ILIAD AND *AETHIOPIS* ON THE STAGE: AESCHYLUS AND SON

Aeschylus, according to a famous report, described his tragedies as 'cuts from Homer's great banquets'.[1] The anecdote has the ring of truth, particularly as 'Homer' here must include the Epic Cycle, which would hardly have been possible after the fifth century; and there is an obvious source from which Athenaeus might have taken the story, the *Ἐπιδημίαι* of Ion of Chios, which he cites in three other places. This work had the character of a personal memoir describing notable Athenian statesmen, poets, and philosophers whom Ion had known. The emphasis was on their personalities as revealed in their public speeches and private conversation. One of Athenaeus' quotations from it is about Sophocles, and we know from other evidence that as a young man Ion had met Aeschylus too.[2] The anecdote would have been perfectly in place in such a book.

In any case it makes good sense, seeing that the Trojan Cycle provided the subject matter for many of the plays in the Aeschylean canon:

(*Cypria*)	*Τήλεφος, Μυσοί, Ἰφιγένεια, Παλαμήδης, *Κύκνος.*[3]
(*Iliad*)	*Μυρμιδόνες, Κᾶρες* (= *Εὐρώπη*), *Φρύγες* (= *Ἕκτορος λύτρα*).
(*Aethiopis*)	*Μέμνων, Ψυχοστασία, Νηρῆιδες* (see below).
(*Little Iliad*)	*Ὅπλων κρίσις, Θρῆισσαι, Φιλοκτήτης.*
(*Nostoi*)	*Ἀγαμέμνων, Χοηφόροι, Σαλαμίνιαι.*
(*Odyssey*)	*Πρωτεύς* (σάτυροι), *Κίρκη* (σάτυροι), *Ψυχαγωγοί, Πηνελόπη, ?Ὀστολόγοι.*

It will be noticed that two of the Cyclic poems are not represented in the list. The absence of the *Telegony* is not very surprising: it offered only one suitable theme for tragedy, the death of Odysseus at his son's hands, which Sophocles took up for his *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*. It is possible, of course, that the poem did not become known at Athens until late in Aeschylus' life or after his death. More remarkable is his failure to dramatize any episode from the *Iliou Persis*, which supplied Sophocles with material for four plays (*Laokoon, Sinon, Aias Lokros, Polyxena*).

A number of the Aeschylean titles are easily combined in trilogies, for example:

1. *Τήλεφος, Ἰφιγένεια, Παλαμήδης* (Zieliński);
2. *Ὅπλων κρίσις, Θρῆισσαι, Σαλαμίνιαι* (Welcker, Hermann), or perhaps *Φιλοκτήτης* as the third;

My thanks to an anonymous referee for pointing out some places where my argument needed tightening up.

[1] Ath. 347e . . . *τὸ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ λαμπροῦ Αἰσχύλου, ὃς τὰς αὑτοῦ τραγωιδίας τεμάχη εἶναι ἔλεγεν τῶν Ὁμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων*. There follows the story that after a defeat in the competition he said he dedicated his tragedies to Time; for this Athenaeus names his source as Theophrastus or Chamaeleon, *Περὶ ἡδονῆς*.

[2] Plut. *De prof. in virtute* 79e = Ion, *FGrHist* 392 F 22, probably also from the *Ἐπιδημίαι*. On Ion's life and writings, cf. my paper in *BICS* 32 (1985), 71–8.

[3] This play, if it existed at all, might be identical with the *Μυσοί*; cf. W. Schadewaldt, *Hermes* 71 (1936), 39–40 = *Hellas und Hesperien* (Zürich–Stuttgart, 1970), 1.323.

3. *Ψυχαγωγοί, Πηνελόπη, ?'Οστολόγοι* (Wecklein), with *Κίρκη* as the satyr-play (Wilamowitz).[4]

There is broad agreement at least on the assumption of an Achilles trilogy and a Memnon trilogy, and it is with these that the present paper is concerned.

Discussion has usually focused on the contents of the individual plays and the structure of the trilogies. I shall grapple with those matters, but I shall also be addressing what has not hitherto been recognized as a problem: the question whether all the plays were genuinely by Aeschylus. I shall not query the authenticity of any of those making up the Achilles trilogy, though I shall assign the *Nereides* to a different place in it from the conventional one. I will argue, however, that Aeschylus left the Memnon trilogy uncompleted, and that his son Euphorion filled it out with his own work.

Aeschylus had two sons, Euphorion (named after Aeschylus' father) and Euaion. Both were active as tragic poets. Euphorion, at least, was competent enough to defeat both Sophocles and Euripides in the Dionysia of 431. It is reported of him in the *Suda* that on four occasions he won victories with tragedies of his father's that had not previously been produced:

Εὐφορίων, υἱὸς Αἰσχύλου τοῦ τραγικοῦ, Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικὸς καὶ αὐτός· ὃς καὶ τοῖς Αἰσχύλου τοῦ πατρός, οἷς μήπω ἦν ἐπιδειξάμενος, τετράκις ἐνίκησεν. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ οἰκεῖα.

As it was usual to enter three tragedies and a satyr play at each competition, Euphorion would appear to have had a remarkably large number of unperformed plays of Aeschylus at his disposal. That stirs misgivings. Why should Aeschylus have written so many plays that never reached the stage?

This is, as I have argued elsewhere,[5] the key to the problem of the *Prometheus Desmotes*, a play whose Aeschylean authorship was uncontested in antiquity but which, by various technical and dramaturgical criteria, diverges from Aeschylus' manner in so many ways that it cannot be accepted as his work. It appears by these criteria not to have been written until fifteen or twenty years after his death—just when Euphorion was active in the theatre. There is only one feasible solution to the riddle, and it really is a simple solution. Euphorion composed the play himself, together with the *Prometheus Lyomenos*, which is inseparably connected with the *Desmotes*, and probably a third play to make up a trilogy. But he produced these plays under his father's name, perhaps to create a favourable prejudice among the judges.

If he did this once, must we not suspect that the same was the case with at least some of the four victories that he won with previously unknown plays of his father's? He might on occasion have juxtaposed genuine plays of Aeschylus with new ones of his own to make up tetralogies, just as he probably followed his Prometheus trilogy with the genuine Aeschylean satyr play *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*. In any case the suspicion must be that he presented a number of his own works as plays of Aeschylus, and that they were subsequently preserved under Aeschylus' name, to become known to us in the form of titles and fragments. When we study the fragmentary plays, therefore, we ought to be on our guard against the possibility of spurious pieces. There is a double criterion at our disposal: divergence from Aeschylean technique, and similarity with the style and technique of the *Prometheus Desmotes*.

[4] See the conspectus of trilogy reconstructions in S. Radt, *TrGF* 3 (Göttingen, 1985), 111–19.

[5] M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), 67–72.

We have six titles of Aeschylean tragedies based on episodes from the *Iliad* and *Aethiopis*. Three of them were concerned with Achilles, one with Sarpedon, and two with Memnon. That the three Achilles plays made up a trilogy, as usually assumed, is indeed highly probable. That the two Memnon plays belonged together is equally likely and equally uncontroversial. There is less agreement over the identity of a third play that might have stood with them.

THE ACHILLES PLAYS

I begin with the Achilles plays.[6] In first place stood the *Myrmidones*. Its title refers to Achilles' followers, who formed the chorus. The action can largely be reconstructed. The scene was the Greek camp. At the start of the play Achilles sat silent, in his cabin but visible to the audience.[7] The chorus entered, addressing him in anapaests, which led on to lyrics.[8] The military situation was desperate: the Myrmidons wanted to know why Achilles still kept himself aloof and gave no assistance. He remained silent. Then came emissaries from Agamemnon. Odysseus, perhaps, made a speech, to which Achilles again gave no reply. Later Phoenix appealed to him; he finally obtained a response (F 132b), but probably a negative one. In the next scene a new character appeared—perhaps Patroclus (Schadewaldt) or Eurypylus—to report that the Trojans were now closing in and had set fire to a ship (F 134). Achilles could delay no longer. He sent Patroclus off to fight, no doubt with the instructions that we know from the *Iliad*, that he should drive the enemy away from the ships but not pursue them further. The chorus must have sung and danced again, after which Antilochus arrived with the grim news that Patroclus, after heroic feats of arms, had fallen.[9] Presently the body was brought in, and the laments of Achilles and the Myrmidons brought the play to an end.[10]

There can be no doubt about the authenticity of the *Myrmidones*. The language and the metre of the fragments are entirely in accord with Aeschylus' style, as is the structure of the play, which is reconstructed with reasonable certainty. There is, moreover, a series of vase paintings which show the grieving Achilles with his head

[6] On these see in general F. G. Welcker, *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus* (Darmstadt, 1824), 415–30; G. Hermann, *Opuscula* 5.136–63; O. Ribbeck, *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik* (Leipzig, 1875), 349ff.; C. Robert, *Bild und Lied* (Berlin, 1881), 129–42; N. Wecklein, *SBAW* (1891), 327ff.; L. Croiset, *RÉG* 7 (1894), 151ff.; L. Séchan, *Études sur la Tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique* (Paris, 1926), 52ff., 114ff.; W. Schadewaldt, *Hermes* 71 (1936), 25–69 = *Hellas und Hesperien* (Stuttgart–Zürich, 1970), 1.308–54; B. Döhle, 'Die "Achilleis" des Aischylos in ihrer Auswirkung auf die attische Vasenmalerei des 5. Jahrhunderts', *Klio* 49 (1967), 63–149; O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), 196, n. 2; A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari, 1996), 338–48.

[7] *εἴσω κλισίας*, F 131. 3.

[8] F 132; cf. Ar. *Ran.* 914.

[9] Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 1040–1. Aeschylus might have quoted *Il.* 18.20 *κεῖται Πάτροκλος* as the first half of a trimeter.

[10] Besides the fragments collected in Radt's edition in *TrGF*, those of Accius' *Myrmidones* and perhaps of his *Epinausimache* deserve notice (O. Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 3rd edn [Leipzig, 1897], 1.158–60, 204–7; Robert [n. 6], 133–40). See also Wilamowitz, *Aischylos. Interpretationen* (Berlin, 1914), 245; W. Schadewaldt, *Hermes* 71 (1936), 25–60 (= *Hellas u. Hesperien*, 1.308ff.); B. Snell, *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen* (Berlin, 1971),1ff.; O. Taplin, *HSCP* 76 (1972), 62–75; id., *Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 196, n. 2, 423; B. Gredley in J. Redmond (ed.), *Drama and the Actor* (Cambridge, 1984), 8–10.

covered; they begin around 490, and have been persuasively interpreted as showing the influence of Aeschylus' drama.[11]

Since Welcker and Hermann it has been commonly assumed that the second play in the trilogy was the *Nereides*. The Nereids who formed its chorus had evidently come up on shore under the leadership of Thetis. In the *Iliad* this happens only once, when Achilles laments Patroclus (18.65–9). Achilles there tells his mother that he is now desirous of returning to battle to avenge his friend's death on Hector. She points out that he has lost his armour and weapons; she promises to bring him a new set, and after visiting Hephaestus she does so. It has been supposed that this was the starting-point for the *Nereides*. The play would have contained the delivery of the new weapons, the reconciliation with Agamemnon, and as its climax the killing of Hector.

There are difficulties in this hypothesis. The action of the play must all have taken place at Achilles' cabin, as the Nereids cannot be imagined to move inland. Hector could not have appeared there while still alive. The climax of the play, then, would have been the death of a hero who had not been seen on the stage at all. His body could certainly have been brought in, but how were the Nereids to react? With joyful dances round the corpse? An odd sort of tragedy that would have been. Or like the women in *Choephoroi*, suddenly struck by doubt and foreboding for the hero? That might be conceivable if the following play was to contain Achilles' death. But everyone who makes the *Nereides* the second play of the trilogy makes the *Phryges* the third. Hector's body and Nereids do not go together. It is hard to envisage his death being treated on the tragic stage otherwise than from the Trojan point of view.

I believe rather that the second play of the trilogy was the *Phryges*. Its subject matter was taken from *Iliad* 24: Priam's nocturnal visit to Achilles to pay ransom for his son's body. The spectators would have understood at once, and without surprise, that the battle in which Hector was killed had fallen in the interval between the two plays. A parallel is provided by the Danaid trilogy, where, it is assumed, a battle took place in the interval between the *Supplices* and the *Aigyptioi* and the Argive king Pelasgos was killed.[12] The murder of Aegyptus' sons by their brides will similarly have been accomplished between the second play, the *Aigyptioi*, and the third, the *Danaides*.[13]

The scene of action in the *Phryges* was the same as in the *Myrmidones*, Achilles' cabin, but this time the chorus consisted of 'Phrygians', that is, Trojans accompanying Priam (in contrast to the Homeric account where he went with a single herald). They did not enter at the very beginning: first came a prologue in which Hermes appeared and informed Achilles of the gods' decision that Hector must be given up for burial. Achilles had a short dialogue with the god, who then departed. Priam and the chorus entered. The chorus sang a parodos in many strophes, with varied dance movements designed to characterize them as barbarians.[14] Achilles meanwhile sat veiled and silent.

[11] Döhle (n. 6), esp. 95ff. My anonymous referee objects that if the vases are really so early, and reflect Aeschylus, this famous trilogy must have failed to win the prize, since Aeschylus' first victory is dated to 484. But many famous plays—*Oedipus Tyrannus* for example—failed to win. In any case, does anyone trust vase datings to within five years, even so close to the 480 destruction layer?

[12] A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy* (Cambridge, 1969), 197–8, 203; H. Friis Johansen and E. W. Whittle, *Aeschylus. The Suppliants* (Copenhagen, 1980), 1.50; R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1983), 57, 61–2; West (n. 5), 169.

[13] Garvie (n. 12), 196–7; Johansen and Whittle (n. 12), 50–1; Winnington-Ingram (n. 12), 57–8; West (n. 5), 170.

[14] Cf. Ar. fr. 696: (Aeschylus speaking) *τοῖσι χοροῖς αὐτὸς τὰ σχήματ' ἐποίουν . . .* (Interlocutor) *τοὺς Φρύγας οἶδα θεωρῶν, | ὅτε τῶι Πριάμωι συλλυσόμενοι τὸν παῖδ' ἦλθον*

After the choral songs Priam addressed him. It may be conjectured that the chorus supported his appeal with short, interposed strophes, symmetrically arranged, in that form characteristic of Aeschylus' earlier plays, the epirrhematic syzygy.[15] Achilles still declined to speak. But in the end—perhaps after a stasimon—he must have answered and given his consent to accept the ransom and release Hector. After a further choral song (I would suppose) the body was brought on to the stage, if it had not been lying there in view from the start, and also a large pair of scales, for in Aeschylus' version (inspired by *Il.* 22.351) Priam had to pay out his son's weight in gold. The weighing out of the gold until it balanced the body invested the climactic scene of the play with a rare splendour. It is obvious what must have formed the final scene: the departure of the funeral procession, accompanying itself with lyric lamentations.[16]

If the *Phryges* was the second play, how did the trilogy continue? What could follow? The action of the *Iliad* is completed, apart from the return of Hector's body to Troy and his funeral; but not the story of Achilles. One great tragic event is still to come: the death of the hero, narrated in the *Aethiopis* but already casting its shadow over the *Iliad*. This was, surely, the natural conclusion for Aeschylus' *Achilleis*. We know that he wrote a play on the subject, for there is a fragment, unfortunately quoted without a title, in which Thetis laments her son's death (F 350). We may suppose it to come from the *Nereides*.[17] Already in the *Aethiopis* the Nereids had come out of the sea with Thetis to lament Achilles.[18] So it was a natural idea to introduce a chorus of Nereids in a play dealing with his death.

From one of the few fragments quoted from this play (F 150) we learn that the Nereids made an anapaestic entry. As to the rest of the action, it may be reconstructed with some plausibility following the structural principles characteristic of Aeschylean tragedy. Thetis arrived with the other Nereids, as their leader and also as the first speaking character after the parodos, just like Danaos in the *Supplices*.[19] Achilles was, of course, still alive. The setting was again at his cabin, as in the two preceding plays. In the first scene Thetis will have spoken to him and warned him of his imminent death.[20] But he will have been just as willing to embrace it, just as set on his course, as Eteocles in the *Septem*. Following this dialogue he must have gone off to fight his last battle. That brought the scene to an end, and the Nereids sang in sorrowful foreboding, perhaps in amoebaean lyrics with Thetis. Then came the news that confirmed what everyone was expecting. More lamentations were sung, after which the body was brought back, probably by Ajax, to whom the tradition assigned this important role. He must have related the course of the battle, not omitting to report or at least surmise Apollo's involvement;[21] Thetis names Apollo as the god who has killed her son (F 350.8).

τεθνεῶτα, | πολλὰ τοιαυτὶ καὶ τοιαυτὶ καὶ δεῦρο σχηματίσαντας; W. Kranz, *Stasimon* (Berlin, 1933), 147.

[15] Cf. West (n. 5), 14–15.

[16] Besides the Greek fragments and testimonia, cf. those of the *Hectoris Lutra* of Ennius (Ribbeck [n. 10], 1.37–40; *Trag.* 156ff. Vahlen, 149ff. Jocelyn); also Wilamowitz (n. 10), 245–6; Schadewaldt (n. 10), 61–8; Taplin, *Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 430.

[17] Welcker (n. 6), 436–7, already guessed that the *Nereides* dealt with the death of Achilles, and he attributed F 350 to this play, which, however, he put in the Memnon trilogy.

[18] Proclus; cf. *Od.* 24.47, 58–9; Quint. Smyrn. 3.582ff. See further C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* 3 (Berlin, 1923), 1193.

[19] For the typology, cf. West (n. 5), 13–14.

[20] Cf. Proclus' summary of the *Aethiopis*, καὶ Θέτις τῷι παιδὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα προλέγει.

[21] Cf. Proclus, τρεψάμενος δὲ Ἀχιλλεὺς τοὺς Τρῶας καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλιν συνεισπεσὼν ὑπὸ

Aeschylus could end a tragedy simply with sung laments. But in this case the *Aethiopis* supplied him with something more exalted, a sublime conclusion to the story of Achilles. Thetis had carried the body away to the White Island, the abode of the Blessed. That Achilles lived there or in Elysium was a widespread notion in Aeschylus' time.[22] For a poet who must often have sung the skolion

φίλταθ' Ἁρμόδι', οὔ τί πω τέθνηκας,
νήσοις δ' ἐν μακάρων σέ φασιν εἶναι,
ἵνα περ ποδώκης Ἀχιλεύς (PMG 894)

the happy ending was the obvious option. The mother took her son's body into her care,[23] while her sisters returned to their watery abode.

We have traced the outlines of a perhaps rather monochrome but genuinely Aeschylean trilogy. (A satyr-play cannot be identified.) It was an early work, if its influence is rightly seen in the vase-paintings with the veiled Achilles, which begin, as mentioned above, about 490 or not long after. It is in accord with an early dating that these plays, so far as can be seen, required neither a *skene* (Achilles was in his cabin yet on stage, he did not have to come out of a door) nor more than two actors.[24] The *Phryges* must have been staged again in the later fifth century, as Aristophanes can assume that people have seen the Phrygians' dances.[25] In at least four plays, starting with the *Peace*, he also alludes to the *Myrmidones*.[26] So the whole trilogy may have been performed not long before. Euphorion or his brother had perhaps arranged a revival.

THE MEMNON PLAYS

We have two titles of Aeschylean plays concerned with Memnon: *Memnon* and *Psychostasia*. Some older scholars (Butler, Welcker, Nitzsch) thought they might be the same play, but there is no reason to suppose so. As Hermann pointed out, they are listed separately in the transmitted catalogue of Aeschylus' dramas.[27]

About the first we have not much information. According to Aristophanes Aeschylus frightened his audiences Κύκνους ποιῶν καὶ Μέμνονας κωδωνοφαλαροπώλους; so they had seen a Memnon who entered the theatre in his chariot, wearing imposing armour.[28] In the epic *Aethiopis* he had worn a panoply made by Hephaestus, and Aeschylus wanted to do justice to this. But was Aristophanes thinking of the *Memnon* or the *Psychostasia*? Memnon certainly appeared in both. If we accept the usual assumption that they belonged together in one trilogy, we can infer that the *Psychostasia*, which dealt with the Ethiopian hero's death, came after the *Memnon*. It was presumably his initial appearance in the prior play that made such a great

Πάριδος ἀναιρεῖται καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος; Apollod. epit. 5.3 διώξας δὲ καὶ τοὺς Τρῶας πρὸς ταῖς Σκαιαῖς πύλαις τοξεύεται ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος εἰς τὸ σφυρόν.

[22] Cf. Robert (n. 18), 1194–5; H. Hommel, *Der Gott Achilleus* (*Sitzb. d. Heidelb. Akad.*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1980. 1), 13, 18.

[23] F 153 λεπτὸς δὲ σινδὼν ἀμφιβαλλέσθω χροΐ, an instruction to wrap a body up in a fine cloth, probably stood in this context.

[24] The pleaders in the *Myrmidones* may have appeared successively rather than together.

[25] Fr. 696, quoted in n. 14.

[26] Ar. *Pax* 1177; *Av.* 800, 807, 1256?; *Ran.* 911–15, 932, 992, 1041, 1264–77; *Eccl.* 932–3.

[27] Hermann, *Opuscula* 7.345.

[28] Ar. *Ran.* 963; Taplin, *Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 43, 422.

impression on the spectators. It may even have determined the title by which the play was known.

What was the subject of the *Memnon*, if his defeat by Achilles was reserved for the *Psychostasia*? Hermann and Wilamowitz supposed, not unreasonably, that it portrayed his temporary success before he encountered Achilles, success that culminated in his killing of Antilochus when the young man came to the rescue of his father Nestor.[29] This offstage event may indeed have formed the climax of the drama. However, the dialogue of the earlier scenes must have had other springs. At least one important episode, if I am not mistaken, was concerned with the exotic warrior's arrival at Troy and his identification as a kinsman of Priam. We seem to have a remnant of it in F 300 (fab. inc.):

γένος μὲν αἰνεῖν ἐκμαθὼν ἐπίσταμαι
Αἰθιοπίδος γῆς, Νείλος ἔνθ' ἑπτάρροος
†γαῖαν κυλίνδει πνευμάτων ἐπομβρίαι†,
ἐν ᾗ πυρωπὸν †μηνὸς† ἐκλάμψας χθόνα
τήκει πετραίαν χιόνα, πᾶσα δ' εὐθαλής
Αἴγυπτος ἀγνοῦ νάματος πληρουμένη
φερέσβιον Δήμητρος ἀντέλλει στάχυν.

The speaker, probably Priam himself, is interrogating the newcomer and has learned that he is a native of Ethiopia; he finds no fault with that, but awaits further clarification. Memnon will have gone on to explain that he was the son of Tithonus, whom Eos had carried off from Troy to her radiant East, and thus the nephew of Priam. There is a striking parallel with Danaos' return from Egypt to Argos, the land of his ancestress Io, and the questioning of his dusky daughters by Pelasgos (*Suppl.* 234ff.). The Egyptian geography and meteorology in the fragment make a further link with that play (cf. *Suppl.* 559–61). Aeschylus, then, represented Memnon as arriving at Troy of his own accord, not in response to an appeal from Priam as in some later versions.[30] He came, apparently, not direct from Ethiopia but from Susa, where he had established his kingdom.[31] 'So war die Handlung zugleich ein mythisches Spiegelbild der Schlacht von Marathon.'[32]

There is no question about the authenticity of this play. Chariot entries were especially characteristic of Aeschylus.[33] If Bergk was right in assigning to the *Memnon* the verse κυρεῖν παρασχὼν ἱταμαῖς κυσὶν ἀεροφοίτοις quoted in the *Frogs* (1291), which the scholiast wrongly attributes to the *Agamemnon*, then the play contained a choral song in genuinely Aeschylean metre.[34] The interrogation scene shows a

[29] Hermann, *Opuscula* 7.347; Wilamowitz (n. 10), 59, n. 1, 'Notwendig gehört zu der Psychostasie der Memnon, und dem Tode des Helden mußte sein erfolgreiches Eingreifen in den Kampf vorhergehen, vielleicht der Tod des Antilochos.' For the Antilochus episode, cf. *Od.* 4.187–8; Pind. *Pyth.* 6.28ff.; Robert (n. 18), 1181. A number of vase paintings show Achilles and Memnon fighting over Antilochus' body.

[30] Ctesias, *FGrHist* 688 F 1 pp. 441–2 J. (Diod. 2.22.2), echoed by Pl. *Leg.* 685c, Cephalion, *FGrHist* 93 F 1 p. 441 J. In Quint. Smyrn. 2.27ff. Priam announces to the Trojans that he sent for Memnon some time ago, so that he cannot now be far away; a page or so later he arrives. Although this copies a tragic technique of preparing for a new entry (see Taplin, *Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 137–8), we cannot argue from it to Aeschylus' *Memnon*.

[31] F 405; cf. Paus. 10.31.7; Robert (n. 18), 1183, n. 3.

[32] Robert (n. 18), 1183.

[33] Taplin, *Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 76.

[34] Ar. *Ran.* 1291 = Aesch. F 282; metre ia ʃ4da$_{\wedge}$, like *Ag.* 108/9 (= Ar. *Ran.* 1284/5), 116. For the corruption of *Μέμνων* (as play title) to *Ἀγαμέμνων*, cf. Poll. 4.110 (*ἐν Μέμνονι*, v.l. *ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι*), and the sources for each of Radt's fragments *127–*130.

particular affinity with the *Supplices*. The testimony of Pollux (4.110) that in one scene of the *Memnon* there was a brief intervention from a fourth speaking actor does not argue against Aeschylean authorship, because the same thing happens in the *Choephoroi* (900–2).

The *Psychostasia* had its title from the striking scene in which the Homeric motif of Zeus weighing the destinies of two warriors against one another was transferred to the stage. It is nearly certain that the motif was already used in the *Aethiopis* for Achilles and Memnon. We know that Memnon's mother Eos played a part there: she pleaded with Zeus and obtained immortality for her son. And pre-Aeschylean vase-painters show the weighing of Achilles' and Memnon's souls, usually with Hermes holding the scales;[35] perhaps he held them for Zeus in the *Aethiopis*.

In the play Zeus must have appeared in person, a very exceptional thing in Greek drama. He stood or sat up on high, on the θεολογεῖον,[36] and used his scales to determine the fates of the two heroes. Scholia on the *Iliad* tell us that the δύο κῆρε of the Homeric weighing scenes were interpreted by Aeschylus as ψυχαί.[37] In the vase paintings they are portrayed as tiny, naked figures, either winged or accoutred as warriors with helmet, shield, and spear; in the play they were presumably represented by small boys. The two heroes' divine mothers, Thetis and Eos, stood on either side and each begged Zeus to spare her son. The heavier child stepped into Memnon's scalepan, the lighter into Achilles', and Memnon's went down, dooming him to death.

Plutarch says that Aeschylus made an entire tragedy out of this, but it is hard to believe that the whole play consisted of this one scene. No doubt it was just a 'Vorspiel auf dem Olymp',[38] and the entry of the chorus followed. Welcker conjectured that the chorus consisted of nymphs, half of them on Thetis' side (Nereids), half on Eos' (Horai).[39] More likely they were mortals, as the remaining action of the play must have centred upon the terrestrial battle. As Welcker himself noted, the battle could stand without the scene on Olympus, but not vice versa.[40] One may guess that it was a chorus of Trojans.[41]

When they entered, of course, they did not know how the gods had decided the issue. In the first episode Memnon will have appeared and, ignoring prudent advice, declared his intention of fighting Achilles. After his exit the chorus must have sung in anxious anticipation. Then came someone to report on the course of the battle. Following a choral lament, Memnon's body was borne in on a bier, perhaps by a secondary chorus of his own Ethiopian or Kissian troops. At any rate it is certain that the body was brought on to the stage.[42] For the play had a spectacular closing scene which formed a pendant to the divine prologue. Eos, having persuaded Zeus to grant her son immortality (*Aethiopis*), hoisted him up from the earth with the theatre crane and bore him away. She was evidently still, or again, on the θεολογεῖον, as in the prologue.

[35] Robert (n. 6), 143–6; L. D. Caskey and J. D. Beazley, *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* 3 (Boston, 1963), 44–6; *LIMC* s.vv. Ker and Memnon.

[36] Pollux 4.130.

[37] Sch. *Il.* 8.70, 22.210; the texts are collected and set out by Radt in *TrGF* 3.375.

[38] Wilamowitz (n. 10), 58–9.

[39] Welcker (n. 6), 435. In Quint. Smyrn. 2.593ff. Eos is accompanied by twelve Horai when she comes down from heaven to lament Memnon.

[40] Welcker (n. 6), 434, 'den Kampf konnte man ohne die Scene der Höhe darstellen . . . aber nicht umgekehrt die Psychostasie ohne den Kampf'.

[41] Cf. Wilamowitz (n. 10), 59.

[42] Hermann, *Opuscula* 7.354.

It has sometimes been supposed that this scene stood not in the *Psychostasia* but in the *Memnon*. But our source, Pollux (4.130), cites as an example of the use of the θεολογεῖον the appearance of Zeus and other gods in the *Psychostasia*, and straight afterwards, for the use of the crane, he cites Eos' raising of Memnon's body. He evidently associates the two scenes. In any case the weighing of souls, the death of Memnon, and the translation of his body belong together as three phases of the same action. We may reasonably assume that they formed parts of the same tragedy.

From a dramaturgical point of view this was a remarkable play. Because of its use of the θεολογεῖον and of three actors (Zeus, Thetis, Eos), Wilamowitz dated it to Aeschylus' last years.[43] Taplin goes a step further.[44] He regards the testimonia about the *Psychostasia* as altogether problematic. He points out that the appearance of Zeus in person breaks a rule that otherwise holds for Greek tragedy without exception.[45] He argues convincingly that neither the θεολογεῖον nor the crane was in use during Aeschylus' lifetime. He concludes that Pollux must be describing a Hellenistic production of Aeschylus' play in which spectacular new stage effects were employed, or a late 'extravaganza' modelled on Aeschylus.

I draw a simpler conclusion: the poet of the *Psychostasia*, or at least of its opening and closing scenes, was not Aeschylus but his son Euphorion, the poet of the Prometheus plays. The scenes in question diverge from Aeschylean stage technique in the same direction as the *Prometheus Desmotes* and *Lyomenos*, whose author shows a similar taste for the use of divine characters, and who exploits as no one else does the technical resources of the post-Aeschylean theatre, making a whole chorus enter flying and exit sinking into the earth, letting Oceanus ride through the air on a griffin, and so on. Wilamowitz actually remarked of the crane in the *Psychostasia*, 'the contrivance was of the same sort as Oceanus' bird'.[46] The comparison is all the more significant in that Wilamowitz never took the objections to the authenticity of the *Prometheus* seriously. He might also have referred to another use of the crane in the *Prometheus Lyomenos* (F 200), where the eagle that tormented Prometheus each day flew in and was shot down by Heracles.

The structure of the *Psychostasia*'s prologue points in the same direction. So far as we can see, genuine Aeschylean prologues fall into two categories: they consist either of a monologue by a servant or functionary who makes no further appearance in the play, or of a dialogue between two persons who do play a part later and who are making plans for the subsequent action.[47] In the *Psychostasia* prologue, on the other hand, there were three agents present, all of them gods; two of them represented opposing viewpoints and tried to persuade the third, who then made his decision. This does not fit at all into the Aeschylean typology, but is much more like the prologue of the *Prometheus Desmotes*, where three speaking actors appear together, and a κωφὸν πρόσωπον besides, all four of them gods: two of them dispute about Prometheus' punishment, Hephaestus being sympathetic towards him, Kratos not, but both of them compelled to accept Zeus' command. The third actor, Prometheus, speaks only at

[43] Wilamowitz (n. 10), 246.

[44] Taplin, *Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 431–3.

[45] There is some likelihood that in the *Prometheus Lyomenos* Thetis appeared in flight from Zeus (A. D. Fitton-Brown, *JHS* 79 [1959], 57; M. L. West, *JHS* 99 [1979], 144). But that does not mean that Zeus himself arrived on stage. Hermes may have come on his behalf, as in the *Desmotes*.

[46] Wilamowitz (n. 10), 246, n. 0, 'die Maschine war gleicher Art wie der Vogel des Okeanos'.

[47] West (n. 5), 7–8, cf. 54.

the end of the prologue; perhaps it was similar in the *Psychostasia*, if Zeus pronounced his verdict only after the appeals of Thetis and Eos.[48]

The *Memnon*'s links with the *Supplices* and *Oresteia*, noted above, and its use of three speaking actors and momentarily even a fourth, points to its being a work of Aeschylus' last years. Now we find that its companion piece, the *Psychostasia*, was composed at least partly by his son. The integrity of the putative Aeschylean trilogy[49] is compromised. Did Aeschylus write more than the one play? He must at least have intended to: a play about Memnon at Troy in which he was not killed called for a sequel in which he was.[50] Perhaps he failed to complete a trilogy but did leave a finished play about the death of Memnon, to which his son added the divine prologue with the weighing scene and the final scene with the removal of the body by lifting gear.

THE *EUROPA*

If Aeschylus never wrote a third play, it is pointless to speculate on what it would have been about. It may be more fruitful to try to identify the play that Euphorion put before or after the two Memnon dramas to make up a trilogy.

The likeliest candidate in my view is the *Europa*, alternatively known as *Kares*.[51] It dealt with the death of Sarpedon and his funeral in Lycia or Caria. Both events are related in the *Iliad*, and belong chronologically before Memnon's arrival at Troy. So if the *Europa* had a place in the trilogy presented by Euphorion, it would have been the first play.

Hartung in 1855 divined that its subject was Europa's concern for her son Sarpedon and his death at Troy.[52] This was confirmed to everyone's satisfaction in 1879, when Weil published a papyrus from the early second century B.C. containing twenty-three lines of a tragic speech by Europa, evidently from the prologue of the play. It is wildly corrupt, but the structure and general sense can be made out. Here is a text based (with several modifications) on Radt's and Diggle's:[53]

> ταύρωι τε λειμῶ ξένια †παμποδος παραν†.
> τοιόνδε μὲν Ζεὺς κλέμμα πρεσβύτου πατρός
> αὐτὸς μένων ἄμοχθος ἤνυσεν λαβεῖν.

[48] We can hardly suppose that he held up his scales without saying a word.

[49] Or dilogy, as suggested by Wilamowitz (n. 10), 59, n. 1; *Griechische Tragödien* 4 (Berlin, 1923), 314, n. 2.

[50] The belief that he was not killed in the *Memnon* rests on the premise that the play was at some time produced together with the *Psychostasia*. But no one doubts this.

[51] Already proposed as the first play of the Memnon trilogy by W. Schmid, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* 1.2.189, n. 0, followed by H. J. Mette, *Der verlorene Aischylos* (Berlin, 1963), 108ff.; A. Kossatz-Deissmann, *Dramen des Aischylos auf westgriechischen Vasen* (Mainz, 1978), 74; *contra*, T. Gantz, *CJ* 74 (1979), 303, n. 82. My anonymous referee draws my attention to the coupling of Memnon and Sarpedon as objects of the gods' grief in Ar. *Nub.* 622: 'evidence that Athenians had fairly recently had cause to think of these two heroes and to link them together?'

[52] J. A. Hartung, *Aeschylus' Fragmente* (*Aeschylus' Werke* 8, Leipzig, 1855), 95–6.

[53] P. Didot (Louvre inv. 7172) col. iv 10–v 9; F **99 Radt; J. Diggle, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford, 1998), 16–17. I must refer to their apparatuses for most details of what the papyrus gives in each place and who made sense out of it. Line 1 is the conclusion of a sentence in which the subject seems to have been Europa's father, Phoenix. I interpret the transmitted λιμω as an 'Attic' accusative (λειμῶν Weil); for the end of the line, e.g. πάμβοτον (-ος Weil) πορών (Platt) would do. In 3 I write αὐτός for -του; in 7 and 9 I follow Weil, except in putting γονῆσι rather than -αῖσι (γωνεις pap.); in 10 I adopt Bergk's φιτυμάτων for the papyrus' ψυδευματων, and in 17 an *exempli gratia* supplement by Barrett. In 11 I would favour Μίνω<ν>; at *Cho.* 618 Μίνω is the genitive.

τί οὖν; τὰ πολλὰ κεῖνα διὰ παύρων λέγω.
γυνὴ θεῶι μειχθεῖσα παρθένου σέβας
ἤμειψα, παίδων δ' ἐζύγην ξυνάονι.
καὶ τρισὶ γονῆσι τοὺς γυναικείους πόνους
ἐκαρτέρησ' ἄρουρα, κοὐκ ἐμέμψατο
τὸ μὴ 'ξενεγκεῖν σπέρμα γεν<ν>αί<ου> πατρός.
ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων δ' ἠρξάμην φιτυμάτων
Μίνω τεκοῦσα < >
< >
<τὸν δεύτερον δὲ
Ῥαδάμανθυν, ὅσπερ ἄφθιτος παίδων ἐμῶν,
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν αὐγαῖς ταῖς ἐμαῖς ζόας ἔχει·
τὸ μὴ παρὸν δὲ τέρψιν οὐκ ἔχει φίλοις·
τρίτον δέ, τοῦ νῦν φροντίσιν χειμάζομαι,
Σαρπηδόν', αἰχμὴ μὴ 'ξ Ἄρεως καθίκετο.
κλέο<ς> γὰρ ἥκειν <Ἀσιάδ' εἰς πολύσπορον
ἄνδρας δορυσσοῦς, Ἑλλάδος> λωτίσματα
πάσης, ὑπερφέροντας ἀλκίμοι σθένει,
αὐχεῖν δὲ Τρώων ἄστυ πορθήσειν βίαι·
πρὸς οὓς δέδοικα μή τι μαργαίνων δορί
ἀνυπέρβατον δράσηι τε καὶ πάθηι κακόν.
λεπτὴ γὰρ ἐλπίς, ἡδ' ἐπὶ ξυροῦ μένει
μὴ πάντα παίσασ' ἐκχέω πρὸς ἕρματι.

A paraphrase will suffice. Europa relates how she lay with Zeus and gave birth to three sons: Minos, who is already dead and has a position of honour in Hades; Rhadamanthys, who is immortal but lives in a remote place (*sc.* the Isles of the Blest), so that she no longer has any contact with him; and Sarpedon, who has gone to Troy to fight against the Greek aggressors. She is worried about him: has he perhaps been struck by a spear?

The scene is evidently far from Troy. This being so, the Carian chorus suggests a Carian location; there was at least a mention of Mylasa, the Carian capital (F 101).[54] Europa's anxiety might have been occasioned simply by the fact that her third and last son was now in a place of danger, or she might, as Hartung suggested, have been alarmed by prophecies or dreams, like the Queen in the *Persai*.

It is clear what must have followed. News arrived: initially, perhaps, that Sarpedon had been fighting courageously and with success. But then the word came that he had fallen to Patroclus. The messenger might have described the miracle that we know from the *Iliad*, that Zeus in grief for his son shed drops of blood from the sky. Europa and the Carians broke out in lamentation. Europa may have found it particularly bitter that after losing two sons she would now not even see the body of the third. But then—a *coup de théâtre*: two winged figures appeared, Sleep and Death, bearing the dead hero home. That must have been the climax of the play. It remained to make arrangements

[54] One might have expected that it would be Lycia, as that is where Sleep and Death take Sarpedon's body in the *Iliad* (16.454–7, 671–5, 681–3), and where his kinsmen bury him. But Strabo (14.3.3) writes that tragedians mixed up the names of peoples, for example calling the Lycians Carians: *οἱ ποιηταὶ δέ, μάλιστα οἱ τραγικοί, συγχέοντες τὰ ἔθνη, καθάπερ τοὺς Τρῶας καὶ τοὺς Μυσοὺς καὶ τοὺς Λυδοὺς "Φρύγας" προσαγορεύουσιν, οὕτω καὶ τοὺς Λυκίους "Κᾶρας"*. He must have in view a tragedy which spoke of 'Carians' where he thought they should be called Lycians. The obvious candidate is the *Kares*, which dealt with the death of the Lycian Sarpedon. The mention of Mylasa, however, implies that the poet was not applying the name 'Carian' to Lycians but actually locating Sarpedon's home in Caria. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin, 1907), 108, n. 65; E. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften* 2 (Berlin, 1956), 76.

for burial, and perhaps for the erection of the tumulus and stele mentioned in the *Iliad*.[55]

From one point of view the play, so reconstructed, has a genuinely Aeschylean stamp. Just as in the *Persai*, an Asiatic king has gone to war; his mother shares her forebodings with the elders of the kingdom; news comes to confirm her fears; there is lamentation; finally the hero returns, dead or, if not dead, devastated. But we cannot put too much weight on this general similarity in the face of other considerations which speak against Aeschylean authorship. Europa's speech in the papyrus looks more like a prologue of Sophocles or Euripides, in which someone recounts his or her history and genealogy and then explains the actual situation by saying, 'But now I am anxious on account of . . .', or 'But at this moment I am waiting for . . .'. The prologue of the *Trachiniai* is altogether similar.[56] In any case the style does not read much like Aeschylus. Weil, who had a fine sense of Greek, had his doubts about it, while recognizing how well the subject matter suited the *Europa*; so did Herwerden and Cobet.

Two of the twenty-three trimeters of the fragment begin with an anapaest; in one case it is a proper name, in the other it is not.[57] This is not significant in statistical terms, but it is to be remarked that the first-foot anapaest is a particular feature of the Prometheus poet.[58] There are twelve instances in the *Prometheus Desmotes* (not counting proper names), whereas the much longer *Agamemnon* has only seven, and the other five preserved plays only nine in all.

There are also some linguistic points of contact with the *Prometheus*. In speaking of her anxiety about Sarpedon Europa uses the phrase *φροντίσιν χειμάζομαι*, literally 'I am storm-tossed by cares'. The verb *χειμάζω* occurs twice in the *Prometheus Desmotes*—there too in the middle voice, of emotional turmoil—but not at all in the genuine Aeschylus.[59] At line 5 of the fragment, *παρθένου σέβας | ἤμειψα* recalls *Prom.* 23 *χροιᾶς ἀμείψεις ἄνθος*; at line 8, *κοὐκ ἐμέμψατο | τὸ μὴ 'ξενεγκεῖν* recalls *Prom.* 235 *ἐξελυσάμην βροτούς, | τὸ μὴ διαρραισθέντας εἰς Ἅιδου μολεῖν* and 865 *θέλξει τὸ μὴ | κτεῖναι ξύνεννον*; at line 23, *παίσασα . . . πρὸς ἕρματι* recalls *Prom.* 885 *παίουσ' εἰκῆι στυγνῆς πρὸς κύμασιν ἄτης*. These are, of course, not proofs, merely pointers, but what they point towards is a connection with the Prometheus poet, Euphorion.

A feature of this poet evident from the *Prometheus* is what may fairly be called his book learning. I have previously characterized him as 'something of a polymath, with an interest in mythology of the synoptic kind as represented by Hesiodic poetry and the logographers, and in geography, ethnography, and the history of culture'.[60] When

[55] Hartung (n. 52; before the publication of the papyrus, be it remembered) reconstructed the plot in almost precisely similar terms: 'Dann wird ein Bote angekommen sein, welcher den Tod des Helden meldete, und zuletzt werden seine irdischen Reste in der Weise angelangt sein wie deren Heimschaffung bei Homer Il. ζ' [read π'], 667–683 beschrieben ist. Die übrige Tragödie nun mußte die Todtenklage enthalten.'

[56] Cf. also Eur. *Or.* 67–70.

[57] F 99.12 *'Ραδάμανθυν*, 21 *ἀνυπέρβατον* (a convincing correction of the papyrus' nonsensical *αστυβερβαρτον*).

[58] M. Griffith, *The Authenticity of 'Prometheus Bound'* (Cambridge, 1977), 77–8.

[59] *Prom.* 562–3 *τίνα φῶ λεύσσειν τόνδε χαλινοῖς ἐν πετρίνοισιν χειμαζόμενον*; 838 *ἀφ' οὗ παλιμπλάγκτοισι χειμάζηι δρόμοις*.

[60] M. L. West, *JHS* 99 (1979), 146–7, where I listed the authors he appears to have been acquainted with: Hesiod, Aristeas, Aeschylus, Pindar, Protagoras, Pherecydes of Athens, Sophocles; add Acusilaus (2 F 34 ≈ *Prom.* 559) and Herodotus (R. Bees, *Zur Datierung des Prometheus Desmotes* [Stuttgart, 1993], 133–241).

he places Heracles in the thirteenth generation from Io (*Prom.* 774), this shows not the ordinary educated man's knowledge of myth but a studious use of the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue*, where the genealogies, once reduced to a table, yielded just that number.[61] And when Homer's Sarpedon is presented as the brother of Minos and Rhadamanthys and the son of Europa, the construction comes from the same source.[62]

One scene assumed for the *Europa* strengthens the connection further: the arrival of Sleep and Death, flying through the air and bringing Sarpedon's body from Troy. Material evidence for such a scene comes in the form of an Apulian bell crater of the early fourth century. It shows the aerial party descending towards a lady, evidently a person of consequence, who sits in an aedicula dressed in theatrical Asiatic costume, while a couple of underlings (a vestigial chorus) gesticulate in surprise or alarm. The lady is convincingly identified as the Europa of our play.[63] Even without the vase, we should be justified in postulating the scene, because (i) we cannot envisage a play about Sarpedon's death, set in his homeland, where his body was not brought back to serve as the focus of lamentation; (ii) as its conveyance to his homeland was the subject of special attention in the *Iliad*, we cannot envisage its being effected by any other means than those described in the epic; and (iii) we cannot suppose that the divine figures of Sleep and Death came walking up one of the εἴσοδοι, like any mortal character. A dramatist who did not have the μηχανή at his disposal would not have attempted to represent the event at all. As it is, the epiphany was evidently designed as the crowning effect of the whole play, which indeed may have been written chiefly for the sake of it. It is the same bold use of the crane as for the Oceanids and for their father in the *Prometheus Desmotes*,[64] for the eagle in the *Lyomenos*, and for the translation of Memnon's body in the *Psychostasia*. In all these cases we surely have to do with one and the same poet: Euphorion.

My hypothesis is that he completed his father's unfinished Memnon trilogy by composing a *Europa* to go before the *Memnon* and a *Psychostasia* to go after it, or, if Aeschylus had left a play on the death of Memnon, Euphorion added divine scenes fore and aft to make it into a *Psychostasia*. The subject of the *Europa* was not closely connected with that of the Memnon plays, but it sat well enough with them: it too dealt with an Asiatic hero killed at Troy, lamented by his divine mother, and in the end vouchsafed an exalted destiny. There was a sort of zany symmetry in a trilogy where the crane lowered a corpse from the sky in the first play and drew one up into the sky in the third. Aeschylus with his *Myrmidones*, *Phryges*, and *Nereides* had selected three episodes from the *Iliad* and *Aethiopis* that showed Achilles' progression from μῆνις to wild grief, reconciliation and rehumanization, resignation and death. The Sarpedon–Memnon trilogy as completed by Euphorion (whatever Aeschylus had intended to do with it) might be seen as a complementary construct, covering roughly the same time-span but from the barbarian side.

AESCHYLUS AND SON

Aeschylus has constantly been represented as a poet notable for his grand and impressive visual effects. This view of him, which goes back to the ancient Vita, is

[61] Io, Epaphos, Libye, Belos, Aigyptos, Lynceus, Abas, Acrisius, Danae, Perseus, Alcaeus, Amphitryon, Heracles.

[62] 'Hes.' fr. 140–1.

[63] New York, Metropolitan Museum 16.140; Kossatz-Deissmann (n. 51), 66–74.

[64] For the Oceanids, however, I continue to believe that several cranes must have been used. My arguments in *JHS* 99 (1979), 136–7, have been dismissed in offhand fashion but not answered.

exaggerated, as Taplin has shown.[65] It is based partly on the *Prometheus Desmotes*, which today can no longer be regarded as Aeschylus' work; partly on Hellenistic stagings, in which novel effects may have been introduced; partly just on the over-imaginative reconstructions of modern scholars. Now, by distinguishing more clearly between Aeschylus and Euphorion, we are able to define more accurately their respective tastes for the spectacular.

With Aeschylus it remained on a human level. He liked to bring aliens on to the stage or the orchestra: Persians, Egyptians, Phrygians, with barbarian costumes and sometimes barbarian vociferations and dance movements. His kings and queens could make grand entries with horses and chariots. Human pride and human shame were given visual expression through stage properties: Xerxes' torn robe, the purple fabrics trodden by Agamemnon, the old bloodstained bathrobe that Orestes displays in the *Choephoroi*, the heap of gold weighed against Hector's body in the *Phryges*. Even when the action moved into the realm of the superhuman, as with the ghost of Darius, the Erinyes, or the Phorkides, similar means were used: impressive garments and gestures.

Euphorion, on the other hand, staged spectacles of a quite different order: the flying chorus of Oceanides; Oceanus riding on his griffin; Prometheus cast down into Tartarus; the eagle flying down to gnaw at his liver; the two brothers Sleep and Death bearing Sarpedon's body through the air from Troy; Zeus weighing heroes' lives against one another on his heavenly scales; Memnon transported to heaven. This is all of the same stamp, all sprung from one brain. In Aeschylus' time these things were not yet possible; the theatre had not developed the technical means. But a crane capable of carrying an actor on the back of a (wooden) animal was in use by 425 at latest, when Aristophanes alluded in the *Acharnians* to Euripides' *Bellerophon*. In 431 (the year when Euphorion won first prize) Medea had flown off in a snake-drawn chariot. We first see the crane in use, then, in the very years of Euphorion's activity in the theatre.

The recognition that the *Europa* and at least the celestial scenes of the *Psychostasia* are to be ascribed to this man opens the way to a truer assessment of the great Aeschylus' art. At the same time Euphorion emerges a little way from his father's shadow: a lesser poet, certainly, but an individual and ambitious talent, who wanted on the one hand to appropriate and exploit his father's legacy, and on the other to make the fullest use of the new possibilities for representing marvellous things on the stage in astonishing ways. But such effects were not sufficient to hold the cultivated Athenian audience's interest year after year. More gifted poets like Sophocles and Euripides understood that a good tragedy needs intrinsic qualities of a kind that we miss in the *Prometheus Desmotes*: a taut structure, consistency of plot and character, dramatic tension.

All Souls College, Oxford M. L. WEST

APPENDIX: THE END OF THE *SEPTEM*

Most scholars are now rightly agreed that the final scene of the *Septem* as it has come down to us (1005–77), together with two earlier passages which imply the presence of Oedipus' two daughters (861–73, 996–7), is a spurious addition, made for a revival of the play sometime after the production of Sophocles' *Antigone*, which was probably in 440.[66] The *Septem* is one of the plays familiar to Aristophanes' public (*Ran.*

[65] Taplin, *Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 39–49.

[66] See G. O. Hutchinson, *Aeschylus,* Septem contra Thebas (Oxford, 1985), 209–11. Hutchin-

1021–4) and may therefore have been revived sometime in the last third of the century. The question arises whether there is any reason to connect this event and the composition of the spurious passages with Euphorion.

In diction they appear inferior to what we find in the *Prometheus Desmotes*. There are nevertheless some similarities with that play. A herald appears and issues peremptory orders from Thebes' new rulers. The main character already on stage rejects them. The two argue in stichomythia. At the end, following a change into anapaests, half of the (female) chorus resolves to support Antigone in her defiance, whatever the city may do to them. This is all strikingly analogous to the closing scene of the *Prometheus*.

There are also parallels of detail:

Sept. 1031 δεινὸν τὸ κοινὸν σπλάγχνον οὗ πεφύκαμεν ≈ *Prom.* 39 τὸ ξυγγενές τοι δεινόν.

Sept. 1042–3 αὐδῶ πόλιν σε . . . | —αὐδῶ σε μὴ περισσὰ . . . ≈ *Prom.* 69–70 ὁρᾷς θέαμα . . . | —ὁρῶ κυροῦντα . . ., 971–2 χλιδᾶν ἔοικας . . . | —χλιδῶι; The word περισσός occurs at *Prom.* 383 (cf. 328 περισσόφρων) but not otherwise in Aeschylus.

Sept. 1044 τραχύς γε μέντοι δῆμος ἐκφυγὼν κακά ≈ *Prom.* 35 ἅπας δὲ τραχὺς ὅστις ἂν νέον κρατῆι.

Sept. 1046 ἀλλ' ὃν πόλις στυγεῖ, σὺ τιμήσεις τάφωι; ≈ *Prom.* 67–8 σὺ δ' αὖ κατοκνεῖς τῶν Διός τ' ἐχθρῶν ὕπερ | στένειν;

Sept. 1066–7 δράτω <τι> πόλις καὶ μὴ δράτω τοὺς κλαίοντας Πολυνείκη ≈ *Prom.* 935–9 ὃ δ' οὖν ποείτω . . . δράτω, κρατείτω, 992–4 πρὸς ταῦτα ῥιπτείσθω μὲν αἰθαλοῦσα φλόξ . . . κυκάτω . . . ταρασσέτω, 1043 πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐπί μοι ῥιπτείσθω μὲν κτλ.

At *Sept.* 861, ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἤκουσ' αἵδ' ἐπὶ πρᾶγος πικρὸν Ἀντιγόνη τ' ἠδ' Ἰσμήνη, the use of ἀλλὰ (. . .) γάρ to draw attention to a new arrival is paralleled at *Prom.* 941 (and often in Euripides), but not in the genuine Aeschylus. The next lines, in which the chorus anticipate a lament from the sisters but say 'First, however, it is proper for us to sing our own dirge', remind me strongly of the ineptly explicit programming of who is to say what in which order in the *Prometheus* (630–4, 700–4, 782–9, 819–22).[67]

These considerations do not add up to a compelling case for attributing the interpolations in the *Septem* to Euphorion. It is not to be forgotten that another son of Aeschylus, Euaion, was also active in the theatre. But the points of similarity between the *Septem* passages and the *Prometheus* seem to be more than fortuitous.

son considers the interpolation to postdate the closing scene of the *Phoenissae*, but argues as if this were the only alternative to the scene in the *Septem* being genuine Aeschylus. It may be related to the scene in the *Phoenissae*, but I see no reason for assuming the priority of the latter. It is relevant that Hutchinson does not admit that Aeschylean plays were revived before 386 B.C. (op. cit., xlii). The usual view, that there were revivals in the fifth century, has been reasserted by K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs* (Oxford, 1993), 23.

[67] Cf. West (n. 5), 59–61.