Bain, 1985.
22 Apollod. 3.42.
23 Pointed out by Webster 1967, 205.
Pausanias (A.D. 110 to 180) presents a variation of the story, in which Nycteus goes to war with Epopeus and dies as a result of a wound he receives in his defeat.\textsuperscript{24} Lycus takes over the battle, but Epopeus has also died on account of a wound he neglected to take care of, and his successor gives Antiope up.\textsuperscript{25} In both Pausanias’ and Apollodorus’ accounts, Antiope gives birth to the twins Amphion and Zethus on Mt. Cithaeron and exposes them there, where they are found and raised by a herdsman.\textsuperscript{26} Unlike Apollodorus, however, Pausanias makes mention of the alternate account of Antiope’s family present in the \textit{Odyssey}, and gives several reasons for it. He says,

\begin{quote}
Αντιόπης ἐν Ἑλλησί τῆς Νυκτέως ὄνομα ἦν ἐπὶ κάλλει,
kai οἱ καὶ φήμη προσήν Ἀσωποῦ θυγατέρα, ὡς τὴν Ἐλλησί
kai Πλαταιίδα ὀρίζει, καὶ οὐ Νυκτέως εἶναι.
\end{quote}

Antiope, daughter of Nycteus, has a name for beauty among the Greeks, and there was rumour that she was the daughter of Asopus, who divides Thebes and Plataea, and not of Nycteus.

(Paus. 2.6.1)

Therefore although the stronger tradition in later accounts attributes Antiope’s parentage to Nycteus, Homer’s version did survive. In these later traditions, ascribing Asopus as her father may have been a means to make Antiope seem illegitimate (νόθη), perhaps explaining her later conduct in running off with Epopeus against Nycteus’ wishes.

Claiming that someone is the illegitimate offspring of another man is a common practice used in Greek literature to discredit him/her, the most famous example likely being Odysseus, who, when he is being treated as a villain is called the son of Sisyphus, when

\begin{footnotes}
\item[24] Paus. 2.6.3.
\item[25] ibid.
\item[26] Hyginus 8.
\end{footnotes}
as a hero the son of Laertes. But Pausanius also claims that Homer’s use of Asopus in place of Nycteus is because

\[ \text{Ὅµηρος δὲ σφᾶς ἀνήγαγεν ἐπὶ τὸ σεµνότερον τοῦ γένους…} \]

Homer referred to the more august side of the family…
(Paus. 2.6.4)

In addition to this, however, Pausanias gives us yet another option for the father of Antiope, for at no point does Homer say that she is specifically the daughter of the river Asopus. Pausanius tells us that although the Boeotians believed that the river Asopus was the father of Plataea, from whom the Plataeans get their name, Antiope’s father was more likely a mortal of the same name, King Asopus. He does not elaborate on this front, and not much is known of King Asopus.

Pausanius does not mention whether Antiope elopes with (or is abducted by) Epopeus before or after she is ravished by Zeus. Apollodorus states that she is pregnant before she runs away, which is in keeping with the Euripidean version of the story. Hyginus gives two accounts of the birth of Antiope’s sons, one in Fabulae 7 and one in Fabulae 8, the latter of which he directly attributes to Euripides. The first one casts Epopeus in a role very different from other versions. Hyginus writes,

\[ \text{Antiope Nyctei filia ab Epapho per dolum est stuprata, itaque a Lyco viro suo eiecta est. hanc uiduam Iuppiter compressit. at Lycus Dircen in matrimonium duxit, cui suspicio incidit virum} \]

27 Sisyphus, as Apollodorus tells us (1.85), was punished because he told Asopus that Zeus was abducting his daughter Aegina. If Asopus was Antiope’s father, that would mean Zeus ravished three of his daughters, Antiope, Aegina, and even Plataea.
28 Paus. 9.1.1-9.1.2 (9.3.2), Apollod. 3.42.
29 Epaphus and Epopeus are clearly two different names, but most scholars concur that Epaphus is an error for Epopeus in Hyginus. See Gantz, 1993, 486.
Antiope, daughter of Nycteus, was ravished by Epopeus through a trick, and so was cast out by her husband Lycus. Bereft in this way, Jupiter embraced her. But Lycus took Dirce in marriage, who suspected that her husband had secretly slept with Antiope, and so ordered her servants to imprison her, bound, in darkness…

(Hyg. Fab. 7)

This account is quite different from most other versions of the story coming down to us, and may be following the tradition of the Cypria mentioned earlier, where Epopeus is accused of seducing Antiope. Epopeus, rather than Lycus and Dirce, plays the villain here, while just who exactly Lycus is becomes rather uncertain. He very well could be her uncle, as common practices in ancient Greece often encourage incest. An example would be the case of an epikleros in Classical Athens. She was not allowed to keep her inheritance, but was instead also ‘inherited’ by her father’s next of kin, the anchisteus, who was very often her paternal uncle. This law was not unique to Athens, it was standard if not throughout Greece, then at least in a great many of its poleis. The practice is not common in Greek myth, but does exist, notably in Homer’s Odyssey.

Queen Arete of Phaeacia was the only daughter and heiress of her father. She was married to her paternal uncle, Alcinous. In later Athenian law customs, she and her

---

31 Pausanias casts passing aspersions on whether Epopeus comes to Antiope as rescuer or kidnapper as well (2.6.2).
32 The word, as Schaps (1981, 25) points out, has a variety of nuances in meaning, but basically is a woman left property because her father has died and she has no brothers.
34 Od. 7.54-66.
uncle/husband would have been equal heirs to the property of her paternal grandfather, Nausithous, which may explain the authority she possesses in the epic.\(^{35}\)

The father of Amphion and Zethus is unclear in *Fabulae* 7. It is assumed that Antiope became pregnant after she was raped by Epopeus (how else would Lycus have found out?). However, Dirce’s suspicions may also have been triggered by Antiope becoming pregnant *after* she has been cast out. Because she gives birth to twins, both scenarios are likely to be true simultaneously. One of the most common ancient views regarding the cause of twins is that the mother slept with more than one male, i.e. Castor and Pollux, Heracles and Iphicles.\(^{36}\) This would mean that one of the twins is a son of Epopeus, and the other a son of Zeus. Pausanias’ quotation from the poet Asius of Samos, who wrote around 640-617 B.C., coincides with this version regarding the parentage of Amphion and Zethus. He writes:

\[
\text{kai ἐπὶ τούτῳ πεποίηκεν Ἀσιος ὁ Ἀμφιπτολέμου·}
\text{"Ἀντιόπη δ’ ἔτεκε Ζῆθον καὶ Ἀμφίονα δίον}
\text{Ἀσωποῦ κοῦρη ποταμοῦ βαθυδινήντος,}
\text{Ζηνί τε κυσαμένη καὶ Ἔπωπεῖ ποιμένι λαῖν.}
\]

And on this topic Asius, son of Amphiptolemus, composed: Antiope bore Zethus and godlike Amphion, the daughter of Asopus, the swift, deep-eddying river, having been impregnated by both Zeus and Epopeus, shepherd of the people.

(Paus. 2.6.4)

The dual fatherhood suggests that Zeus was the father of one son, and Epopeus of the other. The similarity here to the more famous twins, and sons of Zeus, Castor and Pollux

\(^{35}\) Patterson 1998, 91.

\(^{36}\) Robbins 2013, 239.
is striking, and may have some bearing on Hermes’ lines at the end of Euripides’

*Antiope*:

λευκὸ δὲ πῶλο τῷ Διίς κεκλημένοι
timáς megalistás ἐξετ᾽ ἐν Κάδμου πόλει.

Called the white colts of Zeus,
you will have the greatest honours in the city of Cadmus.

*(Ant. fr. 223, 127-8.)*

As Collard points out, “the white colts of Zeus” is an epithet usually reserved for the Dioscuri, such as when they appear at the end of *Helen.* Like Castor and Pollux, there may have been a mythological tradition, now lost, which had Amphion as the son of Zeus, and Zethus as the son of Epopeus. Asius’ use of ἄτοι with Amphion would suggest that his was the divine parentage, and may account for his prominence in the Theban cycle when compared to Zethus. In Aeschylus’ *Septem*, the scout also makes reference to the tomb of Amphion, son of Zeus, omitting Zethus entirely. Later tradition has the twins buried in the same tomb, but Aeschylus may have not mentioned Zethus, because he was following a different tradition where only Amphion is the son of Zeus. And because the line has one of the Seven (Capaneus) stating that he will take Thebes *in spite of Zeus*, the mention of Amphion as the son of Zeus is significant. Aristophanes, in his *Birds*, has Pisthetaerus threaten that if Zeus keeps bothering him, he will “reduce his dwelling and that of Amphion to cinders” (*Birds* 1247-1248), once again excluding Zethus, and reinforcing the theory that only Amphion is a son of Zeus. Sophocles, too,

---

37 Collard 2004, 321.
38 However, the epithet ἄτοι is hardly reserved for sons of deities, and is even used to describe Eumaeus the swineherd in the *Odyssey* (14.48 is one example, but he is referred to in this way all throughout the *Odyssey*).
39 *Sept.* 527-528.
40 This is a quotation from Aesch. *Niobe*, fr. 160 TrGF.
makes references to Amphion as an early ruler of Thebes, without mention of his brother.\footnote{Ant. 1155.}

After Antiope and her sons kill Dirce, Pausanius tells us that Dionysus drove her mad. He writes,

\begin{quote}
ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ Λύκου Διόνυσον θεόν μάλιστα ἦγεν ἐν τιμή· παθοῦσης δὲ αὐτῆς τὰ λεγόμενα Διόνυσος νεμοσὰ τῇ Ἀντιότη. ἑπίφθονοι δὲ ἄε θεὸς παρὰ θεόν αἱ υπερβολαὶ τῶν τιμωρίων εἰσὶ· λέγουσιν Ἀντιότην μανήν καὶ ἀκοπταῖς τῶν φρενῶν κατὰ πᾶσαν πλανάσθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα, Φώκον δὲ τὸν Ὀρνυτίωνος τοῦ Σισύφου περιτυχεῖν αὐτὴ καὶ ἔχειν γυναῖκα ἰασάμενον· καὶ ὅ τάφος ἐν κοινῷ τῇ Ἀντιότη καὶ Φώκῳ πεποίηται.
\end{quote}

The wife of Lycus held Dionysus in honour the most of the gods; and her having suffered the fate she is said to have suffered, Dionysus became angry with Antiope. Grudges of the gods are always roused by extravagant vengeance. They say that Antiope was driven mad and, being out of her senses, she wandered throughout all of Greece; but Phocus, son of Ornytion, son of Sisyphus, chanced to meet with her and took her as his wife when she was cured of madness. And thus there was made a grave in common for Antiope and Phocus.

(Paus. 9.17.6)\footnote{Silvia Montiglio points out that the cause of a mad person to wander always comes from an external source in myth and tragedy, usually the gods (2005, 38). For example, the Furies chase Orestes in Aeschylus’ \textit{Eumenides} and Euripides’ \textit{Electra}, the gadfly goads Io, and Athena urges Ajax on to mad wandering (2005, 38). Often the mind is also talked of as a sort of external force driving the person on (2005, 38-41).}

Although the end of Euripides’ \textit{Antiope} makes it seem as though Antiope’s troubles are finally over, the mythological tradition would have told its audience otherwise. Her story is in some ways quite similar that of Io, another of Zeus’ “conquests.” She too was held captive and eventually freed with the help of Hermes, after which she was made to wander until finally an end was made to her sufferings.\footnote{Oddly, given Hera’s propensity to wreak revenge.}
for jealousy, vengeance came to Antiope in the form of Dionysus, rather than Hera. The connection of Dionysus with Eleutheræae\textsuperscript{44} makes Dionysus a geographically good choice, though Pausanias tells us that the grave of Antiope is located in Tithorea, near Delphi and on the road across Mt. Parnassus.\textsuperscript{45}

This connection with Eleutheræae becomes important when examining Euripides’ “trilogy” and \textit{Antiope’s} connection with Athens. In his description of the area, Pausanius writes,

\[
πρότερον μὲν γὰρ Ἐλευθερεὺς ὁ Γρηγόρης τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἔστιν;
προσχωρησάντων δὲ Αθηναίων τούτων, οὕτως ἦδη Βοιωτίας ὡς Κιθαρῶν
ἐστιν ὁ ὄρος, προσεχωρήσαν δὲ Ἐλευθερεῖς ὡς πολέμῳ βιασθέντες, ἄλλα
πολιτείας τε ἐπιθυμήσαντες παρὰ Αθηναίων καὶ κατ’ ἐχθος τὸ Θῆβαιν.
\]

For before Eleutheræae was the boundary toward Attica, but when it joined the Athenians the border of Boeotia became Cithaeron. The Eleutheræans joined not because they were forced to by war, but because they wished to share Athenian citizenship, and hated the Thebans.

(Paus. 1.38.8)

Eleutheræae is the link to Athens that Euripides is able to use in connecting \textit{Antiope} to \textit{Suppliant Women}. Eleutheræae turns to Athens for help and protection from the Thebans, just as Adrastus and the Argive women turn to Athens for help against the Thebans in \textit{Suppliant Women}. Euripides is writing after Athens likely took control of Eleutheræae in the 6\textsuperscript{th} Century B.C., although the exact date is unclear, Buck arguing it could have been anywhere from 520-511 B.C.\textsuperscript{46} Pausanias also tells us that an ancient cult statue of Dionysus was brought from Eleutheræae to Athens,\textsuperscript{47} a procession which the Athenians

\textsuperscript{44} The setting of \textit{Antiope} is before a cave at Eleutheræae
\textsuperscript{45} Paus.10.32.10
\textsuperscript{46} Camp 2001, 319; Buck 1979, 113.
\textsuperscript{47} Paus.1.38.8
reenacted from the 6th Century onward, culminating in the chryselephantine representation of the original statue made by Alcamenes.\textsuperscript{48} The procession was a fundamental component of the City Dionysia, the very festival in which \emph{Antiope} was first performed. Pausanias actually mentions the very cave at Eleutherae that Euripides chose to set his tragedy before, hundreds of years earlier:

\begin{quote}
ἀπωτέρω δὲ ὀλίγον σπῆλαιον ἐστιν οὐ μέγα, καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ὤδατος πηγή ψυχρὸν· λέγεται δὲ ἐς μὲν τὸ σπῆλαιον ὡς Ἀντιόπη τεκοῦσα κατάθοιτο ἐς αὐτὸ τοὺς παῖδας, περὶ δὲ τῆς πηγῆς τὸν ποιμένα εὑρόντα τοὺς παῖδας ἐνταῦθα σφᾶς λούσαι πρῶτον ἀπολύσαντα τῶν σπαργάνων.
\end{quote}

Farther off (from the temple of Dionysus) there is a small cave, not large, and next to it a spring of cold water. It is said of the cave that Antiope, after she birthed her boys, placed them into it, and of the spring that the herdsman, who found them, first washed them there, having removed their swaddling clothes.

(Paus. 1.38.9)

Either this story of Pausanias refers directly to Euripides’ \emph{Antiope}, or it is a story older than Euripides, which he too decided to include in his version of the story. Regardless, it is an important link between Antiope, Thebes, and Athens.

Antiope’s eventual fate is no happier than that of her two sons, however.

Amphion’s story is more renowned, which leads me to believe, as I have stated earlier, that in the earlier tradition of the myth he was the one sired by Zeus. Pausanias cites “the writer of the poem on Europa” as saying that Amphion was the first mortal to play the lyre and that he was taught by Hermes.\textsuperscript{49} He received the lyre from Hermes, who

\textsuperscript{48} Camp 2001, 121. It is also important to note that Alcamenes was active in Athens around the same time as the proposed new date for \emph{Antiope}.

\textsuperscript{49} Paus. 9.5.8.
invented the instrument,\textsuperscript{50} for being the first to make an altar to him.\textsuperscript{51} In Plato’s \textit{Laws}, Clinias also says that Amphion was the first to be entrusted with the lyre.\textsuperscript{52} Amphion’s artistic tendencies, and his ability to lift heavy stones with his music, were not mentioned by Homer, though they were by Hesiod and Asius of Samos. Although I believe that his association with the lyre is most likely long-standing, its significance was probably added to as the myth developed, culminating in the \textit{agon} in Euripides’ \textit{Antiope}.

After Amphion’s reunion with his mother, he and his brother Zethus take control of Thebes. \textit{Antiope} tells us that this is done peacefully, when Hermes says:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ὥν χρή σ’ἀκούειν [καὶ χ]θονός μοναρχίαν}
\textit{ἐκόντα δοῦνα[ι τοίσδε Κ]αδμείας, ἄναξ.}
\end{quote}

It is necessary that you listen to them and willingly give them sovereignty over the land of Cadmus, lord.

(fr. 223, 72-73).

Lycus agrees to Hermes’ command, saying to Amphion and Zethus,

\begin{quote}
\textit{ἰτε νῦν, κρατύνετ’ ἀντ’ ἐμοῦ τῆς χθονος λαβόντε Κάδμου σκῆπτρα...}
\end{quote}

Go then, rule this land in place of me, having taken the sceptre of Cadmus…

(fr. 223, 109-110)

This peaceful resolution to the story of Antiope and her sons seems to be almost entirely unique to Euripides.\textsuperscript{53} Apollodorus does not give details on how the twins took over the rule of Thebes, merely stating that they built the walls with the help of Amphion’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} \textit{Hymn. Hom. Merc.} 397-512,
\item \textsuperscript{51} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Plat. \textit{Leg.} 3.677d.
\item \textsuperscript{53} This is not the only example of peaceful resolution in Euripides, however. A parallel can be found in \textit{Andromache}, where Hermione and Orestes succeed in killing Neoptolemus but not Andromache and her son by him.
\end{itemize}
music. As I have already discussed, Zethus’ role is mentioned much less than Amphion’s. In most accounts, Lycus is banished. Pausanius’ account of how the twins gained power is a bit more aggressive, more similar to the story of how Romulus and Remus regained their birthrights back from their own evil uncle in Book 1 of Livy’s History of Rome. Pausanias writes,

Λύκου δὲ ἐπιτροπεύοντος δεύτερον κατίασιν Ἀμφίων καὶ Ζῆθος δύναμιν ἀγείραντες, καὶ Λάιον μὲν ὑπεκκλέπτουσιν οἷς ἦν ἐπιμελές μὴ γενέσθαι τὸ Κάδμου γένος ἕς τοὺς ἔπειτα ἀνώνυμον, Λύκου δὲ οἱ τῆς Ἀντιόπης παῖδες τῇ μάχῃ κρατοῦσιν.

When Lycus was regent a second time, Amphion and Zethus having assembled a force returned. Those who were anxious, lest the race of Cadmus be from then on nameless, spirited Laius away, and the sons of Antiope conquered Lycus with their fighting.

(Paus. 9.5.6)

How this version of events fits in with the death of Dirce tied to the bull is problematic. Most likely Dirce would have been killed when the twins were reunited with their mother, after which Amphion and Zethus took the battle to Lycus, rather than Lycus also coming to them as he does in Euripides’ Antiope.

After Amphion defeats Lycus and becomes a ruler of Thebes, all sources agree that Amphion married Niobe, daughter of Tantalus. Niobe’s story is a famous one, and is mentioned frequently in Greek and Latin literature. Together she and Amphion had a plethora of children, the numbers varying depending on whom you read. In Homer’s Iliad, she had six sons and six daughters (Il. 25.602-610), in Hesiod she had ten of each

---

54 Apollod. 3.40-44.
55 Hes. fr. 183 Merkelbach-West.
sex, and in Apollodorus she had seven of each.\textsuperscript{56} Whomever you read, Niobe had a lot of children, and this led her to boast that she was more blessed with children than Leto. In response to this, Apollo killed all of her male children, while Artemis killed the females. Pausanias forgoes the metaphor of the arrows of Artemis and Apollo, preferring instead to say that the children were killed by plague, the arrows of Apollo and Artemis not being mentioned.\textsuperscript{57} Niobe was turned to stone, and mourned her children forever on the mountains at Sipylus.\textsuperscript{58} The children, according to Pausanias, were buried in two tombs, one for the girls, one for the boys, in Thebes.\textsuperscript{59} The first surviving reference we have to Amphion being Niobe’s husband is in the fragmentary \textit{Niobe} by Aeschylus, and it is never varied from in later writing.\textsuperscript{60} What is left of the fragments seems to imply a symphathetic stance toward Amphion, laying the blame mostly on Niobe for the death of the children.\textsuperscript{61} Sophocles also wrote a \textit{Niobe}, also lost, in which Apollo and Artemis actually appear as they hunt down the children. Amphion’s fate after the death of his family is not treated in particular detail by any surviving works. Pausanias mentions that his “punishment” is described in the lost epic \textit{Minyad}\textsuperscript{62} and also that he was punished in Hades for mocking Leto and her children.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{56} Apollod. 3.45.
\textsuperscript{57} Paus. 9.5.9; he also mentions at 2.21 that there are reports that some of the children survived, Chloris according to most authors, but does not believe them, trusting instead to Homer’s account.
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Il.} 24.614-15; Apollod. 3. 47.
\textsuperscript{59} Paus. 9.16.7.
\textsuperscript{60} Gantz 1993, 537.
\textsuperscript{61} Gantz 1993, 538.
\textsuperscript{62} Paus. 9.5.9.
\textsuperscript{63} Paus. 9.5.8.
Apollos idorus says that Amphion was killed by his only surviving children.\textsuperscript{64} Gantz points out that it is only Homer who states that all the children were killed, which may leave room for other traditions.\textsuperscript{65} Hyginus claims that after the horrible death of his family, Amphion went mad:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Amphion autem cum templum Apollinis expugnare uellet, ab Apolline sagittis est interfectus...}
\end{quote}

Amphion, however, tried to storm the temple of Apollo, and was slain by the arrows of Apollo.

\textit{(Hyg. Fab. 9)}

Ovid’s version in the \textit{Metamorphoses} has Amphion kill himself, writing:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Nam pater Amphion ferro per pectus adacto finierat moriens pariter cum luce dolorem.}
\end{quote}

For the father, Amphion, after he drove a sword through his breast, dying, ended his anguish along with the daylight.

\textit{(Ov. Met. 6.271-272)}

Ovid’s version of Amphion’s death is similar to what happens to Zethus, although on a larger scale. There is not much discussion about the details of Amphion or Zethus’ death in any Classical Athenian texts. Passing references are made to their tomb by Sophocles and Aristophanes, as has already been mentioned, and Demosthenes refers to the Athenians making offerings to the “Amphiones”,\textsuperscript{66} which could possibly be a term for Amphion and Zethus. Overall, however, the fate of their wives, Thebe and Niobe, seems to generate a lot more focus.

\textsuperscript{64} Apollod. 3.47.
\textsuperscript{65} Gantz 1993, 539.
\textsuperscript{66} Dem. 43.66.
Zethus, the brother prone to hard work, lacks the divine interaction for which his brother was famed. In most accounts he married the nymph Thebe, who gave her name to Thebes. Homer gives a different version of the story, where he married Aedon, daughter of Pandareus. He had only one son by her, and like Amphion, lost him. Homer speaks of the incident in the *Odyssey*:

> ὡς δ᾽ ὣτε Πανδαρέου κούρη, χλωρηᾶς ἀηδόν,  
> καλὸν ἀείδηςιν ἔαρος νέον ἵσταμένοι,  
> δενδρέων ἐν πεταλοῖσι καθεξομένη πυκνοῖσιν,  
> ἢ τε θαμὰ τρωπόσα χέει πολυχέα φωνήν,  
> παῖδ᾽ ὀλυφυρομένῃ Ἰτυλὸν φίλον, ὥν ποτε χαλκῷ  
> κτεῖνε δι᾽ ἀφραδίας, κούρον Ζήθοιο ἀνακτος…

Just as when the daughter of Pandareus, a nightingale on young branches, would sing fair when spring is newly come, sitting amid the dense leaves of trees, and ever pouring out her lilting, many-toned song, lamenting for her son, dear Itylus, whom once with bronze she slew through folly, the son of Lord Zethus.

*(Od. 19.518-524)*

Homer does not say how Aedon killed Itylus, apart from that it was done accidentally. The scholia explain that she was trying to kill one of Niobe’s children out of jealousy, but instead somehow kills Itylus. This story is more commonly applied to Tereus and Procne, after the lost tragedy *Tereus* by Sophocles, in which Procne deliberately kills her children and mourns as a nightingale. Sophocles’ Tereus raped his wife’s sister Philomela and cut out her tongue so that she would not be able to tell anyone. The two women, in

---

67 D’Arcy Thompson mentions that translating χλωρηᾶς as green has caused many German commentators “needless conjectures as to some other bird being here alluded to” (1936, 16-17). Thompson offers several examples were χλωρηᾶς is merely young branches, such as Sophocles’ *OC*. 673, and concludes we are in fact dealing with a nightingale (1936, 17).

68 Rutherford 2001, 192.
vengeance, kill Procne’s and Tereus’ son Itys, and serve him as dinner to Tereus. The similarity between the names “Itys” and “Itylus” is uncanny, and the two separate stories are no doubt based on one another, Homer’s version most likely being the earlier one. Webster argues that Tereus was written around the same time as Euripides’ Medea of 431 B.C. It is important to note, especially given the main argument of this paper, that putting Antiope at a date of around 422 B.C. instead of 408/9 B.C. makes its subject matter quite relevant to Tereus.

Pausanias mentions the incident much later, but does not seem overly interested in why the infanticide was committed. He writes:

Ζήθῳ δὲ τὸν παῖδα ἀπέκτεινεν ἢ τεκοῦσα κατὰ δὴ τινὰ ἁμαρτίαν, ἐτεθνήκει δὲ ὑπὸ λύπης καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ζήθος…

The mother killed Zethus’ son on account of some sort of fault, and Zethus himself died from sadness…

(Paus. 9.5.9)

Both brothers therefore share a demise caused by grief at losing their children. According to one legend they were buried in the same tomb, and if the dirt from their grave was placed on the tomb of Antiope in Tithorea at the right time of year, Tithorea would yield a good harvest, while Thebes would not. This account differs from Amphion’s tomb being across from one of the gates at Thebes mentioned in Athenian tragedy. After the
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69 See Dunbar 1995, 139-141.
70 Webster 1936, 3-7.
71 Paus. 9.17.4.
72 Aeschylus’ Septem (528), Euripides’ Suppliant Women (664-666), and Phoenician Women (115-116).
death and collapse of both brothers’ houses, the rule of Thebes passed back to Nycteus’ grandson, Laius.

The family of Nycteus bears looking into. He had one other daughter named Nycteis, who according to Apollodorus, married Polydorus, and it is through him that the family is able to gain its connection to Thebes without needing Antiope to be the daughter of Asopus. Polydorus was the only son of Cadmus and Harmonia, alongside their four daughters Ino, Semele, Agave, and Autonoe. Though Polydorus is mentioned in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (8th-7th century B.C.), he is often overlooked in place of Pentheus, the son of Agave, such as in Euripides’ *Bacchae*. In Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus* (267-68), Euripides’ *Phoenician Women* (5-9), and Herodotus’ *Histories* (5.59) he is mentioned as the father of Labdacus, who is the father of Laius, who in turn is the father of Oedipus. Laius, while in exile, having been banished from Thebes by Amphion and Zethus, stayed with Pelops, who was the father of Atreus and Thyestes. Pelops ultimately curses Laius and his descendants for the rape and suicide of his other son, Chrysippus, which is perhaps ironic as Pelops and his family have also been cursed. This is not the only time the family of Laius and the family of Pelops meet.

As mentioned before, Zethus eventually marries Thebe and Amphion Niobe. Niobe was the daughter of none other than Tantalus, and her fate and the fate of her children are often attributed to the curse on the whole line of Tantalus. It is through her
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73 Apollod. 3.40.
74 Hes. *Theog.* 975-78.
75 Gantz 1993, 483.
76 Apollod. 3.5.5; Athen. 13.602; Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 1760.
that Amphion is also killed, thereby allowing Laius to become the king of Thebes. And it is because Laius is the king of Thebes that the curse of Pelops is able to wreak vengeance on him in such a terrible way.

Euripides wrote several other lost plays featuring these mythical figures, including a *Chrysippus* and an *Oedipus*. *Chrysippus* is generally considered to belong to Euripides’ early career, due to its sexual subject matter, although there are too few remaining fragments for a metrical or vocabulary study. The play is linked in its hypothesis to *Phoenician Women* with *Oenomaus*, and therefore is most likely not the second play in our Theban Trilogy, although its subject matter would fit the overall theme. Cropp and Fick also identify *Oedipus* as coming after *Trojan Women*, suggesting the date of 419 to 406 B.C., stating that the trochaic tetrameters in frs. 545 and *545a are only found in dramas postdating *Trojan Women*.78

Thus we find, as is so often the case in Greek myth, a fairly intricate, convoluted, and often contradictory account of Antiope’s history. Sadly, most testimony we have relating to the myth post-dates Euripides’ own account. Early tradition seems mostly to attribute Antiope’s parentage to Asopus. Euripides’ source material must, therefore, have included the *Cypria*, which offers an alternative to Antiope’s ancestry, and paves the way for her later grievances. That Amphion and Zethus are connected with Zeus and responsible for the construction of the citadel at Thebes is consistent in all source material, before and after Euripides. The prospect of dual parentage is tantalizing. No

77 Collard and Cropp 2008, 462.
material we have specifically indicates this, but the possibility certainly hovers at the periphery. If Amphion were the son of Zeus and Zethus the son of Epopeus, an argument could perhaps be made that the Thebans had their own version of the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux, much in the way that the Athenians made their own Heracles, Theseus.\textsuperscript{79}

Buck has pointed out that Boeotia has several examples of “builder twins” in addition to Amphion and Zethus, including Trophonius and Agamedes from Orchomenus, and Leucippus and Ephippus from Tanagra, which points to the possibility of an early Mycenaean cult of divine twins.\textsuperscript{80}

Apart from a later Roman play by Pacuvius, also lost, Euripides seems to be the only dramatist to portray this particular incident in the Theban cycle. There can be no doubt that his tragedy had a huge effect on later interpretations of the myth, especially as the trend towards having Antiope be the daughter of Asopus drops off in favour of Nycteus. With so little knowledge of the source material he had to work with, we cannot say for certain which innovations were purely Euripides’.

\textsuperscript{79}See Preller and Robert 1964, Vian 1963, 69-76.
\textsuperscript{80}Buck 1979, 57.
Chapter 3: Antiope

The following fragments follow Kannicht’s numbering system, but I have arranged them in the order I believe they took place in the tragedy:

Test. iii (a)

EADEM (i.e ANTIOPA) EURIPIDIS. Nyctei regis in Boeotia fuit filia Antiopa; eius formae bonitate Iuppiter adductus grauidam fecit. (2) Quam pater cum punire uellet propter stuprum, minitans periculum Antiopa effugit. Casu in eodem loco quo illa peruenerat Epopeus Sicyonius stabat; is mulierem aduectam domo matrimonio suo iunxit. (3) Id Nycteus aegre ferens cum moreretur Lyco fratri suo per obtestationem mandat, cui nam regnum relinquebat, ne impune Antiopa ferret. Huius post mortem Lycus Sicyonem ueniit; interfecit Epopeo Antiopam uinctam adduxit. In Cithaerone parit geminos et relinquit, quos pastor educauit, Zetum et Amphionem nominavit. (4) Antiopa Dirce uxori Lyci data erat in cruciatum; ea occasione nacta fugae se mandauit; deuenit ad filios suos, ex quibus Zetus existimans fugitiuam non recepit. In eundem locum Dirce per bacchationem Liberi ilico delata est; ibi Antiopam repertam ad mortem extrahebat. (5) Sed ab educatore pasto re adulescentes certiores facti eam esse matrem suam, celeriter consecuti matrem eripuerunt, Dircen ad taurum crinibus religatam necant. (6) Lycum cum occidere uellent, uetuit eos Mercurius, et simul iussit Lycum concedere regnum Amphioni.

The same one by Euripides. Antiope was the daughter of Nycteus, the king in Boeotia; Zeus, drawn by the excellence of her beauty, made her with child. (2) When her father wished to punish her for this violation, Antiope fled this menacing danger. By chance, in the same place in which she had arrived, Epopeus of Sicyon was staying; this woman he took to his home and joined her with himself in marriage. (3) This Nycteus bore ill, and when he was dying, he enjoined to oath his own brother, to whom he was leaving his kingdom, that Antiope not go unpunished. After his death, Lycus came to Sicyon; after he slew Epopeus, he took back a fettered Antiope. On Cithaeron she bore and abandoned her twin boys, whom an herdsman reared, and he named them Amphion and Zethus. (4) Antiope was given into torment to Dirce, wife of Lycus; but when met with the opportunity for flight, she availed herself of it; she came to her sons, but Zethus, thinking her a fugitive, did not receive her. Into that very same place Dirce was brought by the Bacchic rites of Liber Dionysus; there having found Antiope, she began dragging her to her death. (5) But by their foster father, the herdsman, the youths were informed that she was their mother; having quickly followed them, they rescued their mother, and Dirce, having tied her to a bull by her hair, they murdered her. When they purposed to kill Lycus, Hermes forbade them, and at the same time commanded Lycus to cede the kingdom to Amphion.
...you have, may you be generous to me and to my master who dwells on the plains of Oenoe, their pasture joining here to Eleutherae.

one I call «Zethus»; for she sought (ezětēse) comfort for the births, the mother...

(And the other Amphion) . . . from his having been born by the roadside (amph’ hodon).

Of Ether and Gaia, mother of all, I sing…

...for the lyre was reprisal for the cattle.

...time, and the breath of the gods, and the love of singing praise…
<AMΦΙΩΝ?>

[mελετή] ... κρείσσον ὀλβον κτήμα ...
(exercise) ... a possession mightier than wealth ...

183

<ΖΗΘΟΣ>

κακῶν κατάρχεις τήνδε μουσᾶν εἰσάγων ἄργον, φίλοινον, χρημάτων ἀτιμέλη.
You begin this trouble, bringing up music here, idle, fond of wine, not mindful of events.

184

<ΖΗΘΟΣ>

ἐν τούτῳ <γέ τοι>
λαμπρός θ’ ἔκαστος κάτι τούτ’ ἐπείγεται, νέμων τὸ πλείστον ἡμέρας τούτῳ μέρος, ἵν’ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ τυγχάνει βέλτιστος ὁν.
It is in this, at least, that each man shines, and for this that he is eager, bestowing the greatest part of the day to this, where he himself happens to be his best.

185

<ΖΗΘΟΣ>

(ἀμελεῖς ὃν δὲι σε ἑπιμελεῖσθαι)
ψυχῆς φύσιν <γάρ> ὡδε γενναίαν <λαχύν> γυναικομίμῳ διαπρέπεις μορφώματι: κοῦτ’ ἂν δίκης βουλαίει προσθεὶ ἂν λόγον
ουτ’ είκος ὃν καὶ πιθανόν <οὐδέν> ἂν λάκοις
ΟΤ’ έἰκος ὃν καὶ πιθανὸν <οὐδέν> ἄν λάκοις
............... κοῦτ’ ἂν ἀσπιδός κύτει <καλώς> ὁμιλήσει<α>ζ οὔτ’ ἄλλων ὑπέρ νεανικόν βούλευμα βουλεύσαιο <τι>.
(you have no care for that which should be your concern;)
(for) naturally born with a manly nature, you make a display of yourself with the appearance of a woman; you would neither
give council on justice nor add a word that is likely or persuasive
. . . nor to the hollow of a shield bravely keep close, nor on another’s behalf give
sound advice.

186

<ΖΗΘΟΣ>

καὶ πῶς σοφὸν τοῦτ’ ἔστιν, ἥτις εὐφυὰ
λαβοῦσα τέχνη φῶτ’ ἐθηκε χείρονα;

and how is this wise, that having taken hold
of a well-grown man, an art makes him inferior?

187

<ΖΗΘΟΣ>

ἀνὴρ γὰρ ὅστις εὖ βίον κεκτημένος
τὰ μὲν κατ’ οἶκους ἀμελίᾳ παρεῖς ἐδ’,
μολπαίσι δ’ ἡσθεῖς τοῦτ’ ἂεὶ θηρεύεται,
ἀγρός μὲν οἶκοι κἂν πόλει γενήσεται,
φύλοις δ’ουδεῖς: ἡ φύσις γὰρ ὀίχεται,
ὅταν γλυκείας ἥδους ἱσσων τις ἤ

For any man who well acquires a livelihood
and permits its decline with his indifference,
and who delights himself with song and dance
and is always chasing it, will be idle at home and in the polis,
and a nobody for his friends; for a man’s nature is lost
when he is conquered by the sweetness of pleasure.

*187α

<i>ΖΗΘΟΣ</i>

(i) ῥύψον τὴν λύραν, κέχρησο δὲ ὀπλοῖς.
(ii) μάτην κιθαρίζεις μὴ δὲν ὑφελὸν, ἀλλὰ ἔξελθε:
στρατιωτικὸν βίον ζῆσον καὶ <εὖ> πόρησον καὶ τυράννησον.

(i) Discard your lyre and use weapons!
(ii) Idly you play the cithara, helping no one. Go out!
Live a military life and be well provided and a ruler!
<ΖΗΘΟΣ>

ἀλλὰ ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ·
paūsai matáξων καὶ πόνων εὔμοισιν
ἀσκεῖ· τοιαῦτ’ ἀείδε καὶ δόξεις φρονεῖν,
σκάπτων, ἄρδης γῆν, ποιμνίοις ἐπιστατῶν,
ἄλλοις τὰ κομμάτα ταῦτ’ ἀφεῖς σοφίσματα,
ἐξ ὧν κενοῖς ἐγκατοικήσεις δόμοις.

But be persuaded by me,
stop working folly and perform the music of hard work;
sing this as your song and you’ll seem prudent,
digging, tilling the land, tending the flocks,
having left your fancy arts to others,
from the cause of which you will be living in an empty house.

<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>

ὁ δ’ ἡσυχος φίλοις τ’ ἀσφαλῆς φίλος
πόλει τ’ ἀριστος. μή τά κινδυνεύματα
αἰνεῖτ’· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὔτε ναυτίλον φιλῶ
τολμώντα λίαν οὔτε προστάτην χθονός.

He who is at ease is a steadfast friend to his friends,
and is best for his city. Do no praise hazardous venture;
for I love neither an overbold sailor nor leader.
Such it is, the life of miserable mortals:
neither wholly fortunate nor unfortunate.
He is prosperous and then he is not prosperous.
Why then, when we stand in uncertain happiness,
do we not live as pleasurably as possible, without distress.

And if a fortunate man who possesses a livelihood
will pursue no beauty in his home,
I myself shall never call him happy,
but instead a lucky guardian of goods.

You were wrong to fault my body as weak
and effete; for if I am able to reason well,
this is superior to a muscular arm.
<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>

γνώμαις γὰρ ἄνδρὸς εῦ μὲν οἰκούνται πόλεις,
εὖ δ’ οίκος, εἰς τ’ αὐτ’ πόλεμον ἴσχυσθει μέγα·
σοφὸν γὰρ ἐν βουλεύμα τάς πολλὰς χέρας
νικᾷ, σὺν δ’ ὁχλῳ δ’ ἀμαθία πλεῖστον κακὸν.

For it is by man’s judgements that cities are well governed,
and the house well governed, and is a great resource in war;
for one wise council may prevail over many hands,
and stupidity together with the mob is the biggest evil.
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<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>

καὶ μὴν ὅσοι μὲν σαρκός εἰς εὐεξίαν
ἀσκοῦσι βιοτῶν, ἢν σφαλῶσι χρημάτων,
κακοὶ πολίται· δεὶ γὰρ ἄνδρ’ εἰθυσμένον
ἀκόλαστον ἦθος γαστρὸς ἐν ταύτῳ μένειν.

Indeed all who live life for big muscles, if their
wealth should fail, are bad citizens; for when a man becomes
accustomed to habits of gluttony, he remains in those habits.
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<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>

ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἄδοιμι καὶ λέγοιμι τι
σοφῶν, ταράσσων μηδὲν ὁν πόλις νοσεῖ.

Certainly I may delight and say something wise,
not stirring up the city with troubles.
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<ΖΗΘΟΣ>

κόσμος δὲ σιγή, στέφανος ἄνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ·
τὸ δ’ ἐκλαλοῦν τοῦθ’ ἥδονῆς μὲν ἀπτεται,
κακὸν δ’ ὀμιλῆμ’ ἀσθενὲς δὲ καὶ πόλει.

Silence is an ornament, a garland for the man without wickedness;
While blathering of this sort fastens itself to pleasure,
is bad company, and is bad for the polis.
Many mortals suffer this evil; although intelligent they are not willing to obey their good sense, their heart prevailed upon by friends.

Best is that man of inquiry he who gained learning, not being troublesome to citizens nor urging them into unjust deeds but perceiving the ageless order of immortal nature, and in what way it was put together and whence and how. He never stands for the practice of shameful deeds among such men.

A man could make an argument for two sides of any matter, if he were a clever speaker.
 Humanity has many troubles, strangers.

I understand what I suffer, and this is not a small evil: for not to know that one is ailing has some pleasure, in misery ignorance is an advantage.

Oh child, words well spoken might be false, and with the beauty of words, might conquer truth; yet this is not the surest test, that is character and right; he who conquers with his fluency, he is clever, but I hold facts mightier than words, always.

...when I was being brought back again, as I was pregnant, I gave birth.
<ΑΝΤΙΟΠΗ>
ei d’ hemelithen ek theon kai pai’d’ emo,
exei logon kai touto· ton polla·n broto’n
dei tou’c men einai dustychie·s, tou’c d’ eutychie·s.

And if we were overlooked by the gods, my two sons and I,
even this has logic; out of all mortal men there must be some
who are unlucky, and some who are lucky.

209  <ΧΟΡΟΣ?>
ou sophronizein emathon· aideiathai de’ chrη,
gynai, to’ lian kai philassethai phonon.

I did not learn to moderate; but it is necessary to be ashamed,
woman, of excess, and guard oneself against ill-will.

210  <ΑΜΦΙΩΝ?>
oud’ gal thra doko
theta’ kakourgou scharmat’ ekmouymenon
soi Ze’n’ecs eunivn’ wosper antheta’vnon molein.

For I do not believe
that secretly, taking the guise of a wicked beast,
Zeus came to your bed as though a man.

215  <ΑΜΦΙΩΝ?>
pasi d’ argel’w broto’is
esthla’v ap’ an’dro’n eugene’v spairein te’kna
(one or more lines lost?)
ou gar pote’ an pra’exeivan ez’ telo’c kakos.

I proclaim that all mortals
beget children from women of well-born men

for they shan’t ever fair badly, right up to the end.
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<ΧΟΡΟΣ>

φεῦ φεῦ, βροτείων πημάτων ὡσα τύχαι
ὡσα τε μορφαί· τέρμα δ’ οὐκ εἰποι τις ἄν.

Alas! How many are the fortunes, how many are the forms of mankind’s misery! One could not speak an end to them!

217

<ΑΝΤΙΟΠΗ?>

. . . τὸ δοῦλον οὐχ ὄρη δόσων κακόν;
. . . do you not see how great an evil it is to be a slave?
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<ΧΟΡΟΣ?>

φεῦ, φεῦ, τὸ δοῦλον ὡς ἀπανταχῇ γένος
πρὸς τὴν ἐλάσσω μοῖραν ὄρισεν θεός.

Alas! Utterly has the god bestowed the slave the fate of the inferior genus!

175<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ?>

οὐκοῦν] ἐκοῦσα τήνδ’ ἔρημός[εις ἐδραν,
μὴ χειρία]ν ἐλκωσί σ’ οἴδε προσπ[ 6-7 letters ἑθείρας: οὐ γὰρ ἐν τρυφαῖ[ς ἐτι
μέλαθρα]ν ναιεσ Ἡράκλει οὐδεστ[ 5
7-8 letters ]δ’ ἰκεὶς ἢ δι’ οἰωνῶν πλ[άκας

<ΔΙΡΚΗ?>

7-8 letters ]μελλὼν συνθανεῖν πρε[ 10
μηδεὶς θι]γῆ μου δοῦλος ὄν ἐλε[υθέρας
7-8 letters ] . . χρώτ’· ἀλλ’ ἐκοῦσα πε[ἰσομαι.
ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς γὰρ ἴν γένει’ ὁτῳ παρῆ
τραχεία κωζόθμος ἀμαθίαν ἐχει·
δόστε δὲ πρὸς τὸ πίπτων εὐδόργος φέρει
τὸν δάμον’, οὕτος ράον ἀθλιωτ[ 15

81 Kannicht assigns fr. 175 based on the assignation of Stobaeus of II. 14-15 to Antigone. I shall be discussing my assignation to Antiope in Chapter 4.
(Amphion?)

Abandon your (seat) here willingly so that these . . . do not drag you away in their power by your hair… for no <longer> in luxury are you living in the <hall> of Heracles. . . nor have you come… or ranged (through?) birds…plains without…with… of a fawn skin (draped) from you . . . for these sacred things you do not have.

(Dirce?)

. . . the future . . . to die with . . . let (no one) who is a slave lay hold of me (being free) . . . body; but readily I shall suffer. for in these evils if nobly-born women become harsh and short tempered, she is stupid. but whoever bears their fate composedly before what befalls them, more easily . . . most wretched . . .
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οὐ χρῆ ποτ’ ἄνδρα δοῦλον ὄντ᾽ ἑλευθέρας γνώμας διώκειν οὐδ’ ἐς ἀργίαν βλέπειν.

It is necessary that a slave man never pursue free thought and not look to idleness.
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<ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ>

εἰ δὲ ποιν τύχοι πέριξ ἐλίξας π’ εἰλ’ ὀμοῦ λαβὼν γυναῖκα πέτραν δρῦν μετελάσσων ἀεί.

And if < it >

happened to turn this way or that it dragged the woman, rock, and tree, ever changing.
They say that Dike is the child of Cronos and brings to light whichever of us is not wicked.
<BOUKOLOS>
*about 13 letters*] ζας ἦδομαι κακὸν . . . .

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
oὐκ ἀσφαλὲς τὸδ' εἶπας, ἀνθρώπε, στέγ[ος].

<BOUKOLOS>
30 δράν δεὶ τιν' κεῖνους δ' οἶδ' ἐγὼ τεθνηκό[τας].

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
καλὸς ἄρ', εἴπερ οἶσθα, ταξόμεσθα νῦν.

<BOUKOLOS>
tάξιν] τίν' ἀλλην ἦ δόμων στείχει[ν] ἔσω;
*about 14 letters*] και πρὶν οἰκούμεν [ . . .

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
*about 14 letters*] τοὺς ἔξων ἐδόν μ. [ . . .
<BOUKOLOS>
*about 14 letters*] δορυφόρους ἔξω πέτ[ρας]
remains of one line
c. 11-12 letters ἰμ[ε]ῖς καὶ σὺ θήσομεν καλὸς.

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
[πόσοι δὲ δὴ τὸ]82 πλ[ῆθός εἰσιν οἱ ἔξονι;

<BOUKOLOS>
eἰς ἦ δὺ' ἐγχη]83 δ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐν χεροῖν.

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
40 ὀπλοισὶ νυν84 φ[ρουρεῖτε περίβολον πέτρας]
*about 11 letters*] οτες, καν τι[ς] ἐκκύπτη δόμων,
λάζουσθε' ἐγ]ὼ δὲ παῖδα Νυκτέως ἐμῇ
*about 10 letters*] σα χειρὶ καὶ τάχ' εἰσται

fr. c col. i
<BOUKOLOS>
*about 14 letters*] οτας ὡς μάτην λόγων
*about 12 letters*] σµµµάχους ἀνωφελεῖς.

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
45 ὂς ἦν θεὸς θέλῃ
*about 14 letters*] τὴν' ἀνὰ στέγην τάχα.

<XHOROS>

82 Suggested by Collard and Cropp 2008.
83 ibid.
84 ibid.
about 14 letters  ριων σθένος βρόχοισι κατα-
10-11 letters  βροτών δ᾽ αὐ τέκναις
50a remains of one half-line

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
50b ιὸ μοί μοι.

<XΟΡΟΣ>
έ]α ἔα·
καὶ δὴ [πρὸς ἔργῳ] τῶν νεανιῶν χέρες.

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
ὁ πρόσπ[ολοι . . .]ντες οὐκ ἀρήξετε;

<XΟΡΟΣ>
ἀλαλάζετα[ι ἀ στ]έγα· βοὴ
θανάσιμον μέλος.

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>

<XΟΡΟΣ>
κλύεις ὁ ρᾷ<ς;>
πα[ρα]καλεῖ πόλιν φοβερός αἴματος·
Δίκα τοι Δίκα χρόνιος ἀλλ᾽ ὀμος
ἔπιπεσοῦσ᾽ ἐλαθεν ἐλαβεν ὅταν ἢ[δ]ῃ
τιν ἀσεβῇ βροτῶν.

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
οἴμοι θανοῦμαι πρὸς δυοῦν ἀσύμμαχος.

<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>
60 τήν δ᾽ ἐν νεκροῖσιν οὐ στένεις δάμαρτα σήν;

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
ἡ γάρ τέθνηκε; καίνον αὐ λέγεις κακόν.

<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>
ὁλκοῖς γε ταυρείοις διαφορούμενη.

<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
πρὸς τοῦ; πρὸς ὑμῶν; τοῦτο γὰρ θέλω μαθεῖν.

<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>
ἐκμανθάνοις ἀν ὡς ὀλωλ᾽ ήμῶν ὅπο.
<ΛΥΚΟΣ>
65 ἀλλ᾽ Ἰτινο[ν] πεφύκαθ᾽ ὄν σύκ οἴδ᾽ έγώ;

<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ>
τί τούτ᾽ ἐρευν[α]/ ἐν νεκροῖς π[ε]ύṣῃ θανῶν.

<ΕΡΜΗΣ>
fr. b col. i c. 13-14 letters [μον ἔχορμομένους 5-6 letters ἀνα]ξ Ἀμφίων· ἐντολάς δὲ σοί Ἐρμής ὡ] Μαίας [c. 11-12 letters ].ἐνος . . . . ] Διός κήρυκ[μ c. 8 letters]ν φέροιν.
τί δήπανε[ ] a few letters legible at line end
Ζηνὸς μολούσα λέ[κτρα ] a few letters legible
75 ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ὀρίζει καί δι[ c. 8 letters ] κακά,
δὲν χρὴ σ᾽ ἀκούειν [καὶ] χθονὸς μοναρχίαν ἐκόντα δοῦνα[ι τοῖσδε Κ]ακείμειας, ἀναζ.
81 σαρκον ἄθροίσας τῆς ταλαιπώρου φύσιν ὡς ἐν τὸ Δίκης ὅνοι ἐπόνυμον λάβῃ κρήνης ἀπόρρους ὃς διέσιν ἀστεως
85 πεδία τὰ Ἡθηβης ὄδασιν ἔξαρδον ἀεὶ.
σὺ μὲν [. . . ] . . έρυμα πολεμίως λαβόν (one or more lines missing)
90 Ζήτω τάδ᾽ εἶπον· δεύτερον δ᾽ Ἀμφίωνα λύραν ἄνωγα διὰ χερόν ὀπλισμένον μέλπειν θεοὺς φόβασιν· ἔνσχεται δὲ σοι πέτραι τ ἐρυμναὶ μουσικῆ κηλοῦμεναι δένδρη τε μητρός ἐκλιπόνθ᾽ ἑδώλια,
95 ὡστ᾽ εὖμ[α]ρεῖαν τεκτόνων θήσῃ χερί. Ζεῦς τίν τε μίθῃ σὺν δ᾽ ἐγὼ δίδωμι σοι, οὔπερ τὸδ᾽ εὔρημ᾽ ἔσχες, Ἀμφίων ἀναζ. λευκῶ δὲ πόλω τὸ Διός κεκλημένοι τιμᾶς μεγίστας ἐξέτ᾽ ἐν Κάδμου πόλει.
100 καὶ λέκτρ᾽ ὁ μὲν Ἡθηβαῖο λή[ψ]εται γάμων, ἦ δὲ Ἐφρύων κάλλιστον ἐνυντήριον, τὴν Ταντάλου παῖδ᾽ ἀλλ᾽ ὅσον τάχιστα χρὴ σπεύδειν θεοῦ πέμψαντος οία βούλεται.
<ΛΥΚΟΣ>

ὦ πόλλ᾿ ἀελπτα Ζεῦ τιθεὶς καθ’ ἡμέραν,
105 ἔδειξας τάδ᾽ ἀβουλίας ἐμᾶς ἐσοφ[ 7 letters ] δοκοῦντας οὐκ εἶναι Δίως.
Πάρεστε καὶ ζήθ᾽ ἐνε μηνυτῆς χρόνος
ψευδεῖς μὲν ἡμᾶς, σφόν δὲ μητέρ᾽ εὔνυξη.

ὦ πόλλ᾽ ἄελπτα
Ζεῦ τιθεὶς
καθ᾽ ἡμέραν,
ἐδειξας 5-6 letters τάσδ᾽ ἀβουλίας ἐμᾶς ἐσοφ[ 7 letters ] δοκοῦντας οὐκ εἶναι Δίως.
Πάρεστε καὶ ζήθ᾽ ἐνε μηνυτῆς χρόνος
ψευδεῖς μὲν ἡμᾶς, σφόν δὲ μητέρ᾽ εὔνυξη.

λαβόντε Κάδμου σκῆπτρα: τὴν γὰρ ἀξίαν
σφόν προστίθησι Ζεῦς ἐγὼ τε σὺν Διί.

<Amphion>
. . . these men, nor how we shall flee.
For if indeed Zeus is our father,
he will save us, and with us punish our enemy.
Things have come in all ways to so great a circumstance
that we could not flee – even if we wished –
punishment for Dirce’s newly spilt blood.
Staying, our fortune comes to this,
that either it is necessary to die within the daylight
(or indeed) with our hand set up a trophy of war.

<Chorus>
(Here) Lycus is himself, if we must suppose
from his sceptre; let us keep silent, my friends.

<Lycus>
Where . . . cave . . .
20 with flight . . .
who and . . .doing? From what land?
Show me, tell me . . .
Deeming it outrageous, I myself not having slighted. . .
<Herdsman>
. . . I take delight . . . evil . . .

<Lycus>
You say this abode is not safe, man!

<Herdsman>
30 There is need to do something; but I know those men are dead.

<Lycus>
Well –since you know – we shall now prepare.

<Herdsman>
What (preparations), other than to go into the house?
. . . and before we were dwelling . . .
. . . permitting the strangers . . .
35 . . . spear-bearing men outside (the cave) . . .
. . . we and you shall prepare well.

<Lycus>
(But just how many) in number are the strangers?

<Herdsman>
(One or two) they do not hold (weapons) in their hands.

<Lycus>
40 (Now with arms) keep an eye on the cave’s surroundings
. . . and should anyone come out from the house,
(catch him; I) Nyteus daughter . . .
. . . with my hand . . . and soon (he/she) will know
. . . that in vain . . . of words . . .
45 . . . useless allies . . .

<Herdsman>
. . . if the god be willing . . .
. . . soon throughout this house . . .

<Chorus>
. . . strength with nooses . . . down-
. . . again with the arts of mortals . . .
50a . . .

<Lycus>
50b Oh god no!
<Chorus>
Listen!
(At work) indeed are the hands of the young men!

<Lycus>
Oh attendants . . . will you not help?

<Chorus>
The abode is crying out; it cries
a deathsong!

<Lycus>
Oh land of Cadmus and city of Asopus!

<Chorus>
Do you hear, do you see?
He is calling on the city, fearful of blood!
Dike, Dike dallies, but still takes and seizes
unawares when she sees him,
any impious mortals.

<Lykos>
Alas, I shall be murdered by two men, without allies!

<AMphion>
Do you not mourn your wife, now among the dead?

<Lykos>
Now has she died? Again you speak fresh sorrow!

<AMphion>
Dragged by a bull, torn apart!

<Lycus>
By whom? By you both? For this I wish to know!

<AMphion>
You may know, since you wish, she was killed by us.

<Lycus>
But aren’t you born of parents I do not know?

<AMphion>
Why ask this? You shall learn among the dead after you die.

<Hermes>
. . . excited to action . . .
. . . (lord) Amphion; commands for you

70 . . . bearing the proclamation of Zeus.
    And first I shall speak to you (both) regarding your mother,
    that Zeus had sex with her and does not deny this.
    Why . . .
    Having come to (the bed) of Zeus . . .

75 Since he determines and . . . evils,
    and she herself from dreadful (circumstance was delivered)
    and (discovered) these two to be her sons from Zeus.
    You must listen to them (and) the monarchy of the land
    of Cadmus you must give willingly to them, lord.

80 And when you bury and place your wife on the pyre,
    after you gather the wretched woman’s remains, taking
    the burnt bones throw them into the spring of Ares,
    so that it may be named for Dirce,
    the outflow of the spring, which goes through the city
    and always soaks the plain of Thebes with water.
    And you, whenever you may go pure to the city of Cadmus,
    you must go, (sons), and by the Ismenus build
    a city with seven gated openings.
    And you . . . taking a bulwark against enemies . . .

85 . . .

90 To Zethus I say that: and secondly I command Amphion,
    armed with lyre in hand, to sing praise of the gods
    and both the mighty rocks enchanted by your music
    and trees leaving their mother’s seat, will follow you,
    so that you shall give ease to the hands of the builders.
    Zeus gives to you this honour, and I too,
    from whom you had this invention, Amphion lord.
    The white colts of Zeus you shall be called,
    And have the greatest honours in the city of Cadmus.

95 And marriage – [Zethus] shall have a Theban bride,
    and [Amphion] from the Phrygians a most beautiful bedmate,
    daughter of Tantalus; but you must quickly
    hasten, the god having sent such councils.

**UNCERTAIN**

100

<ΑΜΦΙΩΝ?>

ἀπαντα τίκτει χθόν πάλιν λαμβάνει.

The earth gives birth to all things and takes them back again.
εἰ νοῦς ἔνεστιν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, τί δεῖ καλῆς
gυναικός, εἰ μὴ τὰς φρένας χρηστὰς ἔχειν;

If there be sense in her; if not, why need a beautiful wife, unless she have good sense?

κόρος δὲ πάντων· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ καλλιόνων
λέκτροις ἐπὶ αἰσχροῖς εἶδον ἐκπεπληγμένους,
δαίτος δὲ πληρωθέεις τις θάμνους πάλιν
φαύλη διαίτη προσβάλων ἧσθη στόμα.

There is a surfeit of all things; for I have seen men drive away a beautiful wife for an ugly one, and full from banquet someone glad to sit and crack his teeth against poor fare.

κηδὸς καθ’ αὐτὸν τὸν σοφὸν κτάσθαι χρεῶν.

The wise man ought to take a wife according to his merit.

οὐ χρὴ ποτὶ ἀνδρὰ δοῦλον ὄντ’ ἐλευθέρας
γνώμας διώκειν οὐδ’ ἐς ἄργιαν βλέπειν.

It is necessary that a slave man never pursue free thought and not look to idleness.
Chapter 4: The Reconstruction

Characters: Herdsman, Amphion, Zethus, Antiope, Dirce, Messenger, Lycus, Hermes
Chorus: Athenian men; sub-chorus of maenads

(i) The Fragments

Euripides’ Antiope has been given a great deal of attention in secondary scholarship. In all, there are over forty fragments that have been assigned to the tragedy with a degree of certainty. Most of these fragments have been preserved by citation in other ancient writing, by scholia, and by lexicographers. Collard has chosen to include a fragment which Nauck and Kannicht ascribed to Antigone as fr. 175 in his reconstruction.\(^85\) I agree with Collard that the fragment seems to illustrate details from Hyginus’ Fabulae 8, especially the reference to dragging Dirce by the hair.\(^86\) References to a δοῦλος at line 10 in fr. 175 also conform to the discussions of being a slave in fr. 217 and fr. 218. I have therefore included fr. 175 in my reconstruction. Frs. 212, 213, 214, 215, and 216 have been attributed to Antiope by Kannicht and Nauck, but later scholars have been divided on this. Kambitsis preserves Kannicht’s and Nauck’s ascription, but Collard and Cropp have maintained that these fragments are more uncertain, wondering if they may belong to Euripides’ Antigone.\(^87\) Frs. 212-215 most certainly seem to belong together, but I tend to agree with Cropp and Collard that we cannot be certain they belong to Antiope, since we have no other evidence that Antiope deals with the topic of having a beautiful wife. Fr. 215 has more to do with the idea of childbirth and γένος, a prominent

---

85 Collard 2004, 260.
theme in *Suppliant Women* and possibly *Antiope*, which I shall be expanding on in the final chapter. The fragment which sets the study of *Antiope* apart from other lost plays is of course fr. 223, which contains 116 lines of almost unbroken text belonging to the end of the play. I have included fr. 910 in my reconstruction, although it is by no means certain that it belongs to *Antiope*. Kannicht places the fragment in his “Incertum Fabularum” category, but most scholars, notably Webster, Di Benedetto, Kambitsis, Collard, and Cropp, include it in their interpretations of *Antiope*. Scodel, however, places it with *Palamedes*. Altogether, there are 47 fragments that could potentially be assigned to *Antiope*, the most we have for any lost play.²⁸⁸

In addition to the fragments, we also have Hyginus’ *Fabulae 8*, which gives an account of the Antiope myth that coincides well with what we know of Euripides’ rendition. Euripides appears to have been the only Greek author to write a tragedy for Antiope, and his version, as Collard and Cropp point out, most likely was the inspiration for later Italian vase paintings, as well as statue groups such as the “Farnese Bull.”²⁸⁹ The comic poet Eubulus wrote a lost burlesque *Antiope* in the mid-4th Century, and the Roman playwright Pacuvius wrote an *Antiopa* in the 3rd or 2nd Century B.C. Cicero refers to Pacuvius’ play as merely a translation of Euripides’ *Antiope* into Latin,²⁹⁰ but, as Collard points out, it is much more likely to be a Roman interpretation.²⁹¹

---

²⁸⁸ Collard 2004, 260.
²⁸⁹ Collard and Cropp 2008, 175.
²⁹⁰ Cic. *De Fin.* 1.24.
(ii) The Setting

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Antiope’s story is firmly rooted in Boeotia. The tragedy is set before a cave at Eleutherae, on the foothills of Mt. Cithaeron, on the road to Thebes. Eleutherae itself occupies the northwest frontier of Athens, its ownership passing between Athens and Boeotia throughout its history. This setting is where Antiope gave birth to, and was forced to abandon her twin boys. The *skene* building would have represented the cave,² which most likely served double-duty as the herdsman’s dwelling and the shrine to Dionysus. Huys points out that there is no clear reference to the cave in the fragments.³ Collard and Cropp use fr. 203 as evidence, but the dwelling of the herdsman is referred to as a θάλαμος. Fr. 223 refers to the herdsman’s dwelling as a στέγος (29, 47), and a δόμος (33, 41). There is, however, most certainly a cave nearby, as references are made to Dirce and Lycus being lured into a πέτρα in fr. 223. It would follow that the cave was the *skene* building’s central door. There is always the option that the herdsman’s dwelling was an alternate door on the stage. Comedy certainly seems to have made use of three distinct doors, but the tradition in tragedy seems to have been to use only one.⁴ It is likely, therefore, that the cave, the shrine, and the dwelling are either all one and the same, or that the dwelling was simply understood to be located through the local *eisodos*, Thebes occupying the distant *eisodos*.

---

² Consider Soph. *Phil.* and Eur. *Cycl.* in which the *skene* is also a cave, also Men. *Dysc.* where the central door is Pan’s cave.
⁴ Storey 2006, 41.
Huys wonders if this is also the very cave where Antiope was raped by Zeus disguised as a satyr.\textsuperscript{95} Webster also believes that this is the cave where Zeus came to her, both he and Huys basing this claim on a ‘Homeric’ bowl from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Century B.C.\textsuperscript{96} The bowl depicts a woman raped by a naked god carrying a thunderbolt (Zeus) beneath a rocky arch representing a cave. Huys makes an important observation about the setting of Antiope with regards to the agon in Episode 1. The rural setting of the cave near Eleuthereae seems to typify what Amphion argues for – the peace of his pastoral existence.\textsuperscript{97} I disagree, however, for two reasons. First of all, as Huys himself points out,\textsuperscript{98} this cave is the location where Antiope gave birth to and was forced to abandon her sons. If it is also the place where she was raped by Zeus, there is little in this setting that gives off a peaceful and tranquil air. Secondly, the cave at the foot of the mountain can also be interpreted as ‘the wild’ which embodies much of what Zethus endorses in his side of the argument – hunting, training, etc.

Eleutherae is important for both its affiliation with Athens, as well as its connection to Dionysus. Its connection to Athens has been mentioned already in Chapter 2, and will again be spoken of in later chapters. The worship of Dionysus Eleuthereus was imported from Eleutherae to Athens by Pegasus of Eleutherae,\textsuperscript{99} the whole area being a famous cult site for the god.\textsuperscript{100} Eleutherae itself is believed to have been

\textsuperscript{95} Huys 1995, 178.
\textsuperscript{96} Webster 1967, 205, Huys 1995, 179; bowl from Athens: National Archaeological Museum inv.nr.11798.
\textsuperscript{97} Huys 1995, 180-181.
\textsuperscript{98} Huys 1995, 178-180.
\textsuperscript{99} Paus. 1.2.5; 1.20.3; 1.29.2; 1.38.8; Buck 1979, 113.
\textsuperscript{100} Camp 2001, 319.
sympathetic to Athens even after the break between the Thebans and Peisistratids in about 520 B.C., but its alliance to Athens in the fifth century B.C. is difficult to date.\textsuperscript{101} Dionysus’ preeminence in the region may be the reason that Zeus chose the form of a satyr when he raped Antiope and so fathered Amphion and Zethus.\textsuperscript{102} The connection to Dionysus is important to the actual tragedy as it provides a very important plot point: it is Bacchic rites that bring Dirce to the area and cause her to encounter Antiope, Amphion, Zethus, and her death.

In a tragedy that has so much to do with the exposure of infants and the eventual happy reunion of a Theban royal family, the proximity of Mt. Cithaeron to Eleutherae is a striking backdrop. Antiope, in the course of the tragedy, is reunited with her two sons in the very place where she exposed them. Luckily for her, the herdsman is able to reveal the identities of the three to each other, and therefore prevent the twins from delivering their mother into the gruesome death plotted by Dirce. In effect, the herdsman prevents them from indirectly committing matricide. Another infant in Greek tragedy was exposed on Mt. Cithaeron, however, and he is a descendent of Antiope’s family. In the mythological tradition used by Sophocles in his \textit{Oedipus Tyrannus}, Antiope’s great nephew, Laius, also exposes his child, Oedipus, on Mt. Cithaeron. Sadly for Laius – and Oedipus – there is no trusty herdsman to intervene and stop Oedipus from committing patricide, not to mention incest with his mother. \textit{Oedipus Tyrannus} was produced before

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{101} Buck 1979, 113.
\footnote{102} Kambitsis 1972, 78.
\end{footnotes}
424 B.C., most scholars arguing for 429 or 427-5 B.C., only a few years before our proposed new date for Antiope.\textsuperscript{103}

This cave before Eleutherae is therefore the beginning and end of Antiope’s troubles. It is where she is first disgraced and impregnated by Zeus, it is where she gives birth to her sons and is forced to expose them, and it is where she eventually is vindicated and reunited with her sons. The cave also represents a symbolic tie between Thebes and Athens, which will later be exploited in Euripides’ Suppliant Women. The backdrop of Cithaeron also looks towards the future of Thebes and its rulers, which makes it an excellent setting for the first play in a broadly themed trilogy based on Thebes and the fate of its rulers.

\textit{iii) Prologue}

Earlier reconstructions of Antiope postulate that a divinity speaks the prologue, based on Diodorus and Hyginus’ accounts indicating that the herdsman was not aware of the twins’ identities.\textsuperscript{104} Webster recommends Dionysus for the role, and explains fr. 179 by arguing that it is either a quotation from another character within the speech, or spoken by a character entering after the god finished speaking.\textsuperscript{105} Kambitsis, however, does not believe that Dionysus appeared in the play, saying, “Encore que le dieu

\textsuperscript{103} Storey 2006, 254.
\textsuperscript{104} Webster 1967, 206. It is certainly common for a god to speak the prologue, Sophocles’ Ajax, Euripides’ Alcestis, Hippolytus, Trojan Women, and Bacchae being but a few examples.
\textsuperscript{105} Webster 1967, 206.
(Dionysus) n’ait pas à jouer un rôle dans la pièce…”

Both Kambitsis and Snell argue for the herdsman speaking the entire prologue. Webster believes that the herdsman could not have spoken the prologue because he could not have spoken frs. 181-182. This would mean that the herdsman was aware of Amphion and Zethus’ parentage, which Diodorus says he and his wife were not. Webster would have it that the majority of the prologue was spoken by some nymph or god, or by Dionysus himself, and fr. 179 was perhaps a quotation (since it could not have been spoken by Dionysus), or spoken by a human within the prologue. However, the herdsman must be aware of Amphion and Zethus’ parentage in order to take part in the recognition scene later on in the play, and confirm to Amphion and Zethus that Antiope is in fact their mother. Someone has to know, and the only other person to confirm this would be Hermes, as a messenger for Zeus, and he does not appear on stage until the end, long after Amphion and Zethus have recognized Antiope as their mother. Kambitsis has satisfactorily countered the idea of a divinity speaking the prologue since Webster, and it is generally accepted, notably by Collard and Cropp, that the herdsman delivers it instead.

Based on the Pacuvius Fragment 1, *exorto iubare, noctis decurso itinere*, which Kannicht places in the prologue, it is assumed that the play begins in the morning.

---

106 Kambitsis 1972, 21.
108 Webster 1967, 206.
109 ibid
110 ibid
111 Kambitsis 1972, IX-XII.
112 See Kambitsis 1972, IX-XII.
113 “Since the sun has risen having accomplished his nocturnal way…”
114 Kannicht 2005, 278; this placement is accepted by most editors.
The herdsman makes a prayer to Dionysus (fr. 179), which leads Snell to speculate that the herdsman is worried about something, else why ask Dionysus for help? Snell proposes that the motivation is a dream, while Pickard-Cambridge thought that the disputes between the brothers “caused him anxiety.” Collard wonders if the herdsman has somehow received word that Antiope has escaped and is on her way to Eleutherae, Zsigmond Ritook suggesting that Dionysus himself warned him. Kambitsis maintains that there is no reason at all to believe that the herdsman is worried, and that “il est vain de faire des suppositions sur les raisons qui ont poussé le pâtre à invoquer Dionysos et à rappeler les circumstances de la découverte des enfants exposés.” He also points out that “chez lui, les songes nocturnes hantent exclusivement les femmes.” I agree with Kambitsis that the herdsman does not need a specific reason to begin his speech invoking Dionysus, just a general feeling of unease. The noble herdsman of Electra, for example, speaks the prologue with an unease brought on not by any forewarning of Orestes’ arrival, but merely by a constant worry that he might return.

The herdsman would have then gone on to recount how Antiope gave birth to the twins and exposed them, and how he himself came to raise them as his own. Frs. 181 and 182 are excellent examples of the Athenian fascination with etymology. The name

---

115 There are many parallels in surviving plays, Aeschylus’ Agamemnon and Sophocles’ Antigone.
116 Snell 1964, 73.
117 Snell 1964,73; Pickard-Cambridge 1933, 106.
119 “It is futile to speculate on the reasons that led the shepherd to invoke Dionysus and to recall the circumstances of the discovery of the exposed children”, Kambitsis 1972, 22.
120 “in his works, night dreams haunt women exclusively”, Kambitsis 1972, 22.
121 Compare Pho. 1-30.
122 Electra 1-49.
Ζήθος is said to come from the Greek verb ζητέω, which means “seek” or “search”, while Ἄμφιον is said to come from ἀμφί and ὁδόν, “beside the road”. This etymology may have been mocked by Aristophanes in fr. 342 PCG, where he says Amphion should have been called “Amphodos.” It is wondered whether the herdsman himself chose the names, or was directed to name the boys by Antiope or a god. Collard prefers to use Bothe’s correction of κικλήσκω “I name” over Valckenaer’s κικλήσκει “she names”, though Snell originally preferred the latter. The MS tradition has the imperative κίκλησκε, indicating that the herdsman was ordered to name the boys Amphion and Zethus by a god or Antiope. The former option is unlikely, for although there are examples of abandoned infants being named by their foster fathers, such as Alexander being named Paris in Alexander, there are no other examples of a god personally delivering children into the care of a shepherd and telling him what to name them. Collard and Crop believe that the imperative is a copying error. Apart from fr. 179, fr. 181, and fr. 182, there are no others that could belong to the prologue.

(iv) Parados

After the prologue, Amphion enters, most likely with the chorus of Athenian men, singing with his lyre, and firmly establishing himself as a musician. Collard points out that the chorus is far more likely to be Athenians than Thebans as in Schol. Hipp. 58 = TrGF Tv, because the Thebans would not have had difficulty recognizing Lycus as they
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123 i.e. “street”, the humour here escapes me. See Collard 2004, 299.
124 ibid.
125 Snell 1964, 72-72; Collard 2004, 298-299.
127 See Alexander test. v
do in fr. 223.17-18.\textsuperscript{128} This may not necessarily be the case, as local townsfolk, Athenian or Boeotian, can perhaps not be expected to recognize, or have even seen, Lycus. The order of appearances is debatable, Collard wondering if Amphion enters after the chorus comes on, possibly having sung in honor of Dionysus,\textsuperscript{129} while Cropp poses the possibility that Amphion enters first, later followed by the chorus.\textsuperscript{130} Webster, too, believes that Amphion sang with the chorus as they came on stage.\textsuperscript{131} Snell recommends that Amphion comes on stage and then attracts the chorus to him with a song.\textsuperscript{132} By far the most common sequence in the extant Euripidean plays is to have the chorus join an actor already on stage.\textsuperscript{133} There are, however, examples of the chorus entering an empty stage,\textsuperscript{134} as well as the chorus and an actor entering together.\textsuperscript{135} Snell’s recommendation would fit nicely with \textit{Episode 1}, in which Amphion seems to be answering questions about the lyre (fr. 190). The lyre itself is atypical in these sorts of scenes, as ordinarily shepherds use a syrinx to accompany each other’s songs.\textsuperscript{136} It would therefore be reasonable to have the chorus attracted by its sound early on, establishing Amphion as not only a musician, but an exceptional one, which sets the scene for him later on.

\textsuperscript{128} Collard 2004, 262.
\textsuperscript{129} Collard 2004, 262.
\textsuperscript{130} Collard and Cropp 2008, 172.
\textsuperscript{131} Webster 1967, 207.
\textsuperscript{132} Snell 1964, 72.
\textsuperscript{133} As in \textit{Andromache}, \textit{Ion}, \textit{Bacchae}, \textit{Electra}, \textit{Hecuba}, \textit{Helen}, \textit{Children of Heracles}, \textit{Medea}, \textit{Orestes}, and \textit{Trojan Women}.
\textsuperscript{134} As in \textit{Alcestis}, \textit{Herakles}, \textit{Iphegenia at Aulis}, and \textit{Phoenissae}.
\textsuperscript{135} As in \textit{Hippolytus}, \textit{Iphigenia in Tauris}, and, to some extent, \textit{Suppliant Women}.
\textsuperscript{136} Snell 1964, 73.
(v) Episode 1

Episode 1 most certainly contains the famous *agon*. Amphion engages with the chorus after the *parodos*, perhaps, as Collard suggests, answering questions about the lyre (fr. 192, fr. 191). This is in some way interrupted by the entrance of Zethus, who begins the *agon*. Snell and Collard suggest that Zethus comes on stage with the intention of taking Amphion hunting (based on Hor. *Ep.* 1.18), and then begins to upbraid his brother for his idleness. Since Snell mentions that the chorus has approached Amphion, because they were attracted by the sound of his lyre, I would wonder if Zethus were also attracted by its sound. His entrance may have been less to ask Amphion to hunt, but more just to chastise him, already angry after hearing the song *while* he was hunting.

Nevertheless, Zethus enters during Amphion’s conversation with the chorus. It is here that the *agon* between the two brothers is held - Zethus attacking Amphion’s love of music and art as effeminate and useless, Amphion calling his brother a boor for his contempt of the arts. There is contention among scholars about who exactly won this debate. Some, such as Snell and Webster, believe that Zethus had a false victory, much like Hecuba in *Trojan Women*, where Amphion yields merely to shut his brother up.

The argument is mostly based on Horace, *Ep.* 1.18:

\[
\text{nec tua laudabis studia aut aliena reprendes,} \\
\text{nec, cum venari volet ille, poemata panges.} \\
\text{gratia sic fratrum geminorum, Amphionis atque}
\]

---

137 Collard 2004, 262.
138 Snell 1964, 73; Collard 2004, 262.
139 There is more than a hint of the denunciation of the athlete in fr. 282 of Euripides’ lost *Autolycus*.
140 Webster 1967, 207; Snell 1964, 73-74.
Neither shall you praise your own pursuits or criticize another’s, nor, when that man should wish to hunt, shall you compose poetry. In this way the love of the twin brothers, Amphion and Zethus, had ceased, until the lyre, which was looked at in askance by the stern one of the brothers, was silenced. Amphion is thought to have yielded to the custom of his brother; you too cede to the gentle commands of your powerful friend…

(Hor. Ep. 1.18.39-45)

Webster and Snell, therefore, choose to believe that Horace is referring directly to Euripides’ account of this argument. This may not be a tremendous leap, since, as Collard and Cropp point out, Euripides’ Antiope appears to be unique in that he was the only classical tragedian to write on the subject, and the agon continues to be the most commonly referenced episode in the tragedy. If Horace is indeed referring to Euripides’ Antiope, Zethus’ victory is a false one. This would not be the only time that Euripides gave one of his characters a false victory. M. Lloyd has pointed out that agones in Euripidean tragedy rarely solve anything, and whether a character wins or loses a debate has little effect on the later outcome of the play. In Trojan Women, Hecuba very clearly wins the debate between herself and Helen, and yet we know that Menelaus does

---

141 Depending on whether severo is ablative or dative, this particular clause could be read, “Until the lyre, which was looked at in askance by the stern one of the brothers, was silenced” or “Until the disliked lyre was silenced for the stern brother.” The meanings here are slightly different, the ablative translation suggesting that Zethus in some way “silenced” his brother’s lyre, the dative suggesting that Amphion silenced it for his brother.

142 Collard and Cropp 2008, 175.

143 Lloyd 1992, 16-18.
not kill Helen, but actually ends up living happily ever after with her back in Sparta.\textsuperscript{144} In the case of \textit{Antiope}, Amphion’s surrender – according to Horace – is due more to his desire to keep the peace than to his actual agreement with what his brother is saying.

Collard and Cropp take a different tack, arguing instead that Amphion wins the debate, stating, “Amphion’s later prominence in the action suggests that his quietude ‘won’ the argument, for his calm and steely intelligence directs the punishments of Dirce and Lycus.”\textsuperscript{145} It does not seem that Collard and Cropp are dismissing Snell and Webster’s acceptance of Horace’s account. If anything, they are suggesting that in yielding to his brother, he has made Zethus look a trifle blustering, and in keeping his dignity, wins the argument. Collard and Cropp’s choice of “quietude” is very telling. As Amphion is arguing for the inactive lifestyle, his acquiescence to Zethus for the sake of some peace and quiet seems very much in character and in keeping with his argument, and apathy is a very difficult stance to argue against. Conversely, Zethus’ need to interfere with his brother and to change his mind in regards to his leisurely pursuits is also in keeping with Zethus’ argument. If Horace got it right, and was referring to the \textit{agon} in \textit{Antiope}, rather than just a generic form of the myth, fr. 220 most likely belongs in the \textit{agon}, though few scholars put it there:

\begin{quote}
\textit{πολλοὶ δὲ θητῶν τοῦτο πάσχουσιν κακῶν:}
γνώμη γρονούντες οὐ θέλουσ᾿ ὑπηρετεῖν
ψυχῇ τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς φίλων νικῶμενοι.
\end{quote}

Many mortals suffer this evil; although intelligent they are not willing to obey their good sense, their heart prevailed upon by friends.

\textsuperscript{144} See \textit{Od.} 4.1-298.  
\textsuperscript{145} Collard and Cropp 2008, 172.
This fragment, positioned in the *agon*, could mean any number of things, as Collard and Cropp point out.\(^{146}\) It sounds, however, like it could be part of Amphion’s surrender to Zethus in the argument. It would be in keeping with what Horace wrote. In simpler terms, Amphion is admitting that sometimes it is just easier to agree.

It is tempting to assume that Amphion, by yielding to his brother to preserve the peace, is the true victor of the debate, especially when considering his later prominence in the play. However, I believe that this debate ends much in the way that the debate between Theseus and the Herald in *Suppliant Women* does – in a stalemate.\(^{147}\) Indeed, although Amphion takes the primary role in the action that follows, Hermes’ speech at the end of the play indicates that both brothers are needed to make Thebes strong (fr. 223; B col. ii), meaning that neither one nor the other brother in himself is enough to be a good ruler. As I will discuss in more detail later on, I believe that this argument is not intended to make one side look worse than the other, but to show that taking either extreme is unhealthy: consider the title character of either *Hippolytus*, where the chaste youth is brought down by his extreme worship of Artemis and disregard for Aphrodite. One of the fragments coming down to us from the *Hippolytus Veiled* even goes so far as to tell us that “those of mankind who flee too much from Cypris are similarly at fault to those who hunt after her too much” (*Hippolytus Veiled*, fr. 428). This would not be the first time that Euripides, like the philosopher Aristotle, recommended we find the mean between two extremes.

\(^{146}\) Collard and Cropp 2008, 203.

\(^{147}\) See *Supp.* 339-583; this will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 6.iv.
(vi) Stasimon 1

The brothers leave after the debate, after which the chorus has its first stasimon. There are no fragments or testimonia that could indicate the subject matter here. Collard tentatively suggests fr. 910 as an endorsement of Amphion’s argument. As I believe the agon ended in a stalemate, I do not place it here, and have already included it in Episode 1.

(vii) Episodes 2-3/4

The course of the play becomes even less clear at this point. Antiope enters, having escaped from Dirce, her bonds miraculously loosed. She recounts her sad history either to the chorus alone, to the chorus and Amphion, or to the chorus, Amphion and Zethus. Webster believes that Antiope begins by addressing frs. 204, 207, 203, and 208 to the chorus, and then fr. 206 to her newly entered sons. He recognizes, however, that this is problematic, as whoever delivers fr. 210 knows of Antiope’s claim that Zeus raped her, and is most likely well apprised of her situation in general. This must mean that Antiope either repeats herself to the twins, or they come on stage at some point in the middle of her speech. Either Zethus or Amphion must come back on stage to hear some of what Antiope says, so that one of them may deliver fr. 210, rejecting her story:

149 Kambitsis (XV) and Van Looey (232) accept what Apollodorus suggests, that Dionysus did this, which is odd given that Dirce is his follower and he later avenges her death by driving Antiope mad.
150 Webster 1967, 208. Collard and Cropp are able to dismiss Antiope’s use of “ὦ παῖ” at the beginning of the fragment convincingly, saying it is simply a way of addressing a young man, though they point out that some editors use it to justify the herdsman speaking the lines (197).
151 Webster 1967, 208.
οὐδὲ γὰρ λάθρα δοκῶ
θηρὸς κακούργου σχῆματ’ ἐκμιμούμενον
σοι Ζῆν’ ἐς ἑνήν ὀσπερ ἀνθρώπων μολεῖν.

For I do not suppose that secretly, mimicking the form of a villainous beast, Zeus, as though he were a man, came to your bed.

(fr. 210)

Hyginus would have it that Zethus is the one to reject her story, but it is also likely that Zethus was a silent character by this point in the play.\textsuperscript{152} Given that this is a failed recognition scene between mother and son, a Euripidean favourite, it makes sense that both brothers are on stage, even if Zethus is a silent character. As Collard suggests, Amphion is the more likely speaker here.\textsuperscript{153} This episode also seems to contain discussion on the evils of slavery, which would have perhaps afforded the audience with some dramatic irony. Both the twins and Antiope are mistaken for slaves, but both in some way know that they are above this class – this being shown through Amphion’s use of the lyre rather than the syrinx, and Antiope’s boasts of having lain in the arms of Zeus.

The action of the remaining episodes must now rely entirely on conjecture, as there is little remaining that can illuminate it. Amphion and Zethus probably go off-stage again, leaving Antiope with the chorus. Dirce enters with her sub-chorus of Bacchant women,\textsuperscript{154} having come to Eleutherae to take part in a Dionysian revel. Her motivation is most likely religious and not to reclaim Antiope, as she would not have brought maenads with her for that purpose.\textsuperscript{155} From here we must surmise that she in some way threatens

\textsuperscript{152} Hyginus 8; Collard 2004, 163.
\textsuperscript{153} Collard 2004, 263.
\textsuperscript{154} Based on Pacuv. 12; compare Hipp. 61-71 and Phaethon 227-44.
\textsuperscript{155} Snell 1964, 77.
Antiope’s life while the two women have some sort of exchange of words, which somehow manages to motivate the herdsman to reveal to Amphion and Zethus their true parentage. It is usually understood that Dirce herself plans to kill Antiope by tying her to the bull, but Collard points out that in some version of the myth Dirce gave Antiope to her two sons to kill. This version is generally dismissed regarding Euripides’ Antiope as it differs too much from Hyginus. I should like to entertain the notion, however, especially with the knowledge that Mt. Cithaeron is looming in the background of Eleutherae, as mentioned earlier. The two boys just saved from unwitting matricide must serve to remind the audience of Sophocles’ version of Oedipus in Oedipus Tyrannus, born and exposed so close to the setting, who was not spared from committing patricide.

Collard places fr. 175 in this episode, as do I, although, as stated previously, Kannicht and Nauck originally ascribed it to Antigone. Dirce’s demand that “no one who is a slave touch [her]” (fr. 175.9-10) suggests that Amphion and Zethus are the ones laying hold of her and that Dirce is still ignorant of their true identities. Indeed, Snell argues that although Amphion and Zethus accept Antiope as their mother at this point in the play, they may not have accepted Zeus as their father until Hermes confirms it at the end. The rest of Dirce’s speech – if indeed she speaks it – has much in common with
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156 Collard 2004, 263.
157 See Kambitsis 1972, 29.
158 Snell 1964, 77. This version of the story would be similar to Ion, in which Ion cannot fully accept his mother’s assurance that he is the son of Apollo before first consulting the god himself (1546-8), but Athena appears before he goes to the temple and confirms Creusa’s story (1560-2).
sentiments Antiope voices in frs. 205, 208, and 209, both women in essence explaining that maintaining dignity in hardship is virtuous.

It is difficult to track who exactly is on stage during this sequence. At some point, as I have mentioned, Antiope, Amphion, and Zethus must be on stage for the failed recognition scene. Because Dirce comes on stage, Zethus must either be a silent character, or he must exit before her arrival. The herdsman must also appear in order to reveal the twins’ identities before they are able to kill Antiope. I suggest that Antiope leaves the stage in the charge of Dirce, at which point the herdsman comes on stage to make his big revelation and then leaves. The twins decide to kill Dirce in the same way she plotted to kill their mother, thus when Dirce comes back on stage with Antiope, the twins seize her (fr. 175). Amphion tells Dirce to come willingly (fr. 175.1), to which she acquiesces in order to maintain her dignity (fr. 175.10-15). Dirce and the twins must leave the stage in order for them to kill her.

(vii) Stasimon (?), Episode 4/5-Exodos

It is not possible to delineate accurately the episodes at this point in the reconstruction. There is no evidence remaining about the stasimon here, but most editors place it before the messenger’s speech. The messenger does enter, and gives everyone on stage an account of Dirce’s death:

εἰ δὲ ποῦ τύχειν
πέριξ ἐλίζας < > ἐξεῖ ὁμοίων λαβὼν
γυναῖκα πέτραν δρῦν μεταλλάσσων ἅμι.

If [the bull] happened to turn all the way around somewhere…together with it
This is a very gruesome death, though death by bull is not uncommon in Greek myth, nor is it uncommon in Greek tragedy. The title character of Euripides’ extant *Hippolytus*, for example, shares in a fate similar to Dirce’s. A bull from the sea spooks Hippolytus’ horses as he drives along the beach. Hippolytus is thrown from the chariot, tangled in his horses’ harness, and is dragged behind the horses until he dies. The episode is brought on by the curse of Hippolytus’ father, Theseus, in vengeance for the alleged rape of Phaedra. Hippolytus, like Amphion and Zethus, is an extreme character. Unlike the twins, however, Hippolytus is unable to compromise, and it is this failure to achieve a balance that results in his death. Because Amphion and Zethus are able to compromise – Amphion by taking the active role in his mother’s rescue; Zethus, by being passive in the tragedy to the point that he becomes a mute character – they are instead able to visit death upon their enemies. It should be noted, however, that Pausanias refers to the gruesome death of Dirce as the reason why Antiope is later driven mad by Dionysus, as elaborate acts of vengeance attract the anger of the gods.\(^{159}\)

It is not clear to whom the messenger speech is spoken. It cannot be Amphion or Zethus, as they played the active part in Dirce’s death. Neither can it be addressed to Lycus, as he is surprised by the news of his wife’s death at the end of the play, when Amphion taunts him with it.\(^{160}\) Collard assumes that the speech is spoken to Antiope and

\(^{159}\) Paus. 9.17.6
\(^{160}\) fr. 223.56-66.
the chorus, with the possibility of the herdsman as well.\footnote{Collard 2004, 264.} If the speech is delivered to Antiope, this would mean that after her rescue from Dirce’s clutches, she then flees, and does not witness the gruesome death of her former tormentor, or that she came back on stage with Dirce and witnessed her being dragged off by the twins, as I have suggested. This passivity would be very different behaviour from some of Greek myth’s more blood-thirsty female characters, most notably Hecuba in \textit{Alexander} (fr. 62d).\footnote{Collard says that a female witnessing, or playing a part in, the death of another would be shocking to an ancient audience, but there \textit{are} a number of examples where a woman is the one committing murder, most notably \textit{Agamemnon} and \textit{Medea}.} This mother went with her son in order to take vengeance on Paris, mistaken for a slave, for defeating her sons in the funeral games. Antiope has shown herself already to be of a more passive disposition, especially when she speaks frs. 205 and 208 from earlier on in the play:

\begin{quote}
φρονῶ δ᾽ ἀ πάσχω, καὶ τόδ᾽ οὐ σκιρκὼν κακόν·
tὸ μὲ εἰδέναι γάρ ἰδονήν ἐξει τινὰ
νοσοῦντα, κέρδος δ᾽ ἐν κακοῖς ἀγνοσία.
\end{quote}

I understand what I suffer, and this is not a small evil
For not to know that one is ailing has some pleasure,
In misery ignorance is an advantage.

\textit{(fr. 205)}

and

\begin{quote}
eἰ δ᾽ ἡμελήθην ἐκ θεῶν καὶ παῖδ᾽ ἐμῶ,
ἐξει λόγον καὶ τούτο: τῶν πολλῶν βροτῶν
δεῖ τοὺς μὲν εἴναι δυστυχεῖς, τοὺς δ᾽ εὐτυχεῖς.
\end{quote}

And if we were overlooked by the gods, my sons and I,
Even this has logic; out of all mortal men
There must be some who are unlucky, and some who are lucky.

\textit{(fr. 208)}
As Snell identifies from these fragments, Antiope’s philosophy is almost stoic, if such a thing existed at the time this tragedy was written.\(^{163}\) If some men are happy, she says, other men must therefore be unhappy. Her only regret is knowing how she suffers, as that makes it worse. She is completely passive in her attitude here. However, the fact that, when the opportunity presented itself, she fled her captors, does show that she has at least some spirit. It is not, therefore, improbable that she left the dirty work to Amphion and Zethus, therefore freeing herself to be the recipient of the messenger’s speech. There is, however, a chance that the speech was spoken solely to the chorus, or the chorus and the herdsman, who also needs to be back on stage for the exodus to speak with Lycus.

I venture to suggest that Antiope is on stage to hear the messenger’s speech. She hears from the messenger that Lycus is on his way to Eleutherae, and warns her sons when they reenter the scene. The end of the tragedy is preserved somewhat imperfectly in fr. 223, and there are gaps in the papyrus that still need to be filled. Amphion would deliver lines 1-16 after hearing that Lycus is on his way to Eleutherae. There is a chance that the herdsman is also on stage in this scene, with Zethus being a silent character. Zethus, Amphion, and Antiope would withdraw through the skene door into the cave to await Lycus, leaving the herdsman on stage to meet the Theban king and lure him into the cave.\(^{164}\) When the three have withdrawn, the chorus delivers lines 17-18, as Lycus comes on stage. Upon his entry, Lycus demands to know the identities of the chorus and possibly the herdsman (19-23). There is a gap of about 30 missing lines after line 23, in

\(^{163}\) Snell 1964, 80; note that Snell does not say “Stoic”.

\(^{164}\) There is a parallel for this plot in Orestes, where Electra, Orestes, and Pylades plot their revenge on Helen, at the end of which the two men exit, leaving Electra on stage (1105-1245) to hear the attempted murder of Helen (1286-1310).
which Collard and Cropp suggest that the herdsman comes on stage, but also could just include a short monologue wherein Lycus explains his reasons for coming to Eleutherae. The fragment picks up again with the herdsman and Lycus engaged in stichomythia. The subject of their conversation is very troublesome, as at some point the herdsman tells Lycus:

δρᾶν δεῖ τι: κείνους δ’ οίδ’ ἐγὼ τεθνηκό[τας].

Some action must be taken; but I know that those men are dead.

(fr. 223.58)

Exactly who “those men” are is elusive, although the most obvious answer is that the herdsman is lying to Lycus, telling him that Amphion and Zethus are dead inside the cave. However, the next few lines make this seem impossible as Lycus asks,

πόσοι δὲ δὴ τὸ πλῆθός εἰσιν οἱ ξένοι;

But just how many] in number are the strangers?

(fr. 223.67)

to which the herdsman responds that they are not armed. Exactly what story the herdsman gives to Lycus to lure him into the cave is unclear. Who are these unarmed strangers supposed to be? What Lycus knows upon coming on stage is also difficult to interpret, as lines 71-2 reveal that Lycus has not heard of his wife’s death yet. Furthermore, before entering the cave, Lycus tells someone to guard the cave’s surroundings (69). It is uncertain to whom he tells this, as the main chorus of Athenian men is not a part of his guard. Most editors assume that Lycus has brought guards with him as mute characters.

---

165 Collard and Cropp 2008, 211.
166 Snell 1964, 79.
Nevertheless, Lycus enters the cave and his struggle with Amphion and Zethus is heard by the chorus on stage (80-87).\footnote{Other examples of the chorus listening and commenting on cries from off stage in Euripides include \textit{Electra} 1165-1172 and \textit{Medea} 1271-1292. Menander, for whom Euripides was decidedly a precursor (Knox 1985, 1), makes use of the technique in his comedy \textit{Old Cantankerous}, wherein Sikon the chef listens to the rescue of the old man form the well. This works, perhaps, as a better parallel as both Lycus and Knemon come back on stage alive.} At line 88, Lycus is brought back on stage by the twins, most likely on the ekkyklema,\footnote{Snell 1964, 79,Webster 1967, 210 points out that Euripides uses the ekkyklema in \textit{Kresphontes} for attempted murder on stage.} where they reveal their terrible murder of Dirce just before they attempt to kill him. Collard says that this particular part of the tragedy would have been very surprising to an ancient audience, as deaths do not occur on stage.\footnote{Collard 2004, 264.} It is important to note that Lycus does not die on stage; his presence back on stage probably signaled the audience that he was going to be spared. However, as Collard himself admits later, this particular scene is a “typical Euripidean play-end.”\footnote{Collard 2004, 314.} Revenge is followed by the arrival and entrapment of the victim, and then the arrival of a god to stop the whole thing. In the case of \textit{Antiope}, before they are able to kill Lycus, Hermes appears and delivers a speech, confirming that Antiope was indeed impregnated by Zeus. He commands Lycus to hand Thebes over to Amphion and Zethus, and Zethus and Amphion to build the seven-gated citadel, giving specific instructions to each of the brothers, so that they may both use the skills they argued about at the beginning of the play (115-132). Lycus responds willingly to Hermes’ commands, and, we can assume, the survivors leave happy.
Chapter 5: Studying Antiope as Part of a Trilogy

The format for poets producing tragedies at the City Dionysia seems almost to demand a trilogy, if not a tetralogy. Each poet in the fifth century was required to write three tragedies and one satyr play, to be produced together at the festival. Trilogy was certainly present on the Classical Athenian stage, but not as predominately as one would assume from the four play requirement. Aeschylus and Sophocles are both credited with trilogies, Aeschylus with as many as 14 by Sommerstein and Sophocles with one or two lost trilogies by Sommerstein and Talboy.171 Some of the lesser poets, such as Philocles and Xenocles, are also credited with trilogies. Aeschylus is much more famous for his productions of trilogies than Euripides and Sophocles, mostly due to the surviving Oresteia. The Oresteia fits most with our modern idea of trilogy, and it also best fits the format of the City Dionysia. The Aeschylean trilogy follows the story arch of action, reaction, and resolution. Our extant Aeschylean trilogy, the Oresteia of 458 B.C., follows this arc, with Agamemnon detailing the murder of Agamemnon by his wife and wife’s lover, Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. In Libation Bearers, Aeschylus recounts Orestes’ reaction to his father’s murder as he murders Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. Eumenides resolves what appears to be a never-ending spiral of bloodguilt by having Athena transform the Furies of Orestes’ mother into the Eumenides, or “kindly ones.” One of the most popular examples of this pattern today is the original Star Wars trilogy.172

171 See Sommerstein 2008; Sommerstein and Talboy 2011.
172 Aeschylus also firmly credited with a Theban trilogy in 467 B.C., consisting of Laius, Oedipus, and the extant Septem, as well as his Supplices trilogy around 463 B.C., consisting of the extant Supplices, and the lost Aigiptiô and Danaïds. The Theban trilogy follows the lives of one man from each generation, Laius dealing with the rape of Chrysippus and resulting curse, Oedipus with the curse following Laius’ son, and finally
An argument can be made for an extant trilogy by Sophocles, though of a very different form than Aeschylus’. The trilogy deals with Thebes, beginning with *Antigone*, followed by *Oedipus Rex*, and then *Oedipus at Colonus*. These plays were not performed together, as was the case with Aeschylus. *Antigone* was performed around 443 or 442 B.C., *Oedipus* most likely sometime between 429 and 425 B.C., and *Oedipus at Colonus*, which was produced posthumously in 401 B.C., and likely written in 406/7 B.C.\textsuperscript{173} This is not a trilogy in the classic sense of the word (i.e. the Aeschylean sense), as the three plays were not written in order, nor were they written together. Sophocles’ Theban trilogy is the work of almost forty years, and follows the order C, A, B, rather than the Aeschylean A, B, C. Though this non-linear timeline could potentially be enough to dismiss the three plays as not being a trilogy, I have to disagree. It is not uncommon even among more modern authors to write their stories out of order, and to go back to the beginning in order write prequels. The first book that C.S. Lewis wrote in his *Narnia* series, for example, was *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, which was published in 1950. Five years later, however, Lewis published *The Magician’s Nephew*, which takes place before *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*. From the original three *Star Wars* movies there has been a huge amount of literature regarding events that happened long before the subject matter of *A New Hope, The Empire Strikes Back*, and *Return of the Jedi*.

*Septem* dealing with the curse on Oedipus’ sons, Polyneices and Eteocles. The second trilogy follows the daughters of Danaus’ flight from their marriages with the sons of Aegyptus, their father’s orders to marry the sons and then kill them, and then the reconciliation for these crimes. The latter trilogy follows a similar pattern to the *Oresteia*.\textsuperscript{173} Lewis argues for 438 B.C., see 1998, 35-50.\textsuperscript{174} Storey 2005, 252, 254, 257.
Although Euripides never wrote connected trilogies like Aeschylus’ *Oresteia,* or the broadly spanning trilogy of Sophocles concerning the family of Oedipus, he appears to have sometimes connected his plays with an over-arching theme, such as his so-called “Trojan Trilogy” of *Alexander, Palamedes,* and *Trojan Women.* Even with two of these plays coming to us only in fragments, we know that that they do not make a trilogy in the sense that *Agamemnon,* *Libation Bearers* and *Eumenides* make a trilogy. However, all three plays are Trojan themed, in a loosely connected timeline. *Alexander* gives us the story of Hecuba’s dream of Paris’ destruction of Troy (test. iii P.Oxy. 3650), his consequent abandonment and exposure, and – in what is the plot of the tragedy – his acceptance back into the royal family. *Palamedes*\(^{175}\) jumps us ahead into the midst of the Greek camp in the middle of the Trojan War, and then *Trojan Women* displays the consequences and aftermath of the war. Even though this ‘trilogy’ does not follow a linear story arc along the lines of the *Oresteia* – action, reaction, resolution – it cannot be doubted that it is connected in theme and action. Each poet had his own unique form of trilogy: Aeschylus being the most “text-book” form of trilogy, Sophocles’ being almost a pensive, lifelong relationship with the story of Oedipus and his children, and then Euripides, taking broad spans of time and connecting them with topography and themes.\(^{176}\)

\(^{175}\) It is important to note that very little is know about this play, there being as few as 11 usable fragments remaining of the play, and three testimonia.

\(^{176}\) Mastronarde argues against another possible Euripidean trilogy, *Chrysippus,* *Oenomaus,* and *Phoenician Women* due to their being link in a fragmentary hypothesis. (1994, 11-14, 36-38). Collard and Cropp also believe that this does not need to be the case (2008, 462). Scullion argues for another trilogy of *Archelaus,* *Temenus,* and *Temenidae* (2006, 185-199).
Euripides’ main model in his trilogies is most likely Aeschylus. His obsession with the old master is seen in many of his tragedies, most famously in his Electra where he famously pokes fun at Aeschylus’ recognition scene in Libation Bearers. Ruth Scodel, in her book The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides, suggests that Euripides adopted the idea of trilogy from Aeschylus, but in his usual style, transformed it and made it his own.\(^{177}\) Euripides was clearly influenced by Aeschylus in his writing, and he just as clearly often questioned the older poet’s style and ideas.\(^{178}\) He very likely could have taken the Aeschylean trilogy, and changed it from being united by a series of closely associated actions and characters to a broad timeline joined together by themes and places. She, of course, uses this argument in order to establish Alexander, Palamedes and Trojan Women as a loose trilogy. Scodel argues that even if the audience is not quite aware of “trilogy,” “it is hard to believe that they could have seen the Alexander and Troades on the same day and made no connection.”\(^{179}\) If the two plays recall each other so obviously, it cannot be without authorial intention, and it is therefore prudent to include all three plays of the trilogy in our analysis of any one of them.

There is, therefore, a precedent for a loose Euripidean trilogy defined primarily by its concentration on a particular city – especially a city at war. It is not a huge step to argue that the ‘Trojan Trilogy’ was not the only one Euripides wrote, for in Greek myth there is another, even more prominent city that once hosted an epic battle. Connecting the

\(^{177}\) Scodel 1980, 18; take for an example, Euripides’ recognition scene in his Electra compared to Aeschylus’ in Libation Bearers.

\(^{178}\) Scodel 1980, 18.

\(^{179}\) Scodel 1980, 19.
Antiope and Suppliant Women allows us the potential for another loose trilogy centered around war and battle, much in the manner of the “Trojan Trilogy.” Antiope takes place before the “seven gated walls” of Thebes are built. As in Alexander, a mother has left her children (child in the case of Alexander) to be exposed. In both cases, the children are destined for great things when they discover their true parentage – in the case of Amphion and Zethus, to build the great walls of Thebes, while Alexander, oppositely, will prove to be the destruction of Troy.

Suppliant Women takes place after these same walls were disastrously attacked, and, like Trojan Women, centres around the fates of those who lost the war. There are other similarities as well. Both plays feature a chorus of mourning women, led in their laments by a central, regal figure – Hecuba and Adrastus. Cassandra and Euadne both come on stage dressed as brides, ready for death. Unlike Cassandra in Trojan Women, Euadne does not make it clear that she is dressed for a wedding. Her father, Iphis, does comment on her dress at line 1054, wondering why she has dressed herself in a particular garment, to which Euadne responds that her dress means “something famous” (1055). It is tempting to assume, therefore, that she is dressed as a bride. Either way, both women are dressed oddly for their situations.\(^{180}\) Although Cassandra will not die during Trojan Women, she predicts her death upon her arrival at Mycenae:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἀλλ᾽ ἄττ᾽ ἐᾶσω· πέλεκων οὐχ ὑμνὴσομεν,} \\
\text{δὲς ἐς τράχηλον τὸν ἐμὸν εἰσὶ χάτέρων·} \\
\text{μητροκτόνους τ᾽ ἀγῶνας, οὐς οἴμοι γάμοι} \\
\text{θήσουσιν, οίκων τ᾽ Ἀτρέως ἀνάστασιν.}
\end{align*}
\]

But I will let that go: I shall not sing of the axe,

---

\(^{180}\) See Morwood 2007, 219-221.
the one that will go into my neck, and the necks of others,
nor the matricide trial, which my marriage shall cause,
nor the fall of the house of Atreus.

(Trojan Women, 361-365).

Likewise, Euadne proclaims her intentions to die just before she jumps onto the pyre of her husband Capaneus. It is interesting that Cassandra calls her union to Agamemnon “marriage” and Agamemnon himself her “husband” when she really goes to him as a slave and mistress. Both women, however, go into death with their “husbands” willingly – one for love, one for revenge. Furthermore, the victors of the war, behaving badly in their victories, are doomed to suffer alongside those who lost, as the prologue of Trojan Women foretells and the victory of Theseus in Suppliant Women assures. There are, doubtless, a great deal of similarities between Alexander and Antiope, as well as Trojan Women and Suppliant Women. The idea of trilogy existing between Antiope, Suppliant Women and another play, perhaps, as Storey suggests, Erectheus, is not, therefore, a wild claim.

i) Themes in Antiope

Snell and Webster refer to Antiope as an “exciting” play with a “thrilling” plot.\(^{181}\) It certainly contained some of Euripides’ favourite plot devices. There is the ἐκθεσις which Huys discusses at length, in which a hero is exposed at birth and eventually reclaims his birthright.\(^{182}\) There is also the failed recognition of family members, which we see elsewhere in tragedies such as Ion and Electra. Although Antiope is regrettably incomplete, and the only Greek tragedy we know of written on this topic, thereby

\(^{182}\) See Huys 1995.
precluding comparison, what remains suggests an array of some startling themes. I believe the driving theme behind the tragedy is family. There is the relationship of Zethus and Amphion, and embedded in it the famous agon between the active and inactive lifestyle. There is the effect that the role of mother has upon the family – how Antiope’s presence calms her sons and leads to their reconciliation and teamwork. Euripides also treats the role of father – both surrogate and biological – while still managing to return to one of his favourite themes of questioning the gods. The herdsman, who remains until the end faithful to his adopted sons, is sharply contrasted with Zeus, who begets and then abandons them (fr. 223, 11-15). There is also continuous reference to the life of a slave. Both Amphion and Antiope accuse each other of being slaves, and therefore not credible. This theme is, I argue, tied closely to the idea of family, and to the role of the mother and especially of the father. The boys are mistaken for slaves due to the absence of their father (Zeus), while the mother is made a slave also due to the absence of the father.

**ii) Parents**

Antiope is punished by her father because she was raped and impregnated by Zeus, and later fled her father to wed Epopeus against his wishes. According to one of the most widely accepted interpretations of Classical Athenian law, what Antiope has done amounts to μοιχεία – adultery, though not adultery as we now understand it. Adultery in Classical Athens was not limited to the seduction of another man’s wife. Kenneth Dover defines μοιχεία as “[the seduction of] the wife, widowed mother, unmarried daughter,

---

183 Not, admittedly, Theban law, but anachronism in tragedy is quite common.
sister, or niece of a citizen.” Cohen points out that there is no Greek equivalent for “adulteress”, the term µοιχός being a masculine one, with no feminine counterpart. The first µοιχός in Antiope’s case is not available for punishment, as he is none other than Zeus. We are told by Hyginus that Nycteus did not believe that Zeus sired Antiope’s children, which means that the brunt of his anger most likely fell upon Antiope and the second µοιχός, Epopeus. Although Hyginus tells us that Epopeus *mulierem aduentam domo matrimonio suo iunxit*, marriage in Classical Athenian terms had no formal legal definition or recognition, nor was there any sort of legal registry. The recognition of marriage was more social than legal. One of the most important aspects of a “legitimate” marriage in Athens was the formal betrothal (ἐγγύη) of the woman as the mother of future legitimate children. Demosthenes defines legitimate children as being born from a woman whom the “father or brother or grandfather betroths.” If Nycteus believed that Epopeus sired either Amphion or Zethus, or both, he would have therefore perceived them as illegitimate. He never betrothed Antiope to Epopeus. Epopeus is, according to Athenian custom at least, a µοιχός.

---

184 Dover 1974, 209. Dover bases this definition on Dem. 23.53-55. This definition has been challenged, notably by David Cohen 1991, 100-107. Patterson accepts that µοιχεία usually involves a marital violation, but evidence also supports that it sometimes was used more broadly to encompass women under the man’s protection, using the case of Phano as an example (Patterson 1998, 125).
186 “took this woman (Antiope) to his home and joined her with himself in marriage” (Hyg. 8.2).
188 Patterson 1998, 108.
190 Demosthenes, 44.49; Patterson 1998, 109.
191 Cohen 1991, 101. In Athenian law, the µοιχός must be caught in the act in order to justify his murder. In Euripides’ *Antiope*, we do not know in what manner Lycus kills Epopeus, although in some accounts he is killed in battle (Paus. 2.6.3). Heroes in myth
It does not necessarily follow that illegitimate children should be exposed, but fatherless children are considered pitiable, especially in tragedy. In Euripides’ *Alcestis*, Alcestis declares that she volunteered to die in Admetus’ place because she thought it worse for children to be fatherless than motherless. Phaedra in *Hippolytus* kills herself and frames Hippolytus for rape rather than have Theseus believe that their children are not actually his, which would leave them fatherless in every way that counts. It is not clear from the myth or the tragedy whether Antiope was forced to expose the boys or if she herself chose to do it. The illegitimate children of a dead father would be nothing but a nuisance to the men of the *oikos*, and so Lycus may have forced her to abandon them. Antiope herself may have chosen to leave them, however, because she was unable to care for them, fatherless, in her present state. The boys are eventually legitimizied, however, when it is confirmed that they are in fact the sons of Zeus, who is ἀθάνατος – very much alive.

As I have already discussed, the parentage of Amphion and Zethus is questionable. Nothing in the fragments suggests directly that Euripides had Zeus be the father of only one of the boys, although Hermes reference to “the white colts of

are oftent granted greater liscense than real life examples, and I therefore do not propose to completely superimpose Athenian law onto the myth. Rather, I am trying to provide insight into how an Athenian audience might have been inclined to view the matter, based on their own practices.

192 *Alcestis* 280-325.
193 *Hippolytus* 715-721.
194 In *Alexander*, Hecuba choses to sacrifice Alexander because of an ill omen (her dream), but in *Melanippe Wise* the motives of the mother appear quite similar to *Antiope*. Melanippe, fearing her father’s anger, hides her twins, sired by Poseidon, so that her father does not find out about them.
195 Note that in fr. 223. 2 if the suggestion of ἡμας is correct, then Zeus was the father of both boys in the tragedy.
Zeus’

suggests a vague possibility that only one brother could boast of divine heritage, just like the Dioscuri, who are also regularly associated with horses. Separate mythological traditions certainly suggest that Zeus was the father of Amphion only, and that Zethus was more likely the son of Epopeus. Either way, it is the lack of a father that ultimately causes the disruption of their family. Zeus’ proclivity for fathering sons and then abandoning both the sons and their (often unwilling) mothers is common to many other myths. What is rare, however, is the censure whereby he is reproved in Antiope. Amphion says, just before they are about to launch an assault on Lycus,

σοι δ’ ὃς τῷ λαμπρὸν αἰθέρος ναίεις πέδον,
λέγω τῷ οὐ λυπάσθαι, μὴ γαμεῖν μὲν ἡδόνα,
γήμαντα δ’ εἶναι σοὶς τέκνοις ἁνωφελῆ.
οὐ γὰρ καλὸν τὸ δ’, ἀλλὰ συμπαχεῖν φίλοις.

and to you, who dwell amid the light of the ether,  
I say this much, do not lie with a woman for pleasure,  
and having slept with her be useless to your children
for this is not a fair deed, but it is with honour that you aid them…

(fr. 223.11-14)

Amphion is quite clearly reproving his reprobate father here for abandoning him and his mother, enjoining him now, at least, to aid him as he takes revenge on Lycus. Thus here in Antiope we get yet another example of Euripides’ unique sympathy for the plight of women in his society. Though famously called a misogynist by Aristophanes in his Thesmophoriazusae, Euripides’ extant works prove that he was quite the opposite. He

196 fr. 223.98.
197 fr.223.2 would suggest that Amphion considers that Zeus is the father of them both, but it is not uncommon, notably in the case of Castor and Pollux, for mortal parentage to be ignored and both children to be referred to as sons of Zeus.
198 I find it very likely that Aristophanes was not at all serious in this claim, and was instead poking fun at Euripides’ sympathy for women, much in the way “Little John” is
in fact often displays an unparalleled sympathy and understanding for the plights and trials of womankind. My favourite example comes from Medea, in which he has his title character say,

πάντων δ’ ὡσ’ ἔστ’ ἐμψυχα καὶ γνώμην ἔχει
gυναίκες ἔσμεν ἀθλιώτατον φυτόν:
ἀς πρῶτα μὲν δεὶ χρησίμων ὑπερβολῆ
πόσιν πρίασθαι, δεσπότην τε σώματος
[λαβεῖν: κακοὶ γὰρ τοῦτ’ ἔτ’ ἀλγιον κακόν]…
…λέγουσι δ’ ἡμᾶς ως άκίνδυνον βίον
ζόμεν κατ’ οἴκους, οἱ δὲ μάρνανται δορί,
κακοὶ φρονοῦντες· ως τρίς ἃν παρ’ ἁσπίδα
στήναι θέλομί ἂν μάλλον ἣ τεκεῖν ἅπαξ.

Of all creatures that have breath and sensation, we women are the most unfortunate. First at an exorbitant price we must buy a husband and master of our bodies. [This misfortune is more painful than misfortune.]…
… Men say that we live a life free from danger at home while they fight with the spear. How wrong they are! I would rather stand three times with a shield in battle than give birth once.

(Med. 230-50)

First Euripides expresses very considerable insight and sympathy into the actual physical act of childbirth. There is not only the extreme physical pain associated with the act, but also the very real risk to life and limb. Dying in childbirth was very common, therefore making the primary duty of a woman in the ancient world quite dangerous. More than this, however, given the context of Medea, Euripides is pointing out the social structures that leave the care of children with the mother while at the same time denying her any means actually to care for them – something that is still prevalent up to the present. This contradictory patriarchal structure may have been what led Antiope to abandon her sons.

One would hope that Zeus, with his infinite resources, could provide for his offspring. Euripides was fond of questioning how the gods could be so full of vice, if they always portrayed as an extremely large man in Robin Hood. See Jennifer March’s “Euripides the Misogynist?” 1990.
were gods, which opened him up to the jokes of Aristophanes accusing him of atheism.

In Hippolytus, Euripides has a serving man say, σοφωτέρους γὰρ χρῆ βροτῶν εἶναι θεοῦς. Antiope provides an example of this idea, through a comparison of the humble herdsman to Zeus. The herdsman saves the boys and raises them as his own, standing by them to the end, even after they discover he is not their true father. Contrarily, Zeus, king of the gods, sires and then abandons them. The absence of a father is what splits the boys from their mother. Zeus being the “love ‘em and leave ‘em” type, and Epopeus being dead, the family is unable to be maintained. This theme is developed on a broad scale much earlier in Homer’s Odyssey. Odysseus’ long absence causes his livelihood to be devoured by the suitors, as his wife is unable to prevent them from staying due to her precarious position as a woman without a husband, but also unable to take a new husband, and his son’s precarious position as a minor without a father.

But the father-figure, though central to keeping the family powerful enough to stay together, is not the only figure that is essential. The family’s harmony is disrupted by the lack of the mother. When we first meet Amphion and Zethus, they are quarrelling, clearly not seeing eye-to-eye, and certainly not living in harmony. It is Antiope’s return that allows the brothers to reconcile and get along. Compare this with Eteocles and Polyneices, whose mother Jocasta committed suicide. In this case, there was no uniting force for the brothers to work together. Romulus and Remus, too, were without a mother and wound up doing battle. In Alexander, however, the mother plays the same

---

199 “For gods should be wiser than mortals…” (Hipp. 120).
200 A noble herdsman appears in other tragedies by Euripides, notably in his Electra.
201 This can be contrasted with Phoenician Women, where Jocasta is alive and commits suicide only after the brothers commit fratricide. The underlying cause of her suicide may not only just be grief, but also shame in her failure to fill the role of mother and bring harmony to her children.
role as in Antiope, but in a more roundabout manner. Ignorant of the fact that Alexander is her son, she plots with Deiphobus to kill him. At first glance, her effect on the two brothers is the opposite of conciliating. However, it is through this scheme to kill him that Hecuba is ultimately reunited with Alexander, and Alexander is taken back into his family. It therefore takes Zeus’ recognition of the twins as his sons to allow them to be legitimized in the eyes of Antiope’s family, and Antiope’s presence to allow the boys to work in harmony so that they are able to keep their reclaimed birthright – Thebes – stable and healthy.

iii) Brothers and Mothers

The more firmly established “Trojan Trilogy” begins with Alexander, wherein the hero, Paris, is reunited with his mother only after his brother, Deiphobus, convinces her to attempt to kill him. The second play, Palamedes, deals with Oeax’s attempts to avenge his falsely executed brother, Palamedes, with the help of his father, Nauplius. The final play in the “Trojan Trilogy”, Trojan Women, deals with the aftermath of fraternal duty – Hector to Paris, Agamemnon to Menelaus. The first play of the proposed “Theban” trilogy, Antiope, also deals with the restoration of mother to son, only after the two brothers are able to put aside their differences and save her. Suppliant Women, as in Trojan Women, focuses on the legacy left by two brothers, Polyneices and Eteocles, but rather than duty to one’s brother being the cause of the women’s sorrows, it is discord.

The “Trojan Trilogy” begins with the restoration of Alexander (better known as Paris) to his family in Alexander. The rough outline of the play is as follows. Hecuba had
exposed the baby Alexander because she dreamt that he would destroy her family. The baby is saved by a herdsman, who raises him as his son. Every year Hecuba holds games in honour of Alexander, in which the young Alexander one year desires to take part, ignorant that they are held to commemorate his supposed death. His success in the games causes the resentment of his estranged brother Deiphobus, who after being rebuffed by Hector, plots with his mother Hecuba to kill Alexander. Alexander’s true identity is discovered before they are able to carry out this plan, and Alexander is welcomed back into the family.

The baby Alexander was exposed by his parents, Priam and Hecuba, because Hecuba had a dream that she would give birth to a firebrand that would consume Troy. The existing hypothesis to the play says,

‘Εκάβης καθ ὑπνόν ὄψεις
ἔδωκεν ἐκθείναι βρέφος...

...(because) Hecuba had a vision in her sleep, she gave the baby up to be exposed...

(Alex. test. iii, 4-5)

The hypothesis goes on to tell us that the exposure is unsuccessful, as it always is in myth, and the baby is raised by a herdsman on Mount Ida, who names Alexander Paris:

...(a herdsman) raised him as a son having named Alexander Paris.

(Alex. test. iii, 6-7)

---

Hecuba, wracked with guilt, holds funeral games every year for the son that she left to die \((\text{Alex. test.iii, 8-10})\). Inevitably, one year Alexander participates and is victorious in the games, and under these circumstances meets his brothers.

His brothers do not like him. Or, I should say, one particular brother \textit{really} does not like him. Deiphobus, aggrieved that he has been bested by a slave, complains first to his brother, Hector:

\begin{quote}
αἵνῳ μὲν οὐ\[δὲν ὃστις ἔστι δυσχερῆς
. . . . . . .]. κακοίσι μαλθάσσει φρένας...
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
καὶ πᾶς, κα[σίγνηθ'] Ἕκτωρ, οὐκ ἀλγεῖς φρένα[ς
δούλου πρός] ἀνδρὸς ἀθλ. ἀπεστερημέν[ος;
\end{quote}

I do not set store by anyone who, when aggrieved by mistortunes, softens his heart...

And now, brother Hector, don’t you suffer in your heart
Having been despoiled of prizes by a slave?
\((\text{Alex. 62a, 5-6, 9-10})\)

This scene is, most likely, the first time we see any of Alexander’s brothers. It begins with the appeal of Deiphobus to his brother Hector to sympathize with him.

Unknowingly, he has been bested by a brother, and therefore hopes to unite with another brother in order to right what he feels is an injustice. Hector, however noble he may appear by his response, rejects this appeal to brotherhood. He responds,

\begin{quote}
ἐγὼ δὲ γ’ ὃς τις σμίκρ’ ἔχων ἐγκλήματα
μεγάλα νο]μίζει καὶ συνέστηκεν ἃφοβωι†...
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
. . . . . . .]. εἰς, Δηφοβε—τί γάρ με δει
. . . . . . . οὗ] καιρὸς ὀδίνειν φ[ρέ]νας.
\end{quote}

Nor I of anyone who having petty complaints
believes them great and is wedded with fear.

....you go], Deiphobus: for why is it necessary that I
[....this is not] the time to anguish our hearts.

(Alex. 62a, 7-8, 11-12)

Although later writing has vilified Odysseus, emasculated Achilles, and made a fool of Menelaus, Hector always seems to have been treated with a great deal of respect. He is a noble and dutiful, if dull, Trojan hero. Here he is no different. Deiphobus, outraged that he has been beaten by one so far beneath him, invites his brother to get revenge, but Hector, perhaps quite rightly, feels that the doings of a slave, however glamorous, are beneath notice and should not upset a prince so personally. He scorns his brother not because he has lost a competition to a slave, but because he has allowed himself to lose his head over one. Hector says:

...εἰ δ’ ἐστὶ κρείσσων, σοῦ κόλαξε τὴν φύσιν,

And if he is superior, chastise your own heart
which is what defeated you: for you have more authority.

(Alex. 62b, 33-34)

In this debate we might see echoes of the Zethus and Amphion divide, Deiphobus asking his brother to take action, and his brother preferring not to be involved. The chorus introduces the two characters by saying that, εἰς δ’ ἄμιλλαν ἤκουσιν λόγον (Alex. 62a, 4).²⁰³ In Antiope, Amphion is eventually convinced that action must be taken, when he and Zethus kill Dirce, in order to save their mother. He is not convinced by Zethus’ words, but by the actions of his mother. Zethus, one might argue, is also eventually forced to concede that some things need to be left alone, when Hermes intervenes and

²⁰³ “They have fallen into an argument.”
stops the twins from killing Lycus. In effect, Zethus is convinced by words. In the case of

*Alexander*, rather than waste time in convincing his brother after the original snub, he
turns to his mother, Hecuba.

Hecuba enters into his feelings, despite the arguments of his more famous brother,
who thinks that Deiphobus is overreacting. She says:

...κεῖνον μὲν ὁνήθ’ ὃς ἐστι θαυμάζειν Φρύγας,
Πριάμου δὲ νικ. . . γεραίρεσθαι δόμους.

...That he, being who he is, is admired by the Trojans,
and the family of Priam not honoured.

(*Alex.* 62d, 22-23)

This is of course a piece of dramatic irony, for “he” is none other than her long lost
son, Alexander, and part of the family of Priam. Indeed, Deiphobus promises her:

. . . . . .]ὑπῆς γ’ ὀτ[ι κρ]ατεὶ τῶν σῶν τέκων.

You shall (not?) see that he is stronger than your sons.

(*Alex.* 62d, 30)

Alexander *is* in fact her son, and, one might go further, in a roundabout way proves to be
the strongest of her sons in that he causes the death of all of them. Hecuba occupies a role
that is the extreme opposite of Antiope’s – far from helpless, she is the source of power
from which Deiphobus draws his own resolve and enables him to carry out his revenge.

As Scodel points out, *why* Hecuba agrees to join Deiphobus in the plot to kill Alexander
is unclear.\(^{204}\) Antiope’s sons agree to help her only after the recognition scene between
mother and sons. Their reasons are obvious, and are central to the plot of *Antiope*: she is
their mother and her life is in danger. Hecuba’s resolution to kill Alexander is most

\(^{204}\) Scodel 1980, 32-33.
certainly in keeping with Euripidean plotlines. In both *Ion* and *Cresphontes*, Euripides writes of mothers about to kill their children while remaining ignorant of their relationship. Scodel points out that the motives for the mothers in these two plays are not only obvious, but also central to the action of the tragedies.\(^{205}\) In *Ion*, Creusa is jealous of her husband’s supposed son as she herself is now barren. In *Cresphontes*, Merope believes that Cresphontes was responsible for her son’s death. Scodel gives several possible motives for Hecuba’s compliance in the attempted murder, all hinging on the possibility that Alexander is a bastard son of Priam and may in some way supplant her own, legitimate, sons.\(^{206}\)

I believe that these motives may explain Hecuba’s compliance, but only when coupled with the theme of brotherhood explored in this chapter. On its own, such a motive seems rather weak when compared to other examples in Euripidean drama. There is no mention of this motive in any of the remaining fragments or testimony that we have for this play. The emphasis of this scene, insofar as we are able to determine from what little remains, is on family and slaves. That Deiphobus should go to Hector first and be turned away is important. It highlights the theme of brotherhood prevalent throughout the entire trilogy, as well as the theme of action/inaction. Hector, by choosing not to act, inadvertently is saving his brother from committing fratricide. We are reminded of the debate central to the Theban trilogy: is it better to be involved or stand aside? In the case of *Alexander*, the latter may appear preferable at first glance. Hector’s lack of enthusiasm for the murder is commendable, and we as an audience recognize that he is stopping his

\(^{205}\) Scodel 1980, 33.
\(^{206}\) Scodel 1980, 33-35.
brother from committing a terrible crime. Hecuba’s acceptance and participation in the scheme is problematic.

At first we may be shocked that she would agree to participate in it. Females who participate in murder in Greek tragedy are often villainous. Clytemnestra in Agamemnon, Medea in Medea, Hermione in Andromache, and even Electra in Electra are but a few examples. Unlike Hecuba, we might argue, these women are fully aware of whom they are killing. Surely Hecuba belongs to the other category, to the Meropes and Creusas. But Hecuba has already tried to kill Alexander as a baby, fully aware that he was her son. Her guilt over this fact is what led her to hold the games in the first place, which consequently results in his current predicament: again his mother is trying to kill him. Her lack of clear motive may even be intentional on the part of Euripides. Hecuba’s initial instinct when faced with Alexander and his destiny was to expose him and avert disaster. Again faced with her son, though unaware of that circumstance, her instinct is again to eliminate him.

And so we have in this case Hector representing the inactive, Hecuba representing the active, and Deiphobus as the catalyst. The inactive choice seems to us, as the audience, to be the correct one. We know that Alexander is Hecuba’s son – we know what a crime it would be for her and Deiphobus to kill him. In Antiope, the inactive

---

207 Albeit not always, as in the case of Creusa and Deianira.
208 In Euripides’ lost Cresphontes, Merope’s son Cresphontes pretends to be his own killer to fool Polyphontus, who wants him dead. Merope, believing Cresphontes killed her son, attempts to murder him before realizing her is in fact her son. Creusa also attempts to kill her son in Ion, because she believes he is a bastard son of her husband Xuthus.
choice is just as clearly in the incorrect one. Not knowing who Antiope is, Amphion and Zethus refuse to save her. And yet these seemingly bad choices lead to our recognition scenes. Hecuba and Deiphobus’ attempt on Alexander is what leads to his eventual restoration to the royal family. Alexander is saved only just in time by the manic recognition of Cassandra and the later confirmation of his foster father. The hypothesis to the play states:

Παραγενηθέντα δὲ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον
Κασ[σάν]δρ[α] μὴν ἐμμανής ἐπέγνω
καὶ π[ερὶ τῶ]ν μελλόντων ἑθέσπισεν,
'Ἐκάβη [δὲ ἄπο] κτείναι θέλουσα διεκο-
λύθη· π[α]γενόμενος δ’ ὁ θρέψας αὐτὸν
dιὰ τὸν κίνδυνον ἤσαγκάσθη λέγειν τὴν
ἀλήθειαν· Ἐκάβη μὲν οὖν οἶον ἀνεδρε

When Alexander arrived, Cassandra became possessed and recognized him, and prophesied about about what was going to happen; And Hecuba tried to kill him and was prevented. The man who raised him arrived, and because of the danger (to Paris) was compelled to tell the truth. Thus Hecuba rediscovered her son..

(test. iii, 25-32)

It is the danger to Alexander’s life that prompts the herdsman to reveal the young man’s parentage. If Hecuba and Deiphobus did not attempt to kill him, there would be no danger, and thus no reunion. Ironically, Hecuba’s first attempt to kill Paris estranged him, and her second attempt brought him back to her. 209

It is Zethus who is credited with refusing to help his mother in Antiope. Hyginus’ Fabulae 8 tells us that,

---

209 These sorts of ironies are the very essence of tragedy. I use them here for comparison and analysis rather than as evidence of a unique link between Alexander and Antiope.
...deuenit ad filios
suos, ex quibus Zetus existimans fugtiuam non recepit.

[Antiope] came to her sons,
but Zethus supposing her a fugitive did not receive her.

(Ant. test iii.6)

It is a little surprising that in this case Zethus, the brother representing the active argument in Antiope, should propose inaction with regards to his mother. His and Amphion’s refusal to act for her almost results in Antiope’s death, just as Hecuba and Deiphobus’ overzealous need to act almost results in Alexander’s death. However, just like in Alexander, the herdsman who raised the twins steps in at the last minute and reveals to them that Antiope is their mother. Had the twins simply agreed to help her escape from Dirce in the first place, they may have never known who she was.

To all outward appearances, both plays end happily, with the reunion of mother and son, brother and brothers. But any ancient Greek audience would not finish either play with warm and fuzzy feelings, most especially Alexander. When he returns to the royal house, we all know that Alexander is going to be responsible for the deaths of all his brothers, Hector and Deiphobus included. In the earlier disagreement and debate, therefore, between Hector and Deiphobus, audiences may recognize that Hector is allying himself with the inferior brother. But his refusal to act may, in the end, have been the best course. If Deiphobus had given up after Hector’s refusal, seen the sense of his advice not to regard the doings of the slave, and forgotten about the whole affair, Alexander would have continued on in ignorance as a herdsman’s son. There is not enough left of the play to say with any kind of accuracy how Deiphobus or Hector felt about Paris after discovering their relationship, or indeed if Euripides privileged us with this information.
to begin with. But, given the events that unfold after Paris’ restoration, Hector seems to have had the right idea. After all, both Paris and Deiphobus end up marrying Helen.

_Antiope_ focuses on similar themes: exposure, estrangement, and reunion. Most importantly, once again we have the first play in a Euripidean trilogy about the differences and reconciliations of brothers. The play _Antiope_ is less about its namesake, Antiope, and much more about her two sons, Amphion and Zethus. Antiope herself is more of a catalyst, who transforms her fighting progeny into a unified front able to work together to save her. In the beginning, one might say all three characters are lost. The brothers are arguing, and have no notion of what hell their mother is in, let alone who she is. When they are reunited with their mother, the twins are able to put aside their differences in an uneasy truce in order to take vengeance on Dirce and Lycus. Perhaps we might think that this truce is doomed to failure once their mother is saved, but Hermes steps in at the end and makes sure that the brothers continue to work together and respect each other’s gifts. They will work together, and in doing so, make Thebes stronger. Their mutual affection will, in effect, result in the seven-gated walls of Thebes.

Once again, we have a story with a happy ending, which may not leave us feeling very happy. True, although the Amphion and Zethus of myth may have more tragedies to come in their stories, neither perishes or suffers at the other’s hands. Their later troubles are independent of any brotherly squabbles. However, when one understands that the seven-gated walls of Thebes are made by the reconciliation and teamwork of two brothers, one cannot help but look ahead to the day when another pair of brothers makes
an end of each other on them. These uneasy feelings and false endings make it quite clear that Euripides had trilogy in mind when writing both plays. These stories are by no means over, and he intends to explore the implications of these reunions.

At first glance, it may be difficult to see how there could possibly be a brotherly theme in *Trojan Women*, or indeed in *Suppliant Women*. Certainly in the former no brothers come on stage, and the play seems more concerned with the suffering of women. Two of the main characters in this play, however, are the widows of Hector and Paris, whom we saw getting along amicably enough in *Alexander*. In these two women, and indeed the other women suffering on stage, we see, perhaps, the consequences of blind brotherly affection. For the sake of Paris’ happiness, Hector sacrificed himself, his father, his other brothers, his city, and his son. Menelaus also comes on stage, who, when coupled with his own brother Agamemnon, provides an excellent foil to Paris and Hector. Menelaus and Paris, both completely under the spell of Helen, appear a trifle foolish. However, Menelaus, as pathetic as he may seem in *Trojan Woman*, is victorious. There is little to suggest in almost any version of the myth that Agamemnon wants Helen back for the sake her beauty, but for the sake of his brother. He is quite ruthless in this desire, willing even to sacrifice his own daughter to alleviate the plight of his brother. Hector, too, never gives us any reason to suppose that he defends his brother or Helen because he thinks that Helen is worth the trouble. In the *Iliad*, Homer takes pains to introduce Hector to us as a great family man. This in and of itself casts him into sharp relief to the man who killed his daughter and is destined to be killed by his wife. However, Agamemnon’s more direct approach seems to answer much better than Hector’s. Hector, too, sacrifices
himself his family for the sake of his brother and his beautiful wife, but in the end his 
brother does not get the girl.

Suppliant Women also deals with the aftermath of brotherly duty. In this case, it is 
the opposite of what the Trojan Trilogy ends with. Troy was destroyed by the strength of 
brotherly duty, and Thebes by the strength of brotherly jealousy. The whole plot of the 
play is to regain the bodies of the dead men who sacrificed themselves for a conflict 
between brothers who do not know how to share. But while at least one side came out the 
victor in Trojan Women (Agamemnon and Menelaus), no one really wins in Suppliant 
Women. Both brothers, Eteocles and Polyneices, die as a result of their disagreement. 
The aftermath of their battle leads to more conflict, and the resulting enmity of three 
nations instead of two. Hector, friendly to his brother even when he thought him a slave, 
ends up losing everything because of that very same brother. Agamemnon, too, ends up 
dead in a bathtub (according to Aeschylus) because he stopped at nothing to help his own 
brother.\textsuperscript{210} Amphion on Zethus, able to overcome their differences and work together, 
build the very gates where their descendants commit fratricide.

The two trilogies are not very optimistic about brotherhood, it seems. But the 
message is unique when compared to other stories, in that it seems brotherly love leads to 
destruction, as opposed to the usual brotherly discord. Disagreement between brothers is,

\textsuperscript{210} In the \textit{agon} in Iphigenia at Aulis, Menelaus argues that Agamemnon should sacrifice 
his daughter in order to reclaim Menelaus’ faithless wife, but Agamemnon is unwilling. 
Menelaus wins the argument, but has a change of heart and tells Agamemnon not to 
sacrifice Iphigenia. By then, however, it is too late, and the desires and arguments of 
either man are no longer relevant. Iphigenia is going to be sacrificed because that is what 
the army wants.
and always has been, a common theme in myth and literature. Osiris and Seth, Thor and Loki, Cain and Abel, Danaus and Aegyptus, and Romulus and Remus are but a few of the more famous examples. Romulus and Remus provide a very good point of comparison for our Theban Trilogy. Although the origin of their story most likely was not Greek, but locally Italian, later additions to the myth certainly seem to borrow from Greek traditions (as the Romans were often wont to do), producing an effect notably similar to a combination of the stories of Amphion and Zethus, and Eteocles and Polyneices.

Amphion/Zethus and Romulus/Remus are both sets of twins who are illegitimate sons of gods, who are exposed, and who are the cause of their mothers’ suffering merely by their births. Livy is not explicit on the fate awaiting Rhea Silvia, but being bound and given to the guards (1.3.13-14) is not very promising. Both are raised by a peasant in the country and both, upon discovering their birthrights, set out to reclaim their position and right the wrongs done to their families by their evil paternal uncles. Romulus and Remus kill Amulius and restore power to their grandfather, Numitor. Amphion and Zethus kill Dirce and attempt to kill Lycus, but are stopped by Hermes. Having been restored to their proper place, both twins build walls around their respective cities. But where Amphion and Zethus are content to keep their truce, and remain friendly, Romulus and Remus inevitably quarrel over who has the ruling of the city and Romulus kills his brother. This bloody end, however, marks the beginning to a long history of a prosperous city, which no foreign power is able to overpower for many a century, while the walls built by Amphion and Zethus are destined to yield to the enmity of Eteocles and Polyneices. In
essence, the walls built with the enmity of brothers (Romulus and Remus) are stronger than the wall built with the love of brothers (Amphion and Zethus).

Perhaps the fratricide, Romulus, prospered in comparison with the twins who were able to finally live in harmony, because he acted much more in the manner expected of twins. Robbins points out that although tales and stories about twins are abundant not only in Greek myth, but also in most mythologies throughout the world, the twins are usually hostile to each other. He gives examples such as Romulus and Remus, Proetus and Acrisius, and Danaus and Egyptus. It is uncommon that the twins work together, or are even amicable. Amphion and Zethus provide us with a rare exception to this trope. At first glance, especially in Euripides’ Antiope, it appears that the brothers will end up the way twins usually do. The two boys represent opposite modes of life – the active and the inactive. Other plays by Euripides, such as Suppliant Women, deal with these two philosophies as essentially opposed to one another. In Suppliant Women the active/inactive is used in a broader manner, with problems of the state rather than of the individual. However, the agon between the Theban herald and Theseus leave us in no doubt that the two are mutually exclusive. In the case of our Theban twins, Amphion represents the inactive, and Zethus the active. They begin Antiope by fighting with each other over their chosen lifestyles. If anything, they seem more doomed than Romulus and Remus. The Roman twins at least begin their story working together, even if they do not

212 Robbins 2013, 238
213 Another of Euripides’ lost plays, Melanippe Wise, deals with the birth of twins, though in that case the father is Poseidon. In this case, the mother hides the twins from her father in a stable where they are found by a shepherd.
214 Robbins uses Castor and Pollux.
215 There will be more discussion of these two agones in Chapter 6.
end that way. And yet, despite the differences between the Theban pair, after they take revenge on Dirce, they are still able to work together.

This is explained in Antiope by the appearance of Hermes. The brothers are about to slay Lycus, when the god appears in order to stop them. He goes on to tell them that they must put aside their differences in order to build the walls of Thebes and rule it together. They do, and Thebes passes into their charge until later fates place control of the city back in Lycus’ hands. In Suppliant Women, as well, polypragmosyne versus apragmosyne is resolved in the end. Theseus takes back the bodies of the fallen Seven (active), but stops before he sacks Thebes (inactive). Unlike in Antiope, his decision is not brought on by the intervention of a god, but, as I shall argue later, is actually ruined by the intervention of Athena at the end of the play.

What then makes Amphion and Zethus so different from less “friendly” twins? Like the more famous twins, Castor and Pollux, they are sons of Zeus. In the case of the Dioscuri, only one brother is a son of Zeus, and one the son of a mortal, conceived and born in the same womb. Amphion and Zethus, may have a similar story, although the more commonly accepted one has both being sons of Zeus, neither of them being divine. Is there something in their parentage, i.e. Zeus, which makes them more likely to be brotherly? Romulus and Remus are both sons of Mars. Though Mars was highly honoured by the Romans, the Greeks did not like Ares very much.
Chapter 6: Antiope and Suppliant Women

The final chapter of this thesis will be devoted to a comparison of Antiope and Suppliant Women. The reading of these two plays together is what makes the idea of re-dating Antiope so appealing. Despite the fact that we have more left of Antiope than any other lost tragedy, the fact remains that we still do not have much. Given the fact that there is so little left of Antiope, it is even more remarkable that there are so many connections between it and Suppliant Women. Thebes and Athens are connected by Antiope’s setting in Eleutherae, which also speaks to the Bacchic themes present in both plays. Theseus, Amphion, and Zethus all are potentially mythological figures hijacked from Sparta and the Peloponnese. Both plays also deal with the question of γένος and the advisability of helping ξένοι. The most obvious connection between the two tragedies is the agon between Amphion and Zethus in Antiope and the agon between Theseus and the herald in Suppliant Women. Within the Antiope agon, however, there are connections to other areas of Suppliant Women, notably to Adrastus’ funeral oration.

i) Eleutherae and Dionysus

The setting of Eleutherae has already been discussed in Chapters 2 and 4. As previously mentioned, it lay on the northwest frontier of Attica, and, for most of its history, passed back and forth between Athenian and Boeotian control. The Greek geographer Strabo (64/3 B.C. to A.D. 24) has the following to say on the subject:

αἱ γὰρ Ἐλευθέραι πλησίον, ἅς οἱ μὲν τῆς Ἀττικῆς, οἱ δὲ τῆς Βοιωτίας φασίν.

For Eleutherae is nearby (Plataea), which some say belongs to Attica, others to Boeotia.

(Strabo 9.2.31)
The town may have been one of the causes that began hostilities between Thebes and the Peisistratid tyranny in Athens.\textsuperscript{216} It became an ally of Athens sometime near the end of the sixth century B.C., around the time that the cult of Dionysus Eleuthereus was imported to Athens by Pegasus of Eleutherae.\textsuperscript{217} The cult was responsible for the City Dionysia, the very festival where Classical Athenian drama was performed, and the theatre housed the chryselephantine statue of Dionysus made by Alcamenes (which replaced a wooden one taken from Eleutherae).\textsuperscript{218} Eleutherae therefore provides a link between Thebes and Athens, and tragedy itself.

As was mentioned in Chapter 2, Pausanias tells us that the Eleuthereans joined Athens willingly because of their hatred of the Thebans.\textsuperscript{219} This means that the very setting of \textit{Antiope} echoes the entire plot of \textit{Suppliant Women}. Adrastus and the Argive women also come to Athens in order to obtain their help against the hated Thebans. Admittedly, they do not actually wish to become a part of Athens, nor is Thebes painted utterly black, \textit{Suppliant Women} being a play of shades of gray. Athens is, however, the superior \textit{polis} of the three in all respects: its morals, its politics, and its leaders. Argos launched a dubious attack on Thebes without \(\epsilon\nu\nu\nu\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omega\nu\), for the sake of Adrastus’ son-in-law, Polyneices, a foreigner, whom he married to his daughter based on an – according to Theseus – foolish understanding of Apollo’s oracle.\textsuperscript{220} Thebes, meanwhile, refuses to grant proper burial to the fallen Argive warriors, a ritual sacred to the gods. Neither

\textsuperscript{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{216} Buck 1979, 99.}}
\textsuperscript{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{217} Paus. 1.2.5; Camp 2001, 121, 319; Snell 1964, 71, Buck 1979, 99, 113.}}
\textsuperscript{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{218} Camp 2001, 121; see Paus. 1.38.8.}}
\textsuperscript{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{219} Paus. 1.38.1.}}
\textsuperscript{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{220} Supp. 135-158, 219-237.}}}
Argos nor Thebes are democracies, as Athens is, which may, according to the agon, be why they are both making such foolish and immoral decisions. And of course, the leaders of Argos and Thebes prove themselves infinitely inferior to the leader of Athens.

Adrastus comes on stage already defeated, and worse, defeated in an unlawful battle he took up on behalf of foreigners. Creon, after his success, “does not understand how to use it” and allows bodies to moulder unburied, he being the successor to Eteocles, who was killed in mutual fratricide, battling over the inheritance of his father, who, after all, was also his half brother (Oedipus). Zeitlin argues that Thebes is used as the antithesis to Athens, a city that “is meant to be dramatically ‘other’ than itself.” Basically Thebes is a place where a man would marry his mother and kill his father. Argos, Zeitlin argues, is the middle ground, neither as extremely good as Athens, nor as extremely other (i.e. bad) as Thebes.

Eleutherae is also where Theseus buries the bodies of the common soldiers, having brought the infamous Seven to be buried at Eleusis. The incident is recounted by the messenger to Adrastus as follows:

* Ἀδραστος: ὃν δ᾽ εὗνεχ᾽ ἄγων ἦν, νεκροῦς κομίζετε;
* Ἀγγέλος: ὅσοι γε κλεινοὶ ἔπτ᾽ ἐφέστασαν δόμοις;
* Ἀδραστος πός φῆς; ὁ δ᾽ ἄλλος ποῦ κεκμηκότων δήλος;
* Ἀγγέλος: τάφῳ δέδονται πρὸς Κηθαιρώνος πτυχαίς.
* Ἀδραστος: τούκεϊθεν ἢ τούνθενδε; τίς δ᾽ ἔθαψε νυν;
* Ἀγγέλος: Ἐπαύξεσ, σκιώδης ἐνθ’ Ἐλεύθερης πέτρα.

221 Although it may seem strange to have Theseus, a king, champion democracy, the Greeks generally did not see an issue with this. See Morwood 2007, 8-11. Walker does not seem to think that Theseus was championing democracy at all (1995, 147-54).
222 Supp. 124.
223 Zeitlin 1990, 131.
225 Supp. 759.
Adrastus: Do you bring the bodies they were fighting for?
Messenger: As many as lead the seven companies.
Adrastus: What’s that you say? Where are the rest of the dead?
Messenger: They have been given burial before the dells of Cithaeron.
Adrastus: On this side (Athenian) or that side (Theban)? Who buried them?
Messenger: Theseus, near the shady cave of Eleutherae.
(Supp. 754-59)

πέτρα is the word Euripides uses to describe the cave in Antiope. Could this be the same πέτρα? It is wholly tempting to believe so, and if the two plays were indeed produced together, I would say that it is very likely. Antiope, therefore, is set before a cave in Eleutherae, and the followers of the Seven are buried by a cave in Eleutherae in Suppliant Women. This is significant in my theory of a Theban trilogy as it implies a beginning and an ending. It is at Eleutherae that the two rulers who build the seven-gated walls of Thebes discover their birthright and destiny, and it is here that those who tried and failed to break through these very walls were buried in their failure. Furthermore, Eleutherae is the place where Amphion and Zethus are mistaken for commoners and slaves, and it is where the common soldiers are eventually buried. Given the history of Eleutherae constantly changing hands between Athens and Boeotia, it is also important to note that the tombs of heroes are often used to legitimize claims to the territory at which they are located.

Dionysus is also a connecting factor, in accordance with his association with Eleutherae, but for other reasons as well. He appears in neither play – the role of divine spokesperson being left for Hermes and Athena. It has, of course, been suggested by past scholars that Dionysus speaks the prologue of Antiope, but as I have already discussed in
Chapter 4, the general consensus today is that it was the herdsman. Dionysus’ inclusion in both tragedies seems almost accidental, until the two plays are read together. Dirce comes to Eleutherai for a bacchic ritual (fr. 175), and Euadne comes to the pyre of Capaneus “having been excited to a bacchic frenzy” (Supp. 1001). Both women die horribly as a result of their pilgrimage – one being murdered by being tied to a bull, the other committing suicide by jumping onto a funeral pyre and burning alive. Zeitlin points out that in Antiope there is also a Dionysian reversal of roles. Dirce, having come to the mountainside as a maenad, meets her former victim Antiope. The roles reverse, however, and Dirce becomes the victim when she falls into the power of Antiope and her sons. Something similar can be said of Euadne in Suppliant Women. The boundary between male and female becomes blurred in her, as she refers to herself in masculine terms, such as the “πόνος” of her life (Supp. 1005), her “καλλίνικος” victory (Supp. 1059), and indeed her “εὐκλείας” over all other women (Supp. 1015). These are all terms most commonly associated with Heracles, but are also appropriated by Theseus in Suppliant Women. Indeed, Heracles himself was also killed by fire. In the cases of both Dirce and Euadne, this Dionysian reversal of roles results in death.

ii) Theseus vs. Heracles, Amphion and Zethus vs. Castor and Pollux

Throughout this thesis, I have continually been bringing attention to the possibility that only Amphion is the son of Zeus, while Zethus is the son of Epopeus. It is

---

226 Zeitlin 1993, 177.
227 Zeitlin 1993, 177. Zeitlin also mentions that it was Dirce’s intention to tear Antiope apart by tying her to a wild bull, and this is why Amphion and Zethus kill Dirce in this way.
never stated outright in any known version of the myth, but is still, I argue, quite plausible, and has led several other scholars to view the Theban twins as an appropriation of the Spartan Castor and Pollux.\textsuperscript{229} Wording of certain ancient authors regarding the twins, as well as what we know about the prevailing theories in the ancient world of how twins are even possible both speak to this point. In general, twins are explained in one of two ways. First, the fetus divides in the mother’s womb, thus beginning their life-long conflicts.\textsuperscript{230} This first explanation does not quite fit with what we know of Amphion and Zethus, for although they certainly believe in different lifestyles, they display “a remarkable unanimity of purpose.”\textsuperscript{231} This leaves a second option, perhaps even more common than the first, of superfetation. Generally speaking, the mother has two sexual partners, and each act of copulation results in a child by each of the fathers.\textsuperscript{232} Lévi-Strauss mentions that the woman is sometimes seduced by a trickster figure,\textsuperscript{233} but often the second father is a divinity. The divinity could be taking on a trickster role, such as when Zeus disguises himself as Amphitryon to seduce Alcmene,\textsuperscript{234} but he does not necessarily have to disguise himself as the woman’s spouse. In the case of Antiope, for example, he is disguised as a satyr, and she knows that it is him, while in the case of Leda Zeus turns into a swan.

\textsuperscript{229} Buck 1979, 57; see Preller 1964 and Vian 1963. 
\textsuperscript{230} Robbins 2011, 239; Lévi-Strauss 1978, 25-34. 
\textsuperscript{231} Robbins, 2011, 239. Robbins mentioned this in comparison to the unity of purpose Castor and Pollux show in saving their sister Helen when she is carried off by Theseus. The connection here between all three subjects (the Dioscuri, the Amphionces, and Theseus) is most likely incidental, but, could unconsciously be responsible for Euripides’ decision to use Theseus and the Theban twins together. 
\textsuperscript{232} Robbins 2011, 239. 
\textsuperscript{233} Lévi-Strauss 1978, 29. 
\textsuperscript{234} Apollod. 2.4.8; this results in the birth of the twins Iphicles and Heracles, the former being the mortal son of Amphitryon, the latter the divine son of Zeus.
Leda’s twins, the Spartans Castor and Pollux, are undoubtedly more famous than their Theban counterparts. They are also more popular, their function in many ancient stories being protective and helpful to humanity.\(^{235}\) What we see with the evolution of Amphion and Zethus’ story may in fact be Thebes borrowing from the popular Spartan myth in order to create their own, local, Castor and Pollux. This theory would provide yet another parallel with *Suppliant Women* and *Antiope*.

Theseus is quite widely accepted as Athens’ local answer to Heracles.\(^{236}\) Hans Herter argues that Theseus was actually a pan-Ionian hero, rather than just a local Athenian one.\(^{237}\) Henry Walker has since convincingly disproved this theory, and he concludes that Herter’s theory is “a tribute to the success of the Athenians in raising their local hero to the status of ‘another Heracles.’”\(^{238}\) James Morwood points to two specific instances of Theseus being linked directly to Heracles in *Suppliant Women*. The first instance is in the messenger speech, where Theseus is vividly described in battle as wielding a club.\(^{239}\) Theseus won his club at Epidaurus, but the club of Heracles constitutes one of his three most famous iconographic symbols,\(^{240}\) with countless representations of him wielding it.\(^{241}\) The second instance Morwood mentions occurs in

\(^{235}\) Robbins 2011, 240.
\(^{237}\) See Herter, 1936, 177-239.
\(^{238}\) Walker 1995, 13; for Walker’s full treatment of the theory see pg. 9-20.
\(^{239}\) *Supp.* 714-717.
\(^{240}\) The other two symbols being his lion skin and bow.
\(^{241}\) Morwood 2007, 12; see Morwood 2007, 12 for bibliography regarding both the club of Heracles and of Theseus.
the *exodus*, when Athena talks about a tripod Heracles left with Theseus between labours.\(^{242}\) Morwood points out that this tripod appears nowhere else in mythology and seems to be pure invention on the part of Euripides, concluding that its presence in Athena’s speech must serve the sole purpose of linking Theseus with the Dorian hero.\(^{243}\) The heroes of both *Antiope* and *Suppliant Women* could, therefore, be examples of myths hijacked from the Peloponnese, and used to ‘spruce up’ the local heroes of Boeotia and Attica.\(^{244}\)

### iii) Γένος and Ξένοι

Amphion, Zethus, and Antiope, upon their first meeting, refuse to acknowledge the other on the mistaken assumption that the other is a slave and a foreigner. Lycus also mistakes Amphion and Zethus for slaves and therefore underestimates them. This preoccupation may have been inspired by the idea of citizenship in Athens at the time. Consider fr. 215:

> Πᾶσι δ’ ἀγγέλλω βροτοῖς 
> ἐσθλῶν ἀπ’ ἀνδρῶν εὐγενὴς σπείρειν τέκνα 
> *(one or more lines lost?)*
> οὐ γὰρ ποι’ ἄν πράξειν ἐς τέλος κακῶς.

I proclaim that all mortals beget children from women of well-born men

... for they shan’t ever fare badly, right up to the end.

*(fr. 215)*

The question of parentage and citizenship was very much on the mind in the mid fifth century B.C, as is evidenced by Pericles’ law passed in 451 B.C. that only children born

\(^{242}\) *Supp.* 1197-1200; Morwood 2007, 12.

\(^{243}\) Morwood 2007, 12.

\(^{244}\) This is odd, especially in the case of Thebes, a city with such a wealth of myth.
of two Athenian parents could be considered citizens.\textsuperscript{245} In \textit{Suppliant Women}, Theseus is horrified when Adrastus admits that he knowingly married his daughters to foreigners, and says to him, \textit{λαμπόν δὲ θολερῷ δόμα συμμείξας τὸ σὸν/ Ἥλκωσας οἴκους.}\textsuperscript{246} Marrying his daughters to \textit{ξένοι} was, to the majority of the Athenian audience, an unforgivable pollution to his family and (as he is its king) his city.\textsuperscript{247} Adrastus no doubt deserved the defeat he suffered in Thebes, for not content with marrying his daughters to foreigners, he even went to war for them. The question of the genuine Athenian, and of the gray area between citizen and son of a concubine may have some bearing on the question of slaves and mistaken identities. In \textit{Ion}, the title character also shows a large degree of surprise and censure to Creusa when she admits that she, an Athenian, married a foreigner, despite Xuthus’ lofty ancestry of Aeolus and Zeus.\textsuperscript{248} Who is a slave, a foreigner, and a legitimate son is rendered questionable by the absence of a father, and the couplings of the mother. Daniel Mendelsohn points out that this aversion to aiding and marrying foreigners contributes to the \textit{agon} in \textit{Suppliant Women}, and I add its relevance to the one in \textit{Antiope} as well.\textsuperscript{249} Mendelsohn argues that Theseus’ aversion to \textit{ξένοι} puts him on the \textit{inactive} or \textit{apragnosyne} side of the argument, which would put him on the same side as the Theban herald and preclude him from actually assisting the Argives to reclaim their dead.\textsuperscript{250} In \textit{Antiope}, Amphion and Zethus also refuse to act

\textsuperscript{246} \textit{“Having mixed your illustrious home with foulness, you harmed your house”} (\textit{Supp.} 222-223). See Mendelsohn 2002, 152-161. He argues that Theseus shows real shock here, alongside Collard (\textit{Euripides’ Supplices}, 144), unlike Michelini (\textit{Ramus}, 20/21 (1991), 24 who says that he only sounds mildly surprised.
\textsuperscript{247} Walker 1995, 150.
\textsuperscript{248} \textit{Ion} 289-93. See Mendelsohn, 2002, 158-161.
\textsuperscript{249} Mendelsohn, 2002, 159-160.
\textsuperscript{250} Mendelsohn, 2002, 159-160.
outside of their γένος, when Antiope first arrives at Eleutherae. They think her a slave, and unrelated to them, and so they refuse to help her. But while Theseus accepts that it is sometimes important to act outside of your γένος and so helps the Argives, Amphion and Zethus merely learn that Antiope is a part of their γένος, and so help her. Mendelsohn goes on to make a very striking point, especially when put in the context of both *Antiope* and *Suppliant Women*. Mendelsohn writes,

We already know that Theseus’ refusal to acknowledge obligations outside his own genos-as-polis puts him in danger of violating what is never doubted to be a divine law that requires both burial of the dead and obligation to the suppliants. More important, however, is the fact that the exchange between the young king and Adrastus goes on to include pointed references to the saga of Oedipus (149f.), whose every trouble, we might say, stemmed from a failure to leave the city, and indeed who stayed, in too many ways, within the boundaries of his own genos.

(Mendelsohn 2002, 159-60)

In *Antiope* we see the beginnings of the danger of “the saga of Oedipus.” Amphion and Zethus do not learn how to “act outside of [their] own genos,” instead only choosing to assist Antiope when they find out that she is their mother. *Suppliant Women* then takes us to the point where the danger has reached its peak and fallen off the edge: the aftermath of the destruction of Oedipus’ incestuous line.251 Theseus shows evidence of beginning the cycle again, of perpetuating an “incest prohibition”252 that will eventually end in the destruction of his on genos and polis, but in the end he is able to step outside the constraints of the fanaticism of Athenian autochthony.

---

251 The sons, at least, which are even now generally counted on to “carry on the family name.”
iv) The Agon

The similarities between the agones in Antiope and Suppliant Women, especially specific wording and phrases, are what prompted Storey originally to make the connection between the tragedies and suggest the Theban trilogy. In Suppliant Women, a herald comes from Thebes to Eleusis shortly after Theseus has agreed to help Adrastus reclaim the bodies of the Seven from Creon. Before he gives Theseus Creon’s message, however, he is distracted by Theseus’ declaration that Athens is a democracy, and he and Theseus launch into what some deem an irrelevant debate over the merits of tyranny and democracy. Underneath this argument is another, namely of polypragmosyne versus apragmosyne. Matthew Leigh highlights a similar version of this argument in the guise of Plato and Aristotle. In Charmides, Plato is firmly in the apragmosyne camp, saying that polypragmosyne is the opposite of doing that which is proper to oneself. Aristotle, while admitting that one does not want to run the risk of being a busy-body, maintains that it is important to understand that we must sometimes act outside ourselves in the form of household management and political legislation. Both Plato and Aristotle use the plays of Euripides as examples in their writings on the subject. Aristotle, as Leigh points out, uses Odysseus’ prologue speech from Euripides lost Philoctetes in his Nicomachean Ethics, while Plato uses the agon in Antiope in his Gorgias.

---

253 Supp. 399.
255 See Leigh 2013, 16-22 for full discussion.
256 ibid
257 Leigh 2013, 24.
The Theban herald in *Suppliant Women* praises the city that does not involve itself in affairs outside of itself. He tells Theseus that he should not grant Adrastus supplication for aid since he “has no connection with the Argives’ city.” Furthermore, he says that:

σφαλερὸν ἡγεμῶν θρασύς
νεώς τε ναύτης ἰσχυρὸς καιρό, σοφός.

A rash leader and sailor of a ship are likely to stumble; he who is quiet at the right time, wise.

(*Supp. 509-10*)

In the *Antiope*, Amphion and Zethus argue *polypragmosyne* versus *apragmosyne* on a more personal level. While the herald and Theseus debate what sort of man (or men) makes a better ruler, Amphion and Zethus argue what sorts of values make a better man. What may be surprising here is that Amphion’s stance on the matter seems much more in keeping with the Herald’s – a character commonly thought to be in the wrong in *Suppliant Women.* Zethus, on the other hand, argues the side that Theseus takes in the *agon.*

Zethus charges Amphion with idleness, and a lack of participation in politics and war. He clearly advocates that one be active, that one “throw away the lyre and use weapons” (fr. 187a.i.) and “live a soldier’s life, and be well provided, and be a ruler” (fr.

---

258 *Supp.* 473. Again notice arguments based around γένος.
259 See Storey 2008, 48. Walker argues this, calling Theseus rather “a defender of the narrow-minded, middle-class, and not very democratic patriotism that the Athenians were guilty of” (1995, 150). Mastronarde argues that the unfeeling attitude of Theseus in his initial dialogue with Adrastus (195-249) is taken up by the herald (1986, 202). Lloyd takes a more moderate stance, suggesting that both sides score some good points, and many of the things Theseus says carry through positively through the rest of the play (1992, 78).
Furthermore, in devoting his time to music, Amphion acts in a womanish manner, for he takes no part in politics or war, which is a man’s job (fr. 185). Zethus’ message is clear – do not sit back and watch events unfold, but take part in bringing them about. Zethus, like Theseus, will not do as the herald suggests and watch Argos and Thebes struggle with one another.

Amphion, on the other hand, takes the herald’s part in the debate. He tells his brother that

*ὅτις δὲ πράσσει πολλὰ μὴ πράσσειν παρόν, μῶρος, παρὸν ζῆν ἡδέως ἀπράγμονα.*

Whoever is very active when he may be inactive, is a moron, when he may live pleasurably without activity.

(fr. 193)

It is clear that if given the choice, Amphion will not willingly involve himself in another’s affairs. But Euripides does not stop at vaguely connecting the two separate arguments in his two plays – he at some points almost reuses phrases. Compare the following fragment spoken by Amphion to the lines the herald in *Suppliant Women* says at 509-510:

*ὁ δ’ ἥσυχος φίλοισι τ’ ἁσφαλῆς φίλος πόλει τ’ ἀριστος. μὴ τὰ κινδυνεύματα αἴνειτ’ ἐγὼ γὰρ οὔτε ναυτίλον φιλῶ τοιμῶντα λίαν οὔτε προστάτην χθονός.*

The quiet man is a sure friend for friends, and best for a city. *Don’t praise risky undertakings: I love neither a sailor nor a city who is too venturesome.*

(fr. 194)
A rash leader and sailor of a ship are likely to stumble; the one quiet at the right time, wise.

(Supp. 509-510)

The two sentiments are spoken in almost exactly the same way, but Euripides puts one in the mouth of an antagonist, the other in the mouth of his protagonist. It is not here alone that Amphion speaks with the same ideals as the herald, however. Compare again, the following:

Cities are well managed by a man’s judgments, and his house well, and he is a great resource in war, for one wise counsel defeats many hands, and crassness partnered with a mob is the greatest evil.

(fr. 200)

Yes, indeed, it is a plague for the better class of men whenever a man of low class has high esteem, having gained mastery over the people through his speaking, when he was nobody before.

(Supp. 423-25)

Indeed, both men agree that power is best left in the hands of one wise man – not a vulgar mob. But while we only grudgingly allow that the herald in Suppliant Women scores some points for tyranny against Theseus, we are invited to sympathize with Amphion in
Antiope. For Zethus comes on stage much in the same manner as the Theban herald. Amphion is most likely playing his lyre and singing to himself or speaking to the chorus of Athenian men, only to be interrupted and insulted by his brother. Similarly, Theseus is about to send a peaceful messenger to Thebes when his intentions are interrupted, rudely, by the Theban herald. It is possible to argue that Theseus precipitates the argument by immediately bridling at the herald’s request to speak to a τύραννος. It is even perhaps ironic that I argue that he is rude for addressing his social superior (i.e. a king) in such a way, when Theseus has just declared that he is equal to his subjects. 260

Yet, Euripides is not merely content with putting the same ideals into the mouths of a hero and a villain. He also twists the arguments Theseus uses to defend his side in the mouth of Amphion, so that the two use the same arguments to prove completely different points. Compare the following two passages, the first spoken by Amphion in Antiope, the second by Theseus in Suppliant Women:

 ἄπαντα τίκτει χθὼν πάλιν λαμβάνει.

The earth gives birth to all things and takes them back again. (fr. 195)

and

έσαςε ἣδη γῆ καλυφθήναι νεκροὺς,
δὲν δ’ ἔκαστον ἐς τὸ φῶς ἀφίκετο,
ἐνταῦθ’ ἀπελθεῖν, πνεύμα μὲν πρὸς αἰθέρα,
τὸ σῶμα δ’ ἐς γῆν· οὔτε γὰρ κεκτήμεθα
ἡμέτερον αὐτὸ πλὴν ἐνοικήσαι βίον,
κάπειτα τὴν θρέψασαν αὐτὸ δεῖ λαβεῖν.

260 Yet another example of Euripides’ uncanny ability to pull the rug out from under you? For more discussion see Storey 2008, Chapter 4.
261 This line is most likely a topos, but is still worth mentioning. Even if it is a throw away line, it would still make sense for Euripides to utilize one that had some bearing on his themes, and burial is a very strong theme in Suppliant Women.
Now (that they are dead), allow the bodies to be covered in the ground and to go away to the place from which each part of them came to the light, the breath to the air, the body to the earth. For we do not possess it as our own but only as something to dwell in for our lifetime, and then the (earth) that nourished it must recover it.

(Supp. 531-36)

These two passages are not only remarkable in their similarity, but in the two opposite purposes for which they are spoken. Although the Antiope fragment, by its nature, is lacking in context, there is a very good possibility that it belongs to the agon. Amphion would then be using this as a reason ‘not to get involved’, while Theseus uses this argument in order to justify his decision to bury the bodies of the Seven. This example certainly seems to embody yet another fragment of the Antiope:

ἐκ παντὸς ἄν τις πράγματος δισσῶν λόγων ἄγόνα θεῖτ' ἄν, εἰ λέγειν εἴη σοφός.

A man could make a contest between two arguments from any matter, if he were a clever speaker.

(fr. 189)

By completely reversing the two arguments in the two plays, what is it exactly that Euripides conveys? That polypragmosyne is acceptable only for Athens, noble only in the mouth of an Athenian leader? If read seriously in this manner, Suppliant Women is reduced back to the piece of Athenian propaganda it is often accused of being. If it is meant as a means of questioning Athens’ involvement in Greek affairs and its intolerance of other poleis involving themselves, it saves Suppliant Women. Reading Suppliant

262 See Storey’s discussion of whether Supp. is a piece of propaganda in Storey 2008, Chapter 6; Zuntz 1955, 3-25.
Women alongside Antiope throws us further into that gray and unstable area that engulfs us upon any careful analysis of the extant play.

Some would argue that both agones are irrelevant to the plot of both plays, and are put in simply because Athenians liked arguments and Euripides wrote good ones.263 Grube called the agon in Suppliant Women a “flagrant irrelevancy”, while Lloyd says on the topic of agones in Euripides in general that Euripides “seems positively to avoid engaging the agon in the action of the play.”264 Others see the agon in Suppliant Women as a very important point in Theseus character development, making his actions later in the drama believable.265 I hope that I have already made it clear that I believe these two agones central to the themes of Suppliant Women and Antiope. Both plays try to discover what is better: polypragmosyne or apragmosyne? If Amphion in Antiope chose not to involve himself, he would not have discovered his parentage and inherited his birthright. If Theseus chose not to act, the laws of Greece would have been violated and the Seven left unburied. Yet both are also checked from being too active. Amphion participates in the murder of Dirce, but before he can kill Lycus, Hermes intervenes. Theseus does battle with Thebes, but stops himself from sacking the city, content with the recovery of the bodies. These agones set the stage for the action of the plays. And it becomes ever more clear why it is so important that neither side wins the agon – for, as the tragedies prove, neither side is entirely right.

264 Grube 1941, 234; Lloyd 1992, 17.
There is little in *Suppliant Women* that can be considered “black or white”, wrong or right. Theseus, the great Athenian hero, comes off as a pretentious and foolish boy in our first encounter with him. He speaks as rudely to Adrastus in his first encounter with him as the Theban herald does to him later on. And he outright refuses to involve himself in Adrastus’ affairs – warning Adrastus, even, that “the god makes no distinction between [men’s] fortunes and with the sufferings of the sick man destroys the man who is not sick and has done nothing wrong” (*Supp.* 226-28). Only when his mother intervenes does Theseus change his tune, and he does this so drastically it almost seems too good to be believable. Walker chooses not to believe it, instead arguing that Theseus yields to his mother’s argument, which is not very sound, “but this apparent lack of logic has always characterized Athenian policy.” He in essence argues that her argument is an appeal to Theseus’ vanity, and that there is little growth in his character until the *agon* with the herald. Peter Burian, conversely, says that Aethra’s arguments to her son are a delicate balance of appeals to both the personal and the political. She even directly says to Theseus, εἴπω τι, τέκνο, σοί τε καὶ πόλει καλόν; She appeals to his sense of morality by involving the gods and the sanctity of proper burial, as well as to his honour in helping the destitute. As Burian states, these appeals “cannot be reduced to a matter of personal pride” as they are inherent in the political argument as well.

---

266 Walker 1995, 152; it should be noted that Walker takes an extremely negative view of both Athens and especially Theseus in *Suppliant Women* throughout his discussion of the play. It is unlikely that an Athenian audience would have sympathized with his views.


269 “May I say something to you, son, that is good for both you and the city?” (*Supp.* 293).

270 *Supp.* 306-311.

271 Burian 1985, 135.
argument is the enforcement of law, and inherent in the appeal to honour is the threat of dishonour should he shun his duty to the law.\textsuperscript{272}

Aethra herself also leaves us in uncertain territory. She mentions several times that wise women act through men (\textit{Supp.} 40-41; 297-300). Yet when Theseus comes upon her and asks her what is going on, she tells him to ask the chorus of suppliant women, not Adrastus (\textit{Supp.} 109). When Adrastus fails to persuade Theseus to aid him, Aethra, again not acting through men, takes charge and persuades Theseus to help. Indeed, Aethra adopts the masculine role in this episode, ceding the feminine one to Adrastus – who is continually being feminized throughout the drama.\textsuperscript{273}

As the leader of the Argive army, as the king of Argos, the shrouded and weeping Adrastus (\textit{Supp.} 112) is not at all what we expect. Our first impression of him is much like our first impression of Hecuba in \textit{Trojan Women}: a prostrate figure weeping for the dead. Like Hecuba, Adrastus has not died with the men. Hecuba, as a woman, has been kept alive and sold into slavery. Although Adrastus was not captured, he failed to die alongside the men, and now weeps alongside the women. He is not allowed to go with Theseus to reclaim the bodies. Theseus tells him not to speak to the herald or to mix his words with Theseus'.\textsuperscript{274} He is, in many ways, forced to become the sort of man Zethus accuses his brother Amphion of being in the agon in \textit{Antiope}. Although Adrastus' lack of involvement in the manly affairs of the tragedy is not due to a love for the arts, his

\textsuperscript{272} Burian 1985, 135.
\textsuperscript{273} See Mendelsohn 2002, 149-151.
\textsuperscript{274} \textit{Supp.} 513-515.
inability to take part effectively relegates him to an effeminate status. In spite of all this, however, the king of Argos still manages to exude a great deal of dignity and nobility.

Although he is constantly being insulted by Theseus, the Theban herald, and even the messenger, Adrastus manages to respond to these insults with equanimity. His response to Theseus’ initial refusal is extremely dignified, and it casts Theseus’ rudeness into sharp relief. He also proves himself willing to shame himself for the sake of his people when he says

\[
\text{ὁ δὴ γε πολλοὺς ὀλὲσε στρατηλάτας.} \\
\text{άλλ᾽, ὦ καθ’ Ἑλλάδ᾽ ἀλκιμώτατον κάρα,} \\
\text{ἀναξ Αθηνῶν, ἐν μὲν αἰσχύναις ἔχω} \\
\text{πίτυνων πρὸς οὔδας γόνυ σὸν ἄμπισχειν χερί,} \\
\text{πολιὸς ἀνὴρ τύραννος εὐδαίμον πάρος:} \\
\text{ὅμως δ᾽ ἀνάγκη συμφοραῖς εἰκείν ἐμαῖς.} \\
\text{σῶσον νεκροὺς μοι, τάμα τ᾽ οἰκτίρας κακὰ} \\
\text{καὶ τῶν θανόντων τάσδε μητέρας τέκνων}
\]

But, oh king of Athens whose prowess is supreme throughout Greece, although I hold it shameful to fall to the ground and clasp your knees with my hands, a gray-haired old man who was previously a blessed king, yet I am nevertheless compelled to yield to my calamities. Save the dead for me, and pity both my sufferings and these mothers of dead sons…

(\textit{Supp.} 163-69)

Indeed, his gratitude to Theseus at the end of the play is equaled in nobility only by Theseus’ response. And even here Euripides “pulls the rug out from under us,” for when both Adrastus and Theseus have come to peaceful terms of their own accord, Athena shows up on stage and, if I may be so bold, ruins everything. Theseus has become a man
and much better leader than the one at the beginning of the play, Adrastus has reclaimed his dignity and his dead, and the bloody cycle of war seems to have been halted by Theseus when he chose not to sack Thebes and merely return with the dead bodies. Athena, in her speech, puts Adrastus back into a subservient role (1184-90), commands Theseus to return to the suspicion of Adrastus he harboured at the beginning of the play (1190-95), and finally, restarts the cycle of war by telling the sons of the Seven that they will ‘avenge’ their fathers and sack Thebes themselves (1213-25). The son of Adrastos, not he himself, shall be the one to lead the expedition. Almost, we are right back to where we were at the beginning of the play. Conacher mourns this final command of Athena to the young sons of the fallen Argives, saying that this vengeance runs “counter to the thought” of the rest of the play. At every turn we are invited to realize and accept that the Argives have only received what is just in their punishment from the gods, even the suppliant mothers refusing revenge. Suppliant Women is constantly undercutting itself, leaving us feeling extremely uneasy throughout the drama. Conacher says it best when he writes, “Athena’s pronouncements [at the end of the play] cap the latent irony in this play’s treatment of the just and kindly gods.” If the play was indeed produced in a trilogy with Antiope, it is undercut yet again (and most likely vice versa). What is right and what is wrong becomes even grayer. Should Theseus have gotten involved? According to the hero of Antiope and one of the “villains” of Suppliant Women, he should not have.

277 ibid.
278 ibid.
v) Adrastus’ Funeral Oration.

If the comparison of the two arguments between the Theban Herald and Theseus, and Amphion and Zethus were not enough to confuse us about the dramatist’s intentions, a comparison of a few of Zethus’ arguments against his brother to Adrastus’ funeral oration over the dead Seven most certainly will be. What Adrastus praises in the dead men is almost verbatim praised by Zethus. Consider Adrastus’ eulogy for Hippomedon:

\[ \text{ὁ δ’ αὖ τρίτος τῶν} \ 'Ιππομέδων τοιόσδ’ ἔφυς,}
\[ \text{παῖς ὁν ἐτόλμησ’ εὐθὺς οὐ πρὸς ἡδονάς}
\[ \text{Μουσών τραπέζας πρὸς τὸ μάλθακὸν βίου,}
\[ \text{ἀγροὺς δὲ ναίον, σκληρὰ τῇ φύσει διδοῦς}
\[ \text{ἔχαιρε πρὸς τάνδρεῖον, ἐς τ’ ἀγρας ἰόν}
\[ \text{ὑποὶς τε χαίρουν τόξα τ’ ἐντείνον χερῶν,}
\[ \text{πόλει παρασχεῖν σώμα χρήσιμον θέλων.}

The third of these, Hippomedon, was like this: starting right from childhood, he had strength of mind to avoid the Muses’ pleasures and the soft life. No, living in the country he loved to subject his nature to harsh training so that he would achieve manliness, both going to the hunt and loving to ride and bending his bow in his hands, wishing to make his body useful to the city.

(Supp. 881-887)

Compare this description of Hippomedon to the following fragment spoken by Zethus:

\[ \text{ἀνήρ γὰρ ὅστις εὗ βίον κεκτημένος}
\[ \text{τὰ μὲν κατ’ οἶκους ἀμελία παρεῖς ἡμῖν,}
\[ \text{μολπαῖσι δ’ ἡσθεῖς τοῦτ’ ἂεὶ ἐπικόλουθοι,}
\[ \text{ἀγρός μὲν οἶκοι κἂν πόλει γενήσεται,}
\[ \text{φιλοσκόπῳ δ’ οὔδείς· ἡ φύσις γὰρ ὀίχεται,}
\[ \text{ὅταν γλυκείας ἡδονῆς ἦσσων τις ἦ.}

A man who possesses a good livelihood but neglects matters in his own house and lets them slip, and from his pleasure in singing pursues this all the time, will become idle at home and in his city, and a nobody for those close to him: a
man’s nature is lost and gone when overcome by pleasure’s sweetness.
(fr. 187)

Central to Adrastus’ praise of each fallen soldier is that they were all active in war and politics, and moderate in their behavior. Capaneus did not glut himself on his own wealth and he treated his fellow citizens as equals. Eteocles worked hard and did not accept charity from his friends, disliking anyone who harmed his city. Hippomedon, as we have seen already, trained his body so that it was useful to the city, while Parthenopaeus, though a foreigner to Argos by birth, took an active role in its military and treated his adopted city as his home. All of them are great by virtue of the very things Zethus praises in Antiope. Indeed Tydeus, considered the greatest villain of the Seven in Greek myth outside of Suppliant Women, most notably in Aeschylus’ Septem, fits Zethus’ descriptions of a virtuous man most of all.279 For Tydeus found his art in warfare (Supp. 906),280 he was ambitious rather than passive (Supp. 907), and he did not waste his time in idle talk but in action (Supp. 908).281

These men are all guilty of shunning the very things that Amphion in Antiope thinks of utmost importance. They are the “Zethus extreme” that does not learn moderation.282 For although the twins in Antiope begin the play arguing their own cases, there is evidence in the speech made by Hermes that they must compromise with each other, and allow that both sides are important, for they cannot build Thebes without each

280 This line may have been a later addition to Supp.
282 Note how far reading these two plays together has taken us from G. Zuntz’s early observation that “the dead warriors are presented as representatives of the values upheld by Athens” (Zuntz 1955, 16).
other. With the *Antiope* as a background to *Suppliant Women*, and to Adrastus’ funeral oration, his praise of these men almost becomes an inadvertent insult. These men never learned moderation, they never learned how to reconcile their “manliness” with the virtues Amphion proves are equally important. Therefore, although we are surprised by Adrastus’ praise of the Seven – as traditionally they were great villains – this praise becomes double edged in light of the *Antiope*. They dared too far,\(^{283}\) and just as both Amphion and the Theban herald warn, they “stumbled” in consequence.

\(^{283}\) See fr. 194 and *Supp.* 509-510.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

Reading *Antiope* and *Suppliant Women* together provides new insight into our interpretations of both plays. Even if my arguments that they were produced together in a trilogy do not entirely convince, reading the plays together quite clearly has merit. Despite there being only a few hundred lines left of *Antiope*, the connection existing between the two plays is uncanny. And indeed, I believe that when read together, the possibility of a Theban trilogy adds an entirely new dimension to our understanding of *Suppliant Women* and *Antiope*. The agones of both plays are not merely irrelevant tangents but extremely important discussions that hang over the remainder of both plays. Their lack of resolution highlights that *Suppliant Women* is not merely a piece of Athenian propaganda, and they at no point in time clearly decide on any issues they bring up. Rather, the drama highlights just how fragile our understanding of human virtue is, and how what seems good in some situations is disastrous in others. And even, with *Antiope* in mind, how what sounds good in the mouth of one man sounds evil in the mouth of another.

Euripides is quite capable of contrasting themes in dramas that were produced years apart. Helen, for example, is given two very different personalities in *Trojan Women* (415 B.C.) and *Helen* (412 B.C.). In the former play, Helen is the epitome of a “bad” woman, guilty of the worst kind of μοιχεία, and responsible for the death of hundreds. She feels no remorse, and takes no responsibility. In *Helen*, however, Euripides succeeds in taking one of the most notorious women in Greek myth and turning her into an absolute paragon of virtue. Far from being an adulteress, she is instead virtuously
awaiting rescue in Egypt from her husband, Menelaus, as she wards off the advances of an Egyptian prince. And yet, despite the differences in characters, in both tragedies we still find a Helen who takes no responsibility for the Trojan War. As we explored in Chapter 6, there are also similar themes between *Suppliant Women* and *Trojan Women*. The most striking similarity between the two tragedies is undoubtedly the characterizations of Adrastus and Hecuba. Both are defeated, dressed in rags, and lead a chorus of mourning women. Both are silent characters laying prostrated on stage during the prologues. And both maintain an awesome sense of dignity throughout the tragedies despite their respective situations.

I think it is also clear, however, that the similarities between *Antiope* and *Suppliant Women* are far subtler than the ones between *Trojan Women* and *Helen*. The effect of the constant reversals and contradictions would only have been apparent to its ancient audience if the plays were produced together, but when produced together, would have produced a very powerful effect indeed. The cave in Eleutherae provides the trilogy with a tangible beginning and ending, but while Hermes calls for an end to violence in *Antiope*, Athena’s speech at the end of *Suppliant Women* calls for an end to peace. Nothing is certain when the plays are read together, and they evoke each other quite powerfully.

It is my belief that further scholarship on Storey’s proposed second position tragedy and satyr play, *Erectheus* and *Autolycus*, would continue to provide more insight into *Antiope* and *Suppliant Women*. Storey has pointed out similarities between
Erectheus’ and Suppliant Women’s view on just and unjust battles,\textsuperscript{284} not to mention the continued theme of a distrust of ξένοι.\textsuperscript{285} The three plays also deal with family, and the relationships between parents, sons, and in the case of Erectheus, daughters.\textsuperscript{286} Autolycus, as Storey also has pointed out, includes a famous denunciation of the athlete,\textsuperscript{287} connecting with Zethus and the agon in Antiope.\textsuperscript{288} Although I am conscious that I have neglected to study Erectheus’ and Autolycus’ place in this Theban trilogy in favour of giving a more thorough treatment of Antiope, I remain confident that further study on these plays will, at the very least, continue to provide more insight into all the tragedies in question.

\textsuperscript{286} Storey, 2008, 3-4.
\textsuperscript{287} fr. 282.
\textsuperscript{288} Storey 2008, 7.
Map 1
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