**News and Messaging in Aeschylean Tragedy
and their Impact on Internal and External Audiences**

Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Ancient History)

Cardiff University, 2018

Elizabeth S. Fitzgerald, B.A. (Hons), M.A.

Thesis Summary

The thesis aims to examine how news and messages are delivered and to investigate their impact on internal and external audiences through the extant plays of the Athenian tragedian Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.E.). The research investigates how delivery of messages and news in tragedy is achieved through formal 'messenger-identified' characters, principal and supporting figures, and the chorus. The analysis includes the role of messaging in crossing barriers of time and space.

The research indicates that delivery of news and messages is more complex than first appears. Previous scholarship has focused on messenger-identified figures, but these are not the only means of communicating news and messages. Factors which facilitate or enhance the delivery of news and messages include textual and dramatic techniques. An important category which has its own dramatic forms and trajectories is that of false messages. The research formulates a new concept, message enabling, which considers the impact of changing actions and events on message-deliverers and circulates messaging responsibility amongst the dramatic figures.

The ancient texts studied incorporate significant mythological information which contextualises the action and frames the narrative. The way this information is used situates the internal and external audiences. This is achieved by the selection of mythological narratives, their presentation and sometimes by how they are changed and developed. The only extant play based upon an historical event also utilises aspects of mythological narratives to convey information, indicating their importance in the development of the tragic form.

The research introduces new conclusions about news and message delivery systems in Aeschylean tragedy. The thesis is a sustained investigation of the topic in relation to the work of one poet but also establishes a framework for conducting comparative analyses with the work of other tragedians. There are also implications for how the plays are re-interpreted and staged in modern contexts.

Acknowledgements

Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Introductory Note and Abbreviations

Quotations and citations from original Greek texts are taken from Aris & Phillips Classical Texts unless otherwise noted. Translations from ancient Greek are my own unless otherwise indicated.

Abbreviations

FGrH   Jacoby, E (1923-58), *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin and Leipzig

TrGF   Kannicht *et al*. (1971-2004), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen

P.Oxy   Oxyrhynchus Papyri

All other abbreviations follow Hornblower *et al*. (2012), *Oxford Classical Dictionary, Fourth Edition*, Oxford.

Editions and Commentaries

Editions and commentaries of Aeschylus' plays that were used are as follows:

Greek Editions	English Translation	Commentary
Persians (Πέρσαι)		
• Broadhead, H. D. (1960) *The 'Persae' of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press	No	Yes
• Garvie, A. F. (2009) *Aeschylus' 'Persae'*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	No	Yes
• Hall, E. (1996) *Aeschylus: 'Persians'*, Aris & Phillips Classical Texts, Oxford, Aris & Phillips Ltd	Yes	Yes
• Page, D. (1973) *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, Oxford, Clarendon Press [includes *apparatus criticus*]	No	No
• Sommerstein, A. H. (2008) *Aeschylus Volume I*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press	Yes	Yes
Seven against Thebes (Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας)		
• Dawson, C. M. (1970) *Aeschylus: 'The Seven against Thebes'*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, Inc	Yes	Yes
• Hutchinson, G. O. (1975) *Septem contra Thebas*, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford, Clarendon Press	No	Yes
• Page, D. (1973) *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, Oxford, Clarendon Press [includes *apparatus criticus*]	No	No
• Sommerstein, A. H. (2008) *Aeschylus Volume I*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press	Yes	Yes
• Tucker, T. G. (1908) '*The Seven against Thebes' of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press	Yes	Yes
Suppliants (Ἱκέτιδες)		
• Bowen, A. J. (2013) *Aeschylus' 'Suppliant Women'*, Aris & Phillips Classical Texts, Oxford, Aris & Phillips Ltd	Yes	Yes
• Page, D. (1973) *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, Oxford, Clarendon Press [includes *apparatus criticus*]	No	No

Greek Editions	English Translation	Commentary
• Sommerstein, A. H. (2008) *Aeschylus Volume I*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press	Yes	Yes

***Prometheus Bound* (Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης)**

	English Translation	Commentary
• Griffith, M. (1983) *Aeschylus: 'Prometheus Bound'*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Green & Yellow), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press	No	Yes
• Page, D. (1973) *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, Oxford, Clarendon Press [includes *apparatus criticus*]	No	No
• Podlecki, A. J. (2005) *Aeschylus: 'Prometheus Bound'*, Aris & Phillips Classical Texts, Oxford, Aris & Phillips Ltd	Yes	Yes
• Sommerstein, A. H. (2008) *Aeschylus Volume I*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press	Yes	Yes

***The Oresteia* (Ὀρέστεια)**

	English Translation	Commentary
• Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus: 'Agamemnon', Vol. I, Prolegomena, Text, and Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	No
• Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus: 'Agamemnon', Vol. II: Commentary on 1–1055*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	Yes
• Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus: 'Agamemnon', Vol. III: Commentary on 1056–1673, Appendices, Indexes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	Yes
• Garvie, A. F. (1986) *Aeschylus: 'Choephori'*, Oxford, Clarendon Press	No	Yes
• Headlam, W. (1910) *The 'Agamemnon' of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press	Yes	Yes
• Page, D. (1973) *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, Oxford, Clarendon Press [includes *apparatus criticus*]	No	No
• Podlecki, A. J. (1989) *Aeschylus: 'Eumenides'*, Aris & Phillips Classical Texts, Warminster, Aris & Phillips Ltd	Yes	Yes
• Raeburn, D. & O. Thomas (2011) *The 'Agamemnon' of Aeschylus*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	No	Yes
• Sommerstein, A. H. (1989) *Aeschylus: 'Eumenides'*, Cambridge Greek and Latin	No	Yes

Greek Editions	English Translation	Commentary
Classics (Green & Yellow), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press		
• Weir Smyth, H. (1926) *Aeschylus Volume II*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press	Yes	Yes

English Translations	Notes	Commentary
Persians		
• Collard, C. (2008) *Aeschylus' 'Persians' and Other Plays*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	No
• Podlecki, A. J. (1970) '*The Persians' by Aeschylus*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, Inc	Yes	Yes
• Vellacott, P. (1961) *Aeschylus. 'Prometheus Bound', 'The Suppliants', 'Seven Against Thebes', 'The Persians'*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books	Yes	No
Seven against Thebes		
• Collard, C. (2008) *Aeschylus' 'Persians' and Other Plays*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	No
• Vellacott, P. (1961) *Aeschylus. 'Prometheus Bound', 'The Suppliants', 'Seven Against Thebes', 'The Persians'*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books	Yes	No
• Verrall, A. W. (1887) *'The Seven against Thebes' of Aeschylus*, London, Macmillan	No	Yes
Suppliants		
• Collard, C. (2008) *Aeschylus' 'Persians' and Other Plays*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	No
• Vellacott, P. (1961) *Aeschylus. 'Prometheus Bound', 'The Suppliants', 'Seven Against Thebes', 'The Persians'*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books	Yes	No
Prometheus Bound		
• Collard, C. (2008) *Aeschylus' 'Persians' and Other Plays*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	No
• Conacher, D. J. (1980) *Aeschylus' 'Prometheus Bound': A Literary Commentary*, London, University of Toronto Press [play text not included]	No	Yes

English Translations	Notes	Commentary
• Vellacott, P. (1961) *Aeschylus. 'Prometheus Bound', 'The Suppliants', 'Seven Against Thebes', 'The Persians'*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books	Yes	No

The Oresteia

	Notes	Commentary
• Burian, P. & A. Shapiro (2011) *The Complete Aeschylus. Vol. I – 'The Oresteia'*, Greek Tragedy in New Translations, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	No
• Collard, C. (2002) *Aeschylus: 'Oresteia'*, Oxford, Oxford University Press	Yes	No
• Conacher, D. J. (1987) *Aeschylus' 'Oresteia': A Literary Commentary*, Toronto, University of Toronto [play text not included]	No	Yes
• De May, P. (2003) *Aeschylus: 'Agamemnon'*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press	No	Yes
• Fagles, R. (1966) *Aeschylus: 'The Oresteia'*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books	Yes	No
• Grene, D. and R. Lattimore (1953) *Aeschylus I: 'Oresteia'*, Chicago, IL; London, The University of Chicago Press	No	No
• Lloyd-Jones, H. (1970) *Aeschylus: 'Agamemnon'*, Englewood Cliffs [Hemel Hempstead], Prentice-Hall, Inc	No	Yes
• MacNeice, L. (1967) *The 'Agamemnon' of Aeschylus*, London, Faber and Faber	No	No
• Meineck, P. (1998) *Aeschylus: 'Oresteia'*, Indianapolis, IN; Cambridge, Hackett Publishing	No	No
• Vellacott, P. (1956) *Aeschylus: The Oresteian Trilogy*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books	Yes	No

Adapted Translations	Notes	Commentary

The Oresteia

	Notes	Commentary
• Hughes, T. (1999) *Aeschylus: 'The Oresteia'*, London, Faber and Faber	No	No

Introduction

Rationale and Aims of the Thesis

The thesis will consider how the extant plays of the Athenian tragedian Aeschylus (c.525-456 B.C.E.) present and utilise news and messages; it will consider how these news and messages contribute to the development of the dramatic structure; and it will consider how those elements affect the internal and external audiences. The formulation and communication of messages and news in tragedy is important for situating the internal audience and external spectators within the narrative (i.e., into the wider story upon which the play is based enhanced by the revision – if any – of the chosen myth), developing plot points, exploring the epistemological and affective aspects of the performance and driving the action by addressing and incorporating events that have occurred off-stage. News and messages also affect the (sometimes different) understanding that the internal audience, the dramatic figures, and the external audience take from the plays.

A principle argument of the thesis is that news and messages are not always delivered by 'generic' messenger figures and that news and messages, and the way they are delivered, can have different impacts in different ways. News and messages can be used to deliver specific information that impacts upon subsequent activity. Theatre is a living medium which is brought to life

through the synergy of performance and audience engagement.[1] The thesis will consider the impact of news and messages in relation to the two audiences of the play, the internal and the external. The cultural lenses that spectators bring to the play help inform their responses. The way the play's narrative situates the external audience helps focus these cultural lenses and may lead the external audience to change any presuppositions they may bring with them to the performance.

One of the primary contributions of the thesis is to demonstrate that news and messages are delivered not just by formal 'messenger' figures who are identified as such (for example, the figure identified as messenger (ἄγγελος) in Aeschylus' *Persians* (*Πέρσαι*) of 472 B.C.E.), but also by protagonists, the chorus and secondary or supporting figures, some of whom may only have a brief or limited presence. This wide variety of figures provide conduits for facilitating news and messages to both internal and external audiences. This necessarily renders these figures as formal mechanisms on a comparable level with the protagonists.

Message enabling is an important mechanism for facilitating the delivery of news and messages. Message enabling occurs when a figure, action or a set of circumstances specifically facilitates delivery of a message. Here, actions, intentions and circumstances combine to allow a message's delivery which

---

[1] 'Whatever the actors do, it has an effect on the spectators; and whatever the spectators do, it has an effect on the other spectators and the actors. A performance generates itself through the interactions between actors and spectators.' Fischer-Lichte (2010): 30.

may otherwise have rendered it void. Message enabling adds to the news and messaging system by creating another avenue of access for the poet to communicate the nuances of the story he is telling, revealing the flexibility of the system. The news and messaging system is supple, and porous, in that it is able to utilise all the figures of a play in order to create and allow the message enabling model.

In addition to the news and messaging function, the impact of characters' actions on the internal audience of the play, and the external audience watching the performance, creates contrasting temporal layers, with knowledge gained from the past, present and future evoked and revealed in both audiences in different ways. The thesis will consider how the construction and deployment of theatrical conventions in Aeschylus' extant plays facilitates these actions. Both the messenger figure and the chorus are key communicators in ancient tragedy so examining how Aeschylus refines and develops these figures is especially important. The resulting overlapping layers allow further interpretation and knowledge consolidation by the internal and external audiences.

The thesis does not intend to provide a comparative analysis using extant tragic plays by other tragedians such as Sophocles (c.497-406 B.C.E.) and Euripides (c.480-406 B.C.E.) although it will provide the framework for such an exercise for future research. There are also implications for how the plays are adapted within the context of subsequent work in the field of reception studies.

Structure of the Thesis

The thesis will address four key questions which provide the structure of the investigation:

1. How are messages and news items created and conveyed to the internal and external audiences?

2. How do the news and message delivery mechanisms affect their impact and subsequent consequences for the direction of the plot and action of the play?

3. How do myth and/or historical content contribute to news and messages, and what role do they play in helping to situate the internal and external audiences?

4. What does the analysis of messages and news items indicate about the frames of time, place and space and how they shape the perceptions of the internal and external audiences?

A theatrical performance always has two audiences, the internal cast of characters and the spectators in the ancient theatre.[2] When thinking about the external audience of the plays, it should be remembered that there is the contemporary external audience, those present at the original production, and there are also the later and/or contemporary audiences, both within the ancient world and leading up to the present day (which in turn impact upon the ways in which scholars approach and interpret the plays). The spectators help shape the performance through understanding and engagement with the themes of the play which in turn adds layers of complexity to the performance. The synergy between the internal and external audiences creates perspectives which are constantly shifting between past, present and

---

[2] Where the terms 'internal audience' and 'external audience' are used in the thesis they will refer to the on-stage actors (internal) and the off-stage audience (external) of the play's original production unless otherwise stated.

future and through mythology, history, divinity and humanity. News and messages are a means of crossing boundaries – boundaries of space, time and status are variously traversed, broached or blurred by the messaging functions the thesis explores. This activity is testament to the importance of the news and messaging analysis in terms of examining ancient texts from their original perspective and for future interpretations.

The Messenger Figure in Ancient Greek Tragedy

The function of the messenger within tragedy is, like any other character, to bring a specific dimension to the play – in the messenger's case the most obvious dimension being delivering a message as part of his narration. Message delivery includes narration of events from the distant or recent past, acting as an eyewitness offering first-hand information about events taking place off-stage or indicating beliefs about future activity or events. The messenger sets a scene for a message to be delivered or reports on circumstances relevant to their presence, a dramatic enabler who brings and disseminates information and news within a play to both internal and external audiences. The messenger is a presence which does not necessarily require extensive characterisation or explanation. Rather, the term 'messenger' is a code for the distribution of information through a single point; the figure can arrive and leave without disrupting the immediate activity of the play but nonetheless has a significant impact on events, relevant to both internal and external audiences. The messenger figure has substantial power over the direction of the play which the tragic poet can use to reflect or redirect the

focus of a scene towards other meanings for either the internal or external audience.

A traditional messenger (ἄγγελος) figure appears in three out of only six extant plays known to be by Aeschylus, described as such in *Persians* and identified as a herald (κῆρυξ) in *Suppliants* (Ἱκέτιδες, c.463 B.C.E.) and *Agamemnon* (Ἀγαμέμνων, 458 B.C.E.).[3] Given ancient sources attribute eighty titles to Aeschylus,[4] it would be difficult to argue that the lack of formally-identified messenger figures in the extant plays has any kind of significance in terms of intended message delivery systems. It may be that he chose to include figures of a wider range and flexibility in order to experiment with different types of communication. A play, and in particular an extended, connected trilogy of plays,[5] was a vehicle for connecting a series of messages both overt and oblique; different kinds of communication delivery would therefore be one method of dealing with these layers of content. There is no evidence that the construction of ancient drama was rigidly proscribed and a certain amount of freedom may have been available

---

[3] The play texts were not transmitted with intact lists of *dramatis personae*. West (1973) states that in the manuscripts of dialogue texts 'the change of speaker was normally signalled only by a dicolon (:) and/or a paragraphus, a dash over the beginning of the first complete line. It is not certain whether even this practice goes back to the earliest times, and the divisions given by manuscripts are so often erroneous that they cannot be regarded as useful evidence of the author's intentions. Certainly the attribution of a speech to such-and-such an interlocutor rests on no tradition that reaches back to the author (except perhaps where the speaker makes his first appearance) but only on later interpretation. The practice of regularly identifying the speaker seems to have been invented by Theodoretus in the fifth century [C.E.]. The critic is free to distribute the dialogue as best fits the sense.' (55). See also Lowe (1962), Taplin (1977): 294, Garvie (1986) and Lavery (2003): 30-2.
[4] A full list of plays can be found in Sommerstein (2008b) and Sommerstein (2010): 11-12.
[5] Although tragic trilogies did not necessarily feature connected plays; see p. 59 below.

to poets who wished to create distinctively individual productions.[6] Aeschylus is the earliest of the extant tragedians but as Ley points out, the modern scholar should guard against assuming too much; the extant work of Aeschylus was from the latter part of his career and assumptions about Aeschylus' role in 'developing' the tragic form are one of the 'more obvious traps' of reading too much into too little evidence.[7]

Modern Scholarship on the Messenger Figure

Messenger figures occupy a crucial role in ancient tragedy and merit deeper consideration than has previously been the case. Important modern scholarship on the messenger figure includes work by Irene de Jong (1991), James Barrett (2002) and R. B. Rutherford (2012). These works are notable for the distance in time between them, indicating that the messenger has not been widely recognised as a significant figure in ancient tragedy. As de Jong confirmed in 1991, at that time 'no single, up-to-date work of reference on the messenger-speech in Greek tragedy is available'.[8] Her approach, focusing on the tragic poet Euripides, was to consider the dynamics of the messenger figures – specifically what restrictions they are bound by (12-29) and whether they act as narrators or focalisers (30-73) – alongside the mechanics of the figure. She examines the form and style of the messenger figure and the place of the messenger narrative in the dramatic form,[9] principally based upon the

---

[6] The *Vita Aeschyli* 5, 14 and 16 comments on his innovative approach.
[7] Ley (2007): 4-6.
[8] de Jong (1991): vii.
[9] She notes that previous scholars have 'underrated the role of the messenger as focalizer', de Jong (1991): viii.

assertion that 'being an eyewitness is the messenger's very theatrical *raison d'être*',[10] but overall the analysis is limited to the messenger figure's introduction and scene only. Whilst de Jong established the importance of the messenger figure's characterisation, this thesis develops it further, and will have a much wider scope in messaging analysis which will demonstrate that messaging is not restricted to formal 'messenger'-identified characters.

Barrett (2002) takes analysis of the messenger figure much further than de Jong when he suggests that the messenger is a vehicle for exploring thematic interests. He identifies the tragic messenger as a key narrative concept that has a much deeper complexity than first appears. Barrett's messenger has knowledge and a 'privileged voice', but not knowing everything about the wider story, only the circumstances that he is directly witness to, creates a 'crisis of understanding' for the figure:

> The charioteer's *angelia* [in Euripides' *Rhesos* (Ῥῆσος) of c.450 B.C.E.], I suggest, does something similar: in a play populated by figures characterized by ignorance and folly, a messenger who does not know is perhaps the most pointed example of this crisis of understanding. Conventionally endowed with knowledge and a privileged voice, the messenger here stands out for his ignorance and readiness to hazard worthless guesses: so pervasive is this crisis in this play that it subordinates even tragic convention.[11]

He correctly points out that the messenger figure can distort the conventional form of the message, the crisis brought about by his failure to act in

---

[10] de Jong (1991): 8.
[11] Barrett (2002): 189.

accordance with his dramatic identity. He recognises the contrast between seeing and hearing – the narrative of who has seen (or not) versus what is heard, e.g., in Sophocles' *Oedipus* (Οἰδίπους Τύραννος, produced c.429 B.C.E.) no one actually saw Laius die, rather, the news was based on rumour.[12] The play's commentary on knowledge is expressed through sight; this is analogous to the messenger character: seen -v- heard and hidden -v- revealed. In the absence of a defined messenger or message, the external observer is drawn into the act of discovery and becomes the searcher and the one who is discovered. According to Barrett, the lessons of the play are applicable to the audience as well as the characters.[13] The messenger has a narrative function whose impartiality creates a distance where other characters do not.[14] Again, Barrett focuses on the 'messenger'-identified figure. His engagement with the wider thematic impact of the figure approaches but does not address the implications of multiple messengers and message enabling.

As Rutherford (2012) notes, the traditional messenger speech, whilst ubiquitous in the plays of Sophocles and Euripides, is less commonly used by Aeschylus. The Sophoclean and Euripidean messenger speech is also more likely to comment on affairs current to the plot of the play whereas the

---

[12] *Oed*. 130-49, 350-1, 788-90, 812-13, 833.
[13] Barrett (2002): 210-22.
[14] In analysing the death of Jocasta (Soph. *Oed*. 1364-82) Barrett (2002): 199 argues that the Messenger's inability to directly witness Jocasta's death himself 'serves to augment the sense of distance and difference between word and deed. The closed door literally bars his view, and Oedipus distracts it, redirects it. Thus the impetus of the narrative is not only stopped; it is also deflected elsewhere … it [the narrative] becomes rather an account of the *exangelos*'s experience.'

Aeschylean messenger tends to comment on past or future events.[15] This links with Aeschylus' tendency to focus on pre-Olympian mythology, the ancient history of the gods,[16] which contributes to the temporal shifts within his plays.[17] Interweaving pre-Olympian mythologies with later mythological stories allows Aeschylus to build up layers of time in his plays that communicate their own messages in tandem with other messaging techniques. Rutherford allows that other non-'messenger'-identified figures also act as messengers but restricts this to 'where a character with a larger role in the plot performs a messenger function'. He refers to Orestes' *paedagogus* in Sophocles' *Electra* (Ἠλέκτρα, produced around 418-410 B.C.E.) who 'is, as it were, pretending to be a conventional messenger'.[18] Rutherford suggests using characters in this way is evidence that the dramatists were seeking messenger speech alternatives in order to allow the 'messenger'-identified figure to deliver a specific message for a specific effect. He cites Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* (Οἰδίπους ἐπὶ Κολωνῷ, produced posthumously in 401 B.C.E.) where the narrative is designed to allow the messenger to narrate the death of Oedipus rather than allocating this task to the Chorus, who sing of Theseus' battle for Oedipus' daughters. Rutherford explains that 'this [Theseus' battle] would be a typical subject for a messenger speech to treat retrospectively (cf. Eur. *Supp*. 634-730), but the poet wants to reserve the

---

[15] Rutherford (2012): 200.
[16] See discussion below, p. 200.
[17] See discussions below on the *Prometheus Bound* (pp. 206 ff.) and the *Oresteia* (pp. 261 ff.).
[18] Rutherford (2012): 201.

messenger for a less conventional subject, the passing of Oedipus'.[19] Rutherford, like Barrett, fails to address the wider scope of news and messaging analysis that I will discuss in the thesis.

Unlike de Jong, both Barrett and Rutherford extend discussion of the messenger figure to a wider dynamic which affects the narrative structure and focus of the play but both restrict their focus to analysis directly relevant to the 'messenger'-identified figure.   The thesis will demonstrate that identification of alternative messenger figures enriches the messenger figure concept resulting in a more nuanced portrayal, and that message delivery mechanisms are present not as alternatives to messengers but as valid and important conduits in their own right. Some of these messenger figures may only have a brief or limited presence but their impact upon the narrative may be considerable, thereby elevating their internal dramatic status.

Classifying Messenger Figures for the Thesis

The role of the messenger (ἄγγελος) is to provide new information to illuminate a situation, to recreate a scene in the diegetic space,[20] or to bring specific, legitimised news to the stage, any of which serve to progress the story. The thesis demonstrates that messenger figures fall into three main groups: formal messenger characters, main characters and secondary

---

[19] Rutherford (2012): 201.

[20] Diegetic space refers to events which are described but not shown. As Issacharoff (1981): 215 notes, 'diegetic space is mediated through the discourse of the characters, and thus communicated verbally and not visually'.

characters; the majority of these figures do not have formal messenger-roles. The chorus can also act as messenger figures, even when they seem to take the form of main characters as they do in *Suppliants* and *Eumenides*. The differences between messenger figures demonstrate the fluidity of the narrative constructions in which they appear. Their authority can range from the lowest (in terms of civic status), such as the nurse (τροφός) in *Choephoroe*, to the highest, as personified by the ghost of Darius (εἴδωλον Δαρείου) in *Persians*.

The reliability of messages is a significant area that is addressed as the analysis progresses which includes but is not necessarily limited to the use of false messages. There is a tendency to accept the formal messenger figure's authority without question, used to great effect in the case of delivering false messages. This results in a dichotomy represented by the trusted figure of the messenger versus the possibility of them delivering a false message.

Mythological Narratives

A play is written focused around a specific story and every element is purposely created by the poet to facilitate his vision; every aspect of the play is designed to build information, with clarity revealed incrementally and/or at the end. Dramatic figures were inspired by a myth or story but the poet was not constrained by either of these and so could manipulate the cast of a play to tell the story how he wanted.

Pre-Olympian mythology is a common thread through Aeschylus' surviving plays, most obviously in the realisation of the Erinyes (Ἐρῖνύες, 'curses') in the *Eumenides*[21] and, significantly for the authorship debate, the *Prometheus Bound.* Pre-Olympian mythology is an aspect of Aeschylus' work which contributes to the overall news and messaging structures. The problem of keeping 'news' fresh and interesting for an audience that ostensibly knew what to expect was one of the challenges faced by the tragic poets. This could be achieved by the choosing of a specific aspect of a particular myth and by shaping how the external spectators related that usage to their own world.

Mythological narratives were intrinsic to ancient Greek culture, with Richard Buxton putting forward the supposition 'that large areas of Greek mental life were shaped by myths is beyond question'.[22] Robert Fowler highlights the importance of ancient mythological narratives in the ancient world: 'National identities were founded on these stories. They underpinned the religious calendar … they were indispensable to every kind of literary and artistic endeavour.'[23] Nevertheless, the ancient myths were fluid; there was no one accepted 'version' and the ancient tragedians did not appear to feel any need to follow a particular template.[24] Ancient mythology was the basis of many

---

[21] See discussion below, p. 200.
[22] Buxton (1994): 16.
[23] Fowler (2013): xviii.
[24] Although important narratives, myths were by no means standardised; Vanda Zajko suggests that 'the very idea of a mythological tradition is arguably misleading because it suggests a freely available repository of narratives, able to be accessed and added to by successive generations engaged in a continuous practice of storytelling. In fact, the process of the transmission of myth is much more patchy and contingent than this and in some cases a story disappears completely for a time, only to be revivified by a robust and surprisingly novel version', Zajko and Hoyle (2017): 2.

social customs and the foundation of the religious belief system. Raymond

Williams suggests that the ancient mythologies defy categorisation or a

collective design:

> Fate, Necessity and the nature of the Gods … were not systematised by the Greeks themselves: it is a culture marked by an extraordinary network of beliefs connected to institutions, practices and feelings, but not by the systematic and abstract doctrines we would now call a theology or a tragic philosophy … for it is the nature of myth that it resists anterior explanation; its extensions are always from its particulars to these newly experienced particulars (this is the dimension of varying interpretation and emphasis in the tragedians).[25]

For the ancient Greeks, their mythology told the story of themselves,

explaining their present within the context of their past.[26] Edmund Stewart

also points out that the myths

> do not concern any one city or community, but instead collectively tell the story of the Greek nation in its entirety … in dramatizing the tales of long-dead heroes, tragedy created a common past for its contemporary and panHellenic audience.[27]

This demonstrates the importance of how the poet interpreted the myths to

help situate the external (and to an extent, the internal) audience of the plays'

original productions.

---

[25] Williams (2006): 39.

[26] Buxton suggests it was plausible that myths were taught to children, Buxton (1994): 177-9.

[27] Stewart (2017): 19. He goes on to say that 'many of the myths of the Greeks, like the poets themselves, have their origins in one particular city. However, if we look more closely, we often see that these myths form part of an overarching matrix that ties one god or hero to many different locations. Even myths that apparently concern the fate of one *polis*, such as Troy, are in fact the stories of great journeys' (20). This is evident, for example, in the story of the Danaids discussed in chapter three, or that of Io in chapter four.

In Aeschylus' plays there are several departures from the 'standard' stories of ancient mythology. Stratos E. Constantinidis suggests that

> Aeschylus constructed his plays by accepting or changing (to a degree) the codes and traditions which his predecessors had established for composing and staging tragedies, but also by accepting or changing (to a degree) the codes and traditions derived from companion art forms such as dance, music, sculpture, painting and poetry.[28]

Alan H. Sommerstein discusses the many differences present in just the *Agamemnon*, for example: Aeschylus' Agamemnon sacrifices Iphigenia with his own hand (*Ag.* 205-11), something not found in myth before the play;[29] and Aegisthus is no longer born of incest and is a survivor of Atreus' murderous plan (*Ag.* 1604-11). The changes of myth may be subtle or seemingly incidental but the play was a construct and any changes, or omissions or additions, to the myths were deliberately and consciously created by the poet for a specific reason. How mythological stories were selected, adapted and refracted within the plays is a defining feature of the argument for a playwright's innovation. The prologues of the plays are therefore particularly important for indicating to the spectators the direction the poet is going to take because the information they provide situates the audience.

---

[28] Constantinidis (2016): 4.
[29] Sommerstein (2010): 138.

Introduction

Epic Poetry, Myth and the Public Imagination

The *Iliad* (Ἰλιάς) and *Odyssey* (Ὀδύσσεια), possibly composed by the eighth-century B.C.E. poet Homer,[30] are essential primary sources for many mythological histories and genealogies, as is the *Works and Days* (Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι) and *Theogony* (Θεογονία) of Homer's contemporary Hesiod. Homeric poetry was propagated by the Homeridae, a guild of poets dedicated to keeping his poetry alive and current, who are first mentioned by the lyric poet Pindar (c.518-after 446 B.C.E.) in c.485 B.C.E.[31] Visual material is also an important source of information about myth and the light it sheds on the myths deployed in tragedy has been the subject of considerable debate, especially in respect of painted pottery.[32] This material evidence indicates that ancient mythological stories were well known to the original audience and that it was likely they attended a performance with expectations about how the story being presented was going to end.[33]

The poems of the Epic Cycle (Ἐπικός Κύκλος), of which only fragments now remain, were another source of information about ancient mythology. The Epic Cycle was a collection of ancient Greek Epic poems that related the story

---

[30] 'When, where, how and why the poems were composed has been debated for centuries', van Wees (1992). The issue of the 'Homeric Question' is summarised and brought up-to-date by West (2011).

[31] *Nemean Odes* 2.1-2. van Wees (1992): 11 notes that the ancient sources claim 'Homer's works were not preserved intact, but in fragments scattered all over Greece, until the Athenian tyrant Peisistratos around 550 B.C. commissioned a reconstruction of the original poems. The majority of modern scholars think that this so-called Peisistratean "recension" in reality involved no more than marginally editing existing texts, and some would deny that it ever took place. Still, there are also those who argue that the poems were in fact written down at Peisistratos' instigation, and no earlier.'

[32] Taplin (2007). See further discussion below on p. 43.

[33] Buxton (1994) discusses how mythological stories probably also featured in the drinking songs at private *symposia*, 28-9.

of the Trojan War that includes the *Titanomachia* (Τιτανομαχία),[34]

Oedipodeia (Οἰδιπόδεια),[35] *Thebais* (Θηβαΐς),[36] *Epigoni* (Ἐπίγονοι),[37]

Alcmeonis (Ἀλκμαιωνίς),[38] *Cypria* (Κύπρια),[39] the *Aethiopis* (Αἰθιοπίς),[40] the

Little Iliad (Ἰλιὰς Μικρά),[41] the *Iliou Persis* (Ἰλίου Πέρσις),[42] the *Nostoi*

(Νόστοι)[43] and the *Telegony* (Τηλεγόνεια).[44] Composed around the seventh

and sixth centuries B.C.E., the only direct evidence comes from the

Chrestomathia (Χρηστομάθεια) by Proclus the Neoplatonist (c.410-485

C.E.).[45] Epic poetry was probably performed in much the same way as that

of Homer.[46] The delivery of Homeric and Epic Cycle poetry was through the

medium of song and evidence suggests it would have been known to the

---

[34] Attributed to Eumelus or Arctinus of Miletus and dealing with the battle between the Olympian and Titan gods.
[35] Attributed to Cinaethon of Lacedaemon and referred to by Paus. 9.5.11, who confirms it is a retelling of the Oedipus myth.
[36] Attributed to Homer and dealing with the war between Eteocles and Polynices.
[37] Attributed to Homer and dealing with the aftermath of the deaths of Eteocles and Polynices.
[38] Authorship unknown, it tells the story of Alcmaeon and Eriphyle. This poem, the *Oedipodeia*, *Thebais* and *Epigoni* form what is commonly referred to as the Theban Cycle (Θηβαϊκὸς Κύκλος).
[39] Attributed to either Stasinus of Cyprus or Hegesias of Salamis and concerning events immediately before those recounted in the *Iliad*.
[40] Also known as the *Amazonia* and attributed to either Homer or Arctinus. It chronologically follows the events of the *Iliad*, following from the death of Hector to the dispute between Odysseus and Aias for Achilleus' armour.
[41] Attributed variously to Homer, Lesches of Mytilene, Pyrrha, Thestorides of Phocaea, Cinaethon of Lacedaemon or Diodorus of Erythrae. Chronologically follows the *Aethiopis* and culminates with the Greeks building the wooden horse at Troy.
[42] Sometimes attributed to Arctinus of Miletus or Lesches. Chronologically follows the *Little Iliad* and deals with the Greek ambush from the wooden horse, the massacre of the Trojans and finishes with the sacrifice of the Trojan princess Polyxena.
[43] Attributed to Homer, Agias of Troezen or Eumelus. It chronologically follows the *Iliou Persis* and deals with the return of the Greeks from Troy, including the murders of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, events subsequently related in the *Odyssey* and by Aeschylus in his *Oresteia*. Homer's *Odyssey* is the next text in the sequence.
[44] Possibly another name for the poem is *Thesprotis* (Θεσπρωτίς), mentioned by Paus. 8.12, or that may be a separate poem altogether. Possibly by Eugammon of Cyrene or Cinaethon of Lacedaemon, it relates the story of Telegonus, the son of Odysseus and Circe, and ends with the death of Odysseus by Telegonus' hand.
[45] Allen (1908): 64.
[46] Buxton (1994): 29-30, 40.

external audience through the performances of rhapsodes (ῥαψῳδός, 'reciter')

at the Panathenaia (Παναθήναια),[47] the Athenian civic festival in honour of

the goddess Athena whose central procession from the agora to the Acropolis

was immortalised on the frieze of the Parthenon.[48] Buxton highlights the

importance of rhapsodes and citharodes (κιθαρῳδός, 'lyre-singer') as being

> … threefold. First, their extensive travelling illustrates how the language of mythology transcended local boundaries. Secondly … it is clear that the narrations of rhapsodes and citharodes were public in a way that performances at banquets of the aristocracy were not: in principle, they stood before the whole community. Thirdly … the *contest* is a fundamental feature of the transmission of myths.[49]

Thus, as well as situating an audience, mythology is also part of the fabric of

public and civic life. Mediation of mythological stories through the dramatic

festivals was therefore both expected and relied upon by the external

audience.

The personalities of characters were of course completely open to

interpretation and the fine nuances afforded them by the poets may have been

carefully calibrated for maximum impact within the story. Mythological

characters in the plays each acted within their own logic and rarely acquiesced

to coercion from other characters without persuasion. Although an audience

might recognise a mythological story, it was by no means certain that

---

[47] Diog. Laert. 1.57 and Plat. *Hipparch*. 228b. 'Although rhapsodes delivered other poetry than epic, and although we hear of them composing their own verses, the commonest role in which they appear is that of reciters of Homer', Buxton (1994): 29-30. See Burgess (2004) for an analysis of the evidence around delivery of Homeric and Epic Cycle poetry to subsequent audiences.

[48] See Paus. 1.29.1 and 8.2.1; Apollod. 3.14.6; Hopper (1963): 15; Neils (1996).

[49] Buxton (1994): 31.

characters would behave in expected ways. Subverting the 'traditional' portrayal of a particular character or scene was one of the fundamental ways the poet could surprise and engage with his audience. Creating a new personality for a character – or introducing a new character in the story – was a powerful way for the poet to connect with the external audience because it both caught their attention and subverted their expectations. This adjusted the sense of expectation within the external audience as to how the character would behave and progress in the play. Thus the characters' actions impact upon the audience not only through the vehicle of the play but also through their own individual representations.[50]

It should be noted that the allocation of specific names to the *dramatis personae* in the texts was not necessarily as they were originally designed. Taplin notes 'that all or most attributions in our manuscripts are pure conjecture'.[51] Taplin is here referring to changes of speaker but his statement that 'the actual paragraphoi must be allowed some textual authority through continuous transmission, though they are easily corrupted' could equally apply to the list of cast names and is a reminder that we are dealing with texts that may have undergone considerable (but in many cases perhaps accidental) revision through the process of copying and re-copying.

---

[50] There are also additional layers of meaning afforded by repeat viewings or peripatetic productions. Popular plays were reproduced outside Athens from the 460s B.C.E. and could be geographically far-ranging (see Hall (2010): 20) and this has implications for assumptions about the 'freshness' of performances for a particular audience. See also Stewart (2017) on the wider panHellenism of Athenian tragedy.
[51] Taplin (1977): 294.

Aeschylus' Use of Mythology

As we have seen, the poets often took their ancient myths as a focus for the plots of their plays but were not averse to changing elements of the stories to suit their own purposes. The mythological stories that Aeschylus chose to use in the extant plays include that of Oedipus for *Seven against Thebes*.[52] Aeschylus altered Oedipus' myth by having his children born by his mother (811-13) rather than his second wife Euryganeia as cited in Epic poetry.[53] In *Suppliants*, the alternative mythology of the Danaids is significantly different to the version Aeschylus provides with Danaus himself taking the throne on arrival in Argos. In the *Prometheus Bound*, the changes are more subtle, changing Prometheus' parentage (17) to enhance his identification as a god of prophecy. The *Oresteia* is rooted in the mythology of the line of Atreus. In the *Agamemnon*, the circumstances of the quarrel between Atreus and Thyestes is altered (1582-5), as is the provenance of Cassandra's gift of prophecy (1202); in the *Choephoroe*, the names of Agamemnon's daughters are different to those in Homer. More importantly, this play is the first time that Electra appears in the extant ancient texts. There is less departure from established myth in the *Eumenides*, the most significant change being the alteration of the parentage of the Erinyes (321, 790, 962).

Victoria Wohl, writing principally about Euripides, observes that

> Athenian playwrights had quite a lot of freedom in
> presenting mythic material, but they seem rarely, if ever, to

---

[52] Lines 70, 203, 372, 654, 655, 677, 695, 725, 752, 775, 785-91, 801, 807, 833, 868, 989, 1004.
[53] Apollod. 3.5.8.

have changed a major plot point. So Euripides could set his *Electra* [Ἠλέκτρα, c.420/19 B.C.E.] on a farm and have Electra married to a farmer, but apparently couldn't have the farmer kill Aegisthus and Clytemnestra: mythically speaking, that's Orestes' job. Greek tragedy is structured, then, less by the suspense of not knowing how things will turn out than by the suspense of not knowing how things will manage to turn out the way they have to, of fearing that we may not be able to get there from here – a suspense, in other words, between dramatic means and mythic ends.[54]

Barrett, also discussing Euripides, in this case his *Rhesos* (*Ῥῆσος*),[55] points out that changing a myth, 'reframing the familiar', allows contrasts to be drawn between a 'standard' version, and the traditions arising from it, with the changed version.[56] News and messaging strategies reveal these nuances and are the keys that helped Aeschylus unlock the constraints of the 'fixed' mythological dénouements. The journey to the end of the story is revealed to be much richer and more layered than would otherwise be the case. An examination of exactly how Aeschylus uses the myths and the consequences of any alterations in the context of news and message enabling will form part of the discussion and will contribute to an understanding of the complex processes underpinning the theatrical realisations of the stories.

---

[54] Wohl (2015): 19.

[55] Produced c.450 B.C.E. Euripides' authorship of the play is disputed, as Barrett (2002): 169-70 notes.

[56] '… this act of reframing the familiar underpins much of the play. To a significant degree, this interest in restating the familiar in altered form is directed toward staging an encounter between the Iliadic version of the Rhesos myth and the traditions that diverge from it. And in so doing, the play announces that one of its chief concerns is the fate of Rhesos in the poetic tradition.' Barrett (2002): 174.

Internal and External Audiences

The thesis will demonstrate that news and messaging systems act as essential triggers for both the internal and external audiences to point them towards specific messaging narratives and to create responses to what is taking place on the stage. In this way, messaging can also influence the perspective of the internal and external audiences.

The distinction between internal and external audiences, as well as relating to the news and messaging delivery system, is also significant in terms of space and time. The external audience brings to the performance varying degrees of knowledge or expectation depending on how well they know the character and/or plot of the play. The social status of figures on the stage necessarily influences the perception and forms of interaction with the external audience. This was by no means a homogenous group. Stewart has written about the cosmopolitan nature of the ancient audience; he notes that a civic festival

> serves as a gathering place for Greeks from more than one state or region. The Athenians intended for their city to be open to the Greek world and they took active steps to ensure the presence of allied delegations at the Dionysia. The audience of most performances of tragedy in the classical period would have contained a significant proportion of non-Athenian visitors and resident aliens.[57]

The resulting broad social mixture would have created an audience with contrasting, possibly conflicting, views on the social, civic and mythological narratives portrayed on the Athenian stage.

---

[57] Stewart (2017): 66.

Internal and external audiences can connect on a number of levels. Griffith

says that

> an audience in the theater experiences simultaneously (or in
> rapid alternation) at least three quite different perspectives
> on the action unfolding before it: (i) it empathizes with the
> ambitions or horrified anxieties of the leading character(s);
> (ii) it shares and enjoys the gods' or prophet's (and
> author's) ability to look down on those leaders, from a
> distance, as misguided and error-prone objects of pity or
> scorn; (iii) along with the fearful choral group or minor
> character, it gazes up at these leaders from below in wonder,
> as stupendously superior pillars of strength, ambition, and
> determination. And from first to last, safe in his/her theater
> seat, every member of the audience knows that this 'internal
> audience' of minor characters and chorus, will *survive*, to
> resume their lives after the drama of the leaders has played
> itself out, just as they themselves (the theater audience) will
> resume their everyday lives upon leaving the theater. To
> that extent at least, these minor characters and this chorus
> are felt to be more *like* the theater audience, and *closer* to
> them, than are their leaders, upon whom so much attention
> (from both internal and theater audiences) is so fiercely
> focused [his emphases].[58]

The internal audience of the play comprises the other characters, particularly

the chorus, whose internal status can sometimes be marginalised compared

with the other characters. Chorus identity can be perceived as being low

status (for example, the women in the *Seven against Thebes* and *Choephoroe*)

contrasted with the highest (the Erinyes of the *Eumenides*); this can also affect

external audience responses.[59] Sheila Murnaghan notes that

> although chorus members themselves were invariably
> citizens, their dramatic roles usually depart from the profile

---

[58] Griffith (1995): 73.

[59] 'Although they are often on the margins of the action, choruses are closely involved with the main characters: They are "both the prisoners and the passionately engaged witnesses to tragic experience" [Gould (1996): 221], and this tempers the degree to which they offer the detached perspective expected of narrators (the role of non-dramatic choruses) and spectators.' Murnaghan (2011): 246.

> of a citizen as free, male, native, and, in ideal form, in the prime of life: choruses most often depict figures who are socially marginalized, like female slaves, or disqualified from full participation in active life, like the old. This feature of the tragic chorus is often noted, but has been difficult to interpret, since choruses do not simply voice the perspective of outsiders: whatever their fictional identities, they often articulate broadly shared communal traditions and values.[60]

The perception of the audience contributes to how the play comes to life as it is performed.[61] Ancient theatrical performance is a two-way process between actor and spectator, stage and community, and is therefore dependent upon the audience for full theatrical realisation. Staging and interpretation processes inform audience perception and conclusions drawn from modern scholarship on audience response may be extrapolated back to try to understand how these decisions affect performance and production. It would be wrong to suggest that this analysis would provide 'evidence' for the ancient productions but it will provide insights into the process.[62] It also helps to generate thoughts on ancient staging techniques which could lead to new ways of looking at the texts which may inform future productions.

Conceptual Tools

During the research a variety of concepts and models were utilised to help identify, navigate and think around the issues that my investigation raised. The most important conceptual tools are discussed below to explore their

---

[60] Murnaghan (2011): 247.
[61] Arnott (1991), Scodel (1993), Rhodes (2003), Taplin *et al.* (2003), Revermann and Wilson (2008), Barker (2009) and Roselli (2011) all discuss audience participation.
[62] As Fischer-Lichte has also noted, it is the human element of a performance that creates meaning, not the text alone, Fischer-Lichte (2010): 35-6.

construction and explain how they will be used, and to prepare the reader for their deployment throughout the thesis.

Message Enabling

Message enabling is a key extension of the news and messaging delivery system. Message enabling is a function performed by those characters who do not necessarily act as messengers but who nevertheless allow the creation and delivery of messages to either internal or external audiences, or to both, and who act as triggers for news and messaging. It is a mechanism that can be subtle or overt. The ghost of Darius in *Persians* (681-842), the Scout in *Seven against Thebes* (ἀγγελλος κατάσκοπος, 39-68, 375-652), Pelasgus in *Suppliants* (234-523, 911-975) and Io in *Prometheus Bound* (561-886) are all prominent message enablers.

As an example, the presence of Darius' ghost in *Persians* reflects the deceased man's pervading influence in the play's universe. Darius' authority is entrenched throughout the play;[63] it is his authority that allows him to ascend from the Underworld (691). The inclusion of Darius through his ghostly manifestation simultaneously enables both the internal and external audiences to reflect on Persian history and its future, and the impact of this in the performance present becomes representative of the rolling past-present-future pattern of the play. He symbolises the dualities explored in the play between empire and family, duty and personal desire, psychology and

---

[63] Lines 244, 555-6, 647-55, 662, 671, 852-70.

practicality; he also acts as a trigger for the internal and external audiences. His presence thus enables the realisation of these various messages for both the internal and external audiences; without his ghost in attendance to bring these elements forward, many of the multi-layered messages he represents would not be as effectively deployed. In contrast, the Scout in *Seven against Thebes* (39-68, 375-652) performs a slightly different function. He begins by declaring the safety of the *polis* (794) and delivers the news of the brothers' deaths (805). He creates an opportunity for the internal and external audiences to reflect on the history that led to their fight: his message enables the Chorus to bring the origins of the brothers' troubles to the fore, explicitly linking them to their deaths (832-47). In these ways, the important concept of message enabling stimulates a wealth of new and alternative narratives.

Time and Space

The interactions between the various characters on stage have repercussions on the perceptions of the external audience. The contrasting temporal spaces of the stage and the external audience create a state of constant flux which reveals past, present and future knowledge to both internal and external audiences in different ways. These temporal spheres help to reveal subtle nuances embedded within the play that add depth and richness to the story unfolding on stage. Because the temporal dimensions moving between the two audiences are fluid, they allow for multiple layers of meaning to be revealed simultaneously, generating ambivalence and creating a complex presentation which prompts the audience to think more deeply about the issues explored in the play.

Rush Rehm has formulated a spatial model that dismantles the concept of a single performative space presented to an audience.[64] His model has identified six categories of space that create individual and compound layers of meaning when used to interpret a scene. These six categories are:

1. theatrical space (a composite of all space);
2. scenic space (the physical);
3. extrascenic space (offstage, via the *skene*, the structure at the back of the stage);
4. distanced space (accessed via the *eisodoi*, the entrance/exit passageways to the stage);
5. self-referential/metatheatrical space (reflecting back on the genre); and
6. reflexive space (similarities to the real world).

The thesis examines how Aeschylus combines different spatialities to create distinctive spatial frameworks that work within the news and messaging system and Rehm's model is a useful starting point for thinking about this.[65] The concept is relevant across the thesis but particularly for the work on *Persians* and *Seven against Thebes*, chapters which further develop the theory.[66] Messaging is a key mechanism for linking and bridging these layers of space.

---

[64] Rehm (2002).

[65] Hardwick (2016a): 155 builds on Rehm's model in a way that is useful for thinking about how ancient tragedies are interpreted and received in the modern world. She identifies 'the cultural space in which both ancient and modern spheres of reference can meet. It is the overlap and sometimes collision within and between ancient and modern cultural spaces that electrifies performance and fuels its transformative capacity in contexts in which the spectators are increasingly seen as realisers of meaning, and in which performances of Greek drama have come to be associated with deep issues of cultural transition and associated crises of identity and legitimation.'

[66] See chapter one (pp. 54 ff.) and chapter two (pp. 102 ff.).

Aetiology

Using temporality as a conceptual tool opens up the relationships between aetiological narratives and messaging. An aetiological narrative is another layer of message delivery that requires investigation. The term aetiology refers to study of the cause or origin of something. It is derived from *aition* (αἴτιον),[67] a story, which provides an explanation of the origin of a name, a place or an aspect of a mythological story. A broad interpretation of the word (αἴτιος + λόγος)[68] relates to the interpretation of a cause or event – so understanding the court scene of the *Eumenides* is an aetiological process for the external audience because it reflects on the origin (or the association) of events taking place in an historical time near to their own.[69] Aetiology is a way of highlighting the origin or cause of something; it can indicate explaining a name or even creating a mythological history for a place or family thereby forming an 'origin' story. When appearing within the context of a play, aetiological narratives connect the theatrical world to the world of the external audience.

An aetiological narrative also delivers messages which can either support or enhance the more explicit messages being delivered. For example, the story

---

[67] The lexicon of Liddell and Scott (2013) offers the interpretations 'cause, responsibility; to blame, blameworthy, culpable; the accused'. Goldhill notes that the word can also mean 'guilty' and can therefore apply a different meaning to the text if interpreted in this way, Goldhill (1997): 132-3

[68] Λόγος is 'a word; saying, statement; speech, discourse, conversation; a saying, tale; prose; a speech, oration; the thing spoken of, subject-matter; a proposition, position, principle', Liddell and Scott (2013).

[69] In the *Persians*, the Persian court scenes and descriptions of the army may be considered as aetiologically-tinged narratives because they have real meaning for an external audience who may have had direct contact with the Persian army.

of Prometheus' trickery of Zeus at Mekone is aetiological because it explains why the ancient Greeks burned fat for the gods during sacrifices whilst keeping the meat back for themselves.[70] It is a way of understanding what is being shown on stage relative to the audience's own experience and/or knowledge (for both internal and external audiences) and helps when thinking about the differences between news and messages when they are shared and/or directed at the internal or external audience – there may be one meaning for the internal audience but another for the external audience (which may have other aetiological perspectives in addition to those explored in the play). Aetiological narratives create links between what is shown on the stage and what the audience may know from their own lives; links that perhaps are so ingrained that the original audience would not consciously register them but that are nevertheless so useful to later scholars attempting to unravel the meanings of the dramatic form.

Various scholars approach aetiology in a more complex way. Edith Hall's definition is that the *aition* in tragedy is an explanation made through myth for the origins of an Athenian custom.[71] Patricia E. Easterling believes drama is aetiological through the constantly shifting nature of the theatrical event and therefore is inherently self-referential.[72] Martin Revermann discusses the

---

[70] Hes. *Theog*. 536-65. Fowler discusses the importance of the role of mythographers in the aetiology of cults, Fowler (2013): xi. Mekone was identified with Sikyon in the Peloponnese; see West (2002): 116.
[71] Hall (1997): 100.
[72] '… drama almost by definition exploits the audience's awareness of the contradictory nature of the theatrical event – real and not real at the same time – and is therefore always potentially self-referential in this broad "aetiological" sense, though any particular reading may of course be open to debate.' Easterling (2008): 221-2.

Introduction

Eumenides' Pythia's 'aetiology of space', which he explains as encompassing past, present and future and simultaneously acknowledging the power of the chthonic gods.[73] The resolution of the trilogy becomes a combination of the justice of Athena and the justice of the Athenian people (248).[74] Revermann describes aetiology as 'a narrative that provides reasons for why things are the way they are now by reference to events of the past'.[75]

Aetiology as a conceptual tool is relevant to the research because an aetiological narrative is another layer of message delivery, albeit one that is much more subtle than other mechanisms. Activating an aetiological narrative delivers implicit messages which can either support or enhance the more explicit messages being delivered. The aetiological aspects of Aeschylus' extant plays will help illustrate the (sometimes changing) understanding between the internal and external audiences. It is of particular relevance for the discussions on the *Eumenides.*[76]

Metatheatricality

Closely linked with the aetiological aspect of messaging is the concept of metatheatricality,[77] the combination of two worlds, or the play within the

---

[73] Revermann (2008): 241.

[74] *Eumenides* is a '*sustained* aetiological narrative' [his emphasis], Revermann (2008): 253.

[75] Revermann (2008): 252. For Revermann the aetiological mode operates using chronotopes. The chronotope is a mechanism where the spatial and temporal frameworks explicit or implicit in a text have the same structure Seaford (2012): 1, 10. In other words, the temporal and spatial planes of a particular scene are in harmony in terms of their thematic content and action.

[76] See chapter five, pp. 307 ff.

[77] See Falkner (1998), Burian (1997) and Segal (1997).

play. Metatheatricality enables and invites the spectator to reflect on the performance. An example of this would be the portrayal of democracy found in the *Suppliants*.[78] Allusions to contemporary history are also found in *Persians*,[79] and to later history in the *Eumenides*, where the external Athenian spectators become subsumed into the on-stage narrative of the dramatic jury. In respect of Homeric poetry, Peter Burian suggests implicit Homeric cross-references can be understood by the spectator and as such are referenced by the audience, rather than the poet (194);[80] the poet expects the audience to understand the framework he has created. Metatheatricality makes the external audience both participant and observer.

Intertextuality

Intertextuality normally points to the relationships between texts and their subject matter – the external audience are able to make connections and find patterns between the texts based on their own knowledge of the stories portrayed. This knowledge is supported by awareness of mythological narratives embedded within Athens through the medium of song or poetry, such as the performance of Epic poetry at festivals and the propagation of Homeric poetry.[81] These retellings are by their very nature intertextual; Barrett notes that

> Every act of (re)telling (part of) the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* in
> the classical period – or, indeed, in the archaic period –

---

[78] See discussion in chapter three on p. 465.
[79] See chapter one, pp. 54 ff.
[80] Burian (1997).
[81] See discussion on p. 18 above.

> necessarily asks that it be read against the Homeric version. Such intertextuality was, of course, widely practiced and used to greatly varying effect.[82]

The thesis considers the relationship between the myths or stories in the play texts, and the mythological narratives, as being intertextual. Mythological narratives were extrapolated to create new stories: 'forever repeating but never the same, it follows that tragedy is not casually or occasionally intertextual, but always and inherently so'.[83] This view is supported by Manfred Pfister who claims that '[prior] knowledge has the effect of forming a contrasting intertextual background which emphasises the elements that deviate from the older version, thus enduing those elements with greater informational significance'.[84]

Foreshadowing

Foreshadowing is a technique which significantly adds to the news and messaging techniques exploited in the plays. Foreshadowing is where additional news and messages are alluded to in statements or where messages have underlying layers within them that can be activated subsequently. Foreshadowing messages are often ominous in nature and are especially

---

[82] Barrett (2002): 186.
[83] Burian (1997): 179. For example, Goldhill suggests that Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (Φιλοκτήτης, 409 B.C.E.) creates a different Lemnos from that of Homer and his *Electra* draws comparisons between Epic and tragic expressions of *kleos,* Goldhill (1997): 130. Easterling cites similarities between the *Electra* plays by Sophocles and Euripides and Aeschylus' *Choephoroe*. The imagery of Electra with the alleged funeral vessel of Orestes was prominent in vase paintings and the different interpretations of the imagery recall the other plays – 'each of the later dramatists seems to exploit the power of the stage picture to recall another play ... to suggest to the spectators ... that what they are seeing now has a new kind of message to offer'. Easterling (1997b):168-9.
[84] Pfister (1988): 43.

prevalent in the *Oresteia*.[85]   In the trilogy the use of foreshadowing contributes to the pervading atmosphere of distrust and deceit in Agamemnon's palace, established right at the start of the trilogy by the Watchman (φύλαξ, *Ag*. 36-9). Not only does it add another dimension to the news and messaging delivery systems, foreshadowing also influences the perception of the internal and external audiences. Foreshadowing is present in all seven plays examined in the thesis to varying degrees and in different ways. It is particularly effective when used in conjunction with mythological narratives where it may alter well-known mythological stories to serve the dramatic story arc.   Foreshadowing may serve to deflect preconceived perceptions of what may be taking place on stage or it may reinforce them.

False Messages

An important aspect of messaging is the use of false messages, whose delivery can change the direction of the narrative. False messages can take the form of lies or of the withholding information, frequently to the detriment of another character. The mechanism of false messaging is a significant method of communication because it involves manipulation of either or both of the internal and external audiences. It sometimes involves privileging one or other of them, most often the external audience who may have additional knowledge not available to the internal audience. In the *Choephoroe*, false messaging deployed through the nurse's treachery (770-82) leads directly to

---

[85] *Ag*. 14-9, 34-9, 580-2, 605-12, 854, 975, 1067, 1100-11, 1258-60, 1284-5; *Choe*. 103-5, 143-4, 560-5, 679-90, 773, 1020; *Eum*. 230-1, 260, 502-5.

the death of Aegisthus. Persuaded by the Chorus to alter Clytemnestra's message, the Nurse's collusion allows Orestes to proceed to the murder of his mother unchallenged.

False messaging would not have been an alien concept to the external audience. Chapter one in the thesis discusses the use of false messaging by the general Themistocles (c.524-459 B.C.E.) in the battle against the Persians, alluded to by Aeschylus in his dramatisation of the Battle of Salamis in 480 B.C.E. (*Pers*. 353-86). Themistocles' act of deception delivered the Persian fleet to the Greeks and began what would come to be a turning point in the wars between the two states. In the *Choephoroe*, Aeschylus uses the technique no less successfully, evolving the narrative of Aegisthus to result in the death of Clytemnestra.[86]

The Significance of Silence

The range of techniques deployed to deliver or enable news and messaging includes the use of silence, focalisation and interruption. These have arisen from the news and messaging analysis of the plays. Silence is a powerful tool that has been revealed to facilitate the delivery of news and messaging. Silence is not just an indication of absence of words; it can also point to deliberate repression of thoughts or withholding of information to bring about or influence an action. It can allow focus on another protagonist or event; to indicate anger or respect; to leave gaps between noises; to indicate the

---

[86] In the *Odyssey*, it is Aegisthus who kills Agamemnon (Hom. *Od*. 4.530-7).

repression of parts of a narrative or responses to events; to imply erasure or subliminal information; to defer realisation or action; and to foster tension or expectation. One figure's silence may allow another figure to act or speak in a certain way. It may allow the internal or external audience to make assumptions about what is taking place or speculate about the motives of the silent figure. Silence is used to great effect in Aeschylean tragedy, most notably in the *Oresteia*. In the *Agamemnon*, Cassandra's first utterance at line 1072 (having been on stage since line 810) has a powerful impact. The silence of Pylades in the *Choephoroe* renders his sole contribution (900-2) much more effectively than might have been the case had he been an active interlocutor. In the *Prometheus Bound*, Prometheus is present but completely silent for the duration of the prologue (1-87), a striking use of the protagonist's opening scene. He later lapses into silence again (436-8) which gives the Chorus the opportunity to sing about his difficult circumstances, reinforcing the messages around his incarceration. Rather than merely being an absence, silence instead actively contributes to messaging narratives.

Focalisation

The concept of focalisation is a useful conceptual tool.[87] Focalisation analysis examines the perspectives presented in speech and how they are

---

[87] '… the following analysis [shows] how a narrative 'works': when we read or hear a narrative we read or hear words which together form a *text*. This text contains a *story*, told to narratees by a narrator. The story he tells contains his view on a series of events that are either supposed to have taken place (the suspension of disbelief characteristic of fiction) or that really have taken place (historiographical or biographical narratives), and that together form the *fabula*. The viewing of the events of the fabula is called focalization: there is the seeing or recalling of events, their emotional filtering and temporal ordering, and the

communicated.[88]   Different speakers and types of speech allow multiple

perspectives to be displayed in a narrative thus adding to the range of

interpretations that might be made, both inside and outside the play. For

example, de Jong's approach is 'that narration always entails focalization'.[89]

There may be multiple narrators and focalisers within a narrative. A narrative

may contain a 'primary narrative-focalizer',[90] e.g., the person who narrates

the *Iliad* is a primary narrative-focaliser who acts to structure the Epic poem.

A further layer is added when a second person's perspective is included by

the narrator-focaliser, resulting in embedded focalisation, typified by verbs of

emotion and perception that bring the perspectives of others into the narrative

in a quasi-objective way.

Focalisation is particularly relevant when examining the delivery of messages

and news, especially when dealing with message enablers. For example, the

Scout in the *Seven against Thebes* uses a focalising narrative when he

describes the Seven arming themselves for battle (the Shield Scene, 375-

652).[91] His exchange with Eteocles brings the Argive soldiers to life and

recreates the scene he witnessed as it would appear to his fellow Thebans,

inspiring fear and trepidation: Tydeus is 'roaring' (βρέμει); Hippomedon is

the embodiment of terror (αὐτὸς δ᾽ ἐπηλάλαξεν, ἔνθεος δ᾽ Ἄρει βακχᾷ πρὸς

---

fleshing out of space into scenery and persons into characters', de Jong (2014): 47 (author's italics).

[88] de Jong (2014): 47 notes that 'the word "focalization" is often used incorrectly in the sense of "the giving of emphasis"'.

[89] de Jong (2014): 47.

[90] Schmitz (2007): 60-1.

[91] Chapter two, pp. 101 ff.

ἀλκὴν Θυιὰς ὡς φόβον βλέπων, 497-8); Amphiaraus will empty the city by

force (ἦ μὴν λαπάξειν ἄστυ Καδμείων βίᾳ, 531). The Shield Scene, evoked

by the Scout's narration, brings forth an emotional response from Eteocles

and the Chorus which in turn affects how the external audience responds to

the action. This is particularly relevant to the Messenger's speech in

Persians,[92] where the emotional engagement of the external audience evoked

by the Messenger would have been intensified by the remembered real-life

experiences of those present in the external audience who had actually fought

in the Persian wars. Focalisation embeds an emotional response within the

narrative which affects how the external audience may respond to events on

stage.

Interruption

Interruption is a subtle but very effective way of enhancing news and message

delivery. It is used to great effect in the *Prometheus Bound* (631-4, 782-5)

where it is used, through stichomythia (στιχομυθία),[93] by the chorus to control

---

[92] Chapter one, pp. 54 ff.

[93] The technique where two figures have a sequence of alternating lines. For Aeschylus'
use of the technique, see *Pers*. 232-48 (Chorus and Queen), 715-39 (Queen and Darius),
787-99 (Chorus and Darius), 1002-78 (Chorus and Xerxes); *Seven*. 245-63, 712-19 (Chorus
and Eteocles), 875-1004, 1054-78 (split chorus), 1042-53 (Herald and Antigone); *Supp*.
210-21 (Chorus and Danaus), 293-322, 335-45, 455-67, 506-15 (Chorus and Pelasgus),
916-29 (Pelasgus and Herald), 1052-61 (Chorus and Argive chorus); *P.B.* 39-81 (Kratos
and Hephaestus), 246-58, 515-21, 928-36 (Prometheus and Chorus), 377-92 (Prometheus
and Oceanos), 615-30, 757-81 (Prometheus and Io), 964-86 (Prometheus and Hermes); *Ag*.
268-80 (Chorus and Clytemnestra), 538-50 (Chorus and Herald), 931-43 (Agamemnon and
Clytemnestra), 1198-213, 1246-55, 1299-312 (Chorus and Cassandra), 1649-53, 1665-71
(Chorus and Aegisthus); *Choe*. 106-23, 165-82 (Electra and Chorus), 212-24, 489-96
(Electra and Orestes), 526-34 (Orestes and Chorus), 766-82 (Chorus and Cilissa), 908-28
(Orestes and Clytemnestra); *Eum*. 201-12, 225-8 (Apollo and Chorus), 418-35, 892-902
(Athena and Chorus). Two-line alternations, distichomythia, is also used; see *Ag*. 620-36
(Chorus and Herald) and *Choe*. 1051-64 (Orestes and Chorus).

the narrative. The effect of this is to further increase the tension in an already highly-charged narrative and to delay the delivery of news and messages. This delaying tactic is also used by Pylades in the *Choephoroe* (900-2). The interruption of Pylades allows the narrative of the *Choephoroe* to be completed and its importance here is magnified by the fact that these are Pylades' only lines in the whole play. It also significantly contributes to increasing the tension of the scene where Orestes is preparing to kill Clytemnestra; Pylades' interruption serves to heighten the emotional engagement of both the internal and external audiences.

Stichomythia

Stichomythia may be considered a theatrical convention that is also relevant to message delivery systems. This was demonstrated in *Persians* (715-38), where it engenders reinforcement of the news about Xerxes' disastrous defeat at the hands of the Athenians. A similar effect is found in *Seven against Thebes* (961-1004) where a split chorus use the technique to re-enact the fatal dual between Polynices and Eteocles. As discussed above, stichomythia may also be utilised to assert control over the narrative. The stichomythic style forces the other party to postpone their monologue, thereby effectively controlling the flow of the narrative.

The conceptual tools set out above are the principal models for the research. Some concepts are more prominently applicable than others in each chapter

but collectively they support a continuous thread that contributes to the shape of the research narrative.

Aeschylus and His Work

Aeschylus, son of Euphorion, lived 525/4-456/5 B.C.E. The *Life of Aeschylus* (*Vita Aeschyli*) says that he came from an aristocratic family from Eleusis, an Attic deme north-west from the centre of Athens.[94] Aeschylus had a military career as a citizen soldier as well as being a civic playwright; the *Vita* records his bravery at the battles of Marathon (490 B.C.E.), Salamis (480 B.C.E.) and Plataea (479 B.C.E.). His brothers Cynegeirus and Ameinias died at the battles of Marathon and Salamis respectively.[95] The fragments of the *Marmor Parium* (Parian Marble), a stele containing a Greek chronology, also record Aeschylus' participation in the Battle of Marathon in 490 B.C.E. and his first tragic victory in 486/5 B.C.E.[96]

Aeschylus was a famous and influential figure in ancient Athens and beyond: this is apparent from different kinds of evidence. The ancient sources relating to him directly include the comedies of the poet Aristophanes (c.447-c.385 B.C.E.). Aeschylus is mentioned by name in *Clouds* (*Νεφέλαι*) (produced in

---

[94] *Vita Aeschyli 1*.
[95] Herod. *Hist*. 6.114, 362; *Vita Aeschyli 1*. Scaife suggests that the reference to Ameinias may be erroneous as Herodotus (*Hist*. 8.84) ascribes him to a different deme. 'Aeschylus', Suda Online, tr. Ross Scaife, 22 March 2002, accessed 4 July 2017 http://www.stoa.org/sol-entries/alphaiota/357.
[96] The Parian Marble: Translation, A. 2, The Oxford Fragment, Entries 41-50 [Interleaved Greek and English text (translation by Gillian Newing)], http://www.ashmolean.museum/ash/faqs/q004/q004012.html accessed 23 September 2014.

423 B.C.E.) (lines 1368-73) and *Acharnians* (Ἀχαρνεῖς, 425 B.C.E.) (9-12)[97]

and is also referred to in the *scholia* for the latter play.[98] In *Frogs* (Βάτραχοι,

405 B.C.E.), he features as a character, deceased, in competition with

Euripides (also recently deceased) for the throne of tragedy. He also appears

in a fragment of *Krapataloi* (Κραπατάλοι, before 421 B.C.E.) by the comic

poet Pherecrates,[99] a contemporary of Aristophanes. He is referred to by

Plutarch (b.before 50 C.E.-d.after 120 C.E.) in the *Ten Orators* (*Vitae Decem

Oratorum*, 841), which suggests that the Athenian statesman Lycurgus

(c.390-325/4 B.C.E.) decreed that the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and

Euripides should be written down and kept for reference for future

productions.[100]

Of Aeschylus' life, his contemporary Ion of Chios (c.480s-c.421 B.C.E.)

records basic background information[101] and his ancient *Vita* includes his

alleged epitaph.[102] Plutarch chose to record Aeschylus discussing a boxing

match with Ion of Chios[103] and elsewhere writes about a possible reason for

Aeschylus' departure from Athens for Sicily.[104] Athenaeus (fl. c.200 C.E.)

records that he spent some time living on Sicily,[105] while the geographer

---

[97] Sommerstein (1973): 168 and 49 respectively.
[98] Csapo and Slater (1994): 1.17B, 12.
[99] See Farmer (2016): 19 and Hanink and Uhlig (2016): 51-3.
[100] Csapo and Slater (1994): 1.14, 10.
[101] *Elegy and Iambus*, I.16.
[102] *Vita Aeschyli* 8-11.
[103] *Moralia* 79E.
[104] Plutarch (*Cimon*, 8) says Aeschylus was upset at the circumstances of Sophocles' first victory in 468 B.C.E. (Bowra (1940): 392) because Cimon appointed the ten *phylé* (φυλή) leaders to sit in judgement of the contest rather than choosing them by lot as was usually the case (see Wilson (2000): 98-102).
[105] Athen. *Deip*. 9.65.

Strabo of Amaseia (c.64 B.C.E.-c.24 C.E.) also writes of Aeschylus'
knowledge of the island.[106] There is also the *hypothesis* to *Persians*,[107] which
quotes Glaucus' *On the Myths of Aeschylus (Γλαῦκος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Αἰσχύλου
μύθων)*;[108] a scholion to Sophocles' *Aias* (*Αἴας*) (early 440s B.C.E.) which
quotes Aeschylus' lost *Thracian Women* (*Θρῇσσαι*),[109] and the *Register of the
Lives of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides* (*Vitae*) written by Satyrus of
Alexandria (c.200 B.C.E.),[110] part of which is found in the massive archive of
papyri excavated at the Egyptian city of Oxyrhynchus in the nineteenth and
twentieth centuries.[111] There are ancient theatrical production records such
as those found in the *Suda* (*Σοῦδα*), an historical encyclopaedia compiled
during the tenth century C.E.[112]

There are eighty play titles attributed to Aeschylus but, as with much ancient
evidence, this figure is subject to debate.[113] Of these, there are just six extant
plays, and the disputed *Prometheus Bound*:

- *Persians* (*Πέρσαι*) produced in 472 B.C.E.;

- *Seven against Thebes* (*Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας*), 467 B.C.E.;

- *Suppliants* (*Ἱκέτιδες*), c.463 B.C.E.;

---

[106] Strab. 6.1. 'To the scholiast on Aristophanes' *Peace* Aeschylus was virtually a native Sicilian', Stewart (2017): 103.

[107] Hall speculates that the *hypothesis* is probably 'a late compilation of observations dating back to the Hellenistic scholars of Alexandria', Hall (1996): 105.

[108] Lines 1-2, Hall (1996): 36.

[109] Csapo and Slater (1994): I.54B, 28 and Sommerstein (2008b): 100-3.

[110] Csapo and Slater (1994): 1.81, 33.

[111] Select images of papyri are accessible online via http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/

[112] *Pratinas*, Csapo and Slater (1994): II.16, 101. Entries accessible online via http://www.stoa.org/sol/.

[113] Sommerstein provides a full list of plays ascribed to Aeschylus in antiquity. See Sommerstein (2008b) and Sommerstein (2010): 10-11.

- *Prometheus Bound* (Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης), c.460-456 B.C.E.;[114] and

- the *Oresteia* (Ὀρέστεια), 458 B.C.E., the only surviving tragic trilogy comprising *Agamemnon* (Ἀγαμέμνων), *Choephoroe* (Χοηφόροι) and *Eumenides* (Εὐμενίδες).

These surviving plays are diverse in topic and structure: *Persians* is based on an historical event (the Battle of Salamis in 480 B.C.E.); *Seven against Thebes* deals with familial curses and their far-reaching effects; *Suppliants* examines the question of foreignness and assimilation; the *Oresteia*, a towering narrative of revenge and justification studded with Homeric influence; and the *Prometheus Bound*, a play about authority and punishment between mortals and gods, steeped in pre-Olympian mythology. Although only these seven plays have survived to date there is a tradition in the ancient sources that Aeschylus was held in sufficient regard to warrant the reproduction of his plays after his death.[115] Whether this is true or not it indicates a level of ancient engagement with Aeschylus that is very striking.[116]

There are many surviving fragments of Aeschylus' other plays, the standard edition of which is Volume III of the *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*.[117] Text and parallel translations of many of these may be found in the Loeb

---

[114] The question of the authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound* will be addressed below.
[115] Quintilian 10.1.66 quoted in Sommerstein (2010): 16 n. 33 and *scholion* to Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 10, Csapo and Slater (1994): I.17B, 12.
[116] Garvie (2016): 24 notes that although Aeschylus may have been admired, he was not necessarily favoured as time went on: 'although he was popular enough for an edict to be passed after his death, allowing his plays, *exceptionally for that time* [my italics], to be restaged at the Athenian City Dionysia, in the 4th century it was the other two tragedians, especially Euripides, whose plays were most often revived'.
[117] Radt (1971). See also McHardy *et al.* (2005).

Classical Library edition, which also includes the fragments which are unattributed but likely to have been by Aeschylus.[118] Many of the fragments date from the second century C.E. and the manuscripts are thought to be written by the same scribe.[119]

Material Evidence for Aeschylus' Work

Ancient vases exist which depict scenes from tragedy or mythology.[120] The vases are pictorial evidence of the popularity and prevalence of ancient mythological stories and almost represent a form of message delivery in their own right.[121] A particular scene, even if not overtly connected to a dramatic performance, nevertheless encapsulates a narrative, an example or parable which owners of the vases would observe when using them. Oliver Taplin discusses eleven vases that he believes 'may be most plausibly connected with lost plays' indicating that although the plays are now lost, they were once considered popular enough for preservation through this type of medium.[122] Five vases dating from the fourth century B.C.E. specifically relate to

---

[118] Sommerstein (2008b).

[119] Sommerstein (2008b): 333. Constantinidis (2016): 9 notes the inherent dangers in the transmission of the ancient texts across the centuries; see p. 61 below.

[120] Although Taplin notes 'I know, in fact, of only two fifth-century paintings that can plausibly be claimed to show a play in performance. Both are early, from the era of Aeschylus', Taplin (1997): 69-70. Harvey (2005): 40 cautions that vase paintings 'may illustrate a myth, not a tragedy based on that myth; or they may reflect a painting illustrating the myth. If they do depict a drama, the image may not be of one particular moment: the artist may fuse different scenes from the play, or even scenes from different plays; or he may try to include all the main characters (who may not all appear on stage at the same time), in the way that posters for films often show all the leading actors together. They are not photographs of a production.' There are currently around 100,000 Athenian decorated vases in existence which were produced between 499-406 B.C.E., Taplin (2007): 15.

[121] The nature of such evidence, however, precludes a definitive news and messaging analysis in terms of the productions of tragedy.

[122] Taplin (2007): 68. The plays are *Edonians*, *Europe* (or *Carians*), *Niobe*, *Prometheus Unbound*, *Phineus* and *Phrygians*.

Aeschylus' production of the *Choephoroe,*[123] and six vases may feature Aeschylus' production of the *Eumenides*; five of these were produced in the fourth century B.C.E. and one is from c.400s B.C.E.[124] Taplin compares the scenes portrayed on the vases with the text of the plays to determine whether it is more likely that the scenes are from mythology or refer directly to productions of Aeschylus' plays and suggests plausible links may be found.[125] The *Oresteia* has the distinction of being represented in more vase-paintings that any other work,[126] suggestive both of the trilogy's popularity and familiarity with audiences and as a work held in high regard long after Aeschylus' death.[127]

Aeschylus' Unique Voice

Aeschylus' plays are the earliest European extant tragic plays that we currently possess. His style and language were remarked upon by his contemporaries[128] as dissimilar to that of his fellow tragedians.[129] Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.) in his *Poetics* (*Περὶ ποιητικῆς,* c.335 B.C.E.) comments on Aeschylus' innovations in theatre practice, saying that he increased the

---

[123] Taplin (2007): 49-57.
[124] Taplin (2007): 58-67.
[125] The vases are not overtly linked to events described in the plays but connections may be identified. One vase connected to the *Eumenides* features a possible amalgamation of elements of the performance (the Apulian bell-krater, c.380s B.C.E. by the Eumenides Painter, pp. 62-3); another (the Apulian bell-krater, c.400s B.C.E. by the Hearst Painter, pp. 67) may be directly influenced by Aeschylus' production of which Taplin says 'This is really quite close to the scene at *Eum.* 254-396, which, as far as we know, was invented by Aeschylus.' Taplin (2007): 67.
[126] Taplin (2007): 49.
[127] It is notable that many of the vases depicting Athenian tragedy were produced in Greek South Italy. Taplin (1997): 90.
[128] Plutarch records Sophocles commenting on his differences to Aeschylus, *Moralia* 79B; Athenaeus wrote that Aeschylus also used many Sicilian words, *Deip.* 9.65.
[129] Hall (1996): 22.

number of actors to two and increased the volume of spoken dialogue while reducing the role of the chorus.[130] Athenaeus also refers to Aeschylus and says he acted in his dramas and created his own choral dance steps.[131] Aeschylus' *Vita* indicates that he increased the speaking parts in tragedy from one to three[132] but Sophocles is also credited with this particular innovation.[133] *Persians*, *Seven against Thebes*, *Suppliants*, *Prometheus Bound* and *Agamemnon* all feature two protagonists,[134] whilst in the *Choephoroe* three are required when Pylades speaks (900-2) during the scene between Orestes and Clytemnestra (891-930), and in the *Eumenides* there are three on stage when Apollo addresses the jury (611-730). The observations are important evidence for the influence Aeschylus had on ancient theatre practice. Julius Pollux of Naucratis (fl. 2nd century C.E.) also writes about ancient dramatic conventions in his *Onomasticon* (Ὀνομαστικόν) and refers to Aeschylus' practices several times[135] and the Roman writer Horace (65-8 B.C.E.) refers to him briefly in *The Art of Poetry* (*Ars Poetica*) (c.19 B.C.E.).[136] Other writers who mention him in passing include Stobaeus (c.5 C.E.),[137] recorded in the *Suda*,[138] and Vitruvius Pollio (c.80-70, died after c.15 B.C.E.), discussing other tragedians and using Aeschylus' theatrical career as a dating device.[139]

---

[130] Aristot. *Poet*. 1449a16, 629.
[131] Athen. *Deip*. 1.39.
[132] *Vita Aeschyli* 15.
[133] Diogenes Laertius 3.56 in Csapo and Slater (1994): 225-6.
[134] Collard (2008): lvi.
[135] Appendix A: Pollux, *Onomasticon* 4.99-154 in Csapo and Slater (1994): 393-402.
[136] Csapo and Slater (1994): III.129, 171.
[137] Under Ἰωάννης.
[138] Csapo and Slater (1994): IV.30J, 235.
[139] *On Architecture* 7, preface,11.

Taken together all this evidence indicates that Aeschylus occupied a position of stature in his own lifetime and beyond. Through his inventive use of the fairly basic framework of early tragedy he created works of lasting power and influence. This information shows that Aeschylus was perceived in antiquity, as well as subsequently, as an innovative pioneer of ancient dramatic theory and technique. This status underpins the discussions on theoretical concepts and mechanisms employed in the extant plays as discussed in the thesis.

Overview and Structure of the Thesis Chapters

The thesis consists of five chapters, with separate chapters devoted to *Persians*, *Suppliants*, *Seven against Thebes* and *Prometheus Bound*, and a single (and consequently longer) chapter focusing on the *Oresteia*. Careful consideration was given before deciding upon this structure, taking into account the risk of repetition and duplication in analysing the plays if attempting a theme-based analysis. In considering such a theme-based chapter approach, it also became apparent that there was the danger that the nuances of the news and messaging delivery systems would not be effectively teased out and defined as, although there are some similarities, there are also several differences in how they are approached in each play. For example, silence is used to quite different effect in the *Prometheus Bound*, *Suppliants* and *Agamemnon*. There was also the question of how to address and analyse the temporalities, spatialities and internal and external audience aspects of the research effectively across the seven plays whilst maintaining a coherent and readable narrative and avoiding lengthy repetition of scene analysis.

Significantly, each play yields a distinctive aspect of Aeschylus' use of messaging which enables the thesis to relate this in detail to the structure and language of the play. Single chapters by individual play was therefore identified as the best approach, allowing full and complete analysis of all the research questions identified above within the context of each play. This also afforded the opportunity of applying the research criteria to the only extant tragic trilogy, the *Oresteia*, as a contained unit which allowed a sustained analysis across three connected tragedies. The approach permits an analysis tailored to individual plays whilst respecting their individuality.

Careful consideration was also given to the question of whether or not to include the *Prometheus Bound* in the thesis. The (true) authorship of the *Prometheus Bound* has been in dispute since 1856,[140] with some scholars believing the play may have been written by Aeschylus' son Euphorion.[141] The language, style and technical construction of the text is considerably different from the other extant plays and these aspects are discussed more fully in chapter four's introduction. Prior to reaching the decision to include the play, analysis was undertaken against the research criteria to determine if there was cause to include it by examining the prevalence of the news and messaging functions, and whether the thematic elements were present and sufficiently pronounced to indicate similarities with Aeschylus' extant plays.

---

[140] Sommerstein (2010): 228.
[141] Ruffell (2012): 17. The *Suda* confirms that Euphorion produced his father's work as well as his own; see 'Euphorion', Suda Online, tr. David Whitehead, 21 May 2003. Accessed 4 July 2017 http://www.stoa.org/sol-entries/epsilon/3800.

The play's structure demonstrated sufficient similarities with the thematic and news/messaging structures as the plays known to be by Aeschylus to suggest that its inclusion was worthwhile, and beneficial to interpretations of the play itself and Aeschylus' canon as a whole. For the purposes of the thesis the *Prometheus Bound* will therefore be considered part of the Aeschylean canon. Another reason for inclusion is that although the authorship question is always raised, the play is nearly always included in any general textual analyses of Aeschylus' extant work, an opinion which concurs with that of A. F. Garvie:

> It remains to be seen whether an edition of the plays of Aeschylus will ever be published that omits that play [*Prometheus Bound*] … this is the correct procedure, partly because not everyone is convinced that the play is un-Aeschylean, partly because it shares the same textual history as the other members of the Byzantine triad and therefore cannot be treated in isolation from them, and partly because commentators on the other plays or on *Prometheus* itself will find it convenient to have the text of all seven plays in the same volume for purposes of contrast or comparison.[142]

Chapter order will follow the generally accepted chronology of Aeschylus' extant plays. This is both logical and beneficial in that the development of the research parameters can be examined progressively as the Aeschylean canon (as we have it) progresses. Clearly there are large gaps between plays: there are fourteen years between *Persians* (472 B.C.E.) and the *Oresteia* (458 B.C.E.). There are five years between *Persians* and *Seven against Thebes* (467 B.C.E.), four years between *Seven against Thebes* and *Suppliants* (c.463

---

[142] Garvie (2016): 29-30.

48

B.C.E.) and seven years between *Suppliants* and the *Prometheus Bound* (if using the latest date of 430 B.C.E.). All of the extant plays were produced in Aeschylus' later career (he was aged fifty-three when *Persians* was staged, and would die just sixteen years later) so it is feasible that his dramatic approaches and his writing style were fairly developed by the time he composed the plays that we have. Along with Sophocles, Aeschylus was credited with helping to create the art form so it is possible that his style continued to be creative as his career progressed.[143] In other words, it is by no means certain that the style his compositions evolved into would not have continued to change had he lived longer. Awareness of this is part of the challenge when attempting to track progression in style or approach but the thesis nevertheless demonstrates that patterns can be found in how news and messages are handled. The strategy in each play is shaped by the demands of the theme or narrative and by each mythical episode chosen by the poet.

The introduction to each chapter will begin with a brief overview of the ancient text, its place in the tragic canon, its transmission and the mythological narratives embedded within it. Aeschylus uses mythology to situate the internal and external audiences in the mythological narrative through dialogue and the *parodos* (πάροδος, entrance) as well as more broadly in terms of overarching themes. This underpins the news/message delivery system and impacts upon the perceptions of the internal and external audiences.

---

[143] See p. 45.

Chapter one will discuss *Persians* (472 B.C.E.), a unique play in its own right, being the earliest extant tragedy and a fictionalised interpretation of first-hand knowledge (on the part of Aeschylus, the actors and external audience members) of a very recent historical event. As the only Aeschylean play to feature a formal messenger figure, the chapter will focus on how this is used and the effects of the message enablers around it. The examination of the internal and external audience dynamics will be particularly important in this chapter given that the production took place just eight years after the historical event it dramatises. The chapter's contribution to the thesis is the examination of a formal messenger figure, providing a comparative foundation for subsequent chapters to build upon. Once the formal messenger figure is examined the thesis will demonstrate how Aeschylus develops other non-messaging figures and how they develop over time.

Chapter two discusses the *Seven against Thebes* (467 B.C.E.) and focuses on the temporal and spatial aspects of the play's setting inside the city of Thebes, close to the defence battlements. The news and messaging delivery mechanisms in this play are unusual: the recurring Scout figure (ἄγγελος κατασκοπός) creates a different kind of messenger and the unusual prologue denies the audience (both internal and external) any knowledge of events in the previous two plays of the trilogy. In addition, the constantly-shifting spatial planes create multiple layers which have a distinctive effect on the perceptions of the internal and external audiences. The play and chapter are important for all these reasons and for demonstrating how the use of diegetic

space is harnessed in a play that features two primary temporal dimensions to effect changes to the news and messaging mechanisms.[144]

Chapter three examines the *Suppliants* of 463 B.C.E. This play is important to the thesis because it allows full realisation of the message enabling strategy developed by the research. The chapter demonstrates exactly how the messaging strategy is built and its impact in the play. The play is also important for its contribution to the pre-Olympian mythology aspect of Aeschylus' work. The activity of the play is emphatically linked far back in the interior of the play's temporal plane to the Danaids' ancestress Io and the protagonist Pelasgus is similarly identified by his own ancient ancestral lineage. The Chorus of the play are notable for their dominant role and the extent to which they contribute to message enabling. They are symbolic of the dualities present in the play which are tensions between gender, status and foreignness. This is also reflected in the multiple temporalities which are present.

As explained above, the decision has been taken to include the *Prometheus Bound* in the Aeschylean canon for the purposes of the thesis because there are sufficient correlations between it and the plays known to be by Aeschylus. Chapter four shows that when examined against the research parameters, the play demonstrates strong thematic links with Aeschylus' plays and is particularly notable for the way in which news and messages are delivered.

---

[144] See p.11 n. 20 above for an explanation of the diegetic space.

It is important for the thesis because although the cast features the ultimate messenger figure in the form of the primary messenger god, Hermes, the formal messenger figure is nevertheless subverted. Hermes' function is altered and news and messages are instead delivered by alternative messenger mechanisms, the most striking of which is the figure of Prometheus himself. The play is permeated with ancient mythological narratives and in this respect is a perfect example of the dramatist's preoccupation with pre-Olympian mythology.

The last chapter of the thesis is devoted to the *Oresteia* (458 B.C.E.). This chapter represents the pinnacle of the thesis' arguments. This complete trilogy affords the unique opportunity of considering the key ideas in the thesis in relation to an intact trilogy. All the strands which run through the previous chapters, including message enabling, the use of mythological narratives, focalisation and conceptual processes, are drawn together in this final section which presents an analysis of a trilogy that brings together in one chapter a complete expression of the research aims. The chapter is necessarily more wide-ranging in scope and explores how space and time is created and used by the poet in ways that aid and enhance the news and message delivery systems previously established.

The thesis research questions set out on page four, above, frame analysis of how news and messages are delivered in the extant plays of Aeschylus. The distinctive contribution of the thesis is to demonstrate that the delivery of news and messages is not restricted to messenger figures or even protagonists

but can be found across a wide spectrum of dramatic figures that play significant roles in the delivery mechanisms. The research demonstrates how news and messages are not only delivered by alternatives to the traditional messenger figures but also by dramatic strategies such as foreshadowing, the use of silence, and the ways in which mythology is used to situate the audience. News and messaging is entrenched within Aeschylean tragedy and the thesis argues that Aeschylus' innovative use of a wide range of delivery mechanisms reveals deep layers of information and meaning that can illuminate and enhance our understanding of ancient tragedy, informing how we approach it today and in the future.

Chapter 1
Messages and the Messenger: *Persians*

Introduction

This first chapter will consider how the figure of the messenger (ἄγγελος) is portrayed in the *Persians* (*Πέρσαι*). This play contains the only figure in Aeschylus' extant work formally identified as a messenger and as such is the obvious choice to begin such an examination.[145] The messenger figure fulfils the obvious function of delivering messages but as well as this it also interacts with other characters in specific ways and those characters in turn behave in certain ways towards the messenger figure. The identity of the character is of course evident from his title but the title also acts as a signifier; it is the clear and specific function of this figure to deliver a message, or the text was interpreted in this way by the subsequent (ancient) editor(s).

The Messenger Figure

The messenger figure is a key narrative convention used more frequently by Aeschylus' contemporaries in the surviving plays and frequently delivers information and news that otherwise would be difficult to introduce without distorting the dramatic structure. This chapter will analyse the formal construction of the messenger figure and consider how news and messages are conveyed to the internal audience. It shall be seen that the role of this character in the play is crucial both to narrative progression and to the

---

[145] See p. 6 n. 3 for discussion on the identification of dramatic figures in the manuscripts.

orientation of information delivered to the other characters and the external audience.

The Historical and Dramatic Context of the Text

Although we know that Aeschylus was not the first to use actual history as a dramatic resource, his *Persians*, first produced in Athens in 472 B.C.E., is famously the only extant play dealing with an historical event.[146] The poet Phrynichus (fl.511/08-476 B.C.E.) produced two plays also dealing with historical events, the *Capture of Miletus* (Μιλήτου Ἅλωσιν, c.493 B.C.E.) and *Phoenician Women* (Φοίνισσαι, 476 B.C.E.).[147] No copy of either text has yet been found. Herodotus tells us that the *Capture of Miletus* was deemed so distressing to its Athenian audience that Phrynichus was fined and was forbidden to stage the play again.[148] The *Phoenician Women* is no less intriguing given that the hypothesis of Aeschylus' *Persians*[149] indicates that the latter's play was modelled on Phrynichus' earlier work which dealt with the wives of the Persian dead at Salamis.[150] For Csapo and Slater, *Persians* featured overt propaganda in favour of Themistocles, the unseen instigator of

---

[146] Thought to be almost complete, Sommerstein (2008a): n2 17.

[147] With the general Themistocles as *choregos*, Plut. *Them*. 5.

[148] Herod. *Hist*. 6.21. Bachvarova and Dutsch (2016): 86 suggest that the Athenians reacted so badly to Phrynichus' play because it emphasised communal mourning when they themselves tended to favour 'a moderate manner'. Hardwick (2013b): 21 observes that the Athenian reaction 'demonstrates how in times of crisis the "aesthetic distance" between tragedy as art form and expression of real and felt suffering becomes problematic'.

[149] Probably 'a late combination of observations dating back to the Hellenistic scholars of Alexandria', Hall (1996): 105.

[150] Sommerstein (2010): 33. Bachvarova and Dutsch (2016): 88 note that 'the *Suda* does not mention this play, instead including a play with a triple title among those by Phrynichus, *The Just or Persians or Counsellors* (*Sunthõkoi*). So, there appears to be more than one play about the Persian defeat by Phrynichus that Aeschylus could refer to.'

the events leading to the battle.[151] Comparisons between the two poets should take into account that Phrynichus' play dealt with an Ionian defeat whereas Aeschylus' play portrayed a Greek victory. It should also be remembered that although the play is based around actual events, and by extension real people, it is not a historiographical record.[152] It is a dramatic recreation in which Aeschylus has fictionalised the Battle of Salamis and subsequent travails of the Persian army. Re-casting the battle through the lens of his imagination allowed Aeschylus to make the audience experience the battle in a non-linear way, forcing them to navigate the emotions invoked by the suffering of the Persians during their appraisal of the events.

Re-performance of the Production of the *Persians*

Persians holds a further distinction in the context of the extant tragedies for being presented a second time, around two years after the production at the Great Dionysia (Διονύσια τὰ Μεγάλα),[153] at the request of the tyrant Hieron of Syracuse.[154] Sommerstein speculates it may also have been staged at Aetna at around the same time as part of Hieron's victory celebrations and also

---

[151] They suggest this ultimately led to an end of future contemporary historical productions because contemporary events produced works that 'were simply too hot to handle directly', Csapo and Slater (1994): 167.

[152] McLoughlin (2011): 20 notes that 'accounts of war are always authored, in the sense that the gap between the experience and the representation of conflict can be narrowed but never completely eliminated'.

[153] Also known as the City Dionysia (Διονύσια τὰ ἐν Ἄστει), Athens' most prestigious dramatic festival 'where the city and its values and its priorities were on show to the Greek world', Buxton (1994): 32. Rhodes (2003): 108 notes that 'as far as we know competitions in drama were in the fifth century peculiar to Athens'.

[154] Sommerstein (2008a): 10, quoting the *scholia* to Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1028, citing *On Comedies* (Περὶ Κομῳδίας) by Eratosthenes of Cyrene (c.285-194 B.C.E.).

included the lost play *Women of Aetna* (*Αἰτναῖαι*).[155] Hall suggests the restaging was because Hieron liked to contrast his own military victories with those of the mainland Greeks.[156] At the same time it also illustrates the wide-ranging ancient audience of Aeschylus' work and raises the question of how far productions may have travelled geographically.[157] Garvie discusses the possibility of there being two versions of the play. His view is based on *scholia* to Aristophanes' *Frogs* of 405 B.C.E. which may suggest that the Battle of Plataea was more prominent and that the Darius scene was added for the Syracusan production.[158] There were no rules preventing the reproduction of plays outside Athens – some plays such as Euripides' *Andromache* (*Ἀνδρομάχη*)[159] of c.427-423 B.C.E. and *Archelaus* (*Ἀρχέλαος*)[160] of c.409-408 B.C.E. both received their first productions outside Athens.[161] Hall has noted that revivals of Athenian productions outside Athens began during the 460s B.C.E. with increasing frequency towards the end of the fifth century.[162] The productions took place not only

---

[155] Sommerstein (2010): 6. The *Vita Aeschyli* 9 states that *Women of Aetna* (*Αἰτναῖαι*) was written to celebrate Hieron's foundation of Aetna in 476-475 B.C.E.
[156] Hall (1996): 2.
[157] See Stewart (2017) for an examination of ancient theatre across the panHellenic world.
[158] Garvie (2009): liii-lvii. Garvie does 'not believe that *Persae* was ever performed without the Darius-scene', lvii. Constantinidis (2016): 6 makes the distinction between 'restaging' and 'revision': a "remake" is the "revision" (διασκευή) of meaning when a play from the same or a different culture is re-envisioned and revamped (including being re-equipped and dressed up) to suit, attract, and affect a different group or generation of readers and audiences … it follows that the "restaging" (ἀναδιδαχή) of a play is not necessarily a "revision" (διασκευή) of that play. This seems to have been the case with the Syracusans who saw a "restaging" rather than a "revision" of Aeschylus' *Persians* at the Theatre of Hiero in Syracuse'.
[159] Lloyd (2005): 12-13.
[160] Ridgeway (1926): 8-9.
[161] Garvie (2009): lv.
[162] Hall (1996): 2. Lightfoot (2007) discusses the role of actors and technicians, often governed by guilds, who contributed to this process, 215.

in Athens but in Macedon, Sicily and southern Italy.[163] Peter Wilson notes

that Lycurgus instituted legislation in c.333 B.C.E. to protect the works of

Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides for re-performance and this surely

suggests re-performance was likely, including outside Athens.[164] The only

restriction for the re-performance of plays was repeating a production at the

Great Dionysia.[165]

Setting the Scene Inside and Outside the Play

In Athens plays were performed in a sacred space used for dedicatory

offerings and sacrifices, beneath the walls of the Acropolis – a place

according to mythology that was the foundation of Athenian race and

identity.[166]   Aeschylus' greatest audacity was bringing the fictionalised

barbarian court (monarchy in itself being an alien concept to ancient Greeks)

to the 'earth of a city protected by Athene'.[167] The Persians, who had sacked

Athens in 480 B.C.E.,[168] are brought again to Athens through the medium of

tragic theatre, an act which may have been genuinely unsettling for the

ancient audience, certainly for those who had had direct experience of the

Persian wars.

---

[163] Hall (2010): 20.   For theatre in Southern Italy, see Bosher (2006).
[164] Wilson (2008b): 192 as confirmed by Plutarch, see p. 40 n. 100, above. Hardwick (2013b):17 suggests that the protection was intended 'to save them from exploitation by star actors who wanted to place their stamp on them'.
[165] Kovacs (2005): 380-1.
[166] Hom. *Il*. 2.546-9
[167] Wiles (2000): 115. Gruen (2011): 14 discusses how Aeschylus calls 'attention to the Persian practice of prostration before the king. To a Greek mind such custom was offensive and intolerable, indeed crossed the line between mortal and immortal, risking vengeance from the gods.' He notes that Aeschylus 'avoids use of the offensive term *proskynein*, preferring instead *prospitnein*, which could signify obeisance to humans as well as to gods'.
[168] Herod. *Hist*. 8.51-5.

The play describes the battle off the island of Salamis, opposite the Piraeus harbour in Athens, which took place between Greeks and Persians in 480 B.C.E. Although Garvie says that the play 'apparently does not form part of a connected trilogy'[169] Hall disagrees, citing the ancient hypothesis of the play that indicates the tetralogy[170] comprised (in order) *Phineus* (*Φινεύς*), *Persians*, *Glaukos Potneius* (*Γλαῦκος Ποτνιεύς*) and the satyr play *Prometheus Fire-kindler* (*Προμηθεύς Πυρκαεύς*).[171] Sommerstein quotes two fragments which suggest the *Prometheus Fire-kindler* was the story of Prometheus bringing fire to the satyrs.[172] The *Glaukos Potneius* may be about the story of the death of Glaukos at the funeral games for Pelias of Iolcus[173] and the *Phineus* about the tale of the seer who was rescued from the harpies by the sons of Boreas and Oreithyia, who were said to have played a part at the battles of Thermopylae and Artemisium where they had sent gales to help destroy the Persian fleet.[174]

Clearly *Persians* does not fit within the mythological patterns suggested by these other plays and Sommerstein notes that this would have been unusual anyway because at this time trilogies were expected to follow a narrative

---

[169] Garvie (2009): ix.

[170] Sommerstein notes that 'it was a rule of the competition that each competitor should present four plays, namely three tragedies and one satyr play. Modern scholars sometimes apply the term 'tetralogy' to all such four-play sequences, but ancient practice seems to have been to restrict *tetralogia* (and likewise its pendant *trilogia*) to the *connected* [his italics] sequences', Sommerstein (2010): 32.

[171] Hall (1996): 10. Athens had a strong association with Prometheus and housed one of the few cults dedicated to him in the Academy, Thomson (1941): 300. Pausanias indicates that the satyr play was a form that Aeschylus particularly excelled at: τούτῳ τῷ Ἀριστίᾳ σάτυροι καὶ Πρατίνᾳ τῷ πατρί εἰσι πεποιημένοι πλὴν τῶν Αἰσχύλου δοκιμώτατοι, 2.13.6.

[172] Frs.187a, Radt (1971); fr.207, fr.204b, Sommerstein (2010): 224.

[173] Apollod. 2.31; Hesiod *Cat.* 7; Hom. *Il.* 6.154-5.

[174] Herod. *Hist.* 7.189.

thread.[175]   However, A. J. Podlecki discounts the notion that the trilogy followed a single narrative arc as the *Oresteia* does.[176] Henry D. Broadhead summarises investigations into this particular issue and concludes the plays were autonomous within the trilogy, but may have shared the common theme of 'Europe -v- Asia'.[177] Garvie comments that

> the possibility that there was some kind of loose thematic connection among the plays that accompanied *Persians* cannot, therefore, be excluded. There seems, however, to be no parallel for the sandwiching of a historical play between two tragedies which drew their subject-matter in the conventional way from myth, the two myths [*Phineus* and *Glaukos Potneius*] being unconnected with each other, and both of them unconnected with the theme of the satyr-play.[178]

In any event, by the second half of the fifth century trilogies were not expected to comprise linked stories. This resulted in granting more freedom to the poets to explore multiple themes and connect them if they so wished.[179] This indicates that Aeschylus' decision to include *Persians* in this trilogy was a bold one to take.

The Text and its Relation to its Trilogy

Modern detailed analysis of the surviving versions of the text and associated *scholia* is discussed by Garvie[180] and Hall[181] but scholars agree that myriad

---

[175] Sommerstein (2010): 32.
[176] Podlecki (1970): 9.
[177] Broadhead (1960): lx.
[178] Garvie (2009): xliii.
[179] Sommerstein (2010): 32.
[180] Garvie (2009): lvii-lix.
[181] Hall (1996): 25-8.

versions and amendments to copies provide little concrete information upon which a definitive analysis of the structure and content of the play and its trilogy within the current Aeschylean canon can be made.[182] The extent of textual variation renders a definitive or 'final' version unobtainable and therefore exposes the trilogy to incompleteness. It cannot be known for certain unless further evidence is discovered so this matter therefore remains open.

Although forming part of the 'Byzantine triad',[183] *Persians* was not preserved within its original trilogy. The triads were collections put together by Byzantine scholars from the tenth century onwards,[184] who in the thirteenth century chose three plays from Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides for collation and further transmission.[185] The reasons for this may be due either to selection criteria applied by those copying the text or because the relevant collection of texts had not survived or been found.[186]

The lack of concrete confirmation on the trilogy has left the play open to a variety of interpretations which can be viewed both positively and negatively. We do know that Aeschylus won first prize in 472 B.C.E. and that the

---

[182] Constantinidis (2016): 9 notes that 'of course, each generation of ancient and medieval scribes made their share of errors and alterations when they copied down Aeschylus' plays by hand for nearly twenty centuries – from the 5th century BC to the 15th century CE'.
[183] The plays (*Persians*, *Seven against Thebes* and *Prometheus Bound*) were specifically chosen and therefore presumably favoured; Hall notes their subsequent popularity with later Byzantine scholars, Hall (1996): 25.
[184] Helm (1972): 577 n. 5.
[185] Kovacs (2005): 387.
[186] See Garvie (2016): 24-30 on the problems with the transmission of Aeschylus' works.

choregos (χορηγός) was the young Pericles (c.495-429 B.C.E.), son of Xanthippus.[187] Pericles came from an aristocratic family of mixed civic fortunes.[188] Although parts of his family had been branded medisers after the Battle of Marathon in 490 B.C.E.,[189] Xanthippus claimed to have retrieved Xerxes' shackles[190] from the Hellespont and brought them to Athens in triumph. Pericles' motives in financing the production may therefore have had underlying strategies of absolving the charges of medisation and reminding the *polis* of his father's generalship. Accepting the liturgy[191] may also have been seen as contributing towards the launch of his political career.[192]

The Messenger of the *Persians*

The *Persians* contains Aeschylus' only character textually identified as a 'messenger' (ἄγγελος). The setting of the play is the royal court in Susa,

---

[187] See Wilson (2000).

[188] The Alcmaeonidae were a noble Athenian family; Megacles (*archon* in c.632/1 B.C.E.) caused the family line to be cursed following the deaths of Cylon's followers. See Herod. *Hist*. 5.71, Thuc. 1.126, Aristot. *Ath*. *Pol*. 1 and 20, and Plut. *Solon*, 12. Gagné (2013): 209 writes that 'the fact that this pollution was thought to persist over generations seems unquestionable. The *agos* [ἄγος - pollution, guilt] remained attached to a particular kinship group over more than a century. It was, further, obviously thought to be contagious, dangerous for the city as a whole … with the "curse" of the Alcmaeonids, we have a striking example of the idea of ancestral fault taking centre stage in the political upheavals of a prominent late archaic city.' See also p. 82 n. 231 below. Pericles' mother was the Alcmaeonid Agariste, the niece of Cleisthenes, the man responsible for the sixth century B.C.E. reform of the Athenian citizen body and possibly also the concept of ostracism.

[189] Herod. *Hist*. 6.121.

[190] Herodotus records that when the first attempt to create a bridge across the Hellespont failed an enraged Xerxes ordered his men to 'give the Hellespont three hundred lashes of the whip, and to drop a pair of fetters into the sea', Herod. *Hist*. 7.35.

[191] Wilson discusses the political aspects of *leitourgical* expenditure, Wilson (2000): 89-93. He notes that the driving force of repeated *leitourgai* was probably 'a 'timological' one – a calculation, on a complex base of considerations, as to the degree of 'honour' (τιμή) and 'gratitude' (χάρις) that could be derived from an appropriately lavish outlay', 92.

[192] Rosenbloom (2006): 16.

confirmed by the Chorus in the *parodos* (1-154),[193] where Atossa the Queen,

Xerxes' mother, and the Chorus, his advisers (χορός γερόντων),[194] await news

of his campaign in Greece. The messenger, identified as a Persian (δράμημα

φωτὸς Περσικὸν πρέπει) (247), travels ahead of the army to bring news to the

court of Xerxes' defeat (249-55). The ghost of Xerxes' father, Darius, is

raised by his widow and the Chorus learns of his son's actions and prophesies

further disaster including the Persian defeat at Plataea the following year;[195]

Xerxes himself finally appears on stage in a state of extreme grief at the

failure of his campaign and loss of men (908-1078). The play ends with a

prolonged ritual mourning scene (917-1079).

As already noted, the *Persians* is distinct from the other extant tragedies

because it is based on an historical event, the Battle of Salamis in 480 B.C.E.

This battle took place just eight years before the production, where the Greeks

under the generalship of the Athenian Themistocles defeated the Persian king

Xerxes' forces.[196] The Messenger does not name Themistocles but Herodotus

says that it was his slave Sikinnos who delivered the message referred to at

line 362.[197] This dramatic recreation of the Battle of Salamis took place

---

[193] All line references to *Persians* are from the Greek text in Garvie (2009) unless otherwise stated. A selection of translations and commentaries are used to compare scholarly interpretations of the Greek text as detailed in the 'Introductory Note and Abbreviations' above.

[194] As Murnaghan (2011): 261 notes, the Persian elders of the chorus 'are to an extent marginalized by their age: they have been left behind by Xerxes' expedition … but they are also prominent figures'.

[195] 479 B.C.E.

[196] Athenian military command was not particularly lauded by the ancient sources such as Herodotus, who portrays Themistocles as someone prepared to act alone rather than with the wider democratic military, Herod. *Hist*. 8.57-64.

[197] Herod. *Hist*. 8.75 referred to at line 362. Garvie discusses the possible reasons for Aeschylus referencing Themistocles in the play and the academic questions this raises as to

eighteen years after the Athenian victory over the Persians at Marathon in 490

B.C.E., where Xerxes' father Darius was defeated.

It is highly likely that survivors of Marathon were present in the theatre and

if not then almost certainly their sons and families. It is also possible that the

audience are meant to think that the same messenger was also present at

Marathon, for he says he is 'reminded' of Athens (τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ὡς στένω

μεμνημένος) (285). He may be referring to Salamis but if not and he does

mean Marathon it would create a neat narrative thread for the Athenian

members of the external audience between the two Greek victories, reminding

them that they had repelled both father and son from Greek lands. This would

have been a powerful motif for a society that revered its ancestors and

descendants. The Messenger's account of the Athenian war cry to rally the

men evidences this:

> ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων ἴτε,
> ἐλευθεροῦτε πατρίδ᾽, ἐλευθεροῦτε δὲ
> παῖδας, γυναῖκας, θεῶν τέ πατρῴων ἕδη,
> θήκας τε προγόνων· νῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀγών
>
> *Pers*. 402-5

> Oh sons of the Greeks go, free your fatherland, free your
> children, your women and the shrines of your ancestral
> gods, and the tombs of your ancestors: now the struggle is
> for everything.

Before the Messenger arrives, Atossa and the Chorus discuss their fear for

Persia and the meaning of her prophetic dreams (176-99). This is a prompt

---

whether or not Aeschylus was supportive of Themistocles' strategies, Garvie (2009): xix,
184-5. This also has ramifications for evaluating likely effects on the external audience of
what was taking place on stage.

for the external audience to think about how fears become reality, security dissolving into dread. Even though the dreams are ominous, the Chorus suggest the worst of the omens may be avoided by libations and prayers (214-25). The Messenger arrives (247) and immediately declares that the whole Persian host is lost (255):

> ὦ γῆς ἁπάσης Ἀσιάδος πολίσματα,
> ὦ Περσὶς αἶα καὶ πολὺς πλούτου λιμήν,
> ὡς ἐν μιᾷ πληγῇ κατέφθαρται πολὺς
> ὄλβος, τὸ Περσῶν δ᾽ ἄνθος οἴχεται πεσόν
>
> *Pers.* 250-3

> Oh all the cities of Asia, oh land of Persia and harbour of great wealth, one blow has destroyed your happiness, and the flower of the Persians has gone.

The message plunges the Chorus into grief:

> ἄνι᾽ ἄνια κακὰ νεόκοτα καὶ
> δάι᾽: αἰαῖ, διαίνεσθε, Πέρ-
> σαι, τόδ᾽ ἄχος κλύοντες
>
> *Pers.* 256-8

> agonising, agonising, without precedent ... Persians weep as you hear about this disaster

> ἦ μακροβίοτος ὅδε γέ τις αἰ-
> ὼν ἐφάνθη γεραιοῖς, ἀκού-
> ειν τόδε πῆμ᾽ ἄελπτον
>
> *Pers.* 265

> We are old; our lives have been proven too long if we must live to hear about this unexpected calamity

The exchange between the Chorus and the Messenger (256-89) summarises (roughly in the same order) the news the Messenger will detail more elaborately during Atossa's questioning (290-479). This covers the failure of the expedition (250), the loss of the army (252, 254-5), the battle scenes (266-7), the contest between land and sea (278-9), the many dead (272-3), the

island of Salamis (273, 284), Athens (285) and the damage done to the Persians (286-9). The repetition of the news hurts the Persians symbolically each time it is recounted and serves to continuously reroute the path of the narrative from one of hope to one of despair.

The Messenger's identification of Persian generals also acts as a linking device between the beginning and the end of the play. There is a loose form of ring composition applied to the narrative structure of his scene.[198]   The Chorus named seventeen generals earlier in the play while the Messenger names nineteen, six of whom are named by both Messenger and Chorus.[199] When the Chorus are demanding answers from Xerxes, they name twenty-three generals. Table 1 below sets out the Persians named in the play.

Table 1 Persian Generals named in the *Persians*

Chorus	Messenger	Chorus/Xerxes
Ariomardos	Ariomardos	Ariomardus
Tharybis	Tharybis	Tharybis
Arsames	Arsames	
Amistres	Amistris	
Arkteus	Arkteus	
	Lilaios	Lilaios
Artembares		Artembares
Masistres		Masistras
Pharandakes		Pharandakes
Sousikanes		Sousiskanes
Artaphrenes	Amphistreus	Anchares
Astaspes	Argestes	Arsakes
Imaios	Adeues	Datamas
Mardon	Artabes	Diaixis

---

[198] Ring composition refers to a sequential ordering of a narrative so that it follows a narratively balanced pattern, different sections falling into 'pairs', the sequence ultimately returning to where the narrative began but with the benefit of further insights brought about by effect of the circularity. It is a particularly apt mechanism to use in a play which is so focused on journeys. Ring composition is prominent in the *Iliad* (see Whitman (2011): 249-84) and the *Odyssey*, for which see Bertman (1966).

[199] Ariomardos 38, 321, 968; Tharybis 51, 323, 971; Arsames 37, 308; Lilaios 308, 970, Amestres 21, 320; Arkteus 44, 313.

Chorus	Messenger	Chorus/Xerxes
Megabates	Artembares	Hystaichmas
Mitragathes	Dadakes	Lythimnas
Pegastagon	Magos	Memphis
Sosthanes	Matallos	Oibares
	Pharnouchos	Parthos
	Pheresseues	Pelagon
	Seisames	Pharnoukos
	Syennesis	Psammis
	Tenagon	Seualkes
		Sousas
		Tolmos
		Xanthes

These details ratify the integrity of the Messenger's narrative and indicate the shared knowledge between him and the Chorus. Both the Chorus and the Messenger know the generals by name and know their qualities. Choosing to personalise generals from the hordes of the Persian army emphasised in the play indicates a general Persian pride in their armed forces and makes the loss harder to bear. Rehm proposes that

> Aeschylus' decision to name so many of the Persian dead must have suggested to the Athenian audience something of the *specificity* [his italics] of Persian losses. In these situations, specificity matters, for grief and loss affect the human psyche most powerfully when we can associate a human face to what otherwise appears a numbing statistic'.[200]

It is a personal as well as national tragedy for the Persian empire. Rehm's interpretation emphasises this; the humanisation of the Persian dead creates an emotional framework for both the internal and external audiences. In contrast, records of ancient Greek personnel generally refer only to the principal *strategoi* (generals), for example Pausanias at Plataea, Miltiades at

---

[200] Rehm (2016): 145.

Marathon, Alcibiades and Nicias leading the Sicilian expedition; Herodotus

says he knows the names of all three hundred Spartans to die at Thermopylae

but evidently felt no need to record them despite documenting the names of

some of the Persian generals.[201]

A play based on an historical event places different demands upon both the

poet and the audience. Aeschylus was the architect of the dramatic

construction. He had a wider view of the overall pattern of the play and

designed it to elicit a specific emotional effect on the audience. The subject

of a play or trilogy was at his own discretion although some discussion with

the *archon* (ἄρχων) and *choregos* may have been part of the combined civic-

dramatic process.[202] In portraying a facsimile of an historical event, the poet's

chief concern must be to facilitate an emotional connection between the actors

on stage and the audience. This is achieved through recognition (of events,

people and circumstances) and synthesis (understanding how events come to

happen and their ramifications). As a creator of dramatic fiction, Aeschylus

knew he had some licence with his subject, but choosing to tackle so recent

an event as the Battle of Salamis suggests that he specifically wished to induce

some kind of emotional bond between actors and audience, perhaps even

contribute to the creation of cultural memory.[203]

---

[201] Herod. *Hist.* 7.224.

[202] Wilson (2000): 50-71 discusses the administrative and political concerns and scenarios during selection for the Great Dionysia.

[203] Such a reading could also be applied to the ending of the *Eumenides.* Hardwick (2016b): 283 suggests that 'Aeschylus, in the 5th century BC used images and stories from mythology and history, including allusions to Homer, as the basis for his own exploration of Greek cultural memory. Through these he created perspectives on the agonies of

The messaging framework is enhanced by the emotional resonances that can intensify the power of the news or message that is being delivered. The effect is to draw an emotional, visceral response from the (internal or external) audience, which is in turn influenced by their own perspectives which they bring to the performance. Williams has coined the phrase 'structures of feeling', in which emotional recognition is located and framed within social and civic networks:

> the term is difficult, but "feeling" is chosen to emphasize a distinction from more formal concepts of "world-view" or "ideology". It is not only that we must go beyond formally held and systematic beliefs, though of course we have always to include them. It is that we are concerned with meanings and values as they are actively lived and felt, and the relations between these and formal or systematic beliefs are in practice variable (including historically variable), over a range from formal assent with private dissent to the more nuanced interaction between selected and interpreted beliefs and acted and justified experiences.[204]

Wohl's interpretation of the term is that it is 'the lived experience of society as it takes shape in the present moment'.[205] This lived experience of the external audience influenced how they interpreted the world, but crucially how they interpreted the meanings of the plays they both observed and, in the case of citizens, acted in.[206] Whilst an emotional response may be considered

---

knowledge and repression, communication and silence in human experience and understanding.'
[204] Williams (1977): 132.
[205] Wohl (2015): 120.
[206] 'An alternative definition [of 'structures of feeling'] would be structures of experience: in one sense the better and wider word, but with the difficulty that one of its senses has that past tense which is the most important obstacle to recognition of the area of social experience which is being defined. We are talking about characteristic elements of impulse, restraint, and tone; specifically affective elements of consciousness and relationships: not feeling against thought, but thought as felt and feeling as thought:

as being encoded within a scene (a mourning lament, for example, is a convention formally constructed to express and elicit particular responses), news and messages have the power to introduce the unexpected. A mixed message, such as that of the *Persians*' Messenger, begins with good news, the survival of Xerxes, but then moves swiftly to bad news when revealing the annihilation of the Persian armies. This contributes to quick shifts in the emotional response of both the internal and external audiences, although clearly for different reasons in each case. This rollercoaster effect of the message contributes subliminally to the unease the Messenger's arrival evokes and foreshadows, albeit very briefly, the pyrrhic victory that will be revealed imminently.[207] The 'structure of feeling' works with the messaging framework to elevate the tension, because the external audience bring their life knowledge to their understanding of the play. The external citizen audience embody a dual internal perspective as both observers and practitioners of ancient drama.

Given the subject matter and the proximity of the Persian forces in both time (recent history) and place (Athens) Aeschylus would only be allowed so much poetic licence. By locating the action of the play in the Persian court, before a Persian internal audience, Aeschylus is allowing the external audience of Athens the space to understand the Persian viewpoint and to empathise, if

---

practical consciousness of a present kind, in a living and inter-relating continuity', Williams (1977): 132.

[207] The Watchman's speech in the *Agamemnon* has a similar effect, where the joy at the prospect of his king's arrival is immediately overshadowed by the ominous undertones he has observed in the palace; see discussion on p. 281.

they so choose, with their enemy in a safe and controlled way. The external audience know they are seeing a fictional recreation and this knowledge, coupled with the physical setting of the play in safe Athenian space, allows them to absorb as much or as little as they wish of the dramatic narrative. Members of the audience can choose their level of engagement, whether to suspend their own experience to fully engage with the dramatic narrative, or to recognise enough of the reality coming through the narrative to satisfactorily appease their own perspective of the battle. This is a balance that Aeschylus may have been searching for, perhaps for himself and the audience, given his own experiences in the Persian wars.

Historiography is the construction of a narrative of events. This may be information known to be such or information that has evolved into accepted fact which is then recorded by a person or society for onward transmission. A work of fiction is, as noted above, subject to its creator's will but it does have the power to influence peoples' perception of fact. As time moves on from an event, a work of fiction may become a closer aid in understanding the history of the event; a work of fiction may even transplant an actual event in terms of what is remembered. Fiction, and particularly that kind which takes place on the dramatic stage, has the power to transform a person's feelings. Even if someone recognises that a version of an historical event which they are being shown is not quite accurate, their perception of the event, or its impact, is mutable. A creator of fiction can exploit this and create a new perception of historical events.

Constructing the Messenger

In *Persians*, the dramatic messenger figure is a multiple conduit. He is the bridge between the palace and the army, a link between Xerxes and Atossa, between Xerxes and Persia, and a channel between the internal action of the play and the external audience. Anchored within his characterisation, he creates chains of connections that cross the boundaries of space between performance and reality. His position as messenger automatically grants him authority and neither Atossa nor the Chorus doubts his word.[208] The level of detail that he brings to his speech suggests proximity to the battle and he confirms that he was an eyewitness

> καὶ μὴν παρών γε κοὐ λόγους ἄλλων κλύων,
> Πέρσαι, φράσαιμ᾿ ἂν οἷ᾿ ἐπορσύνθη κακά
>
> *Pers*. 266-7

> I myself witnessed this, Persians, and give you an account
> of it. I did not hear it from others.

The Messenger's account of the most senior deceased generals identifies them as individuals as well as symbols of a huge armed force. This resurrects them before the court and allows them to live one last time within the theatrical space. De Jong notes that the 'eye witness effect'[209] increases the emotional power of a scene, personalising the action for the internal audience, the secondary narratees. The Messenger's speech, peppered with undeniable facts (for the Persian court) that relate to senior personnel, weaponry, strategy and allies, brings an aural facsimile of the battle before the court. This means

---

[208] Russell (2000): 144 discusses the more realistic side of real-life ancient messengers, whose traits may have included dishonesty.
[209] de Jong (2014): 68.

that for the external audience, the Persians are defeated twice – literally and figuratively.

The oral account of their deaths is reminiscent of Epic structures.[210] The role of ancient Epic narrative was integral to the society of ancient Greece. Favorini suggests that Aeschylus was 'working in an oral memorialist vein of ancient origin' when he chose to create the play from a Persian perspective.[211] He thinks Aeschylus did this to allow the Greeks to see events from the Persian point of view but perhaps Aeschylus also recognised the power of memory in society.[212] He knew that his production would be discussed, assessed and would no doubt contribute to the formation and dissemination of memories about the Battle of Salamis by his external audience; to make them think a certain way was an additional challenge.[213] Grethlein summarises the findings of anthropologists that a society with an oral culture,[214] which drew heavily from and was directly evolved from its mythological past, created a temporal construction through which activities of the present were embedded in the social memory of the theatre audience. By setting the drama in the Persian court, narrated by Persians

---

[210] Garvie notes that this play's language is often considered to be 'richest in epic borrowings', Garvie (2009): xxxviii. He indicates that Aeschylus adapted Epic form to fit the style of the fifth century, for example adapting references to charioteers (not used in Greek fifth-century warfare) to cavalry, n. 29-30. See 'epic: adaptations of expressions' in Garvie's index for all instances found in the text, Garvie (2009): 392. The naming of the Persians is also reminiscent of the *Iliad*'s Catalogue of Ships, Hom. *Il.* 2.484-759.

[211] Favorini (2003): 108.

[212] Grethlein notes the importance of memory to all kinds of society, not just oral societies, Grethlein (2010): 1.

[213] The use of memory in understanding and interpreting events will be discussed throughout and in particular in chapters five and six.

[214] Grethlein (2010): 111. 'Though Greece was a predominantly oral society, some Greeks … were highly literate', Fowler (2013): xii.

before a predominantly Greek audience, Aeschylus was ensuring that the play

would be remembered beyond his contemporary audience, and that any spirit

of empathy or sympathy for an enemy was preserved in future generations,

creating an emotionally mature society that could be capable of such

actions.[215]   Literary evidence indicates that plays were restaged after their

initial presentation at the Great Dionysia and over time the natural mutative

process of cultural memory,[216] and the different perspectives of subsequent

spectators, would have suggested different meanings to different audiences

as it developed.

The Messenger's emphasis on the veracity of his story (266-7, 513), along

with his hints that he has not told everything to spare the Persian court more

grief (παρόντων δ᾽ ὀλίγ᾽ ἀπαγγέλλω κακά, 330; πολλὰ δ᾽ ἐκλείπω λέγων

κακῶν ἃ Πέρσαις ἐγκατέσκηψεν θεός, 513-14) suggests he has made a

judgement on the extent of despair the court can endure. It could also indicate

shock – rather than assuring the court that they can trust his word he is instead

still reeling in disbelief at what has occurred.

The messenger figure has one hundred and seventy-eight lines of the play's

one thousand and seventy-nine. His contribution fulfils important functions

because he verifies the 'emptiness of Persia' claimed by the Chorus (59-60),

affirms the bad omens of Atossa's dream (176-99) and allows his diegetic

---

[215] Grethlein (2010): 111.
[216] Sommerstein (2008a): 10, quoting the *scholia* to Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1028, citing
Eratosthenes' *On Comedies*; Wilson (2000): 22-4, 316-17 n. 57-9.

reality to become the new reality of the performance. He transforms the scenic space of the stage. He brings the distanced space of Persian land into the theatrical present and so establishes a new space to be occupied by the court. In this way he transports the grief and despair of Xerxes to the court in advance of the latter's eventual arrival at the end of the play. Rehm notes that the external audience already know what happened and so the play does not depend upon the Messenger's news to impart dramatic tension.[217] However, the dramatic tension of the overall story is also pitted against the impact of the tension on the external spectators and the resonances that each stage of the play may have for them.

Although the poets frequently adapted mythological stories to suit their dramatic purposes, Aeschylus would certainly have had to be very careful in attempting to take too much dramatic licence with an historical event. Hall suggests that the play is 'a document of the Athenian collective *imagination* [her italics]: it is beyond all doubt a truthful record of the ways in which the Athenians *liked to think about* their enemy' [her italics].[218] An argument can be made that tension is also derived from the gradual dismantling of the Persian psyche. The outcome gets progressively bleaker for the Persians ending with Xerxes returning emotionally and physically broken by his experiences.

---

[217] Rehm (2002): 240.
[218] Hall (2010): 202.

According to Rutherford, the Messenger in this play and his equivalent in the *Agamemnon*, the Argive Herald (503-82, 613-80), both report on events set some time past before the events of their respective plays. The Messenger figures in later plays usually refer to events that happened within the play or that involve active characters.[219] The Scout in *Seven against Thebes* (39-68, 375-652), for example, comments on very recent action taking place off-stage. I suggest the Persian Messenger and Argive Herald recount past history to add significant depth of time to the action of their plays and that this span of time serves to emphasise the messages they carry and the impact of their suffering on them. Both characters are clearly traumatised by their experiences: the still-grieving Persian Messenger stresses that he holds back in his account (*Pers*. 330, 513-14),[220] and the Argive Herald details the physical hardships the survivors of Troy had to endure (*Ag*. 554-71).[221] The impact on the external audience is deepened by the length of time between the action and the related message. The fears of the Persian court are proved

---

[219] Rutherford (2012): 200. Although the Herald of the *Suppliants* (882-951) fits this pattern, this is not necessarily a significant observation with respect to the Aeschylean canon.

[220] Παρόντων δ᾽ ὀλίγ᾽ ἀπαγγέλλω κακά, 330; πολλὰ δ᾽ ἐκλείπω λέγων κακῶν ἃ Πέρσαις ἐγκατέσκηψεν θεός, 513-14.

[221] i.e.; ἀκτὰς ἀμφὶ Κυχρείας, ὀᾶ, σύρονται: στένε καὶ δακνάζου (570-2). Hardwick notes how a modern reception of ancient tragedy, in this case of the First World War poet Isaac Rosenberg (1890-1918), links back viscerally with an ancient original through a shared experience that is no less muted for being separated by two-and-a-half centuries. Rosenberg writes, 'I wonder if Aeschylus as a private in the army was bothered as I am by lice'; Hardwick goes on to observe that 'lice became a *topos* for linking the experiences of the Greeks at Troy, the Athenians of Aeschylus' time and the soldiers of 1914-18, providing the "realistic" underpinning to a shared psychology of trauma', Hardwick (2016b): 289-90.

true and worse than anticipated, whilst the Argives are buoyed by the Herald's

account.[222]

Alternative Messenger Figures

The Messenger figure is not the only method Aeschylus uses to disseminate

news and messages throughout the play. The Chorus, Atossa and Darius all

contribute to the delivery of messages, both to a linear story arc and to time

shifts within the narrative that help to create the three-dimensional sphere of

time that the activity of the play repeatedly passes through. This allows

Aeschylus to create a narrative arc through a broad depiction of the wider

Persian empire but simultaneously full of detailed nuances like those found

in the *parodos* (1-154) and the Messenger's speech (249-513).

The Chorus describe the departing forces in the *parodos* (1-154) and focus on

the breadth of the King's army (16-58) and the many skills they can deploy:

charioteers (πολλοῖς ἅρμασιν, 46), lancers and spearmen (λόγχης ἄκμονες,

καὶ ἀκοντισταὶ, 51-2), sailors (ναῶν τ᾽ ἐπόχους, 54), archers (καὶ τοξουλκῷ

λήματι πιστούς, 55), and fighters with sabres (τὸ μαχαιροφόρον, 56), whilst

the King himself is likened to a terrible serpent (κυάνεον δ᾽ ὄμμασι λεύσσων

φονίου δέργμα δράκοντος, 81-2). As the external audience know the outcome

of Xerxes' mission, the descriptions allow them to savour the victory they

have achieved over such a vast empiric force. The mighty force is

---

[222] Even though he tells of Menelaus' disappearance he is anxious to portray the unknown as positive (671-80) rather than risk sullying the obvious good news of Agamemnon's return (636-49).

immortalised in the performance and therefore embedded in the social memory of the audience; to remember the play, and the battle, is to also remember the size of the army defeated by Greeks on Greek land.

Throughout the play the Chorus repeatedly talk of the good character and positive qualities of Darius.[223] They report Darius' achievements and personally believed him to be a good and just ruler.[224] Of Xerxes they are less complimentary and hint ominously at the outcome and his failure.[225] Their comments about Xerxes are a combination of foreshadowing the desolation of his return (74, 550-4, 652) and negative personal judgement (1004-7, 1016). The external audience know about Xerxes' comprehensive failure but the Chorus are subliminally reinforcing a sense of Xerxes failing both his campaign and his father's vision and therefore the entire ethos of Persian life is under threat. The vision of the empire as it was under Darius steadily fills the Chorus with fear. They cannot envisage the same kind of success for the hubristic Xerxes.

Finally, they voice their fears unequivocally, lamenting Xerxes' 'wrong-headedness' (Ξέρξης μὲν ἄγαγεν, ποποῖ, Ξέρξης δ' ἀπώλεσεν, τοτοῖ, Ξέρξης δὲ πάντ' ἐπέσπε δυσφρόνως βαρίδεσσι ποντίαις, 550-4). Like the Messenger's claims of veracity perhaps masking disbelief at what has taken place rather than asserting fact, the Chorus' exchanges with Xerxes at the end

---

[223] Lines 244, 555-6, 647-55, 662, 671, 852-70, 857-906.
[224] Lines 244, 555-6, 647-55, 852-70, 857-906.
[225] Lines 74, 550-4, 652-3, 1004-7, 1016.

of the play can be read in two ways: as accusatory or disbelieving that the terrible news from the Messenger really was true. Their repeated questioning of Xerxes betrays the hope they had nurtured,[226] despite the omens of Atossa's dream (181-99), the Messenger's speech (249-514), and the warnings of the ghost of Darius (681-842).

Atossa has been plagued by dreams since the departure of Xerxes (176-80). Her prophecy (181-99) plays to the prior knowledge that sections of the audience would have had. Atossa's questions to the Messenger facilitate consistent progression of the story and prompt each section of his report. This establishes her perspective and presents a slightly different viewpoint from that displayed in the *parodos*. The raising of Darius' ghost is also at her instigation (609-10) and her departure effects the closure of two major scenes, that of the Messenger when she leaves the stage to make libations (517-31) and again when Darius returns to the Underworld and she returns to the palace to make further preparations for Xerxes' return (845-51). Like the Messenger, she links characters and scenes. She stands as an authoritative royal link between the Messenger and the Chorus, combining the worlds of family and royal state.

By raising the ghost of Darius (598-680) and bringing news of Xerxes' defeat to the ghost (712-14) she shows how his disastrous actions brought about the fall of the Persian army (διαπεπόρθηται τὰ Περσῶν πράγμαθ᾽, 716-40). In

---

[226] Lines 956-61, 967-74, 991-1001, 1016, 1029.

doing this she is also the bridge between the corporeal world and the Underworld. Following the exposition by the Messenger, Atossa's repetition of Xerxes' failures reiterates for both the internal and external audiences the scale of the loss the Persians now suffer. The grief the news brings is compounded with each retelling.

Darius is a tangible presence throughout the play,[227] even before his ghost is raised (681). The stichomythic exchange with Atossa (715-38) echoes the Messenger scene (249-513) but the Messenger's news is concisely retold, perhaps given that the internal and external audiences have already heard the full account directly from the Messenger.[228] The presence of the ghost allows the play to impart a deeper understanding of the Persian empire as he describes the mythology and foundation myths of Persia (760-86) and compounds the judgement implicitly expressed throughout of Xerxes' folly in bringing ruin to an ancient house.

The presence of Darius allows the portrait of a glorious Persian empire, begun by the Chorus in the *parodos* (1-154), to be completed. Darius has knowledge of the poor behaviour and impiety of Persians during the war (807-12) but not details of Xerxes' journey to Greece. Nor does he comment on the number of the dead although he does forecast the circumstances of Xerxes' return

---

[227] Lines 244, 555-6, 647-55, 662, 671, 852-70.

[228] Schuren (2014): 93 notes that the stichomythic exchange between the ghost of Darius and his widow (715-38), like that of *Supp.* 291-347, is a precursor to the narrative stichomythia as subsequently developed by Euripides.

(834-6). The piecemeal nature of his knowledge allows Aeschylus to introduce various revelations or perspectives from each of the characters. Together these contribute to the portrayal of Persia suffering under the leadership of a weak man and serve to further tarnish Xerxes' character (725, 826-31).

Darius' explicit confirmation of the implicit knowledge of the internal audience underpins the whole play. The external audience already know that Xerxes should never have attempted his invasion of Greek lands (790). He emphatically states, at the Chorus' questioning (795), that the Persian army was lost regardless of their strength (796). Atossa, like the Chorus before her, emphasises the loss of men (730-6) but then goes on to describe Xerxes' having been unduly influenced by 'wicked men' (τοι κακοῖς, 753-4). This has not been mentioned before in the play. Hall says that such a reference would have had particular resonance for the audience because Herodotus recorded that Xerxes' advisers included the exiled Athenian tyrant Peisistratid family.[229] This admission to her husband's ghost reflects the intimacy of the scene. It also suggests that the Chorus, self-proclaimed 'guardians' (φύλακες, 4) left to manage (εἵλετο χώρας ἐφορεύειν, 7) in Xerxes' absence, declined to make any allusions to such a thing taking place.

If Atossa's assertions about Xerxes' bad counsel are correct this is perhaps indicative of a distance between the Chorus and Xerxes prior to his departure.

---

[229] Hall (1996): 161 n. 753-4 and see Herod. *Hist*. 7.5-6.

Herodotus suggests that, '… great as Athens had been before, once rid of her tyrants [the Peisistratids] she became greater still'.[230] It is likely that tales of the tyrants were preserved within the wider social memory of the democracy and that knowledge of their ties with Persia would have been common enough knowledge to evoke memories in the minds of the external audience.[231] This compresses the realities of the internal and external audiences together.

Focalisation

In accordance with de Jong's theory on focalisation,[232] the internal audience within the play are identified as secondary narratees whilst the external audience, those people sitting in the theatre, are identified as primary narratees.[233] I believe that the internal audience, the designated secondary narratees, could be judged the primary narratees when considered within the parameters of the performance space. In the *Persians*, the Messenger's role is analogous to that of omniscient narrator, echoing and sharing the pain of the Chorus and Atossa,[234] brings the internal audience to the emotional fore because they are experiencing the pain of defeat and loss for the first time, on stage. Whereas for the external audience, the ostensible primary narratees, the Messenger's account is quite literally recent history. Garvie notes that the

---

[230] Herod. *Hist*. 5.66.
[231] Herod. *Hist*. 5.65. As Griffith (1995): 65 notes, Aeschylus 'lived his early years under the rule (*tyrannis*) of the Peisistratid family; and he was already a teenager when the tyrant family was expelled and the leaders of the Alkmeonid clan instituted the extraordinary new "democratic" system of voting, tribal reorganization, assemblies, law courts, ostracism, etc.'
[232] As described in the thesis introduction; see p. 35.
[233] de Jong (2014): 198-9.
[234] Lines 250-55, 285, 431-2, 435-7.

double perspective of the Messenger, which Barrett suggests is a Homeric technique,[235] would have been acceptable to the external audience as much of his account is in the third person.[236] The double perspective may also have been intended to serve as a protective device for the Messenger; by narrating in the third person, particularly the Battle of Salamis, he can preserve a sense of distance from the activities he witnessed.

The personalisation and remembrance of the Persian generals (303-30) resurrects them in the theatrical space: the descriptions of Matallos' red beard (πυρρὰν ζαπληθῆ δάσκιον γενειάδα, 314), the handsomeness of Tharybis (εὐειδὴς ἀνήρ, 324)[237] and the athleticism of Dadakes (πήδημα κοῦφον, 305) put the focus directly on the internal audience: their knowledge, their experience, their loss. The dead Persians are brought into the present space and become a primary focus and the internal audience therefore become the primary narratees of this section of the Messenger's scene. Kate McLoughlin writes that 'while war literature may dazzle with its technique and resourcefulness, its subject matter can – should – sadden and horrify … the dazzlement's raison d'être is to keep the horror in view'.[238] The descriptions of the Persians' deaths serve to resurrect the horror of the battle within the internal space of the play.

---

[235] Barrett (2002): 23-55.
[236] Garvie (2009): 143 n. 266-7.
[237] A general mentioned three times in the play (51, 323, 971).
[238] McLoughlin (2011): 20. McLoughlin does not refer to ancient tragedy at all in her monograph on literary representations of war, although she does include Homer's *Iliad* in her discussions.

When the Messenger describes the deaths of these famous generals (302-30) blending highly-coloured narrative[239] with factual reporting, he creates a point of focus which pulls together the internal and external audiences, creating a single narrative of mourning by combining their dual experiences and perspectives. The Persian internal audience are mourning personal and civic losses and the loss of the war against the Greeks and the external audience, sitting in Athenian theatrical space, are powerfully reminded of their dead. This allows the external audience to mourn again retrospectively, though it also encourages them to reflect on the battle in a way they may not have done before.

For the external audience the relatively short passage of time since the battle allows it to be refreshed in the memory initially from the perception of loss and not victory. Both victory and failure come with losses and the Messenger's omniscient survey allows both internal and external audiences to understand this from within their own perspectives. Despite any kind of dramatic licence Aeschylus may have had, the external audience always knew before the start of the performance that the Greek forces would be the victors and the Persians the defeated. Aeschylus may have been seeking a different way of viewing the past rather than a simplistic representation of Persians as 'bad' and Athenians 'good'.

---

[239] Dadaces was hit by a spear and fell from his ship (πληγῇ δορὸς πήδημα κοῦφον ἐκ νεὼς ἀφήλατο, 304-5); Artembares was pounded against the shore (στύφλους παρ᾽ ἀκτὰς θείνεται Σιληνιῶν, 303); Matallus was covered in blood (ἀμείβων χρῶτα πορφυρέᾳ βαφῇ, 317); and bodies filled the sea (θάλασσα δ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽ ἦν ἰδεῖν, ναυαγίων πλήθουσα καὶ φόνου βροτῶν, 419-20).

As we have seen, the Messenger in the *Persians* is a figure which has significant impact on the direction of the play. He occupies several focalising identities during his speech. In de Jong's model he could be an internal primary narrator-focaliser.[240] Although not explicitly, he uses descriptive language suggesting much of his observations derive from his own first-hand perspective:

> Ἀρτεμβάρης δὲ μυρίας ἵππου βραβεὺς
> στύφλους παρ᾽ ἀκτὰς θείνεται Σιληνιῶν.
> χὠ χιλίαρχος Δαδάκης πληγῇ δορὸς
> πήδημα κοῦφον ἐκ νεὼς ἀφήλατο
>
> <div align="right">*Pers*. 302-5</div>

> Artembares, the commander of ten thousand horsemen, is
> being smashed along the rough shores of Sileniai. And
> Dadakes the chiliarch, at a blow of a spear, leapt lightly
> from his ship.[241]

The Messenger's narration also uses embedded focalisation extensively. The roll call of Persian generals[242] and how they died (302-31) is a particularly strong example of how this technique transforms the dead from mere cyphers of the Messenger's story into the human face of the Persian army, recreating the people to match their grief. The roll call is also an echo of the Chorus' own embedded focalisation of the army at 21-64. The Chorus name the generals in conjunction with their skills: Artembares the charioteer (Ἀρτεμβάρης θ᾽ ἱππιοχάρμης, 29), archer Imaios (τοξοδάμας ἐσθλὸς Ἰμαῖος, 30-1), horseman Sosthanes (ἵππων τ᾽ ἐλατὴρ Σοσθάνης, 32) and the lancers Mardon and Tharybis (Μάρδων, Θάρυβις, λόγχης ἄκμονες, 51). They also

---

[240] de Jong (2014): 49.
[241] Translation Hall (1996). See also lines 254-5, 260, 302-331, 409-32, 465, 480-514.
[242] See Table 1, p. 66.

name the satrapal rulers: Arsames (Μέμφιδος ἄρχων μέγας Ἀρσάμης, 36-7), Ariomardos (τάς τ᾽ ὠγυγίους Θήβας ἐφέπων Ἀριόμαρδος, 37-8), Mitragathes and Arkteus (Μητρογαθὴς Ἀρκτεύς τ᾽ ἀγαθός, βασιλῆς δίοποι, 43-4).

The Messenger, however, names them in terms of the losses their deaths will bring to the Persian empire: now Sardis will mourn 'excellent' Ariomardos (ὅ τ᾽ ἐσθλὸς Ἀριόμαρδος Σάρδεσι πένθος παρασχών, 321-22); the well-born Tharybis is lost to his many ships (Θάρυβίς τε πεντήκοντα πεντάκις νεῶν ταγός, γένος Λυρναῖος, εὐειδὴς ἀνήρ, κεῖται θανὼν δείλαιος οὐ μάλ᾽ εὐτυχῶς, 323-5). Lilaios and Arsames are cruelly defeated (Λίλαιος, Ἀρσάμης τε κἈργήστης τρίτος, οἵδ᾽ ἀμφὶ νῆσον τὴν πελειοθρέμμονα 'κύρισσον ἰσχυρὰν χθόνα, 309-11).[243] The Chorus focus on the qualities of the generals, enhancing their personalisation, whilst the Messenger focuses on the strategic losses and the impact on the empire.

The links between these two sections also look forward to the end of the play and inform the portrait of the profound psychological impact defeat will have on Xerxes. The Chorus harangue Xerxes and demand answers (955-99): he has lost the 'noble' Ariomardos (Ἀριόμαρδός τ᾽ ἀγαθός, 968) and Lilaios (ἢ Λίλαιος εὐπάτωρ, 969) and all his beloved comrades:

> ποῦ δὲ φίλων ἄλλος ὄχλος;
> ποῦ δέ σοι παραστάται,
> οἷος ἦν Φαρανδάκης,
> Σούσας, Πελάγων, καὶ Δοτάμας,
> ἠδὲ, Ψάμμις, Σουσισκάνης τ᾽

---

[243] See Hall (1996): 133 n. 309-10 and Garvie (2009): 165 n. 310, for discussion on the imagery of the Greek word 'κύρισσω which refers to animals 'butting with horns'.

Ἀγδαβάτας λιπών;

Pers. 954-61

Where are all your friends?
Where are your comrades,
Pharandakes, Sousas, Pelagon and Datamas?
Psammis and Sousiskanes, who left Agbatana?

They single out other great generals not named by the Messenger: Xanthes (Μάρδων ἀνδρῶν μυριοταγὸν Ξάνθιν, 994-5), Tolmos and Lythimnas (καὶ Λυθίμναν Τόλμον τ᾽ αἰχμᾶς ἀκόρεστον, 997-8). Interestingly, mentioned for the first time is the 'best of the Persians' and the 'eye' of the king (ἦ καὶ τὸν Περσᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸν σὸν πιστὸν πάντ᾽ ὀφθαλμὸν, 979-80), the only man apart from Xerxes whose father, grandfather and great-grandfather are named in the play (< ------- > Βατανώχου παῖδ᾽ ἄλπιστον τοῦ Σησάμα τοῦ Μεγαβάτα, 981-4) but whose own name is unknown.[244] Xerxes has not only lost all his men and all his noble generals but also the most important of them and this is an indicator of the depth of his personal loss as well as the empiric scale of it.

The Messenger also brings Xerxes into the narrative via embedded focalisation, his second 'appearance' before his physical entrance to the stage. Previously, the Chorus have described how he had attempted to overpower the sea itself to cross the Hellespont (65-71), a description that portrayed the king as overly-confident and arrogant in his own self-belief. Now, the Messenger reverses that image when he describes how Xerxes 'wailed aloud as he saw the depth of the disaster' (Ξέρξης δ᾽ ἀνῴμωξεν

---

[244] Both Hall (1996): 173 n. 983 and Garvie (2009): 357-8 n. 981-5 discuss this enigmatic character.

κακῶν ὁρῶν βάθος, 465). This reversal is a foreshadowing for the external

audience of Xerxes' changed fortunes mapped within the play. Although a

negative portrayal of Xerxes is hinted at earlier (74, 189-99), now the extent

of his failures is baldly confirmed by the Messenger's terrible news, further

endorsed by the perspective of the Chorus.[245]   This creates a bleak

psychological portrait of Xerxes. As the play progresses the internal and

external audiences are presented with an aural illustration of his egotistical

superiority being reduced and descending into abject failure, imagery that is

realised by his behaviour when he does finally arrive on stage.

A particular section of the Messenger's speech has been debated by scholars.

The Messenger describes activities of men:

> οἱ δ᾽ οὐκ ἀκόσμως, ἀλλὰ πειθάρχῳ φρενὶ δεῖπνόν τ᾽
> ἐπορσύνοντο, ναυβάτης τ᾽ ἀνὴρ τροποῦτο κώπην σκαλμὸν
> ἀμφ᾽ εὐήρετμον
>
> *Pers*. 375-8

> … prepared their evening meal, while each sailor looped his
> oar about its thole-pin so that it fitted well

Hall translates this as relating to the preparations of the Greek soldiers.[246] If

accepted this suggests that the Messenger's omniscient presence extends to

the Greek camps as well as the Persians'. A more convincing alternate view

(represented by Garvie[247] and other scholars[248]) is that if the reference is taken

to be to the Greek soldiers, the flow of the Messenger's narrative becomes

---

[245] Lines 550-4, 652-3, 1004-7, 1016.
[246] Hall (1996): 61.
[247] Garvie (2009): 188-9.
[248] Sommerstein (2010): 52; Rosenbloom (2006): 174 n. 22; Bakewell (1998).

discordant, whereas it makes more internal sense if it is taken to refer to the Persian camps. Accepting it to refer to the Persians also allows the court to feel the tension of the camp that evening and enhances their empathic connection with the army. This rendering also provides for the external audience a greater sense of the shock coming to the Persians the next day. The contrast of the quiet night-time preparations with the battle to come is dramatically much more satisfying and would have imbued the external audience with a growing sense of anticipation.[249]

Spatial Design in the *Persians*

For the internal audience the Messenger is the bridge between the unknown, represented by the Persian court desperate for news before his arrival, and the known, where he introduces a new reality to the court with his devastating news of defeat at the hands of the Greek forces. In the context of the Messenger as a multiple conduit he also forms a link between the land of Persia and the Persians now on Greek land, between the space of the theatrical performance and the space of the Athenian theatre. Rehm's model provides a useful starting point for examining how Aeschylus combines different spatialities to create other spatial frameworks.

In *Persians*, distanced and extrascenic spaces are melded together with reflexive space. Much of the information presented by the play, on Xerxes,

---

[249] The use of night to frame this part of the action is reminiscent of Homeric poetry – especially books 10, 22, 23 and 24 of the *Iliad*.

the empire and where the Persian forces are, is pulled from the distanced space of the memories of the Chorus and Atossa. The narrative of the Messenger is in a distanced, extrascenic space because he has travelled directly from the army. He has a unique position because he occupies past, present and future outside the confines of the palace. As an army messenger, he is not designed to exercise personal judgement on Xerxes as are Atossa, the ghost of Darius and the Chorus. His space and function is defined by the army. The ghost of Darius embodies reflexive space; as former king he alone has the power to understand the extent of Xerxes' failures and the impact they will have on the empire. Darius' ghost speaks as a king and judges Xerxes within this context.

The Messenger's account also creates a reflexive environment within Athenian theatre space, one that is on the threshold of merging with 'real' and civic space. Resurrecting the dead Persians by name (302-31), taking the audience to the strait of Salamis (385-471), then through Boeotia (482), Thessaly (489), Magnesia (492), Macedonia (492) and Thrace (509), the Messenger creates a bubble of reality so close to the reality of the external audience that it becomes a powerfully influential meta-reality where fact and fiction start to merge together.

Members of the external audience may have had heard reports of the Persians' retreat after their defeat at Salamis, reports which would have enhanced Athenian pride in repelling them. The new meta-reality offers the audience a much wider scope of knowledge about these events than they may previously

have had. It may have even filled in 'gaps' in their knowledge. It may have

contributed to a revisionistic interpretation of the Persian wars not just for the

external Athenian audience but for any non-Athenians who may have been

present at the performance.

These many possibilities, so difficult to define given that the source is a

dramatic text, demonstrate the fluidity of the tragic form. All of the

suppositions mentioned will have been correct to a certain extent at certain

points of the performance. Aeschylus is shaping the reception of historical

events within the constraints of the rigidly-defined social construction of

ancient Athens.

News from a Persian Perspective within Athenian Space

When the *Persians* was produced in 472 B.C.E., the battles of both Marathon

(490 B.C.E.) and Salamis (480 B.C.E.) were still in the living memory of the

polis.[250] Aeschylus' ancient biography tells us that Aeschylus himself fought

at Marathon,[251] where he lost one brother[252] and another at Salamis.[253] The

subject would have been deeply personal both to him and his Greek audience,

and his ability to create empathy for the Persians in this play suggests a desire

for contemplation on war.[254]

---

[250] Grethlein (2010): 75.
[251] *Vita Aeschyli* 4.
[252] Cynegeirus; Herod. *Hist*. 6.114, 362
[253] Ameinias; *Vita Aeschyli* 4.
[254] A view Grethlein shares, Grethlein (2010): 14.

It is notable that whilst the approach of the Persians was to destroy and burn the landscape and physical material of their enemies, this was not the approach of the Athenians towards Persia. The Greeks did not attempt to invade Persia but sought to keep them out of Greece as much as they could. The Athenian experience of victimhood was not the same as that of the Persians; although many died, the Persians still had cities and homes to return to. The Athenians experienced temporary exile and the destruction of their homes and civic and religious spaces and the production of this play must have been emotionally unsettling for them.

The Persians brought war to the most sacred space of the Athenians, physical desecrations that would have left even deeper scars than the deaths of its men. As R. P. Winnington-Ingram points out, Aeschylus was 'writing for an audience which had seen the sanctuaries of the Acropolis plundered and burnt'.[255] Herodotus describes the influx of Persian forces onto Greek land and their arrival in Attica prior to the Battle of Salamis. Athens had begun a large-scale evacuation with most seeking refuge on Troezen, Aegina and Salamis.[256] He describes how the Persian forces camped on the Areopagus and eventually were able to invade the Acropolis itself; those Athenians who had chosen to remain either killed themselves on the arrival of the Persians or

---

[255] Winnington-Ingram (1983): 12
[256] Herod. *Hist*. 8.40-1.

were killed by them. Herodotus says the Persians then 'looted the sanctuary and torched the whole of the Acropolis'.[257]

Hall suggests that the 'very "universality" of the Persians' experience of defeat' might provide the external audience with a warning on submitting to hubris and arrogance[258] whereas Grethlein suggests that the temporal and spatial distances would allow the external audience to experience an understanding of 'common ground',[259] a recognition of a shared experience.[260] Manipulating temporalities has the effect of inducing pity for the Persians on stage.[261] The confluence of the space of the theatre and the imaginative space of the audience could have provoked conflicting feelings, perhaps tempered by the fact that the play uses 'a setting in which the audience was used to reacting with pity to the suffering on stage'.[262]

---

[257] Herod. *Hist*. 8.53. Mardonius, Xerxes' general in charge of the remaining forces following Xerxes' departure, would inflict further damage on Athens' *polis* in 479 B.C.E. Herod. *Hist*. 9.13.

[258] Hall (2010): 202.

[259] Grethlein (2010): 92.

[260] This shared experience is still relevant to any future audiences, ancient or modern. Hardwick (2013a): 21 discusses the modern reception of ancient tragedy's depiction of war, in particular how 'the physical and mental injuries suffered by soldiers, and especially recognition of the long-term effects of post-traumatic stress disorders (PTSDs) have led to a number of veterans' programmes, in particular in the United States', which use dramatic scenes of ancient warfare as a form of therapeutic intervention. An example is Theatre of War Productions, founded by Bryan Doerries and Phyllis Kaufman, who state that 'by presenting these plays to military and civilian audiences, our hope is to de-stigmatize psychological injury, increase awareness of post-deployment psychological health issues, disseminate information regarding available resources, and foster greater family, community, and troop resilience'. See http://theaterofwar.com/projects/theater-of-war/programs for further information on specific productions.

[261] Rehm (2016): 134 states 'one must assume that tragic references to combat and wartime death carried a sensory and emotional power for the original audience that most moderns cannot – and would not wish to – imagine'.

[262] Grethlein (2010): 89. Allan and Kelly (2013): 96 argue that on-stage suffering has a didactic purpose for the external audience, who learn from the mistakes acted out upon the stage.

Understanding the function of the Messenger figure is crucial to understanding the balance of the play. The Messenger is the conduit between the battle, in Athenian space, and the court, in Persian space. His scene is the point where the prophecies and fears for Xerxes' rule are confirmed, the uncertainties transformed by his presence into certainties. It only remains for the ghost of Darius (681-842) to provide final ratification of Xerxes' failures. Naturally the more authoritative messenger, the speech of Darius' ghost supports the account of the Messenger and lends royal gravitas to his narrative. Chronologically the Messenger must appear before Darius' ghost as this allows the latter scope to mourn the extent of Xerxes' failure; when Darius provides an account of the Persian royal genealogy (765-81), it shows that not only has Xerxes disgraced his royal lineage, he has also endangered its future.

Atossa's description of Xerxes bridging the Hellespont (μηχαναῖς ἔζευξεν Ἕλλης πορθμόν, ὥστ' ἔχειν πόρον, 722-6), so shocking to Darius (φεῦ, μέγας τις ἦλθε δαίμων, ὥστε μὴ φρονεῖν καλῶς, 725), is an indication of the scale of Xerxes' hubris and is perhaps meant to remind the external audience of the sacking of Athens. Herodotus' account of Xerxes punishing the sea with lashes and whips when his first attempt failed[263] portrays a man who is so blinded by his own arrogance and hubristic need that he thinks he can be king of the sea. This is the profile of Xerxes conveyed by Darius and Atossa and

---

[263] Herod. *Hist*. 7.35.

is echoed throughout the play,[264] a portrayal which the performance embeds within sacred Athenian space. Xerxes' successes as a king – his great army filled with famous Persian leaders, the (symbolic and literal) wealth of Persia – are systematically ground down within the performance as messages about his campaign are filtered through the Messenger. That his own parents condemn his actions and mourn the effects of them is a clear signal to the external spectators of the extent of his downfall.

Winnington-Ingram suggests it would have been easy to have Xerxes arrive after the Messenger speech and end the play at this point, which he says would have been a 'sequence very gratifying to Athenian pride'.[265] By delaying Xerxes' arrival, and allowing the ghost of Darius to learn of the extent of his failure from those who know Xerxes best (his mother and royal advisers), Aeschylus extends the destruction of his character and by extension, the destruction of the Persian forces. It is also a reiteration of knowledge for the external audience. Demonstrating a comprehensive reversal of fortune for the Persians, the progression of the play sees Xerxes' personality dismantled and the strength of Athens methodically built up. Performing this process in Athenian civic space also adds additional insult to injury for Xerxes. Winnington-Ingram suggests that the 'troublesome daimon' that is referred to by Atossa (στυγνὲ δαῖμον, 472) and the Chorus (δυσπόνητε δαῖμον, 515) is in fact Xerxes himself, whose foolish attempt to make war against the

---

[264] Lines 74, 550-4, 652-3, 1004-7, 1016.
[265] Winnington-Ingram (1983): 2.

Athenians has transformed him from a '*eudaimon*' to a '*dusdaimon*',[266] a fitting observation.

The Athenian battle strategy rested on the account of the false message from Themistocles' slave (353-86).[267] This perhaps mirrors the reference to the 'wicked men' (753-4) who influenced Xerxes, suggesting he was seduced by false messages before he even left Persia. Hesk, discussing deception, lies and trickery in terms of Athenian democracy and civic identity, notes that the deception portrayed in *Persians* is 'an instance of military trickery packaged as an Athenian virtue',[268] an interpretation that (if correct) may have appealed to the external audience.[269] For the external audience, false messages are also reminiscent of Epic; in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, for example, Odysseus is renowned for his guile and ability to deceive.[270] The effect of the false message, when reproduced in the theatrical setting through the Messenger's speech, is of the internal Athenians encroaching upon Persian diegetic space. It emphasises the sense of Athenian dominance and reinforces the Persian soldiers' isolation in Hellenic land. By successfully infiltrating the Persian

---

[266] Winnington-Ingram (1983): 5-6.
[267] Sikinnos, named in *Herod*. 8.75.
[268] Hesk (2000): 107.
[269] van Wees (2004): 224 observes that 'Themistocles became a national hero for allegedly spreading disinformation and manipulating the Persian fleet at Salamis [in 480 B.C.E.] into an engagement at a location which favoured the Greeks. Whether or not he did, the story shows that deceit was thoroughly acceptable in naval warfare.'
[270] Odysseus' blinding of the Cyclops Polyphemos is an example where this ability could be perceived as a virtue, for it saved the lives of Odysseus and his men (although it earned Odysseus the enmity of Polyphemos' father, Poseidon), Hom. *Od*. 9. See also Hom. *Il*. 3.161, 4.265, 23.703; Hom. *Od*. 4.6, 9.5, 13.3, 14.1, 19.5, 20.1. In *Poet*. 1460a 20 Aristotle says 'δεδίδαχεν δὲ μάλιστα Ὅμηρος καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ψευδῆ λέγειν ὡς δεῖ' ('Homer taught us how to lie in the right way'). See also Walcot (1977), Emlyn-Jones (1986), Pratt (1993), Segal (1994), Schein (1996) and Richardson (1996); (2006).

camp and subsequently implementing Themistocles' strategy, the Athenians were symbolically reclaiming Greek land occupied by Persians. The psychological boost from this achievement was crucial for the Athenian navy before the battle and for the audience reinforced the perception of Athens as a superior power.

Conclusion

Re-enacting the Battle of Salamis through the Persian Messenger allowed Aeschylus to honour the Greeks who took part in that battle from the perspective of someone who was not a king but someone closer in ethos to the Athenian citizen than Xerxes could ever be. Using the Persian messenger, a commoner instead of a king, allows that figure's well-articulated grief to resonate more deeply with the external audience of Athenians, a sharp contrast to the rambling incoherence of Xerxes. The Messenger figure is in a sense a neutral character because, in the play, he is neither (a physical) part of the army nor part of the palace environment. This 'external' status allows him to represent different messages to the internal audience (of Atossa and the Chorus) and the external spectators. He invokes a different perspective for both sets of audiences.

In the play the Athenian navy at Salamis is urged to take ownership of the fight to serve Athens, the ideal democratic state. For the audience watching the performance in Athens, the sudden rallying cry of the Greeks (402-5), echoing off the island rocks (389-90), and the emphasis on the terror it imbued in the Persians (φόβος δὲ πᾶσι βαρβάροις παρῆν, 391) is a triumphant display

of the Greek psyche. The play is also a chthonic homage to the physical land

of Athens, for, as Aeschylus has the ghost of Darius say, 'the land itself fights'

for the Greeks (εἰ μὴ στρατεύοισθ᾽ ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήνων τόπον, 790). The

relocation of Salamis to the diegetic space in the recreation of the battle closes

the distance in both time and space and forges a new cognitive link with the

external audience as they relive the events of 472 B.C.E.

The question of whether the play is a victory boast or a sympathetic

acknowledgement of Persian losses is of course open. Mark Griffith says that

> a play set in the capital city of Persia, and presenting the
> Persian royal family on stage as its leading characters ...
> would resonate very powerfully in the Athenian
> imagination, as embodiments of elite aspiration,
> achievement – *and also failure* [his italics].[271]

Griffith seems to suggest that in spite of any previous successes, such as in

Thrace in c.516 B.C.E. and Macedonia in 512-479 B.C.E., the Persians would

always be considered by those who were so sure of their own way of life as

lesser than the Greeks, or as Griffith puts it, 'sub-Greek'.[272] On the other

hand, Bridges thinks that the humiliation of Xerxes in the play is really the

humiliation of Persia.[273] Winnington-Ingram suggests that Xerxes' greatest

folly was in not understanding that Greeks were meant to be free from

monarchy or tyranny. As he says, the ghost of Darius reminds Atossa that

---

[271] Griffith (2007): 112.
[272] Griffith (2007): 101.
[273] Bridges (2015): 34 following Taplin (1977).

Zeus himself proclaimed Persia to be a monarchical state (760-5).[274] As the play encompasses both victory and sympathy, the progression of events certainly enhances such a theory. The wealth and noble lineage of Persia is acknowledged, as is their difference to the Greeks. The portrayal of their suffering moves from eloquence at the beginning of the play (1-245) to Xerxes' hysteria at the end (931-1076). Xerxes' appearance with torn clothes and an empty quiver (1017-22) 'captures the inexpressible magnitude of the Persian king's loss' and is a physical manifestation of his psychological decline.[275]

There is sympathy in the portrayal but, as Erich Gruen rightly notes, 'it would be absurd to imagine that Aeschylus, who had fought in the Athenian ranks, wept for Persia – or expected his audience to do so'.[276] The Greeks' explosive entrance into the distanced space through the invocation to fight (402-5) vocalises the values so important to their own society. That this expression of Greek power is delivered through the mouth of a Persian Messenger, rather than Xerxes, cements their superiority and the scale of their victory. They have comprehensively unmanned the Persian Great King and rendered him incoherent with grief and sorrow.

---

[274] Winnington-Ingram (1983): 10-11. Allan and Kelly (2013): 103-4 identify a spectrum ranging from autocracy to democracy and warn against a rigid polarisation between Greeks and barbarians. They believe the external audience are able to sympathise with the on-stage Persians as the Persian defeat is based upon their (the external audience's) view of monarchy rather than individual Persians.
[275] Mueller (2016): 154.
[276] Gruen (2011): 16.

Through his use of a messenger figure Aeschylus allows the audience to enjoy a paean to Greek values whilst at the same time helping them understand the human cost this involved. The discussion of how messenger figures are utilised will continue in the following chapter which will demonstrate how alternative messenger figures play pivotal roles in the narrative structure.

Chapter 2
Alternative Messengers and the Importance of Space: *Seven against Thebes*

Introduction

Having considered the role of the Messenger in chapter one above, the focus will now turn to other characters in Aeschylus' plays that act as messenger figures. This chapter will examine how news – and what constitutes news – and messages are used and conveyed to progress the action of the play; to do this it will focus initially on the figure of the Scout, as the primary messenger figure, in Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes* (Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας). The role of the Scout will be explored in terms of his status as a messenger figure and I will consider how his identification and role impacts upon the messages he delivers.

Of particular interest in this play is how Aeschylus uses the diegetic space and communicates a sense of spatialities. Spatial analysis underpins examination of the transformative power of ancient tragedy as it reveals different layers of meaning for different perspectives. The principles of spatial analysis, which includes identifying spatial frames and how they are used and combined, will continue to inform the examinations undertaken throughout the thesis. Rehm's theories on spatial categories[277] will also inform this analysis but I shall build on this to show how the use of space has

---

[277] Rehm (2002).

different ramifications for the internal and external audiences. These will be considered in conjunction with the analysis. Taken together, the role of the Scout and the analysis of the use of spatial dimensions will contribute to an understanding of how very different factors play a part in the delivery of news and messages.

Form and Themes of the Play

The *Seven against Thebes* was the third play in a trilogy produced in 467 B.C.E. Unlike the *Persians*, this play was part of a connected trilogy and as such affords some licence for conjecture as to plot progression and overall themes. The trilogy consisted of *Laius* (*Λάϊος*), *Oedipus* (*Οἰδίπους*) and *Seven against Thebes* and was produced with the satyr play *Sphinx* (*Σφίγξ*). The ancient hypothesis to the play indicates that Aeschylus won first prize against Aristias.[278] Taking the second prize, Aristias was producing his father Pratinas' plays as Euphorion, Aeschylus' son, would do after the latter's death.[279] Polyphrasmon, the son of Phrynichus (fl.511/08-476 B.C.E.),[280] took third prize.[281]

---

[278] P.Oxy 2256 fr. 2,
http://163.1.169.40/gsdl/collect/POxy/index/assoc/HASHfdc8/1133a60d.dir/POxy.v0020.n
2256.a.01.hires.jpg accessed 22 August 2015.
[279] TrGF 1². 88.
[280] As noted in chapter one above, Phrynichus produced a play on the Battle of Salamis from the perspective of the Persian wives upon which Aeschylus was said to have modelled his *Persians* of 472 B.C.E.
[281] TrGF 1²/.84-5.

Fragments are all that now remain of the first two plays in the trilogy.[282] Their titles indicate that the story of Oedipus' dynastic history and legacy were a theme connected through the trilogy. Gregory Hutchinson examines the available fragmentary evidence and concludes that the first play, *Laius*, dealt with Laius' defiance of Apollo's oracle prior to the events of the play and culminated with his death and can see no other reasonable primary subject for the play.[283]

Sommerstein's interpretation of the fragmentary evidence is that Aeschylus located the confrontation between Laius and an unknown Oedipus at Potniae, near Thebes; Sophocles, in his play *Oedipus Tyrannos* (*Οἰδίπους Τύραννος*), produced thirty-eight years after the *Seven against Thebes* in c.429 B.C.E., placed the argument on the road to Delphi, which is much further away from Thebes than Potniae.[284] We could speculate that Aeschylus wished to emphasise that close proximity to Thebes revealed Oedipus' brutal temper, that the closer he got to his true home the more prevalent his true nature (i.e., to kill someone in a fit of anger must point to a volatile personality). This closeness to his home and his father unconsciously revealed his true nature, whereas for the Sophoclean Oedipus there is a sense that his past is more remote and further behind him. Sommerstein posits other theories but

---

[282] TrGF 121, 122, 122a, 387a; P.Oxy 2256 fr. 1.
[283] Hutchinson (1985): xvii-xxiv.
[284] Lines 808-10.

concludes that whatever the reason it was relating to Oedipus in one way or another.[285]

If the first play of Aeschylus' trilogy dealt with the failure of Laius to heed the gods' advice and remain childless, and his subsequent death at the hands of his unknown son, then the second play, *Oedipus*, presumably explored the latter's cursed heritage. It follows that the final play of the trilogy will then deal with the continuation and final fulfilment of the familial curse through the children of Oedipus. In discussing the possible story arc of the trilogy, Sommerstein identifies the most plausible evidence for his theory from within the text of the *Seven against Thebes*.[286] As Sommerstein notes, the *Seven against Thebes* alludes to Laius' hubristic 'defiance' of Apollo (Ἀπόλλωνος εὖτε Λάιος βίᾳ, 745-6). This type of behaviour is echoed in Oedipus' strained relationships with Creon and Teiresias in mythological narrative and explored by Sophocles in his *Oedipus Tyrannos*.[287] The Chorus say that Oedipus is angry with his sons for their poor maintenance of him (ἐπικότους τροφᾶς, 786), which Sommerstein believes implies Oedipus is aged, referencing a tradition of sons supporting their parents in old age.[288] Hutchinson compares the Aeschylean fragments with the fragments of the Epic *Thebais* in order to

---

[285] Sommerstein (2010): 87.
[286] Sommerstein (2008a): 84-9.
[287] Soph. *Oed.* 366-526, 594-651, 693-705.
[288] Sommerstein (2010): 85-6. Sommerstein suggests that the Aeschylean Oedipus of the second play in the trilogy is much older than the version portrayed by Sophocles. He quotes the *scholia* to Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* (1375) which states that Aeschylus' interpretation of the Oedipus myth was similar to that found in the Epic *Thebais* in which Oedipus was supported by his sons, thereby indicating old age.

determine likely plot-connections.[289] He believes that the *Oedipus* included the revelation of the circumstances of Oedipus' marriage to his mother and subsequent incestuous children, his self-mutilation in the knowledge of that revelation and the resulting curse on Eteocles and Polynices.[290]

The *Seven against Thebes* concerns the conflict between Eteocles and Polynices and its resolution. The conflict also has ramifications for the brothers' sisters, Antigone and Ismene.[291] In epic, Polynices was the son of Oedipus by his second wife Euryganeia[292] but the version where he is the son of his grandmother Jocasta[293] was more prevalent during the fifth century B.C.E.[294] Several versions of the myth suggest that Oedipus cursed his sons,[295] either because of their incestuous origin or because they failed to treat him properly, something that is referenced throughout the play.[296] There are different versions of how exactly Polynices came to be exiled from Thebes but these are not mentioned in this play,[297] only the fact of the bitter dispute between the brothers (832-60) which is ultimately traced back to Laius'

---

[289] Hutchinson (1985): xxiv-xxx.
[290] Hutchinson (1985): xxv-xxvii.
[291] Antigone and Ismene are named late in the play and (if one accepts the ending of the play is inauthentic) neither speak although they come on stage (862).
[292] Apollod., *Library* 3.5.8, Paus. 9.5.10-11.
[293] Known as Epicaste in Homer's *Odyssey*, 11.271-80.
[294] Apollod. 3.5.8.
[295] In Homer and the Epic Cycle Oedipus does kill his father and marry his mother but he has no children until he subsequently remarries (Hom. *Il*. 11.6; Apollod. 3.5.7-9).
[296] Lines 70, 653, 655, 681-2, 695, 723, 785-91, 832-39, 886-7, 945-6, 989.
[297] Athenaeus quotes an Epic tradition that had Eteocles presenting his father with a precious cup forbidden for use, *Deip*. 465. In Euripides' *Phoenician Women* of c.409/8 B.C.E., out of shame the brothers confined Oedipus to the palace (63-5) which led to his cursing them in anger; after agreeing to each rule Thebes on a biannual basis to try and avoid the curse, Eteocles reneged on the agreement after the first year and banished Polynices (69-76).

failure to obey the oracle (743-51, 840-2). It is possible that one of these versions was chosen for the *Oedipus*, and perhaps even referenced in the *Laius* providing an early foreshadowing of the troubles to come.

The intention of the analysis is to demonstrate how different types of characters can act as messenger figures and how their identities can enhance or influence how messages are received. With no formal or 'traditional' messenger figure, this play instead must use alternative characters to deliver key information and news. The kind of news that the Scout delivers would surely 'traditionally' come from a character identified as a messenger, for that is the function of a Scout. Instead, the Scout is symbolic of the militaristic theme of the play; he has a military title, possibly conferring more authority upon him than an anonymous messenger would possess.

The issue of the Scout's truthfulness is part of this identity; his status as a military officer is perhaps designed to imply this. Against this interpretation of the Scout are those who are his direct opposite, the chorus of Theban women (χορός παρθένων). Subjected to Eteocles' eternal exasperation, the Chorus are the non-militaristic face of the play, the 'ordinary' citizen who will be just as affected by the outcome as Eteocles. Their status adds authenticity to their delivery of information.

Elements of the play and the characters will first be examined to determine the overall construction of the narrative. The play is structured around different kinds of news and messages, which are brought forward by Eteocles,

the Scout (who appears three times) and the Chorus. There are no figures formally identified as 'messenger' in the *Seven against Thebes* although the scout is identified as ἄγγελος κατασκοπός.[298] The nature of his job necessarily identifies him as someone who delivers information.

The play's story will be analysed in terms of where news and messaging are turning points or where they are central to the narrative structure. The play begins with Eteocles addressing the citizens regarding the coming conflict (1-38); a Scout arrives to say that Polynices and his allies are preparing for battle (39-68). The prologue situates the action of the play firmly as being present in time and publicly situated. Eteocles' address to the citizenry is an early indication of the relevance for the wider population of what is going to take place and that while the focus of the play will be the conflict between the brothers it will also affect the *polis*. A group of Theban women make up the chorus (287-368, 720-91) and are often frantic with terror; Eteocles must manage them as well as prepare for battle (182-286).

When the Scout returns with news of the commanders, Eteocles matches them with Theban generals (375-652) after which Eteocles mourns the fulfilment of Oedipus' curse which will see him fight his brother Polynices at the seventh gate (653-76). Eteocles arms himself whilst the Chorus try to persuade him against fighting (683-719). A Theban Messenger arrives (792-

---

[298] Hutchinson (1985): 2. Literally, 'a messenger who looks around', encapsulating the dual identity of the Scout as a military figure and as a dramatic messenger.

819) with the news that Thebes is saved (792-4) but that Eteocles and Polynices have killed each other in battle (805, 809). While the Chorus mourn the deaths (822-60), the bodies of the brothers are brought on stage. The inauthentic ending includes the appearance of a Herald who forbids Antigone to bury Polynices (1005-53).

The play deals internally with events that are happening in the present; although influenced and perhaps constructed by past events, the prologue's emphasis on the present predicament of Thebes is an early indication that temporalities will play a part in the construction of the plot. The past is represented by Laius and Oedipus whilst Eteocles and Polynices represent the present: the collision of past curses and present battles cancels out a future for the Labdacid line. Another interpretation, given the plot possibilities discussed above, is that the *Laius* represents the past, the *Oedipus* represents the present and the *Seven against Thebes* represents the future.

Like the progression of the story through the trilogy, the final play closes the temporal loop. This type of analysis can be applied to other plays which deploy the same kind of temporal interlocking such as the *Oresteia* and the *Prometheus Bound*. The manipulation of temporalities links with news and messaging to contribute to their delivery. The combination of temporal perspectives can influence interpretation of the story being performed on stage, both for the internal and external spectators and this thread will run throughout the thesis.

A Different Prologue

My interpretation of the prologue informs the foundation of the spatial analysis to follow.[299] Prologues are themselves temporal, often setting out the history of events which are to be enacted.[300] As Hutchinson has pointed out,[301] the prologue of this play establishes nothing of what has gone before. The knowledge of the external audience is reliant either upon what they observed in the earlier two plays of the trilogy or through their own familiarity with the mythological patterns, although there is currently no evidence as to what the 'standard' version of the myth might have been at that time for the original spectators. This is in keeping with the overall framework of the play in which news and messages are almost entirely 'internal' to it and the construction of the prologue contributes to this effect.

The *Seven against Thebes* opens with Eteocles addressing Theban citizens.[302] There is a suggestion that there is a crowd of armed men present before Eteocles.[303] Eteocles is calling upon the citizens to fight for Thebes (10-20); those who can must arm themselves and fight (σοῦσθε σὺν παντευχίᾳ, 31). Eteocles says that a prophet (ὁ μάντις) has interpreted the flight of birds and declared that plans for war by Achaeans are being discussed that night.[304] He

---

[299] See page 135.

[300] In *Persians* we learn that the king has left with a massive army (1-139); in *Suppliants* we learn of the recent past of the Danaids and the dangers they face (1-175); in the *Agamemnon*, the Watchman alludes to recent history (1-39).

[301] Hutchinson (1985): xxx.

[302] More specifically, those of Cadmus' land (Κάδμου πολῖται, 1). Cadmus was the founder of Thebes; see Apollod. 3.4.

[303] Taplin (1977): 129-34 has argued for the presence of silent cast members with which Hutchinson (1985): 41 concurs.

[304] Λέγει μεγίστην προσβολὴν Ἀχαιίδα νυκτηγορεῖσθαι κἀπιβουλεύσειν πόλει, 28-9.

also tells them that he has sent Scouts (κατοπτῆρας) to spy on the enemy army beyond the city gates in order to be prepared for their attack. This speech of Eteocles urges the citizens to think of themselves as children of the motherland (Γῆ τε μητρί, 16); the widespread feeling of unrest or fear plays on the bond between the people and the land. He uses the prophecy to engender action amongst the citizens and that he has sent out scouts is a demonstration that he is doing everything he can as leader.

The prologue consists of forecasting three key pieces of dynamic news that have not yet happened but will impact the events about to take place: Thebes is under imminent attack which has been confirmed by a prophet (24-9), the city must act to defend itself in every way possible (30-5) and scouts are due to report back to Eteocles at any moment (36-9). The circumstances which follow have been created by the recent past: the audience knows the past will direct the future because it derives from the prophecies of the gods. The chronology of the play's action is consequently balanced between the past, present and future. The construction of the play moves between these three states simultaneously to create a fluid narrative.

Following Eteocles' announcement that he has sent scouts to reconnoitre the enemy forces (36-9) the Scout arrives (40-68). His arrival is not announced within the text as arriving and departing characters sometimes are, but the immediacy of his appearance after Eteocles' announcement suggests a natural progression of activity to the external audience and links this first appearance of the Scout to the prologue. This helps to give a sense of fluidity to the

prologue which is designed as a vehicle for contributing to action, rather than reporting on things that have already happened. This inference is supported when the Scout says he is bringing firm news from the enemy camp (ἥκω σαφῆ τἀκεῖθεν ἐκ στρατοῦ φέρων, 40).

A Spurious Epilogue

The final scene featuring the Herald, Antigone and Ismene (1005-78) is believed to be inauthentic. Scholars agree that the original play ends at line 1004, and the remaining lines (1005-78) were added at a later date. This was not necessarily very much later after Aeschylus' death: Quintilian (c.35-c.90s C.E.) records that 'the Athenians allowed later poets to revise his tragedies'.[305] Hutchinson emphatically states that it 'would be the height of paradox to maintain that this scene was authentic' and that the 'whole structure of the drama, and its relation to the trilogy, are destroyed by this inopportune appendage'.[306] His opinion is that the scene was added later than 411-409 B.C.E. as a result of Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (*Φοίνισσαι*, produced c.409/8 B.C.E.). He suggests further the scene is actually an example of post-classical tragedy owing to the language and style of the scene.[307] Collard suggests that later revivals of the play may have wished to 'complete the story' and concurs with Hutchinson's view of the post-classical style of the scene.[308]

---

[305] *Institutio Oratoria,* 10.1.66; quoted by Kovacs (2005): 380-1.
[306] Hutchinson (1985): 209-10 n. 1005-78.
[307] Hutchinson (1985): 211 n. 1005-78.
[308] Collard (2008): xxxv.

Taplin agrees that this final scene is a later addition and suggests there may even have been some alterations to the Aeschylean text to provide the false ending with a better fit with the original text.[309] Sommerstein concurs and notes that the added final ending 'ruins an ending which till then had stressed, over and over again, the equality of the brothers in death, and leaves the action of the play, and therefore of the trilogy, lacking any closure'. He believes that the ending was added after Sophocles' *Antigone* (Ἀντιγόνη, 443/2 B.C.E.) influenced later understanding of the mythological story due to Antigone's actions in that play being inextricably linked with the fate of the brothers.[310] Isabelle Torrance shares this view. As well as the fact that the final scene 'makes no sense in a trilogy in which the threat has always been *complete extinction* [her italics] of the Theban house' she also notes that it disrupts the pattern of gender relations[311] within a play which emphasises the differences between men and women in ancient society.[312] C. M. Dawson, however, whilst acknowledging that the final scene 'disturbs the overall symmetry and harmony' believes that it is 'Aeschylean in tone' and 'the motives used here conform perfectly with those that form the pattern of the play'.[313]

This final scene (1005-78) adds little to the dramatic narrative of the play. The Herald's announcement (1005-41) delivers news of the brothers' deaths

---

[309] Taplin (1977): 169. Taplin provides a detailed section-by-section analysis of the final scene to prove his theory, 169-91.
[310] Sommerstein (2008a): 147.
[311] Torrance (2007): 19.
[312] Torrance (2007): discusses this theme more fully in her chapter five, *Women,* 92-107.
[313] Dawson (1970): 25.

that has already been announced by the Scout (805). The judgement against Polynices' burial (1013-19) is dramatically unnecessary; the tragic theme running through the play has been the conflict between the two brothers and their deaths destined at each other's hands. The story arc, particularly if we accept the propositions discussed above on the likely focus of the *Laius* and the *Oedipus*, is now complete. Antigone's impassioned defiance of the Herald's edict (1026-52) is notable given it is her first and only appearance; there is no other scene against which this appearance can be balanced or compared and because she has not been seen before her character does not form part of the narrative flow of the play. Furthermore, the Herald does not argue with Antigone at any great length, as the same figure does in, for example, Aeschylus' *Suppliants* of c.463 B.C.E.[314] Here the Herald objects to Antigone (1042, 1053) but departs when Antigone refuses to back down (1051-2). The abruptness of the scene is at odds with the finely constructed *rheseis* found elsewhere in the play.

Alternative Messenger Figures

The function of a formal messenger figure is self-evident while other character identities used as messengers, such as the Scout in *Seven against Thebes*, have the flexibility to vary their purpose and mode. In this play, the Scout is a recurring character (39-68, 375-652, 792-819) who consistently provides information that is crucial to moving the story forward. The

---

[314] In that play, the Herald finally warns Pelasgus he is risking war (950-1); see chapter three, pp. 149 ff.

construction of the first appearance of the Scout is essential for maintaining the structure established by the prologue.

The Scout's *rhesis* (39-68) matches Eteocles' prologue in focus and perspective. The Scout first specifies that he is an eyewitness (αὐτὸς κατόπτης δ᾽ εἴμ᾽ ἐγὼ τῶν πραγμάτων, 41), an emphatic declaration of truthfulness.[315] Like the Messenger in *Persians*,[316] the fact that the Scout claims to be an eyewitness lends veracity to his account; it authenticates his narrative.[317] While it does imply truthfulness, the account is the Scout's interpretation of what he saw as opposed to an unfiltered reconstruction of events. Accepting the Scout's word that his account is truthful lends a sense of authenticity to the scene. What follows dramatically is predicated on this acceptance.

The Scout has been able to gain considerable information. He informs Eteocles that he witnessed the leaders of seven companies (ἄνδρες γὰρ ἑπτά, 42) sacrificing a bull to Ares, Enyo and Terror (Ἄρη τ᾽, Ἐνυώ, καὶ φιλαίματον Φόβον, 43-7). He describes the sacrifice vividly, how the seven men let the blood run into a shield[318] (ταυροσφαγοῦντες ἐς μελάνδετον[319] σάκος καὶ

---

[315] Russell notes how someone claiming to be an eyewitness was more likely to be trusted than someone reporting hearsay, Russell (2000): 176.

[316] *Pers.* 266-7.

[317] 'A messenger [authenticates] his narrative on the basis of eyewitness experience', Barrett (2002): 195.

[318] A famous image referenced by Aristophanes in *Lysistrata* 187-9, Sommerstein (1973): 147.

[319] Hutchinson notes that this word simply means 'black' but was understood to refer to a shield, being an object made of metal, Hutchinson (1985): 49 n. 43.

θιγγάνοντες χερσὶ ταυρείου φόνου, 43-5) and swore on it to sack Thebes or die (ὡρκωμότησαν ἢ πόλει κατασκαφὰς θέντες λαπάξειν ἄστυ Καδμείων βίᾳ, 46-7). The bloody scene is a counterpoint to the next piece of information which describes the generals mourning their own deaths and placing locks of hair on Adrastus' chariot to be returned to their families (49-51).[320] All seven generals posted to the gates were to die there and the imagery is an ominous foreshadowing of the deaths to come.[321] As the focus of the play is on the fate of Eteocles and Polynices, it would be easy to forget that other renowned generals were also fated to die.

Adrastus, the leader of the Seven, is notable in mythology for surviving the battle,[322] a fact that may have been familiar to the external audience. The Scout thus ratifies Eteocles' earlier announcements that the city is about to be attacked (24-9) and that the citizens must arm themselves (30-5). Significantly for both the external and internal audiences, the Scout says that when he left the Seven were drawing lots to decide who would fight at each gate of Thebes (ὡς πάλῳ λαχὼν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν, 55-6). This shows that Eteocles' fears were not unfounded and he had judged the situation correctly; war will be made on Thebes by his brother's allies.

---

[320] Hutchinson (1985): 50 n. 49-51 refers to the representation of such imagery on red-figure vases. Taplin includes only one vase that may refer to the play, Taplin (2007): 267.
[321] Although Apollod. 3.6.8 suggests Zeus caused Amphiaraus to vanish.
[322] He was saved by his horse Arion, divine issue of an encounter between Demeter and Poseidon: Apollod. 3.6.8.

The Scout's highly detailed account includes the use of similes and metaphors in quick succession. The internal audience are clearly expected to believe that the Scout is telling the truth. For the external audience the news may not be unexpected and acts as a signpost for the direction of the play. First, he tells Eteocles that the Seven are 'courageous like lions with war in their eyes' (λεόντων ὡς Ἄρη δεδορκότων, 53).[323] He tells Eteocles he must behave 'like a good ship's captain and make the city tight' (σὺ δ᾽ ὥστε ναὸς κεδνὸς οἰακοστρόφος φράξαι πόλισμα, 62-3) for the 'army is like a roaring land-wave' (βοᾷ γὰρ κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ, 64). This has the effect of bringing a high level of detail to a relatively short speech. The language invokes a variety of imagery for both internal and external audiences of the coming conflict and compares the wildness of the natural world with the order imposed by mankind. The descriptions also bring the Argives to life and portray them quite comprehensively. The Scout has evoked images of them making sacrifices to the gods for a good war, of feeling sorrow for their families when they die – and they fully expect to die[324] – and creates an image of the force of their assault.

The Scout has already said that the cavalry are fast approaching (59-60) and that the land is being stained by the horses' saliva (πεδία δ᾽ ἀργηστὴς ἀφρὸς χραίνει σταλαγμοῖς ἱππικῶν ἐκ πλευμόνων, 60-1). The language evokes the idea that the blood of men will follow the horses' saliva. This particular

---

[323] The translations follow Sommerstein (2008a): 159.
[324] Hutchinson (1985): 48-9 n. 42-56 suggests the purpose of this line is to 'alter our attitudes towards them'.

image suggests the Argive army has already symbolically begun their attack and the fate of the Seven – and Eteocles – is therefore already beyond help. This message would be received in the same way by both internal and external audiences.

The imagery is also reminiscent of Homeric styling: in the *Iliad*, 'the ground ran black with blood' (Hom. *Il*. 15.715); Priam's dogs will 'lap his blood' when he is dead (*Il*. 22.70) and Hector's final indignity: 'and all that head that was once so handsome was tumbled in the dust' (*Il*. 22.400).[325] In death the body is reduced to fluids and will be absorbed by the land. As with Epic, and the *Iliad* in particular, the effect is to bring a visceral edge to the narrative. Aeschylus is perhaps utilising the conventions of Epic narrative as a model for enhancing the dramatic imagery. These lines are also another example of a foreshadowing of death. The instances of foreshadowing have a cumulative psychological effect on both internal and external audiences. They contribute to an undercurrent of anxiety that runs throughout the play and is connected to the audience through the Chorus.

Finally, the Scout tells Eteocles that he will continue to observe the enemy and implies that Eteocles can rely upon his reports for knowledge of events outside the city gates (σαφηνείᾳ λόγου εἰδὼς τὰ τῶν θύραθεν, 67-8). It is important for the function of the Scout's character that Eteocles accepts the veracity of his account, as must the Chorus when he later brings news of the

---

[325] Translation Lattimore (1951): 446.

brothers' deaths. The impact of the Scout's news causes Eteocles to appeal to the gods, equating the success of winning the battle for Thebes with success for the gods (69-77). In the prologue he set out the actions he had taken and encouraged the citizens to fight for Thebes; now his final prayer following the Scout's message is one beseeching the gods to protect his city.

The Contribution of Messages to the Development of Military Strategy

The Scout arrives on stage for the second time and this time he is introduced by the Chorus (who identify him as ὅ κατόπτης, 369-70). At the same time the Scout is running on stage (σπουδῇ διώκων πομπίμους χνόας ποδῶν, 371) so, say the Chorus, is Eteocles (σπουδὴ δὲ καὶ τοῦδ᾽ οὐκ ἀπαρτίζει πόδα, 374). These observations may function as internal stage directions but they also lend urgency to the narrative. Two people running quickly - the person who delivers news and the person who has the authority to act upon it - suggests tension. For the internal audience it is a convergence of dynamic characters which could unsettle the emotionally-fragile Chorus. For the external audience, particularly for those seated at a high level in the theatre and who may not have been able to hear everything clearly, it was a visual clue that something was happening.

The Scout's presence is preceded by the Chorus describing the chaos in the city (345-68). Without any preamble the Scout announces that the Seven have been allocated to gates. The episode reveals the skill of the Scout, who has returned from enemy borders with highly detailed descriptions and

information that will allow Eteocles to tailor his defence of the city's gates. The descriptive language deployed in the second portrayal of the Scout links him characteristically with the first appearance; it suggests it is the same person.

The following scene (375-652) is seven pairs of speeches[326] where the Scout advises Eteocles which Argive has been appointed to which gate with detailed descriptions of their character and armour, and Eteocles similarly responds by allocating a matching Theban warrior for each of them.[327] Here the Scout once again relies on highly descriptive narrative to convey the personalities of the Seven. As well as the aural portraits, the Scout identifies each warrior's shield insignia; clearly the audience (internally and externally) is meant to understand the narrative of the shield insignia as forming part of the warrior's psychology.

Tydeus, the first of the Seven to be named (377), is described as 'screaming like a snake' (κλαγγαῖσιν ὡς δράκων βοᾷ, 381) and is like a 'horse panting against the force of bit and bridle' (ἵππος χαλινῶν ὡς κατασθμαίνων, 393) while his shield features bronze bells (χαλκήλατοι κλάζουσι κώδωνες, 386). His shield device shows a blazing full moon in a field of stars, 'boastful

---

[326] Sometimes known as *redepaare* (pairs of speeches), Sommerstein (2010): 69.
[327] Table 2 (p. 123) shows the seven warriors with their shield devices and the gates to which they were allocated as well as their Theban counterparts.

armour' (ταῖς ὑπερκόμποις σαγαῖς, 391) portraying its owner as powerful as the gods.[328]

Capaneus, the second fighter (423), is physically huge (γίγας, 424), fearless before the power of Zeus (οὐδὲ τὴν Διὸς ἔριν πέδοι σκήψασαν ἐμποδὼν σχεθεῖν 427-8) and a boastful man (τίς ἄνδρα κομπάζοντα, 436); his shield device is a man carrying a torch proclaiming he will 'burn the city' ('πρήσω πόλιν', 434). Eteoclus (458) the charioteer is the third of the Seven whose shield device is an armed man ready to scale a ladder and sack the city, which even Ares cannot prevent (ὡς οὐδ᾽ ἂν Ἄρης σφ᾽ ἐκβάλοι πυργωμάτων, 469).

Hippomedon is named as the fourth warrior (488), possessed by Ares (ἔνθεος δ᾽ Ἄρει, 497) with a vast shield (ἅλω δὲ πολλήν, ἀσπίδος κύκλον, 489) depicting Typhon (Τυφῶν, 493), a terrible snake-monster who challenged Zeus himself.[329] The Scout introduces extra tension for the internal audience when he delays naming the fifth warrior, a very young (ἀνδρόπαις ἀνήρ, 533) Parthenopaeus (547),[330] whose shield device portrays the Sphinx crushing Cadmeians – an ominous image for the Thebans who would be faced symbolically with one of their own when attacking Parthenopaeus.

---

[328] Apollodorus says that on first arriving in Argos from Calydon Tydeus' shield device featured a lion, Apollod. 3.6.
[329] Hes. *Theog.* 839-56.
[330] Parthenopaeus was not an Argive (ὁ δὲ τοιόσδ᾽ ἀνὴρ μέτοικος, 547-8). Hutchinson is doubtful of the authenticity of this line and believes its presence may have been influenced by Euripides' *Suppliants* 888-900, Hutchinson (1985): 129 n. 548 and see also Sommerstein (2008a): 209 n. 77.

Amphiaraus, the sixth (569), is a formidable warrior and prophet (ἂν ἄνδρα σωφρονέστατον, ἀλκήν τ᾽ ἄριστον μάντιν, 568-9). Amphiaraus knows he is fated to die (587-8) at a battle which he did not support.[331] Significantly, Amphiaraus does not have any kind of device on his shield. The Scout says this is because Amphiaraus values reality over superficiality (591-4); his wisdom allows him to see the shield device for what it is, an advertisement of intent whereas he knows what he is going to do. Finally, the Scout informs Eteocles of the identity of the seventh warrior, his own brother (τὸν αὐτοῦ σοῦ κασίγνητον, 632). Polynices, says the Scout, has a new (καινοπηγὲς) shield depicting a male figure (representative of himself) following Diké (642-8).[332]

The Scout, and the external audience, will have known from the start of his account that Polynices is destined to fight at one of the gates but delays this piece of news to the end of his speech, although Eteocles must expect to face his brother as their dispute is the whole reason for the battle. Eteocles stated that he would post six men along with himself to the gates (282-6). This was the point at which the audience knew what was to unfold. The Scout emphasises that Eteocles will be punished either through death or banishment (636-41) for his treatment of his brother.

---

[331] In mythology, Amphiaraus was forced by his wife Eriphyle, Adrastus' sister, to join the Seven but knowing he was to die there, he made his sons swear to avenge his death, along with the sons of the other Seven, a group known collectively as the Epigoni (see Table 2, p. 122). Adrastus' son Aegialeus also joined the Epigoni.

[332] In Apollod. 3.6.2 Polynices' shield on arriving in Argos after his exile from Thebes was a boar.

Table 2 Warriors, Gates and Shield Devices in the *Seven against Thebes*

Attacker	Shield Device	Gate	Defender	Epigoni
Tydeus	Full moon and stars	Proetus	Melanippus*	Diomedes
Capaneus	Naked man, fire and phrase	Electran	Polyphontes	Sthenelus
Eteoclus	Soldier on a ladder and phrase	Neisteid	Megareus*	Medon
Hippomedon	Typhon	Athena Onca	Hyperbius	Polydorus
Parthenopaeus	The Sphinx	Borraean	Actor	Promachus
Amphiaraus	None	Homoloid	Lasthenes	Alcmaeon and Amphilochus
Polynices	Man and Diké	Seventh or Hypsistan	Eteocles	Thersander

*descended from the *Spartoi* (Σπαρτοί, 'sown men')[333]

The Scout's account fulfils several functions. It informs Eteocles and the Chorus of the calibre of the men who await the Thebans outside their gates. It makes the imminence of attack concrete. The Seven have made their oaths, prepared and armed themselves and are now awaiting the call to attack. The scene indicates to the external audience the direction the story is going to take. The account also stands as something of a memorial to the Seven, and their Theban counterparts chosen by Eteocles, a process that also contributes to the construction of social memory.

The descriptions of the warriors outside the gates of Thebes add colour and intensity to the Scout's speech. The level of detail and reported speech confirms that the Scout was again an eyewitness and the news that he brings forms a crucial part of Eteocles' defence. Thanks to the detailed descriptions by the Scout, particularly the personalisation of the Seven, Eteocles is able to

---

[333] In his *Phoenician Women* (*Φοίνισσαι*) of c.409/8 B.C.E., Euripides assigns different gates and shield devices to the Seven, with only Capaneus remaining at the Electran gate in both plays, and Amphiaraus bearing no shield device in either. Eur. *Phoen*. 1104-1138.

match suitable warriors against them. Consequently, Eteocles matches the noisy Tydeus with Melanippus (397-416), descended from the *Spartoi* and renowned for his modesty (409-10). Against Capaneus, who claimed invincibility against Zeus' thunderbolts, Eteocles sends fiery (αἴθων, 448) Polyphontes (437-51) who is protected by Artemis (450). Eteoclus will fight Megareus[334] (473-80), another descendant of the *Spartoi*.

That descendants of the *Spartoi* are fighting for Thebes creates a psychological boost for the internal audience. The *Spartoi* derive from the foundation mythology of ancient Thebes. They were the men born from the teeth of the dragon killed by Cadmus; the teeth were sown into the land where Cadmus decided to settle which became Thebes.[335] It perhaps also reminded the external Athenian audience of their own autochthonic foundational mythology, through which Athenians were inextricably linked with the land through their forebear Erichthonius.[336] As David Wiles points out, 'The idea that Athenians sprang from their own soil had huge emotional appeal in an age of migrant peoples, and served to validate Athens' place as the supreme power in the Greek world'.[337] It is not a stretch to imagine the Athenians in the external audience connecting the references to the *Spartoi* with their own

---

[334] The son of Creon, Jocasta's brother, and therefore a cousin-nephew of Oedipus.
[335] Jocasta and Creon were the children of Menoeceus, another descendant of the *Spartoi,* Apollod. 3.5.8; *schol.* Eur. *Phoen*. 942.
[336] Loraux's gendered interpretation of this is interesting, Loraux (2002): 28 and is expanded upon by Calame (2011).
[337] Wiles (2000): 23-4.

heritage and this would also serve to strengthen the emotional link with events portrayed on stage.

To continue with the analysis of the battle allocations, Hyperbius (501-20) will face terror-inducing Hippomedon (Φόβος γὰρ ἤδη πρὸς πύλαις κομπάζεται, 500). Eteocles tells the Scout that Hyperbius and Hippomedon are known enemies (509) and moreover Hyperbius' shield is decorated with Zeus himself who will surely save him (512-13). Actor (555), modest (ἄκομπος, 554) like Melanippus, is paired with Parthenopaeus. Against the powerful Amphiaraus (Ἀμφιάρεω βίαν, 569) Eteocles will send mighty Lasthenes (Λασθένους βίαν, 620). Eteocles honours Amphiaraus with a string of epithets (σώφρων δίκαιος ἀγαθὸς εὐσεβὴς ἀνήρ, 610)[338] and is aware of the prophecy that he is to die in the battle for Thebes (ἀλλ᾽ οἶδεν ὥς σφε χρὴ τελευτῆσαι μάχῃ, εἰ καρπὸς ἔσται θεσφάτοισι Λοξίου, 617-18).[339]

Eteocles' reaction to the news that he is to fight Polynices is to return to the curse of Oedipus (653-4). He refuses to see that Polynices has any claim on the rule of Thebes (658-69).[340] He claims that Polynices was never supported by Diké (664-71) and places his trust in this knowledge (τούτοις πεποιθὼς εἶμι καὶ ξυστήσομαι αὐτός, 672-3). Not only has the Scout delivered news to Eteocles, his report directly contributes to the decisions Eteocles will take in

---

[338] Collard suggests Eteocles sympathises with Amphiaraus, 'the only good man caught up among bad', Collard (2008): xxxii.
[339] Collard highlights the contrast between Amphiaraus and the other warriors' piety Collard (2008): 184 n. 595-6.
[340] Whose name means 'much strife' (πολυνεικής).

forming his battle strategy. Eteocles clearly trusts the word of the Scout but says nothing in response to the fact that the Scout has withheld knowledge of Polynices' posting until the end of his scene. For the external audience, this increases the tension as they may suspect that Polynices will be the seventh warrior.

This appearance of the Scout shows Aeschylus manipulating his cast of characters to provide an alternative to the traditional messenger figure. The Scout's influence on future events elevates his status from that of a mere army scout; his unique knowledge allows him to transcend his traditional status and become a major dramatic figure in his second appearance. Without him Eteocles would not be able to carefully select his choice of warriors to fight against the famous generals that make up the Seven. As Ruby Blondell has noted, 'a single name and attached identity lead us to expect such figures to display a single coherent character across various works'.[341] Familiar historical and mythological figures would evoke recognisable characteristics; so too would naming figures generically, such as 'scout', 'nurse' or 'tutor'.

The Scout as Formal Messenger

The Scout returns for a third time as messenger (ἄγγελος, 792-819). Taplin notes that a manuscript, 'M', dated to the tenth century),[342] does not distinguish this messenger figure from the figure of the Scout that has

---

[341] Blondell (2002): 9.
[342] Hutchinson (1985): xlviii-lii.

appeared previously and concludes that it was probably the same figure: 'there is no point in bringing him back in another role with a completely different dramatic function'.[343]   The Scout arrives to bring ostensibly good news: the city is saved (793). The Scout talks in terms of the city being like a ship, imagery that occurs throughout the play,[344] with Eteocles its captain (62-5, 208-10).   Brock has proposed an interesting theory that such a metaphor represents not a trireme (a warship) as perhaps might be expected but instead a 'merchantman' that sails for long periods and is characterised as being dependent upon a hierarchical structure.[345] This interpretation is based on line 770, ἀνδρῶν ἀλφηστᾶν. Renaud Gagné points out that, 'used only twice in all of tragedy, ἀλφηστής, a common Epic term, is associated with the acquisition of merchants, more specifically naval merchants'.[346]   The merchantman's only goal is arriving at a destination safely and 'lends itself to ideas of process that is ongoing or open-ended, and which can be seen as menaced by a present crisis or future threat, calling in turn for an obedient response to the helmsman's commands',[347] which describes Eteocles' situation perfectly. Such an interpretation also explains Eteocles' anger with the Chorus' fear, for undermining the hierarchy will reflect poorly on the

---

[343] Taplin (1977): 168-9.
[344] Lines 2, 208-10, 556-7, 596-608, 759-65, 769-71, 795-6, 854-60.
[345] Brock (2013): 60.
[346] Gagné (2013): 354. It is found in Hom. *Od*. 1.349; 6.8 and 13.261; the Homeric *Hymn 3 to Apollo,* 458; Hes. *Theog*. 512; Hes. *WD* 82; Hes. *Sh*. 39. The other instance of the term in tragedy is in Sophocles' *Phil*. 709. Word usage statistics can be found in the Perseus Digital Library database,
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/wordfreq?lang=greek&lookup=a)lfhsth%2Fs,
accessed 4 March 2018.
[347] Brock (2013): 62.

helmsman, weakening the resolve of those who are to fight which in turn weakens the authority of Eteocles.

The Scout says victory has been achieved at six gates (799) but at the seventh, Apollo, so-called Master of Sevens (τὰς δ᾿ ἑβδόμας ὁ σεμνὸς ἑβδομαγέτης ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων, 800-1)[348] has exacted payment for Laius' failure to obey his oracles (801-3). This is another confirmation for the external audience that the roots of the conflict start with Laius and it is ultimately responsible for the actions of Oedipus and therefore the actions of his grandchildren.[349] The Scout confirms for the internal audience that Oedipus' curse has been fulfilled and that Eteocles and Polynices have died at each other's hands (ἄνδρες τεθνᾶσιν ἐκ χερῶν αὐτοκτόνων, 805).[350] For the external audience, this is a signal that divine judgement has been acknowledged, and confirmation for both audiences that the realisation of the curse was unavoidable.

The Chorus as Messengers and Arbiters

The focus of the thesis is how news and messages are delivered and includes considering other means of delivery outside the 'traditional' messenger figure

---

[348] Hutchinson cannot see the purpose of identifying Apollo in this way, except that he was associated with the number seven and concludes it relates to his ownership of the number, Hutchinson (1985): 175 n. 800.

[349] Gagné (2013): 351 notes that 'the trilogy was organised on the basis of a succession of calamities transmitted from father to son to grandsons … generation appears there as a dominant factor in the vast temporal fresco painted by the trilogy, as the transmission of punishment through descent is singled out as a motivation for the pain and suffering unfolding on stage'.

[350] There are some missing lines and disputed text in this section which Hutchinson examines in detail in his commentary, Hutchinson (1985): 176-8 n. 804-19. Hutchinson's analysis preserves the tension of the scene. Dawson suggests the variations arise from differing stage versions, Dawson (1970): 101.

or its comparable. The Chorus are the only female characters in the *Seven against Thebes*[351] and fulfil important functions. The *parodos* (78-181) is the first indication of how real the threat from the approaching Argives is. Their terrified reaction frightens Eteocles (182-202); he is afraid that their fear will leech throughout the *polis*. It is likely that the sound of their performance, probably including crying and wailing, would have had an effect on the external audience: Wiles suggests that 'the audience at this early point in the play is denied any position of detachment and objective judgement'.[352] The Chorus are affecting the emotional rhythm of the external audience. Hutchinson observes that 'direct experience may also have affected the audience', suggesting their personal knowledge of battle may have coloured their perception of what was taking place on stage.[353]

In any event, the external spectators are now emotionally engaged through the Chorus. Eteocles, despite his professed dislike of women (182-99), nevertheless recognises that their influence can damage his strategy. His aggression towards the Chorus may be a displacement of his fear of the attacking Argives. As Richard Seaford has noted,[354] this male-female interaction can also be found in the *Iliad* (6.490-3) where Hector tells Andromache to go indoors to her needlework whilst the men go to fight the

---

[351] If one accepts that the ending consisting of lines 1005-78 is a later addition; see further discussion below.
[352] Wiles (1997): 116.
[353] Hutchinson (1985): 89-90 n. 287-368. Wiles has noted that modern academic knowledge of ancient practices allows later interpretations to extrapolate likely actions but 'the Greeks interpreted the stage action in the light of a body of experience that we can recover only with difficulty', Wiles (1997): 11.
[354] Seaford (2012): 160.

Greeks,[355] although Hector is more sympathetic towards Andromache than Eteocles is towards the Chorus. Through the Chorus, the external audience learns how close the Argives are and the effect they are having on Thebans in general. The Chorus may be viewed as a spot sample of the general citizenry: they represent the 'ordinary' and non-military Theban. They are outside the familial circle of Labdacids but will be directly affected by what happens to them.

The Chorus also occupy a unique temporal position within the play which spans past, present and future events. Wiles explains that

> the chorus create a world that exists in three temporal dimensions: time present, because the chorus expresses present fears; time past, because verbal echoes evoke the attack on Homeric Troy; and time future, because the chorus imagines the forthcoming attack.[356]

This temporal positioning allows the Chorus to connect with internal and external audiences on different levels. This takes place through emotional recognition and engagement, shared knowledge internal to the play and similarities with Epic structure.

The Chorus consists of unmarried Theban women (109, 171, 454) and the *parodos* follows Eteocles' departure (78-181). They confirm the information provided by the Scout (59-61) that the army is nearing the city (79-92). The

---

[355] Hom. *Il*. 6.490-3.
[356] Wiles (1997): 117.

parodos (78-181) is in astrophic dochmiacs[357] which indicates distress; their responses to the Scout's account of the Seven (375-652) are also in dochmiacs. Their language is evocative – they hear the clatter of shields (ἀσπίδων κτύπον, 100) and spears (πάταγος οὐχ ἑνὸς δορός, 103) and the noise of the horses (διὰ δέ τοι γενύων ἱππίων κινύρονται φόνον χαλινοί, 122-3). Although they were not on stage at the time of the Scout's scene, they know that the Seven have been assigned by lot to the Theban gates (125-7). This suggests rumour has spread quickly through Thebes; as young Theban women they would be unlikely to know about the affairs of war.

The scope of the Chorus' message delivery function is therefore much wider than the immediate internal audience of the play – they can, through the mechanism of rumour, reach the whole *polis*. Rumour can be described as a perverted form of news and this has ramifications for their impact upon the distanced space. In their panic they pray to the majority of the Pantheon – Ares (105, 136), Zeus (116), Athena (as Pallas,[358] 131, as Onca 164),[359] Poseidon (131), Aphrodite (as Cypris, 138), Apollo (as Lukeion 146, 160),[360] Artemis (147-8, 154) and Hera (152). Their speech conveys to the external audience their overwhelming fear and sense of desperation.

---

[357] As Hutchinson explains, 'The dochmiac metre expresses wild emotion: its effect is particularly notable here, since Aeschylean choruses often entered with spoken anapaests.' Hutchinson (1985): 57 n. 78-181, *Metre*. Hutchinson provides metrical analyses for all sections of the play as the commentary progresses; metrical analysis for lines 78-180 is provided on pp. 57-9.

[358] Perhaps derived from πάλλω, 'brandisher of the spear' or 'παλλακή', young girl; Liddell and Scott (2013).

[359] Onca was a Phoenician goddess identified with Athena; Paus. 9.12.2.

[360] Derived from Lycus' Lyceum; Paus. 1.13.3.

Eteocles is aggressive towards the Chorus and intolerant of their fear. He claims they are disturbing the citizens with their behaviour (καὶ νῦν πολίταις τάσδε διαδρόμους φυγὰς θεῖσαι διερροθήσατ᾽ ἄψυχον κάκην, 191-2) and repeatedly orders their silence (ἢ κωφῇ λέγω, 202; οὐκ ἐς φθόρον σιγῶσ᾽ ἀνασχήσῃ τάδε, 252; σίγησον, ὦ τάλαινα, μὴ φίλους φόβει, 262). He warns them not to call on the gods whilst behaving imprudently (μή μοι θεοὺς καλοῦσα βουλεύου κακῶς, 223).

The Chorus links the diegetic and distanced spaces with what is taking place on stage. As noted above, they are indicators for the Theban citizenry; they are reacting to what is going on around them and what they can see of the Argive forces beyond the gates. They tell the external spectators that despite the rallying optimism of Eteocles (36-8) not all the citizens are comforted by his words. Eteocles finally manages to persuade the Chorus to accept his request to pray for the gods to fight alongside the Thebans (ξυμμάχους εἶναι θεούς, 266), which leads him to his announcement that he intends to post six warriors to defend the gates of Thebes with himself making up the seventh, a key piece of information for both internal and external audiences:

> ἐγὼ δέ γ᾽ ἄνδρας ἓξ ἐμοὶ σὺν ἑβδόμῳ
> ἀντηρέτας ἐχθροῖσι τὸν μέγαν τρόπον
> εἰς ἑπτατειχεῖς ἐξόδους τάξω μολών
>
> <div align="right">*Seven*. 282-4</div>

> I myself will go and station six men, with myself as the
> seventh, to combat the enemy at the seven gates

When the Scout begins his account of the Seven, and Eteocles is matching them with Theban warriors, the Chorus do not allude to the information they

possess. The Chorus and the external audience know something that the Scout and Eteocles do not; this creates an underlying tension for the scene. As the Scout will withhold the information that Polynices will be at the seventh gate, the Chorus withholds that Eteocles intends to fight. The external audience witness how the delivery of important information is delayed and the effect is to create a tension that is gradually built up as time progresses on stage.

As Collard has noted, it is the Chorus who convey the sense of what has gone before in the *Laius* and *Oedipus*.[361] The interpolations of the Chorus to the speeches between the Scout and Eteocles are prayers for good fortune,[362] and denunciations of arrogance (452-6, 521-5) and impiety (563-7). When Eteocles confirms what they already know, that he will meet his brother at the seventh gate, they attempt to persuade him against this course of action (677-718). Eteocles refuses to listen to reason; now he is no longer fighting for his city but waging a personal war with his brother.

Sommerstein states that Eteocles is determined to fulfil 'oracle and curse',[363] and the focus for Eteocles has now moved from one of appropriate civic steerage to one of personal revenge. The Chorus are focused on the past whilst the Scout is focused on the present and future. The temporalities are connected by the figure of Eteocles who is bound by the actions of his familial

---

[361] Collard (2008): xvii.
[362] Lines 417-21, 481-5, 626-30.
[363] Sommerstein (2010): 82.

line. His inability to avoid the curse links the remote past with the immediate future.

Where at the start of the play the Chorus were almost incoherent with fear and angered Eteocles greatly, they have now calmed themselves and are able to deliver their knowledge of events in a more considered way (720-91). Their speech now is more analytical rather than emotional. Hutchinson notes that the content of this ode is designed to conflict with the metrical design, the organisation of temporal narrative within the stanzas conflicting with each other.[364] The Chorus clarify the brothers' fate: 'the Fury of the father's curse, that it has fulfilled the angry imprecations of Oedipus' warped mind' (722-5).[365]

As Hutchinson observes, this choral ode is concerned with the culmination of progressive events.[366] Laius' failure to heed Apollo's oracle and its subsequent effect ('for I speak of the transgression born long ago, punished swiftly, but remaining to the third generation', 743-9),[367] and Oedipus' subsequent marriage to his own mother ('Oedipus the father-slayer, who sowed the sacrosanct soil of his mother', 752-4),[368] were the foundations of the problems of the house. Finally, the Chorus confirm that Oedipus cursed

---

[364] Hutchinson (1985): 161 n. 720-91. For the full metrical analysis of this section see pp. 161-3.

[365] Translations Sommerstein (2008a): 227.

[366] 'We are no longer concerned with a single moment of time: the impending disaster is seen as the last in a series of events', Hutchinson (1985): 160.

[367] Sommerstein (2008a): 229.

[368] Sommerstein (2008a): 231.

his sons (πικρογλώσσους ἀράς, 787). They, and the external audience, now know that the fate of the brothers is unavoidable.

After confirmation of the brothers' deaths, the worst has passed and the safety of the city (823) now means the Chorus do not have to fear slavery.[369] They recognise they must carry out the traditional role of citizen women and conduct mourning rituals for Eteocles (855-6). The final stichomythic exchange between a split chorus (961-1004) is almost an imagining of the final battle between the brothers:

παισθεὶς ἔπαισας	you were struck
σὺ δ᾽ ἔθανες ατακτανών	and struck back
δορὶ δ᾽ ἔκανες	you slew
δορὶ δ᾽ ἔθανες	and you died
πρόκεισαι	you lie in death
κατακτάς	and you dealt death

Seven, 960-5

Their final threnody indicates their acceptance of how events have turned out and allows their mourning to bring events to a close.

Spatiality and the Enhancing of News and Messages

There are varying approaches to the analysis of spatiality. Seaford links the use of space within the play to ancient ritual and customs and specifically the ancient dramatic festivals. What is taking place on stage is an inversion of familiar ritualistic processes, linked through both earth and cosmos.[370]

---

[369] Lines 326, 331, 334, 363, 455.
[370] Seaford (2012): 158-77.

Emmanuela Bakola, writing about the *Persians*, focuses on spatial depth and interiority, showing how the physicality of the staging induces specific types of spatiality.[371] Wiles points out that 'space was not an objective, scientific given in classical Athens but a subject for speculation, experiment and negotiation'.[372] Wiles presents an overview of modern examinations of theatrical spatiality: the synchronic approach of Claude Lévi-Strauss,[373] Anne Ubersfeld's semiological interpretation,[374] and Michael Issacharoff's examination of mimesis and diegesis.[375] Wiles acknowledges the difficulties of separating overlapping spatial categories but notes the impact of the Chorus in particular:

> the phenomenon of the chorus is crucial here. When we consider that the chorus are simultaneously actors and onlookers within the scenic space, and fellow-citizens within the theatrical space, that the masks of the chorus signify simultaneously that the dancers are Greek sailors (or whatever their fictive role is) and that they are worshippers of Dionysus in an Athenian festival, then we have to lay aside any straightforward theatrical/scenic/dramatic segmentation.[376]

Wiles's premise is that Greek theatre was not an 'empty space' but was instead a complex area highly charged with symbolism and meaning for the Athenian citizen.[377] Murnaghan states that

---

[371] Bakola (2014).
[372] Wiles (1997): 3.
[373] Lévi-Strauss (1963): 213-30.
[374] Ubersfeld and Debbeche (1999).
[375] Issacharoff (1981): 215-18. Issacharoff also discusses space as a semiotic system: 220-2.
[376] Wiles (1997): 18.
[377] Wiles (1997): 21. Buxton (1994): 32 writes that through the dramatic festivals 'the citizen group publicly expressed its exclusiveness: it was the citizens alone who put the tragedies on at the Dionysia. Tragic myths were passed through the filter of the democratic *polis*.'

> throughout Greek culture, choral performance is seen as an
> emblem and agent of harmony and stability, an expression
> of human society at its best that mimics the blessed state of
> the gods and the order of the *cosmos*.[378]

Rehm's theory of spatial categorisation of six spatial types focuses on the internalisation of space in the text. As so much of what is important in this play takes place in the diegetic space, Rehm's model is therefore an appropriate framework in which to explore how 'space', in all its forms, is used in this play.

The use of space in the *Seven against Thebes* is particularly interesting for the way in which the diegetic space encroaches upon the scenic space of the stage and in some cases dominates the narrative (see Tables 3-5). The play is set entirely within the walls of Thebes and the diegetic space is also for the most part solely confined to that city, albeit at different times. The distanced space of the play is the land surrounding the city of Thebes. Very little takes place in the standard extrascenic space. The distanced space is brought into focus very early on, when the Chorus arrive on stage crying in fear at the sounds of the approaching army: they see the dust whipped up by the cavalry (αἰθερία κόνις με πείθει φανεῖσ᾽, 81) and can hear the war cries (βοᾷ [τειχέων] ὕπερ ἀλεύσατε., 89). They evoke the presence of the Argive army very effectively and their terror is communicated in their speech patterns.[379] They say they can hear the noise of the horses (διὰ δέ τοι γενύων ἱππίων κινύρονται φόνον χαλινοί, 122-3). The Chorus emphasise the noises they can hear and what

---

[378] Murnaghan (2011): 248.
[379] As noted above the *parodos* is in dochmiacs, a metre associated with extreme emotion.

they can see – they even say that they can 'see the noise' (κτύπον δέδορκα, 103). As Hutchinson observes, what is seen usually makes a much more vivid impression than what is heard,[380] and using the phrase 'see the noise' has the effect of pulling the distanced space of the surrounding land occupied by the Argive armies much closer to the city.

Wiles notes that 'the audience at this early point in the play is denied any position of detachment and objective judgement'.[381] The Chorus break off their descriptive narration to pray to the gods (127-48) but cry out again at line 151 when they say they can hear the chariots around the city (ὄτοβον ἀρμάτων ἀμφὶ πόλιν κλύω) which implies a progression of distance since the first announcement. This is confirmed when they next refer to the pounding of stones on the Theban battlements (ἀκροβόλων δ᾽ ἐπάλξεων λιθὰς ἔρχεται, 159) and crashing shields at the gates (κόναβος ἐν πύλαις χαλκοδέτων σακέων, 161). The total absorption of the Chorus into the experience of witnessing the approaching army is so powerful that it completes the effect of pulling the distanced space forward, to the point that it is almost transformed into extrascenic space given the increasing proximity between the two.

This effect is reflected in the attitude of Eteocles who is enraged at the behaviour of the Chorus, whom he claims have spread panic in the city (καὶ

---

[380] Hutchinson (1985): 63 n. 103.
[381] Wiles (1997): 116.

νῦν πολίταις τάσδε διαδρόμους φυγὰς θεῖσαι διερροθήσατ᾽ ἄψυχον κάκην, 191-2). The Chorus, standing in the scenic space, have become signifiers of the distanced space and therefore bring the imminent threat closer than it had been. This has the effect of conveying a more powerful sense of fear to the external audience.   The Chorus are emotionally occupying the distanced space; their speech patterns (and probably physical movements) enhance this effect and create an emotional connection with the external audience.

The figure of the Scout is the physical link between the scenic space and the distanced space of the Argive army. In his major scene (375-652) with Eteocles the Scout pulls forward the distanced space in the same way as the Chorus in the *parodos*, although where their connection was through fear and anxiety the Scout is, as befits his role, calm and considered. Like the Chorus, his narration emphasises the sounds of the Argives: screaming Tydeus (κλαγγαῖσιν ὡς δράκων βοᾷ, 381, ἀλύων, 391) with his ringing shield (χαλκήλατοι κλάζουσι κώδωνες, 386); boasting Capaneus defying the crashing thunder of Zeus (τὰς δ᾽ ἀστραπάς τε καὶ κεραυνίους βολὰς, 430); the snorting horses of Eteoclus (ἵππους δ᾽ ἐν ἀμπυκτῆρσιν ἐμβριμωμένας δινεῖ, 461-2); the shouting Hippomedon (ξὺν βοῇ παρίσταται, 487); Amphiaraus' insults to Tydeus (κακοῖσι βάζει πολλὰ Τυδέως βίαν, 571) and his speech to Polynices (580-9) and finally Polynices' cries for justice (πόλει οἵας ἀρᾶται καὶ κατεύχεται τύχας, 632-3).

As with the *parodos* described above, the descriptive elements of the account evoke imagery of strong warriors eager for battle, applying a visual element

to an aural portrait. Because the accounts emphasise the personalities of the Seven, recreating the activities of the distanced space within the scenic space generates a convergence of the two dimensions, with the Scout occupying two spatial frames simultaneously. This is supported by Eteocles' responses to the Scout's descriptions of each warrior.

By matching Thebans with Argives Eteocles, the major representative of the scenic space, is co-creating the convergence with the Scout. For the internal audience, in this case the Chorus, this scene (375-652) is a direct continuation of the convergence of their *parodos* and reinforces their perception of what is going on. The scene creates an alternative level of understanding for the external audience which is superimposed over the scenic space of the stage, with the seven pairs of speeches between the Scout and Eteocles guiding the alternations of the two.

The effect of these convergences of space on the delivery of news and messages is to give them a sense of immediacy and urgency. The Chorus are almost incoherent with fear: θρέομαι φοβερὰ μεγάλ᾽ ἄχη (78); ἰὼ θεοὶ θεαί τ᾽ ὀρόμενον κακὸν (87-8); σύ τ᾽, Ἄρης, φεῦ, φεῦ (136); ἒ ἔ (150); ὦ ξυντέλεια, μὴ προδῷς πυργώματα (251); θεοὶ πολῖται, μή με δουλείας τυχεῖν (253). We have seen that the Chorus are indicators for the Theban citizenry; it might be reasonable to suppose that others in the city felt the same way they did. The palpable tension arising from such verbal expressions of discordant fear will leech into the external audience and is part of how the effect of narrowing the distance between spatial spheres is achieved.

While the Scout's account is much more measured in tone, Eteocles' confidence in matching the Seven with equals is again palpable: noble Melanippus (σπαρτῶν δ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἀνδρῶν, ὧν Ἄρης ἐφείσατο, 412); pious Polyphontes (προστατηρίας Ἀρτέμιδος εὐνοίαισι σύν τ᾽ ἄλλοις θεοῖς, 449-50); fearless Megareus (σπέρμα τοῦ σπαρτῶν γένους, 474); brave Hyperbius (Ὑπέρβιος δέ, κεδνὸς Οἴνοπος τόκος, 504); confident Actor (ὃς οὐκ ἐάσει γλῶσσαν ἐργμάτων ἄτερ ἔσω πυλῶν ῥέουσαν ἀλδαίνειν κακά, 556-7); quick Lasthenes (ποδῶκες ὄμμα, χεῖρα δ᾽ οὐ βραδύνεται παρ᾽ ἀσπίδος γυμνωθὲν ἁρπάσαι δόρυ, 623-4). Following the earlier hysteria of the Chorus, Eteocles' assurance is encouraging but the external audience know that it cannot last for they know that Polynices will be the seventh warrior and that Eteocles must fight him.

Table 3 Breakdown of Spatial Dimension and Scenes in the *Seven against Thebes*

Scenic space	• Eteocles' announcement (1-38) • Eteocles speaking with the Chorus (182-202, 208-10, 216-18, 261-86) • Chorus speaking with Eteocles (226-9) • Eteocles and Chorus discussing the approaching army (230-54) • The seven speeches between Chorus, Eteocles and the Scout (375-652) • Eteocles' lament (653-76) and conversation with Chorus (677-719) • Choral ode (848-1004) • *Herald's announcement (1005-1053) and Chorus' reaction (1054-1078)**
Distanced space	• The Scout's first message (39-68) • The Chorus hearing the approaching army (78-107) • The Scout's third appearance (792-819)
Extrascenic space	• The Chorus on the approaching army (120-8, 150-65, 203-7)
Theatrical space	• Eteocles' prayer to the gods (69-77) • Chorus' prayer to the gods (108-19, 129-49, 166-81, 219-22)
Metatheatrical space	• The Chorus praying to the gods (on stage?) (211-15, 255-60) • Eteocles' reaction to the Chorus' prayers (223-5)

Reflexive space	• Choral odes (287-374, 720-91, 822-47)
Convergence of scenic and distanced spaces	• Eteocles and Chorus discussing the approaching army (230-54) • The seven speeches between Chorus, Eteocles and the Scout (375-652) • The Scout's third appearance (792-819)

*disputed text

Table 4 Spatial Dimensions by Line Number in the *Seven against Thebes*

Spatial Dimension	Passage	Lines
Scenic space	Eteocles' announcement	1-38
Distanced space	The Scout's first message	39-68
Theatrical space	Eteocles' prayer to the gods	69-77
Distanced space	The Chorus hearing the approaching army	78-107
Theatrical space	The Chorus praying to the gods	108-19
Extrascenic space	The Chorus on the approaching army	120-8
Theatrical space	The Chorus praying to the gods	129-49
Extrascenic space	The Chorus on the approaching army	150-65
Theatrical space	The Chorus praying to the gods	166-81
Scenic space	Eteocles speaking with the Chorus	182-202
Extrascenic space	The Chorus on the approaching army	203-7
Scenic space	Eteocles speaking with the Chorus	208-10
Metatheatrical space	The Chorus praying to the gods (on stage?)	211-15
Scenic space	Eteocles speaking with the Chorus	216-18
Theatrical space	The Chorus praying to the gods	219-22
Metatheatrical space	Eteocles reaction to the Chorus' prayers	223-5
Scenic space	Chorus speaking with Eteocles	226-9
Convergence of scenic and distanced spaces	Eteocles and Chorus discussing the approaching army	230-54
Metatheatrical space	The Chorus praying to the gods (on stage?)	255-60
Scenic space	Eteocles speaking with the Chorus	261-86
Reflexive space	Choral odes	287-374
Convergence of scenic and distanced spaces	The seven speeches between Chorus, Eteocles and the Scout	375-652
Scenic space	Eteocles' lament	653-76
Scenic space	Eteocles' conversation with Chorus	677-719
Reflexive space	Choral odes	720-91
Convergence of scenic and distanced spaces	The Scout's third appearance	792-819
Reflexive space	Choral odes	822-47
Scenic space	Choral ode	848-1004
Scenic space	*Herald's announcement*	1005-53
Scenic space	*Chorus' reaction*	1054-78

Table 5 Analysis of Spatial Dimension Occurrences in the *Seven against Thebes*

Spatial Dimension	Occurrences	Line Numbers
Scenic	13	1-38, 182-202, 208-10, 216-18, 226-9, 230-54, 261-86, 375-652, 653-76, 677-719, 848-1004, 1005-53, 1054-78
Theatrical	5	69-77, 108-19, 129-49, 166-81, 219-22
Distanced	3	39-68, 78-107, 792-819
Extrascenic	3	120-8, 150-65, 203-7
Metatheatrical	3	211-15, 223-5, 255-60
Reflexive	3	287-374, 720-91, 822-47
Converged space	3	230-54, 375-652, 792-819

When examining the breakdown of spatial elements in the play (Table 5), it becomes apparent that the scenic space, the space occupied by the internal audience, is the most prominent spatial element. The scenic space is dominated by the Chorus and emphasises their fear and anguish.[382] This contributes to the claustrophobic effect of the action of the play and their fear effects the first occasion of a convergence of two spatial dimensions (230-54). The terror of the Chorus pulls the army into the scenic space, transforming the distanced space of the approaching army by creating a new spatial dimension. This melding of space increases the emotional pressure on the figures of the internal audience and heightens the sense of realism for the external spectators.

The second occurrence of converged space is the key scene of the Scout's second appearance (375-652) where he reports on the seven warriors assigned to attack each city gate and Eteocles chooses their opponents. Alternately shifting between the distanced space of the battlefield and the scenic space of

---

[382] Lines 182-202, 208-10, 216-18, 230-54, 261-86.

the city has the effect of blurring the spatial focus. This significantly contributes to the effect on the internal audience, for whom the scene is emotionally fluctuating, veering between the fear engendered by the Scout's descriptions[383] and Eteocles' confident assertions in response.[384]

The Chorus are calmer now, even hopeful,[385] but tellingly say nothing immediately after Eteocles' announcement that he will fight Polynices (653-76). Eteocles' response reminds the external audience of the focus of the play, that Oedipus cursed his sons (655) and Eteocles and Polynices are sworn enemies who will fight to the death (662-73). The blurred spatial focus also contributes to the dramatic tension for the external audience. As the opposing warriors are paired the tension builds as to whether or not, or when, Eteocles and Polynices will be allotted their places against each other. When confirmation finally comes (653-76) all the narrative strands of the play come together for the external audience.

The Scout provides the final occurrence of converged space (792-819). Echoing previous metaphorical allusions to the city as being like a ship with Eteocles as its captain,[386] the Scout first says that the city is saved (793-8) but then that Apollo has won the battle of the seventh gate (800-2). This is a reference to Laius' failure to obey his oracle[387] and is used to pinpoint the

---

[383] Lines 375-96, 422-36, 458-71, 486-500, 526-49, 568-96, 631-52.
[384] Lines 397-416, 437-51, 473-80, 501-20, 550-62, 597-625.
[385] Lines 417-21, 452-6, 481-5, 521-5, 563-7, 626-30.
[386] Lines 2, 208-10, 556-7, 596-608.
[387] Lines 690, 743-51, 766-68, 801-2, 840-2.

actions of Laius as the root cause of the problems of Oedipus,[388] a reminder

for the external audience of the consequences of not obeying the gods.

The grief of the Chorus (806, 808, 810)[389] paired with the Scout's comments

on Eteocles and Polynices having finally resolved who will rule (οὕτως ὁ

δαίμων κοινὸς ἦν ἀμφοῖν ἄγαν, 812; δισσὼ στρατηγώ, διέλαχον σφυρηλάτῳ

Σκύθῃ σιδήρῳ κτημάτων παμπησίαν, 816-17) once again merges the scenic

and distanced spaces into a new spatial dimension bridged by the realities of

the Scout and Chorus. Aeschylus' alteration of the timeframe of the brothers'

battle, placing it in the middle of the main Theban/Argive conflict, achieves

maximum dramatic impact.[390] The external audience experience the grief of

the city whilst contemplating the desolation of the battlefield.

All the instances of converged space in this play consist of merging the scenic

space with the distanced space. Combining these spaces has the effect of

creating a new spatial category where the effect is polarised by the status of

the observer. The multi-dimensional space of the play is enhanced by the

experience of the observer, whether internal or external, and facilitates a

deeper emotional connection with the story.

---

[388] Lines 70, 653, 655, 681-2, 695, 723, 785-91, 832-9, 886-7, 945-6, 989.
[389] Lines 807-8 are missing.
[390] van Wees (1992): 195 notes that 'Diodoros (IV.65) places it before the battle, but Apollodoros (3.6.8) says that it happened after the battle'.

For Rehm, Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia is representative of ancient theatre,[391] where theatrical space becomes a place disconnected from conforming civic space thus allowing it to explore difficult themes. Foucault describes heterotopias as 'absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about'. The space between a heterotopia and a utopia, an unreal space which presents a perfect form of society, contains a mirror (a form of utopia itself);[392] this mirror connects the heterotopia with the real world by revealing a space between the two, an alternate reality that is simultaneously real and unreal. The heterotopic mirror turns reality around:

> the mirror functions as a heterotopia in this respect: it makes this place that I occupy at the moment when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there.[393]

The effect on the internal and external audiences of the converging spatial dimensions is to create a new space that is both indicative of real life and has an element of figurative distance. In this way the external audience share the emotional experience of the internal audience through immersion in a sub-reality that is nonetheless very close to their own actuality. This is an interpretation close to Kurt Lewin's theory of hodological space,[394] described

---

[391] Rehm (2002): 19, 34, 270-1.
[392] Foucault and Miskowiec (1986): 24.
[393] Foucault and Miskowiec (1986): 24.
[394] '"Hodos", a Greek word meaning "way", to describe psychological occurrences. Lewin realized clearly that what is relevant in describing the behavior is not the perceived *physical changes* but the states of individual's mind which could be separated from each other on the basis of the psychological *meaning* of the state' [author's italics], Rainio (2009): 3.

by Rehm as 'paths that tie people together or distances that keep them apart'.[395]

Conclusion

The *Seven against Thebes* is a play dominated by multiple temporalities. The play is notable for the amount of information given in the diegetic space, and for the influence that the events of the diegetic space, in both the past and the present, have on the internal action on stage. Although the play has one of the shortest character lists of extant tragedy, it is conspicuously populated by the dead: Laius[396] and Oedipus[397] are repeatedly named, but Cadmus is also prominent[398] as are the dark goddesses: the Erinyes (Ἐρῑνύες),[399] Enyo and Terror (Ἐνυώ καὶ Φόβον, 45), the Keres (Κῆρες, 1055), Carnage (Ἀδράστῳ, 574), the Arai (Ἀραὶ, 696, 955), Eris (Ἔρις, 1051) and Ate (Ἄτη, 1001). Jocasta's total absence is notable but is in keeping with the overtly masculine theme that runs through the play. In an ironic construction, the warriors who will die in the battle are vividly alive through the Scout's speech.

The examination of spatiality, and temporalities, within this play is important for the thesis because it shows how manipulation of temporal and spatial dimensions can affect what is taking place on stage and how the external

---

[395] Rehm (2002): 18-19.
[396] Lines 690, 745, 751, 783, 802, 842.
[397] Lines 70, 203, 372, 654, 655, 677, 695, 725, 752, 775, 785-91, 801, 807, 833, 868, 989, 1004.
[398] Lines 1, 9, 39, 47, 74, 120, 137, 531, 543, 679, 792, 823, 1006, 1015, 1025, 1026, 1069, 1075.
[399] Lines 70, 574, 700, 723, 791, 868, 887, 955, 978, 989, 1055.

spectators might react to it. A spatial analysis can reveal different readings that add meaning and depth in a way that makes the play more accessible in terms of understanding how it is constructed, and how the construction contributes to specific interpretations of what is going on. The fluidity of the spatiality serves to create an immersive environment for both the internal and external audiences; both sets of spectators are drawn into the action of the play and both are directed to specific viewpoints of the story. The combination of temporalities aids this process and enhances the effect of shifting between different timelines within the space of the play.

Produced only thirteen years after the Persian invasion of Athens, Rehm asks if this play presents Thebes as Athens' 'analogue, where the Athenian recollection of the Persian invasion is given mythic scope'.[400] Viewing the Thebans as 'the Other' allows the Athenians, he suggests, to think about their own circumstances. Instead of an altruistic reading, the trilogy[401] can be viewed as an exercise in exploring the long-reaching ramifications of disorder: disobeying the gods and ignoring oracles (Laius) and failing the *polis* by allowing personal issues to become more important than civic society (the fight between Eteocles and Polynices) can only end in disaster. For Eteocles and Polynices, neither won rule of Thebes and both died at each other's hands. Although neither was the direct cause of their problems, their

---

[400] Rehm (2002): 238 and 383 n. 9; see also Zeitlin and Winkler (1990): 144.
[401] If the assumptions made above (p. 104) are accepted as likely narratives.

anger with each other clouded their judgement and left Thebes with no ruler.[402]

The role of the Chorus in the play is particularly significant. Rather than acting as commentators or simple signifiers, the Chorus are a complex unit that directly affects the approach of Eteocles and also impacts upon the wider citizenry. The next chapter will build on the analysis of the Chorus by considering their role as message enablers, receiving and disseminating news and messages as non-traditional messenger figures in their own right.

---

[402] Creon initially acted as regent for Eteocles' son Laodamas; Paus. 1.39.2.

Chapter 3
The Dynamics of News on Choral Dualities:
Suppliants

Introduction

This chapter will examine how the two choruses of the *Suppliants* (Ἱκέτιδες) contribute to message enabling, the means by which messages are received or disseminated outside the traditional or 'expected' method using principal characters and traditional messenger figures. The purpose of choosing *Suppliants* for this chapter is it provides the opportunity to study news and messaging across two choral groups;[403] both of whom are foreign outsiders in the play.[404]

Choruses can often be considered outsiders to the main characters;[405] they can provide different points of view to those of the protagonists or they can be outsiders of the civic community represented by the protagonists. In this play the Chorus are double outsiders (in the eyes of Athenian citizens), being both foreign and female. The perspective and experience of the principal chorus, and their response to the Argives from whom they seek shelter, affords an insight to the themes of message enabling.

---

[403] A third collective, of Argive soldiers, only appears at the end of the play (1034-61). Talking about 'the Chorus' in the chapter refers to the primary chorus of Danaids (the suppliants of the play's title); when the secondary chorus of Egyptians is referred to, they will be identified as such.

[404] Goldhill has noted that tragedy is 'the drama of the other' Goldhill (1996): 253.

[405] Notably in Euripides, such as the slaves in *Hecuba* (Ἑκάβη, 424 B.C.E.) and *Helen* (Ἑλένη, 412 B.C.E.) or the bacchants in *Bacchae* (Βάκχαι, 405 B.C.E.).

Suppliants tells the story of the arrival of Danaus and his daughters (the Chorus) in Argos following their departure from their native Libya. There they meet with Pelasgus, ruler of Argos (τῆσδε γῆς ἀρχηγέτης, 251), who eventually agrees, after consultation with his council, to protect the refugees. An Egyptian herald (κῆρυξ) and chorus of sailors arrives (882) – much of this part of the manuscript is missing – and threatens Pelasgus with war if he fails to honour their right to take the Danaids home. The Egyptians depart and Danaus and his daughters are offered sanctuary in Argos, whereupon they renounce their Egyptian heritage and promise allegiance to Argos (1023-5).

The play features a series of interlocking messages with the Chorus central to all events that take place. The style, almost ring composition, of the Chorus' lines is emphasised when the Chorus are reassured by their father Danaus.[406] This has the effect of keeping the Chorus central to the action of the play at all times, an unusual prominence that is important for emphasising the extent of their power to direct events to their own design. In this way news is filtered through the perspective of the Chorus throughout.

The Text (Dating and Place in Trilogy)

Suppliants is probably the first play of a tetralogy that included *Egyptians* (Αἰγυπτίοι),[407] *Danaids* (Δαναΐδες) and the satyr play *Amymone* (Ἀμυμώνη).[408]

---

[406] Lines 739-75, 176-233, 600-24.

[407] *Thalamopoioi* (Θαλαμοποιοι, 'Those Who Prepare the Bridal Chamber') may have been an alternative title for this play. See Suda 'Ai' 357 (Hesy.); Marm. Par. A 56; Papadopoulou (2011): 17.

[408] P.Oxy 2256, Oxyrhynchus Online: http://163.1.169.40/gsdl/collect/POxy/index/assoc/HASHfdc8/1133a60d.dir/POxy.v0020.n

It was produced in 463 B.C.E. and won first prize for Aeschylus. Only one word survives of *Egyptians* (referring to Zeus) and seven lines from *Danaids,* along with three lines of *scholia* referencing the play. The dating of the play was subject to some revision until the publication of P.Oxy 2256.3.[409]

Thalia Papadopoulou sets out further dating evidence,[410] which she links to visual evidence found on two *hydriai* (ὑδρία, a vessel for carrying water). Both are Athenian red-figure *hydriai* dated c.460-450 B.C.E. One shows a seated Pelasgus receiving the Danaids[411] and the other shows the Danaids disembarking from a ship with Danaus still onboard.[412] Papadopoulou presents a convincing analysis of the pictorial story which she links to Aeschylus' production of *Suppliants*,[413] in particular the image of Danaus handing a sash to one of his daughters which Papadopoulou connects to their threat in the play to commit suicide (463). If Papadopoulou's suppositions are correct, the imagery on the pots may directly relate to Aeschylus' production which therefore aids with the dating of the text. There is further visual evidence on other, later, vases which indicate the popularity of the mythological story of Danaus and his daughters. The figure of Amymone,

---

2256.a.01.lores.jpg, accessed 23 January 2016, also quoted in Bowen (2013): 7 and Sommerstein (2010): 101.

[409] Bowen (2013): 7-21 discusses the problems around the dating issue comprehensively.
[410] Papadopoulou (2011): 15-17.
[411] Item 216044, Munich, Antikensammlungen, Munich, Antikensammlungen, J338, http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/record/A9ECA755-6001-4F8A-B916-7DE0D1914890, accessed 23 January 2016.
[412] Item 214678, Geneva, market, Hirsch, Berlin, Antikensammlung, Berlin, Schloss Charlottenburg, 3092, http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/record/980B722E-46A7-4CC2-A899-EDF658EE82DD, accessed 23 January 2016.
[413] Papadopoulou (2011): 101-2.

the subject of the trilogy's satyr play, was particularly popular in vase art. Papadopoulou speculates that this interest may have arisen either because another poet wrote about the myth or was due to a posthumous restaging of Aeschylus' plays.[414]

A. J. Bowen outlines several arguments for the trilogy's play order but he concludes that there 'is nothing in *Supplices* needing a play before it ... and plenty after it needing more than one play'.[415] Bowen sketches the likely plot of the remaining two plays. *Egyptians* features Pelasgus dying in battle and the subsequent arrival of the sons of Aegyptus (presaged in *Suppliants* by the Egyptian chorus and herald); *Danaids* takes place after the murders of the Aegyptidae ends with the rule of Hypermestra and Lynceus.[416] Papadopoulou broadly concurs with Bowen's suppositions.[417] She also believes the play to be the first in the trilogy and builds her theory based on the likely construction of dramatic tension across the trilogy. The potential battle with the Egyptians, threatened in *Suppliants*, fits the narrative progression if *Egyptians* is the second play.[418]

Sommerstein, however, suggests the *Suppliants* must have been the second play, and constructs plausible narratives for both *Egyptians* and *Danaids*.[419]

---

[414] Papadopoulou (2011): 102. The reproduction of plays is discussed above, pp. 56 ff.
[415] Bowen (2013): 8-9.
[416] Bowen (2013): 30-1.
[417] Papadopoulou (2011): 18-19.
[418] Papadopoulou (2011): 18-23.
[419] Sommerstein (2010): 100-7.

His case is based on what he sees as Danaus' abnormal obsession in keeping his daughters unmarried, perhaps related to an oracle that he will die at the hands of a grandson. He suggests *Egyptians* was the first play, where a slighted Aegyptus goes to war against Danaus. Sommerstein believes this explains the opposition of the Danaids towards marriage evidenced throughout *Suppliants*,[420] including their threats to commit suicide.[421] The *Danaids* has Danaus ruler of Argos and is set the morning after the murders of the Aegyptiads, with Lynceus, originally in disguise, defeating Danaus and taking control of Argos. Aphrodite pardons the forty-nine murdering Danaids who are purified by Lynceus and go on to marry Argives.[422]

If Bowen's and Papadopoulou's theses are accepted *Suppliants* introduces the chief elements of Io's (and therefore the Danaids') mythological history. The location of these messages is designed to direct the spectator towards a resolution that will be explored in the next two plays. The Chorus have fled Egypt with their father, they claim Argive protection through ancestral rights and the Argives are persuaded to help them; these are all key pieces of information that will form the structure of the trilogy. This will allow the narrative arc to expand upon the arrival of the Egyptians, their subsequent deaths, Danaus assuming power in Argos, and the successful marriage of Hypermestra and Lynceus taking place followed by divine judgement on the forty-eight murdering Danaids. If Sommerstein's theory is accepted, and

---

[420] Lines 9, 80, 105-11, 143, 151-3, 227-8, 330-2, 392-5, 804-5, 1052-3, 1062-4.
[421] Lines 392-6, 465, 160, 786-99.
[422] Sommerstein (2010): 102-7.

Suppliants is the second play, this makes the placement of news and messages in *Suppliants* puzzling, as the issues around the enforced marriage with the Aegyptidae would surely have been addressed in *Egyptians*. Looking at the text of *Suppliants*, it makes more dramatic sense that it is the first play because it signals the main themes of the Danaids' story. The presence of Pelasgus supports this. The myth of Pelasgus was ancient, recorded in Hesiod,[423] and his inclusion fits with the *Suppliants* being the first play, in terms of setting out their early mythography.

The text of the *Suppliants* survives in six manuscripts. Five are copies (*apographa*) of the tenth century C.E. Mediceus Laurentianus manuscript which also includes seven plays by Sophocles and Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* (Ἀργοναυτικά). Bowen suggests that the scholars of Alexandria may have been reliant on the 'state archives of Athens where official texts of the plays were gathered by Lycurgus in the fourth century BC'.[424] He provides a detailed description of the ancient manuscript in his introduction and includes the suggestion that the play had been 'clumsily reworked' in antiquity.[425] There are many instances of missing text in the manuscripts,

---

[423] According to Strabo (5.2.24) quoting Ephorus, Rosivach (1987): 305.
[424] Bowen (2013): 35. See Turyn (1942) and West (1990b) for discussion of the manuscripts.
[425] Bowen (2013): 32-3. Bowen discusses lines 977-9 in his commentary, pp. 336-7. Bowen refers to the facsimile of the Mediceus Laurentianus in Rostagno, E (1896) *L'Eschilo Laurenziano*, Florence.

particularly towards the end of the play.[426] As has been noted in chapter two,[427] ancient manuscripts were sometimes altered.

The Mythological Background

Mythological narratives were fluid and as with most major mythological characters,[428] the tale of Danaus and his daughters varies between sources.[429] Several strands of the mythological stories are important for the play and include the background of the Danaids and the stories of Io and Danaus. Danaus and his twin Aegyptus are descended from Io.[430] Their father Belus (himself a twin with Agenor), son of Poseidon and Libya, settled in Africa and married a daughter of the Nile, Anchinoe. According to myth, Aegyptus had fifty sons and Danaus had fifty daughters.[431] Apollodorus (c.180-after 120 B.C.E.) says that Aegyptus and Danaus quarrelled which led to the latter's exile.[432] Alternatively, Danaus was afraid that Aegyptus' motive behind the marriage of their children was to seize control of Libya. Danaus then travels to Argos and defeats its ruler Gelanor.[433] In another variant of the myth Danaus displaces Gelanor because his arrival in Argos coincided with a prophecy that a wolf from beyond the borders of Argos would arrive

---

[426] Lines 10, 23, 297, 316, 468, 481, 575, 592, 774, 809, 817, 826, 828-9, 833, 849, 851, 863, 885, 896-9, 942, 972, 975-6, 989.
[427] See discussion on pp. 111 ff.
[428] See discussion on pp. 206 ff.
[429] Mitchell (2006): 208 notes that Aeschylus would probably have known more than one version of the myth.
[430] Io is referenced throughout the play (16-17, 29, 44, 41, 141, 162, 170, 275, 292, 299, 300, 535, 540, 573, 1064).
[431] See Appendix 2 for a list of the daughters and their respective husbands.
[432] Apollod. 2.1.4-5.
[433] Apollod. 2.1.4-5.

and kill the dominant bull of a herd (representing Danaus and Gelanor respectively); Danaus' temple to Apollo Lycaeus derives from this and is probably referenced in the play (ὁ Λύκειος, 686). The ominous imagery of a violent 'foreign' predator attacking the local herd is later expressed through Danaus' daughters when they murder their husbands and perhaps also in *Suppliants* through the portrayal of the bestial savagery of the Egyptian chorus.[434] In all versions of the Danaid myths, Danaus is instrumental in causing dissent one way or another. In *Suppliants*, though, the character of Danaus is subordinate to those of his daughters. The possible reasons for this will be discussed further below.

Danaus was eventually forced to marry his daughters to their Egyptian cousins but instructed them to murder their husbands on their wedding night; all complied except for Hypermestra, who spared her husband Lynceus, and Amymone, already pregnant by Poseidon after being rescued by him from a satyr's attentions. Amymone bore Nauplius and is credited with bringing water to Argos. Zeus instructed Athena and Hermes to purify the murderous Danaids for the massacre of the Aegyptidae, and they went on to marry Argives. One variant of the myth suggests that Lynceus murdered Danaus in vengeance for the deaths of his brothers, another that they were reconciled.[435] The forty-eight Danaids who committed murder received punishment for

---

[434] Buxton notes that the wolf was one of a number of powerful animals commonly used in foundation mythology, Buxton (1994): 190.
[435] Apollod. 2.1.5.; Paus. 2.25.4.

their crimes in the Underworld, forced to draw water in leaking vessels forever.[436]

It is likely that in some myths Danaus' twin Aegyptus did not travel with his sons to Argos, although the *scholia* to Euripides' *Orestes* (Ὀρέστης), produced in 408 B.C.E., says Aegyptus came to Argos to prosecute Danaus after the murder of his sons (the trial was staged on the hill used for Argive assemblies).[437] Phrynichus also brought Aegyptus to Argos in either *Egyptians* (Αἰγύπτιοι) or *Danaids* (Δαναΐδες),[438] whilst Pausanias records a tradition that he was buried in the Peloponnese.[439]

Pelasgus was associated in ancient myth as a king of Arcadia and Thessaly as well as Argos; he was reputed to be autochthonous[440] and Herodotus said the Pelasgii were the forefathers of the Athenians.[441] He is said to have invented huts, perhaps referencing the housing mentioned in the play (957-61). Pelasgus' father, Palaechthon (250, 348), whose name means 'ancient of the land', is not known elsewhere.[442] Pelasgus was also said to have fifty sons, who ruled in Arcadia, and one of them, Lycaon, was transformed by Zeus into a wolf,[443] thus creating another wolf connection in the play. Pelasgus' autochthonous status renders him a figure of considerable authority and

---

[436] See Lucr. 1.1003-10, Plato *Gorg.* 493b and Bowen (2013): 8-10.
[437] West (1987): 243-4 n. 871-3.
[438] *Scholia* on *Orestes* 872, Sommerstein (2008a): 280.
[439] Paus. 7.21.6.
[440] Apollod. 3.8.1.
[441] Herod. *Hist.* 1.56.2-57.3.
[442] Rosivach suggests his name was Aeschylus' invention Rosivach (1987): 298.
[443] Hyg. *Fab.* 176; Paus. 8.2.3.

power with an innate claim to the land over which he rules. The Danaids'
claim is almost autochthonic in its construct – they are descended from Io and
therefore from Argos itself for Io was the daughter of Inachus, an Argive river
god, and as such could be said to be of autochthonic heritage. As Melissa
Mueller notes, 'traditional myths of autochthony deprived Athenian women
of any semblance of political authority by ascribing the birth of citizens to the
Earth, thereby negating the importance of human motherhood'; the Danaids
are therefore revealed to be transgressional in their appropriation of
autochthony.[444] Having the Danaids supplicate another autochthonic figure
imbues their claim with authority.

Io's journey is reversed by the Danaids; where Io had to leave Argos and
could only settle once she reached Egypt, the Danaids had to leave Egypt
(according to *Suppliants*, 4-39) and could only settle in Argos (by virtue of
their ancestral connections). The emphasis on Io's story throughout the play
embeds the idea that the Chorus are suffering as she did, that they too are on
an epic journey that will alter the path of their fate.[445] The Chorus' arrival in
Argos can be viewed as a continuation of Io's journey; her bloodline finding
its way back to Argos and thereby closing the narrative theme, a form of
nostos.[446] The Chorus explicitly link their present suffering to the suffering

---

[444] Mueller (2016): 72.
[445] Lines 16-17, 29, 41, 44, 141, 162, 170, 275, 292, 299, 300, 535, 540, 573, 1064.
[446] Νόστος, 'to return'. *Nostoi* (*Νόστοι*) was also the name given to a collection of songs
relating to the return of the Greeks from the Trojan wars; see Biles (2003): 194.

of Io (πόνων, 49-56).[447] This has the effect of 'authorising' their predicament, supporting their claim for Argive protection.

Io came to the attention of Zeus whilst serving as a priestess of Hera. Upon discovering Zeus' infatuation with Io, Hera turned her into a cow and when that failed to deter him, inflicted a biting gadfly upon her which she desperately tried to outrun across the Greek world, giving her name to the Ionian Sea and the Bosporus (βοὸς πόρος, 'cattle passage') as she went. She eventually arrived in Egypt where Zeus restored her with a touch of his hand, an act symbolised in the name of their son Epaphus (ἔφαξις, 'touch-born'; *Supp*. 45).[448] Epaphus was pursued by Hera but saved by Zeus and Io settled in Egypt, marrying Telegonus. Epaphus married Memphis, the daughter of the Nile, and had a daughter, Libya,[449] the grandmother of Aegyptus and Danaus. Io's descendants would rule in Argos (Perseus), Thebes (Cadmus), Crete (Minos) and Persia (Perses), and her descendants would go on to form equally-illustrious lineages.[450] The myth of Io is famously dramatised in the

---

[447] Bowen notes that πόνος (labour) is used frequently by Aeschylus: *Pers*. – four occurrences, *Seven* – five occurrences, *Ag*. – ten occurrences, *Choe*. – ten occurrences and *Eum*. – nine occurrences. Bowen (2013): 156 n. 51. The word frequency information for πόνος in the Perseus Digital Library database also shows eighteen occurrences in the *Prometheus Bound*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/wordfreq?lookup=po/nos&lang=greek&sort=max, accessed 27 January 2016.

[448] *Prometheus Bound* 561-886, *Suppliants* 540-87; Apollod. 2.1.3; Hyg. *Fab*. 145; Ov. *Met*. 1.583-748; Virg. *Aen*. 7.789.

[449] *P.B.* 850-78, *Suppl*. 41-7, 312-15; Apollod. 2.1.3; Herod. 2.153, 3.27; Hyg. *Fab*. 145, 149; Ov. *Met*. 1.748-50.

[450]

Prometheus Bound (561-886),[451] produced c.460-456 B.C.E. and discussed further in chapter four below.

The tale of Tereus and Procne (58-67), besides being of relevance to Danaid mythology in respect of familial violence, settles a dark shade on the narrative. Procne and Philomela were the daughters of the Athenian Pandion; Procne was married to the Thracian Tereus, a political ally of her father. Procne requested that her husband bring her sister to her in Thrace but instead he raped her, locked her up, cut out her tongue and told Procne she was dead. In vengeance Philomela and Procne murdered Procne's son Itys and served his remains to his father as a meal;[452] when Tereus tried to retaliate the gods turned all three into birds.[453] The personality of the Danaids in this play emphasises their innate otherness as women, highlighted by the Procne/Tereus myth which 'points to a common narrative gambit involving women: they characteristically use something from their own sphere of influence in order to exert a power over men through guile which they could not exercise openly by violence'.[454] The Danaids of the *Suppliants* are prepared to use violence (their suicide) to force action on others.[455] Bowen

---

[451] If produced by Aeschylus. The question of whether Aeschylus wrote the play or not has long been under dispute (Sommerstein (2010): 228) and will be addressed further below in chapter four, pp. 200 ff.

[452] Thereby 'punishing one form of transgressive closeness between kin with another', Buxton (1994): 123-4.

[453] Aeschylus *Supp*. 60-2; Apollod. 3.14.8; Hyg. *Fab*. 45; Ov. *Met*. 6.426-674; Paus. 1.41.8, 10.4.8.

[454] Buxton (1994): 124.

[455] Gottesman (2014): 88 notes how 'in the opening scene the Danaids call their suppliant boughs *encheiridia* (21), which commonly describes a dagger or a knife', which reinforces their portrayal as ruthless women.

suggests the inclusion of the Procne/Tereus myth points to the fact that the Danaids will become 'reluctant wives and cunning killers'.[456] Alternatively, perhaps it refers to the barbarity of men when they are in pursuit of women, which would be in keeping with the attitude of the Chorus towards men in general portrayed in *Suppliants*. Tereus' desire for Philomela led to her rape and mutilation, which in turn inspired the horror of Procne's revenge when she murdered their son Itys and fed him to his father.[457] The Chorus foresee similar levels of devastation for themselves should they be forced into marriage with their cousins.

The portrayal of the Egyptian chorus in the play as aggressive and boorish supports such an interpretation. Philomela, Procne's sister and the rationale for the murder of Itys, is not herself directly mentioned. That the act of the revenge rather than its cause is emphasised mirrors the Chorus' later threat to commit suicide, their own revenge for forced marriage. Afterwards Pelasgus would have to deal with the terrible consequences of their actions. As Laura Swift has noted, 'the foreign Chorus' abnormal rejection of marriage endangers the Greek city which takes them in',[458] something that would have

---

[456] Bowen (2013): 157 n. 57-61.
[457] The myth of Procne and Tereus is similar to that of Aedon and Zethus. In Homer's *Odyssey*, Aedon was married to Zethus and their son, Itylus, was killed by accident (*Od.* 19.518-23). Penelope is explaining to a disguised Odysseus that she is in two minds about her future: 'whom she [Aedon] once killed with the bronze when the madness was on her; so my mind is divided and starts one way, then another', translation Lattimore (1967): 295. In this version of the myth, Aedon, Zethus' wife, was so jealous of her sister-in-law Niobe's many children that she attempted to kill one of them but killed Itylus instead. Pausanias says that Zethus died of grief: ἐτεθνήκει δὲ ὑπὸ λύπης καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ζῆθος, Paus. 9.5.9. See also McHardy (2005): 141-5.
[458] Swift (2013): 132.

been true for both internal and external realities.[459] The *parodos* is therefore integral to the continuity of plot throughout the rest of the play and perhaps the trilogy, if it is the first play.

The predominant themes of the mythological stories portrayed in *Suppliants* are of journeys and suffering. Through appropriating the myths of Io, Procne and Philomela the Chorus are aligning their own circumstances with theirs. The inclusion of the Procne/Philomela myth possibly alludes to the murder of the Aegyptidae at the hands of the Chorus, perhaps addressed in the second play as discussed above. In the case of Io, it is not merely the ancestral link that is relevant, but her suffering at the hands of another, as the Chorus believe they will suffer at the hands of the Aegyptidae. This theory is reinforced with the arrival of the Egyptian Herald and soldiers (882-951), who are also on a journey not of their own choosing, having been sent by Aegyptus to retrieve the Danaids. The Herald is the Danaids' gadfly, sent to chase them away from Argos as Io was by Hera five generations earlier. The Herald also 'suffers' at the hands of Pelasgus when the latter refuses to give in to his demands (938-49). The sting of the rejection will be carried back to Egypt and will further destabilise the relationship between Danaus and Aegyptus, with possible consequences for Argos. The emphasis on particular aspects of the mythological stories corresponds with the dramatic structure of the

---

[459] Buxton (1994) notes that 'from Homer's Penelope, to the unnamed Pindaric maiden at the winning post, to Aischylos' Io and Klytaimestra, to Apollonios' Medea, Greek heroines are defined by their relationship to marriage', 121. Marriage affects relationships between mythical female siblings where 'the relationship of sister is usually overshadowed by that of wife', 144 n. 60.

Suppliants, providing a further level of coding for the messages of the narrative. This also demonstrates how careful use of specific aspects of mythological stories can enhance and illuminate the narrative.

One of the play's focal points is the arrival of the Danaids immediately after a long journey from their homeland followed by the obstacles they must overcome if they are to achieve their goal of staying in Argos. For the internal audience, the perspective of the play is about the end of the Danaids' journey; for the external audience, this play represents a stage in their story (whether the play was placed first or second in its trilogy) which they (the external audience) are encouraged to view as a form of continuing narrative, not from the obvious point of view of a linear narrative of the trilogy, but as a unit of movement through the mythological narrative. Situating the play at this particular point in the Danaid myth enables that focus.

The Choruses of the *Suppliants*

This section will examine the choruses of the *Suppliants*, which comprise the primary chorus of the Danaids throughout, the secondary chorus of Egyptian sailors (836-71) and a third grouping of male Argive citizens (1034-61) who close the play. The primary chorus ('the Chorus'; when referred to, the Egyptian and Argive choruses will be identified as such) are the principal motivators of the narrative, with the scenes with the Egyptian and Argive men providing important additions to the overall narrative.

The play is unusual in that the Chorus is really the principle character, being more dominant than all the other characters in the play. The explanation for their arrival is set out clearly in the first part of the *parodos* (1-22), which provides an account of their escape from Egypt to avoid marriage with their cousins, the sons of Aegyptus (29-39, 79-85). If marriage is to be forced upon them, they can foresee only one outcome – their own deaths through suicide:

> εἰ δὲ μή, μελανθὲς
> ἡλιόκτυπον γένος
> τὸν γάιον,
> τὸν πολυξενώτατον
> Ζῆνα τῶν κεκμηκότων
> ἱξόμεθα σὺν κλάδοις
> ἀρτάναις θανοῦσαι,
> μὴ τυχοῦσαι θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων
>
> *Supp*. 154-60

> But otherwise we, a race dark-complexioned, sun-beaten,
> will approach with our suppliant boughs that Zeus below
> the earth, that one who most welcomes the dead, once we
> die in hung nooses, should we meet with no favour from
> the gods on Olympus[460]

Whatever the motivation of Danaus and his daughters, discussed above in the introduction,[461] the behaviour of the Danaids as portrayed in the play is extreme.

The second chorus in the play, comprised of Egyptian sailors (882-951), is the force which accompanies the Herald to try to return the Chorus to Egypt. The text which covers their arrival (825-35 in particular) is damaged although in his analysis Bowen has consulted the *scholia* to make sense of their

---

[460] Translation Collard (2008).
[461] See page 155.

dialogue.[462] Scholars agree that when the Egyptian sailors arrive they chase and try to grab the Chorus as evidenced by their terrified response: ὁ, ἁ ἁ: ὅδε μάρπτις νάιος γάιος. τῶν πρό, μάρπτι, κάμνοις: ἰόφ .. ὀμ .. αὖθι κάκκας νυ δυϊαν βοὰν ἀμφαίνω (827-9).

The behaviour of the sailors also reflects the polarity between the barbarian and the civilised displayed on Argive soil. Egyptians are portrayed as impious (βωμῶν ἀλέγοντες οὐδέν, 751-2; θεῶν οὐδὲν ἐπαΐοντες, 758-9) and arrogant (κυνοθρασεῖς, 758; οὔτοι φοβοῦμαι δαίμονας τοὺς ἐνθάδε, 893) contrasted with the temperance (οὐ πίνοντας ἐκ κριθῶν μέθυ, 952) and fairness (ἐξ ἐλευθεροστόμου γλώσσης, 948-9) of Greece (243). Portraying the Egyptians in this way has a dual purpose. It ratifies Argos' ultimate decision to offer sanctuary to the Danaids (and therefore invoke war) and it provides the external spectator with a simplistic reason for the behaviour of the Chorus.

Although the Chorus are claiming that their Argive ancestry should be the basis upon which they are protected, the behaviour of the Egyptian sailors also reveals that the Chorus may fear being subjected to similarly aggressive behaviour by their cousins. Their claim for protection thus becomes the subject of a moral obligation and therefore more complicated on the part of the Argives. Rather than seeking inclusion purely based on hereditary links,

---

[462] Bowen (2013): 313-14 n. 825-35.

the Chorus seek to distance themselves from the Egyptians and imply that it is their hereditary links to Argos which have civilised them.

The vote to offer sanctuary to the Chorus was made by the city (τοία δὲ δημόπρακτος ἐκ πόλεως μία ψῆφος κέκρανται, 943-4).[463] It is therefore the honour of the *polis*, not just Pelasgus, which is at stake. Danaus recognised the power of this earlier in the play when he reported that the 'people's ruling hand' (δήμου κρατοῦσα χεὶρ, 604) had decided to offer them sanctuary.[464] For the external audience these are direct allusions to the democracy of fifth-century Athens, a metatheatrical facet of the mythological stage. This is a conclusion supported by Burian's interpretation, where he notes that Aeschylus is suffusing the prehistory portrayed in the play 'with what we might call the scent of democratic politics, an ideal picture that would also call up in the minds of Athenian spectators the reality of debate and decision-making in their own *ekklêsia*'.[465]

The play includes a further grouping (1034-61), of Argives, which may be described as a chorus. The Argives escort the Chorus as they leave the stage at the end of the play. Sommerstein notes that the manuscript does not mark

---

[463] Boegehold (1963): 368-9 comments that 'a ψῆφος, the instrument of secret voting in Aeschylus' *Eumenides,* is a "decision" in his earlier play the *Suppliants*, one reached moreover by an open show of hands. Neither *psephos* nor its compounds refer in any way to secret voting in the *Suppliants*, and one may go on to ask if it ever at any time implied secret voting before say the late 460s.'

[464] Bowen notes that this is 'the first appearance in Greek of the two words which form 'democracy' side by side', *Introd*. §17, Bowen (2013): 13. See also Ehrenberg (1950): 522-4.

[465] Burian (2011): 112. The *ekklêsia (ἐκκλησία)* was the decision-making assembly of adult male Athenian citizens held on the Pnyx, the hill located west of the Athenian acropolis.

changes of speaker in 1018-73 and discusses the various options for the allocation of the dialogue.[466] Bowen takes the discussion further and suggests the change in metre (to the rare Ionic metre)[467] may have been Aeschylus attempting an innovative twist: 'In the finale of *Supplices*, Aeschylus has created something clearly ambiguous, even perverse, and likely to trouble his audience', perhaps bringing out the Eastern aspects of the Chorus.[468] He links this to the presumed ending of *Egyptians*, which might have featured the wedding between the Danaids and sons of Aegyptus.

The Argive chorus can be viewed as an expression of desire for a stabilising influence on the Chorus. Their speech is measured and has echoes of Pelasgus' initial reluctance to help the Chorus; they warn them to observe caution in their prayers, for only Zeus can foresee the future (σὺ δέ γ᾽ οὐκ οἶσθα τὸ μέλλον, 1056). This may be a reaction against their earlier extreme behaviour in the shrine (of which word may have got back to the citizens) and a desire to avoid further episodes. They caution the Chorus to be moderate (μέτριον νῦν ἔπος εὔχου, 1059) and to be mindful of the power of the gods (τὰ θεῶν μηδὲν ἀγάζειν, 1061). Bowen's suggestion, that the Chorus hope that women should be more powerful than their male enemies (καὶ κράτος νέμοι γυναιξίν, 1068-9), which 'is likely to cause shock, fear and anger in

---

[466] Sommerstein (2008a): 424-5 n. 215.

[467] Unusual in tragedy, Aeschylus uses the Ionic metre much more than either Sophocles or Euripides. In *Persians*, Bowen suggests 'they help to create an eastern atmosphere in the play'. In *Suppliants*, *Agamemnon* and Euripides' *Bacchae*, Bowen speculates that they represent 'something we may call unGreek, eastern, female and libertine'. Bowen (2013): 347 n. 1018-73.

[468] Bowen (2013): 348 n. 1018-73.

every man in the audience',[469] perhaps relates more to the etymology of the word κράτος, which could refer to bodily strength (particularly in Homer), an 'unfeminine' interpretation. This could refer to the Chorus' acquisition of power using physical force (the threat of suicide to achieve their aims). Or it could foreshadow the murder of their Argive husbands. It may even be an implicit reference to the fact that the Danaids are perhaps not as 'civilised' as they would like to appear and are more like the aggressive Egyptians than they would care to admit.

It has been suggested that the Chorus see themselves as representing the entire female sex based on their descent from Io (531-3), an audacious claim.[470] If such a claim is accepted, the Danaids are representing a very specific portrayal of the ancient woman: opinionated and difficult, determined to follow through whatever course of action they decide upon, irrespective of the consequences (bringing war to Argos), and ultimately prepared to do whatever their father asks of them (ultimately murdering their husbands). A gendered interpretation of the narrative links thematically with other plays known to be by Aeschylus. The feminised portrayal of barbarians in *Persians* is followed by a dominant female chorus in *Seven against Thebes*, with the power to influence others.[471]

---

[469] Bowen (2013): 358 n. 1062-73.
[470] Papadopoulou (2011): 54-5.
[471] See chapter two above, pp. 130 ff. Aeschylus also challenges concepts of gender in the *Oresteia* through his characterisation of Clytemnestra.

Swift's interpretation of the chorus as a vehicle for observing issues of social belonging speaks to the observance of the external audience.[472] How the external audience perceive the identity of the Chorus is determined by their own experiences and perspective; Swift's 'gender-based bond'.[473] Her assertion that female choruses are more likely to engage with female characters but that male choruses are more likely to identify with the *polis* highlights the links between the identity of the characters on stage and their direct engagement with the external audience.[474] The demographic composition of the ancient theatre audience is unknown but it is possible it comprised a perhaps larger number of men (citizens, metics, visitors and guests) than women.[475] The wide variety of (often marginalised) identities inhabiting choruses in ancient tragedy caused the audience, Swift suggests, 'to question the perspective from which the Chorus speaks'.[476] In this model, the chorus is not necessarily going to 'cause shock, fear and anger'[477] in the male members of the audience but may instead promote reflection on gender relationships.

The ancient tragic chorus comprised, as with all categories of tragic performers, male citizens of Athens.[478] As Revermann notes:

---

[472] Swift (2013): 154.
[473] Swift (2013): 132.
[474] Griffith (1995): 72 notes that it is 'remarkable how seldom a tragic Chorus comprises young male citizens (Sophocles' *Ajax* [*Αἴας*, early 440s B.C.E.] and *Philoctetes* [*Φιλοκτήτης*, 409 B.C.E.] are in this respect exceptional)'.
[475] See Revermann (2006) and Roselli (2011).
[476] Swift (2013): 153. Buxton (1994): 33 identifies the chorus as 'those apparent embodiments of society's traditional wisdom … socially marginal'.
[477] Bowen (2013): 358.
[478] See Wilson (2000) for a comprehensive examination of the institution.

> the percentage of those Athenian spectators at the Great Dionysia who had, at one point or another in their lives, been performing in that very orchestra themselves as members of a dramatic or, more likely, dithyrambic chorus must have been considerable.[479]

It follows that 'there is good reason to believe that in democratic Athens, as elsewhere, those who danced were those in power'.[480] The ramifications for the presentation of female characters by a male, democratically powerful cast on the theatrical stage are therefore intriguing. The requirement of Athenian citizens to occupy sometimes divisive and/or extreme dramatic roles on stage opens up further avenues of analysis for what internal, specifically civic, messages may be embedded within the performance of ancient drama.[481]

The perspective of the internal audience is shaped by the poet's words but also their own experience; how does a male, democratically-educated Athenian citizen get into the mindset of a female character? All drama was an enactment of the (often mythical/heroic) past and perhaps this temporal distance allowed both the actors and the external audience to believe in the transformation of the male citizen into a foreign female character. The question of binary gender thus becomes removed from the immediate consciousness of actor and spectator in terms of immediate gender relations and is instead displaced by the temporal distance between the ancient and

---

[479] Revermann (2006): 1112. The annual dithyrambic competitions comprised ten choruses of fifty men and ten choruses of fifty boys allotted via the ten Athenian tribes; see p. 62 n. 188 above and Murnaghan (2011): 249. See also Buxton (1994): 21-6 who discusses how children participated in ritual song and dance from a very early age, indicating its cultural and civic importance.

[480] Revermann (2006): 111 and see also discussion on pp. 220 ff.

[481] See Hardwick (2013b) for an analysis of the ancient audience in terms of how issues around audience interaction and interpretation have been addressed in modern productions.

mythical/heroic worlds into something less loaded with contemporary imbalances. The external audience are therefore less aware of an overly simplistic, gendered portrayal; for them, the gender differentials in the play are important in terms of their symbolism. The Chorus have fled Egypt and are seeking shelter in Argos not because they are female, but because they are descendants of Io. The genealogical connection is key, not the gender of the Chorus. Whether the Chorus are married or not, the Argives have a moral duty to protect those who are descended from their own, autochthonic heritage.[482] The pursuit of the Egyptian herald is the catalyst which forces Pelasgus to commit to a course of action to protect the Chorus.

As part of the internal audience, the Chorus are acutely aware of the precarious nature of their situation, and use what they can to influence those around them. They begin with the accepted method of religious supplication (240-5, 359-64, 418-27) but quickly turn to a combination of arguments (370-5, 402-6) and warnings (381-6, 392-6, 434-7), finally resorting to threats (455-67). It is striking that the Chorus choose to emphasise the negativity of their situation: instead of trying to persuade Pelasgus with benign or beneficial reasons for accepting them, they choose to threaten. They are aware that as women they hold little power for direct action and it is this that makes their threat of suicide so striking, for it is really the only thing they can do to force Pelasgus to help them. Although they bring danger to Argos,[483]

---

[482] Buxton (1994): 192.
[483] As noted earlier; see page 164 above.

the Chorus can do nothing to lessen it; for example, they can make no promises of alliances. While ordinarily the Argives might assume that there would be marriage alliances in the future, this is emphatically not an option in this particular case. By rejecting marriage, the Chorus are subverting the traditional female role and this raises interesting questions around the motivation of Danaus who is allowing his daughters' rejection of the 'normal' behaviour expected of young women.

Papadopoulou has a theory that 'it is the interplay between familiarity and alienation that is meant to guide the audience's reception of the Danaids as they turn from victims into murderesses across the trilogy'.[484] I suggest that this interplay is particularly in force in *Suppliants* because the characterisation of the Chorus is the embodiment of tension between the familiar and the alien, for both internal and external audiences. The external audience are presented with a characterisation that repeatedly shifts between the familiar and the alien. The internal audience are subjected to conflicting representations of the female as described above (opinionated and difficult, determined, and prepared to do anything their father asks) as opposed to how they 'should' appear – modest and humble (μετωποσώφρων, μὴ θρασύ (191-203), how Danaus suggested his daughters should present themselves to Pelasgus). The Argives perceive a group who look different (πέπλοισι βαρβάροισι, 235)[485] but who share their ancestry; but the behaviour of the Chorus (the threat of

---

[484] Papadopoulou (2011): 56.
[485] See also lines 71, 155, 234-6, 279-80, 496, 627, 719-20.

suicide in the sanctuary of the gods) is alien to them.   The male/female balance is threatened by the behaviour of the Chorus; they are simultaneously foreign but genetically linked to the Argives. The threat of direct action is tempered by Pelasgus' desire to consult the *polis* (ἐγὼ δὲ λαοὺς συγκαλῶν ἐγχωρίους στείχω, 516-23). The question of the marriageability of the Chorus is an obviously familiar trope but their rejection of the concept renders further questions about their motivation in terms of Argive acceptance; will the Chorus continue to dictate their own destiny once they have been assimilated into Argive culture or will they acquiesce to the majority rule as Pelasgus does?

The ancient actor had a dual identity. He was simultaneously a dramatic character and an Athenian citizen. Within this frame the dramatic character, specifically the chorus, can also be further dissected. One interpretation is to view the chorus as embodying two identities: one, an identity of ritual, embodying the cultural and poetic and two, the identity of the dramatic character which is often embedded within a heroic context, distanced from the fifth-century B.C.E. tragic stage.[486] The first form is one of metatheatrical identity; a contemporary presence entrenched within a dramatic construct. So the identity of the Chorus as foreign women is a familiar motif to the external audience, who were watching a performance in a city where metics (μέτοικοι, foreign residents of Athens) comprised a large part of the population,[487] and

---

[486] Calame (2013): 40.
[487] There were around 28,500 metics in 431 B.C.E.; see Csapo and Slater (1994): 286.

also contributed financially to theatrical matters.[488]   The immediate

challenges facing the Chorus – sponsorship and assimilation – were probably

familiar concepts to the spectators, which included (for the larger festivals)

visitors from overseas as well as metics.[489] This metatheatricality allowed the

external audience and the internal characters to develop a connection arising

from familiarity on both actual and fictional levels. The internal characters

are simultaneously aware of the metatheatrical aspects of their performance

and the ramifications they communicated to the external audience.

The second form of identity is metatheatrical in the sense that the external

audience recognises that the heroic world reflects their own contemporary

lives even though it is spatially remote. For Calame, the chorus mediates with

the external audience socially (via their physical placement in the *orchestra*),

spatially (the mask represents the link between the heroic past and the

contemporary present) and religiously (the theatre space is a physical link

with Dionysus, and the performance is in his honour).[490] To take this analogy

further, the temporal distance of the stage also allows a temporal mediation –

the action of the play draws in the external audience for the duration of the

performance and creates a new temporal dimension, where the external

audience become spectators in a heroic landscape where mythical stories

---

[488] See Wilson (2000): 265-6 and Roselli (2011): 119-26. There is epigraphical evidence
that a metic served as *choregos* but, as Csapo and Slater note, this may have been
exceptional, Csapo and Slater (1994): 122; *IG* II² 1186, p. 129. The *scholion* to
Aristophanes' *Plutus* (Πλοῦτος, 388 B.C.E.) 954 suggests that metics were allowed to
participate as *choregoi* in the Lenaea; see Csapo and Slater (1994): 135.
[489] See Griffin (1998); Rhodes (2003); Wilson (2008a); Roselli (2011).
[490] Calame (2013): 35-6.

temporarily become reality, and the actuality of the Athenian landscape and the Athenian population demography become secondary to this.

The heroic/mythological genealogies, familiar to the external audience through the medium of Epic poetry, locate the temporal space for the audience, as noted by Easterling.[491]   They also allow the poet to pick and choose the emphases to fit his stories, memorably described by Easterling as 'heroic vagueness'.[492]   Certain ambiguities in *Suppliants*, in particular the reasons for Danaus' attitude towards the marriage of his daughters, can be attributed to 'heroic vagueness'.[493]   Attempts to analyse the various explanations for Danaus' attitude are difficult without the remaining two plays of the trilogy.[494] Whilst the external audience may have known a given mythological story, they would not necessarily have known how it was going to be presented by the poet until the play was first produced. Rather than considering this a stumbling block in understanding the play, it could instead be an opportunity for the external spectator to come to their own conclusions about Danaus' motivations, the 'heroic vagueness' allowing multiple explanations that in turn facilitates the construction of the temporal bridge between the heroic and the real.   Such a process demonstrates the transformative power of ancient theatre, where the life of the performance

---

[491] Easterling (1997a): 21-2.
[492] Easterling (1997a): 25.
[493] Allan and Kelly (2013): 99-100 see tragedy as a process of 'progress and affirmation': the external audience view events on stage as a period of 'positive change' between the heroic time of the world on stage and their own time. They argue that this therefore replaces Easterling's 'heroic vagueness' with 'heroic difference' as the 'predicated gap between the two worlds remains in effect at all times'.
[494] As noted by Papadopoulou (2011): 56-63.

supersedes, for a time, the realities of ancient life. As the interlocutor between the wider internal and external audiences, the function of the chorus is to facilitate the transformation, to enable it, and to sustain it for the allotted time of the performance. The chorus also links with the internal audience in a more subtle but direct way, so in turn their interactions with other characters influence the external audience to see certain perspectives. The next section will examine this in more detail.

Message Enabling

Although the Chorus are not messenger figures, they nevertheless deliver a significant amount of information to both the internal and external audiences in terms of both the narrative and identity. In the *parodos*, they discuss their native home, the details behind their arrival in Argos and, crucially, their connection to it. The Chorus' affinity for Argos is activated by their desire to break away from arranged marriages, although they are ultimately forced to succumb to their cousins later in the myth. The abundance of information provides a detailed template on which to base the characterisation of the Chorus. Introducing such a wealth of information early on allows Aeschylus to focus on the primary aspects of the story featured in this play: their pursuit by Egyptians and acceptance in Argos. Whilst their conflict and flight from Egypt would have proved an equally compelling plot, Aeschylus has chosen to focus on their point of entry to Argos. This diverts the focus from Egypt to Argos; the Danaids do bring the history of their problems with them but it is not what drives the plot forward.

The plot is concerned with the role of Argos in the Danaid mythology, a prominence which fits with the *parodos* theme.   Their story is enacted upon Argive soil and the Chorus' salvation relies upon Argive acceptance of their cause, decided upon by an Argive collective (δήμου κρατοῦσα χεὶρ, 604). The Chorus are twice removed from the 'norm', being both female and foreign (ξένος, 195, 202), but are the primary motivators of the narrative. Their cultural distance from the internal audience allows the more extreme aspects of their behaviour, such as their threat to commit suicide if they are refused sanctuary (154-61, 465), to appear more credible to the external audience.

In key exchanges with Pelasgus and Danaus the Chorus are the instigators for action. They introduce Danaus to Pelasgus (490-9), they induce Pelasgus to appeal on their behalf to the Argive people and they create the situations that will achieve their aims.[495]   Everything that the Chorus do is focused on manipulating the Argives into providing sanctuary.   Because Danaus is identified by and through the Chorus,[496] his identity is bound in the mind of the internal audience – the Argives – as a supporter (as opposed to a figure of authority).   Danaus tends to take instruction (480-5, 519, 968-71) and although the Chorus refer to his efforts in bringing them to Argos (11, 176-7, 204-6) and he does instruct them in terms of religious observance and moderate behaviour,[497] he does not directly assert authority over his

---

[495] Lines 348-53, 359-64, 370-5, 381-6.
[496] Lines 11, 177, 319, 480, 969.
[497] Lines 178-203, 212-33, 764-75, 980-1013.

daughters' actions or question their attitudes at any point. Branding his identity in this way once again asserts the power of the Chorus. It also ensures that Pelasgus continues discussions with the Chorus rather than Danaus.

Only when Pelasgus orders Danaus to take boughs to the city altars (480-5) does the latter speak to acknowledge Pelasgus as his daughters' sponsor (πρόξενον, 491) and to request an escort, to which Pelasgus agrees (500). The news that the Chorus deliver to Pelasgus is carefully framed so that they remain the focal point throughout their exchanges with both Danaus and Pelasgus, which enables them to dominate the activity of the play, both in terms of what they do themselves and what they induce others to do for them. The Chorus exploit Pelasgus' wariness of making any decision on his own (368-9, 398-9). If the Argives fail to help the Danaids, they frame the result within the context of dishonour and pollution (366, 473). By threatening to commit suicide (ἐκ τῶνδ᾿ ὅπως τάχιστ᾿ ἀπάγξασθαι θεῶν, 465), the Chorus remove choice from Pelasgus' deliberations, asserting authority over him and therefore the Argive citizens. The perspective of Pelasgus is replaced with that of the Danaids and it is this perspective that informs his appeal to his citizens. This has the effect of highlighting a particular element of the Chorus' nature – their willingness to take the worst kind of action, which audience members who may have been familiar with the myth might recognise as relating to the later murder of the Aegyptidae.

For the external audience, the exchange between Pelasgus and the Chorus is imbued with tension relating to conflicts between male/female,

native/foreigner, authority/inferiority, Athens/Argos,[498] played out within a heroic setting but with recognisable contemporary resonances.[499] The struggle of Pelasgus is recognisable to the external audience. The fear of inviting war would be a reasonable excuse for hesitation in a society that lived with recurring warfare.[500]

The role of Zeus, and the Chorus' connection to him, is emphasised and is used by the Chorus to manipulate events to their design. The first choral ode (524-99) is entirely in his honour and he features heavily in the second (625-709). The Chorus emphasise that they are descended from Zeus as well as Io (τίν᾽ ἂν θεῶν ἐνδικωτέροισιν κεκλοίμαν εὐλόγως ἐπ᾽ ἔργοις; 590-1). They acknowledge that his role as god of suppliants is the reason for their success.[501]

The repetition featured in the choral odes is to remind the gods (and the internal and external audiences) of the Danaids' links to Zeus now that they have moved away from the altars (508-10) and guarantees that their core message remains uppermost in the minds of both audiences. When Danaus

---

[498] Mitchell provides a summary of Athenian-Argive relations during the fifth century B.C.E. Mitchell (2006): 220-3.
[499] During the fifth century B.C.E. Argos was a neutral state periodically at war with Sparta, allied with Athens in 461, 420 and 395 B.C.E. Tomlinson (1972): 91.
[500] Sage (1996): xi suggests that Athens was at war at least two years out of every three during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E. and that most other major states were most likely engaged in recurring conflict. However, van Wees (2004): 4 notes a caveat: 'a myth which must be dispelled at once is the notion, long held by the majority of classical scholars, that the Greeks saw war as the *normal* relation between states and peace as a temporary aberration'.
[501] Lines 1, 192, 347, 360, 385, 478, 616, 641.

brings the news that the Argives have agreed to protect them (605-24), ratified by Zeus himself (Ζεὺς δ᾽ ἐπέκρανεν τέλος, 624), the idea of the Danaids' connection to Zeus is still fresh in the minds of the external audience. As descendants of the god, the Danaids' protection confers an expectation that Zeus will extend protection to the Argives as allies.

This scene is countered dramatically with visual evidence with Danaus' announcement that he can see a fleet of ships (τἄλλα πλοῖα, 721) approaching the coastline (713-23). This section marks a turn in the focus of the play: the Egyptians have caught up with the Danaids. This shifts the perspective from one of observation and debate to one of action and conflict. The war that Pelasgus feared has come to Argos. The exchange between Danaus and his daughters reveals the fragility of their situation and leads them to question the wisdom of their flight (πολυδρόμου φυγᾶς ὄφελος εἴ τί μοι; 737) but Danaus reminds them (and both internal and external audiences) that the Argives voted to protect them (739-40).

After Danaus' news that the Egyptians have tracked them down, the Chorus' final ode (776-823) finds them praying for suicide rather than threatening it (786-90). The effect of Danaus' news provokes a complete reversal of confidence in the Chorus which enhances the effects of their confrontation with the Egyptian chorus (836-71). The text for this section of the play is badly damaged,[502] but enough survives to reveal a portrayal of aggressive and

---

[502] See p. 165 above.

barbarous men, chasing and pushing the Chorus around. Bowen has noted that the Egyptians' initial 'ŏ, ŏ, ŏ, ă, ă, ă' (825) 'at once give a sub-human character to the new arrivals',[503] whilst Sommerstein suggests they were given 'broken Greek' to sing,[504] all presumably to enhance their foreignness.[505] Their behaviour also fits with the attitude and the portrayal by the Chorus up to this point. Their portrayal, the Chorus' primary message to the Argives, has been systematically embedded within the thematic construction of the play. Both internal and external audiences have been primed to receive a negative portrayal of Egyptians (as a race and not just the ones pursuing them). It is irrelevant whether they are speaking in broken Greek or even gibberish; the function of their appearance is to support the Chorus' portrayal of them and authenticate the narrative given to the Argives. The Chorus' behaviour is validated when the Egyptians are revealed to match the portrayal of them given by the Chorus. It returns the spectator to the scene where they threaten Pelasgus with suicide and enables the spectator to experience an understanding of their perspective.

While the Argive people have a significant role, they have no on-stage voice until the end of the play (as the Argive chorus, 1034-61). It is only because of the Argives' assent that Danaus and his daughters are allowed to stay and they are omnipresent throughout as the deciders of the Danaids' fate.[506]

---

[503] Bowen (2013): 314 n. 825.
[504] Sommerstein (2008a): 397 n. 166.
[505] 'All those [outside Greece] who did not speak Greek were dismissed as "jabberers" (the literal meaning of *barbaroi*, "barbarians").' van Wees (2004): 7.
[506] Lines 366-9, 398-401, 480-5, 500-3, 517-19, 600-1, 605-24, 943-4, 963-5, 1010.

Instead they occupy a temporally distanced plane which is bridged within the performance by the figure of Pelasgus. The Chorus' interactions with Pelasgus reveal the tension they feel, arising from the necessity of persuading Pelasgus of their cause and ensuring that he departs with the correct messages to the Argive people so that they will offer protection. The Chorus designs the message that Pelasgus will take. Their pivotal scene with him (234-523) ensures that he is sufficiently disturbed by their various threats and warnings so that he will take the right message to the Argives: their threat of suicide (ἐκ τῶνδ᾽ ὅπως τάχιστ᾽ ἀπάγξασθαι θεῶν, 465) achieves their purpose (ἤκουσα μαστικτῆρα καρδίας λόγον, 466; κακῶν δὲ πλῆθος ποταμὸς ὣς ἐπέρχεται· ἄτης δ᾽ ἄβυσσον πέλαγος, 469-70). In this way the Chorus' influence enables the message to the Argives to be theirs, rather than that of Pelasgus.

The chorus of Argive soldiers (1034-61) provide a counterpoint to the happiness of Danaus upon being granted asylum (980-1033). They warn the Chorus not to forget the power of the gods and emphasise how Aphrodite, with the help of Persuasion (Πειθώ, 1040) and Desire (Πόθος, 1039), will create a union (Ἁρμονία, 1041) between men and women; they say the Chorus cannot avoid marriage (γάμων, 1050). This can be read as a foreshadowing of the deaths to come at the hands of the Chorus, made plain when the Argive chorus lament that the Egyptians were able to pursue the Danaids (1043-6).

The attitude now displayed by the Argive chorus reveals an underlying unease on the part of the Argives, surprising given that both Danaus and Pelasgus

stated that the citizens' decision to allow them to stay was unanimous.[507]

Bowen suggests that the Argive chorus do not immediately foresee Argive

marriages for the Chorus,[508] so the reference must therefore be to the future

of the Aegyptidae. An alternative interpretation could be that it is a

foreshadowing of the fate of the doomed Argive husbands of the Danaids: the

references to Aphrodite (Κύπρις, 1034), Desire (Πόθος, 1039) and Persuasion

(Πειθώ, 1040) are ominous in the context of the mythological narrative of the

murdering Danaids, ratifying the ruthlessness they portray in the *Suppliants*.

The Argive chorus' statement that fate is immutable (ὅ τί τοι μόρσιμόν ἐστιν,

1047) seems to seal this reading. Either interpretation suggests that the true,

hard-hearted nature of the Chorus has been recognised on some level. The

final line of the Argive chorus is a warning to the Chorus to moderate their

demands of the gods (τὰ θεῶν μηδὲν ἀγάζειν, 1061). As Bowen points out,

the Chorus has 'leant very heavily on their particular construction of Zeus'.[509]

Zeus' tangible presence throughout the play[510] serves as a constant reminder

of the Chorus' claimed descent from Io which underpins their demand for

protection.

For the external audience, the Argive chorus is a direct link to the part of the

Danaid myth that sees them murder their Argive husbands. It is a

---

[507] Danaus: ἔδοξεν Ἀργείοισιν οὐ διχορρόπως, 605; Pelasgus: τοία δὲ δημόπρακτος ἐκ πόλεως μία ψῆφος κέκρανται, 943-4.
[508] Bowen (2013): 354-5 n. 1043-4.
[509] Bowen (2013): 357 n. 1060-1.
[510] Named in the play at 1, 4, 6, 18, 26, 41, 45, 86, 87, 92, 139, 145, 162, 165, 168, 192, 206, 209, 212, 231, 295, 298, 300, 302, 313, 347, 360, 385, 403, 437, 478, 526, 536, 558, 580, 585, 588, 594, 599, 616, 624, 627, 631, 641, 646, 652, 672, 689, 780, 812, 815, 884, 892, 902, 1025, 1048, 1052, 1059, 1062.

foreshadowing that tints the ending of the play with a sense of death and the inescapability of fate: all may be well now, but it will not last. It also links thematically with the beginning of the play where the Chorus express desire for death at sea for their Egyptian pursuers.[511] The tension between the Danaids and the Argive chorus (1052-61) is representative of the tension that is to come from the arranged marriages to the Aegyptidae. Those murders all take place on Argive soil and the unease of the Argive chorus is recognition that agreeing to protect the Chorus is the start of a difficult time for the state. It is almost certain that Pelasgus dies in the coming conflict with the Egyptians which leaves the rule of Argos open to Danaus' claim, which then allows him to go on to marry his daughters to Argives.[512]

Spatialities and Temporalities

The Chorus of Danaids have physically removed themselves from their native homeland to seek sanctuary with those who descend from the same ancestor. The Chorus occupy three frames of spatiality within the play: (i) the Danaids as they were in Egypt, (ii) as asylum-seekers in Argos and (iii) their future inhabitation of Argos as accepted members of the city, upon which the plot of the play is predicated. These three frames overlap in the characterisation of the Chorus, and consequently reflect on events around them. In this way the Chorus has a focusing effect on temporal spatiality. Their narrative shifts between these spatial planes, providing depth to their story.

---

[511] Lines 33-9, also 529-30, 842-6.
[512] The prophecy of the Danaids' murdering the sons of Aegyptus is recounted to Io by Prometheus in the *Prometheus Bound* (853-73).

The emphasis around the Danaids throughout the play is one of foreignness. The physical space of the theatre represents a platform on to which other spatialities are projected. The intense nature of the presence of Danaus and his daughters overlays a spatial 'otherness', which is expressed through the delivery of news and messages within the context of foreign identity. Despite the Chorus' repeated insistence that they are Argive by blood they cannot escape their foreign appearance,[513] which is probably enhanced by their clothing.[514] Lynette G. Mitchell suggests 'the juxtaposition of the physical appearance of these figures with their Greek ancestry is striking (given immediacy through the presence of Pelasgus) and ultimately shocking'.[515] This 'shock' derives from the physical appearance of the Chorus coupled with their controlling behaviour towards the Argives.

Io is ever-present and her story represents not just the connection with the Chorus but also their journey to Argos.[516] Io travelled from Argos to Egypt; now the Danaids travel from Egypt to Argos and the Chorus implies that their proposed fate is equal to that suffered by Io until she was restored by Zeus. This shows how the combination of information and situating the external audience can sometimes point to analogies. The Chorus brings Egypt with them: they are defined and identified through their Egyptian identities. The news they bring to the Argives – that they have left Egypt and arranged

---

[513] Νειλοθερῆ παρειὰν (71); μελανθὲς ἡλιόκτυπον γένος (154-5) and also 234-6, 279-80, 496, 627, 719-20.
[514] Νειλοθερῆ παρειὰν (71); πέπλοισι βαρβάροισι (235).
[515] Mitchell (2006): 206.
[516] Lines 16-17, 29, 41, 44, 141, 162, 170, 275, 292, 299, 300, 535, 540, 573, 1064.

marriages and that they claim Argive citizenship by virtue of their ancestry –
is repeatedly reinforced within the context of their identity as suppliants.

As asylum-seekers, the Chorus are nominally in a weak position, suppliants
requesting help from an unknown people. The Argives are of course
foreigners to the Chorus but the Chorus are careful never to refer to this.
Instead, the Chorus rely on what Jon Hesk describes as 'zooming devices'.[517]
These are key words which are used to build connections with the internal
audience and which will directly relate to the vocabulary of the external
audience. As has already been noted, Zeus is named frequently throughout
the play.[518] The Chorus invoke him far more than any other character.[519]
They describe him as god of suppliants (Κλάριος, ἱκέτας; 1, 360, 385, 641),
as Father (πατήρ, 139), as Toucher (ἐφάπτωρ, on the birth of Epaphus, 313),
as Saviour (σωτὴρ, 26) and as the god of strangers (ξένιος, 627, 672). The
frequent reference to the most senior of gods is a mechanism for reminding
the internal audience of the validity of the Danaids' claim, reinforcing their
connection to Io. This is further supported by the repeated use of the word
γένος,[520] a word with meanings of direct descent and hereditary relationships.

---

[517] Hesk (2007): 74.
[518] See p. 183 above.
[519] Lines 1, 4, 6, 18, 26, 41, 45, 86, 87, 92, 139, 145, 162, 165, 168, 206, 209, 295, 313, 360, 385, 403, 437, 526, 536, 558, 580, 585, 588, 594, 599, 627, 631, 641, 646, 652, 672, 689, 780, 812, 815, 884, 892, 902, 1052, 1062.
[520] Lines 77, 154, 176, 323, 531, 582.

This is reflected in Pelasgus' comment on the rights of the Danaids to Argive land (δοκεῖτε δή μοι τῆσδε κοινωνεῖν χθονὸς τἀρχαῖον, 325). This is a key statement coming from the ruler of Argos, an acknowledgement that the genealogical claim of the Chorus is valid and recognised. Here Pelasgus is acknowledging the Chorus' ancestral rights. Their connection with Io is genetic, familial, and, unlike the Argives', is more personal for them. This deeper connection between Io and the Chorus is what John Gould describes as 'depth of the past'.[521] Io is not part of mythology for the Chorus, but is instead part of their family and therefore the collective social memory of their familial group. The Argives see Io only as an Argive girl who was pursued by the gods and forced to leave their land; for the Argives, Io's transformation into a mythological character has already begun. The Chorus are actively contributing to the formation of the mythological strand which started with Io, a process that will be recognised by the external audience but not themselves or the Argives. The subliminal message behind this for the external audience is that the roots of mythological stories are based in reality; the external audience are reminded that myths are derived from human experience. This process, part of what Gould describes as 'the "rationality" of myth',[522] contributes to the formation of shared experience which is seeded within the construction of collective memory.

---

[521] Gould (1999): 109.
[522] Gould (1999): 114.

When Pelasgus' support for the Chorus appears to waiver in favour of the will of the Argive council, the Chorus state emphatically 'you are the city, you are the people' (σύ τοι πόλις, σὺ δὲ τὸ δάμιον, 370). They recognise that they must win Pelasgus over in order that he can address the assembly on their behalf; for the internal audience, this is important, for themselves and for the wider Argive assembly. They recognise that Pelasgus has influence and that the collective city exerts reciprocal influence on him. The external audience would also recognise Pelasgus as the theatrical representative of the Argive people and understand that collective agreement must be sought.   The connection between Pelasgus and his people is enhanced by the use of another key 'zooming' word used by the Chorus.   Ψῆφος (640, 644) refers to a democratic system of voting which would have been recognisable to the external audience, within both dramatic and civic contexts.   The Chorus describe the actions of the Argives in a very humanistic way. The Argives passed 'a kind vote' (ψῆφον δ' εὔφρον', 640) to allow them to stay. The vote was to protect women against men (οὐδὲ μετ᾽ ἀρσένων ψῆφον ἔθεντ᾽ ἀτιμώσαντες ἔριν γυναικῶν, 643-5). This is conferring approval upon the Argives and for the internal audience, acknowledging the Argives' altruism in allowing them to stay.

In terms of the internal and external audiences, the Chorus occupy a space 'in between'.   For the internal audience, the Chorus' status as suppliants automatically elevates them above the norm; unless they wish to risk divine wrath the Argives are morally-bound to honour their supplication (438-54). From this perspective the Chorus represent a liminality between their own

Egyptian society and that of the Argives. This in turn allows the external audience to experience the liminal shift from their own perspective as a dominant *polis*.[523] Liminality is the state experienced by someone passing through the stages of a ritual, represented by their adoption of new ways of doing things. The Chorus are multi-liminal and can therefore influence the perspective of their audiences. As they transition between Egypt and Argos, between foreign outsider and metic, the Chorus represent the evolution of their mythological story which began with Io.

The chorus occupied the space between performer and spectator. The fact that messages could be conveyed inward (to the internal audience) and outward (to the external spectators) placed the chorus in a unique position of being able to influence the perception of two audiences. Stephen Mulhall, describing the Chorus as 'Janus-faced' to represent this duality,[524] suggests that their physical placement in the *orchestra* allows them to simultaneously be part of the performance and also part of the physical theatre in which the spectators sat,[525] thus bridging the spatial gap between performance and reality. Mulhall says the *orchestra* was an extension of the seating area of the theatre and that this was how the Chorus was able to bring the external audience into the action of the performance.[526] I suggest that the *orchestra*

---

[523] See Fischer-Lichte (2014) for a discussion on the application of liminality to tragedy.

[524] Janus was the Roman god of the new year, and gates and entrances and had two faces to enable him to simultaneously look forwards and backwards, Ov. *Met*. 14.320; Virg. *Aen*. 7.170.

[525] Mulhall (2013): 248.

[526] '… its distinctive theatrical space makes it the innermost of the concentric circles of terraces on which those spectators sat (taking in both the drama as a whole and the cultural world of which it was the expression), inviting them not only to view but to identify with

was in fact emblematic of the entire physical space of the theatre, a smaller-scale repetition or distillation of the space that embodied every spatial plane of the performance. The playing space and the spectator space converged on the *orchestra* and it was through this convergence that the power of the chorus was fully realised. The nature of the space conditioned how theatrical characters and spectators responded to events enacted within it; as Blanshard has noted, the ritualisation of space also conditions a response.[527] News and messages delivered through the *orchestra* carry the weight of this power.

The chorus is a reassuring presence for the external audience because they cannot and do not leave the *orchestra* for the duration of the performance. This is Simon Goldhill's rooted chorus,[528] an anchor of safety which is constant during sometimes traumatic activity. In the case of *Suppliants*, the reasoning for the ratification of the Chorus' claim for Argive protection, delivered through the mechanism of choral odes (524-99, 625-709), is a potentially disruptive and powerful turning point for ancient Argive history, should it be accepted. Agreeing to protect the Chorus will have long-reaching ramifications for Argive rule, culture and society, an unsettling possibility for the internal Argive audience. I suggest that the Chorus are the physical embodiment of a spatial connection with Argos that stretches across the

---

the chorus, and thereby to overcome their metaphysical distance from the drama in which that chorus is involved. The chorus' function as participant observers thus allows the audience to experience the drama as if they too were participants in it.', Mulhall (2013): 248.

[527] Blanshard (2014): 254-6.

[528] Goldhill (1996): 246; discussed below, p. 334.

Mediterranean Sea to Egypt, a connection forged in myth and transformed into reality by their arrival on Argive land. When the Chorus repeatedly refer to their ancestral links with Io, they are reducing the horizon of their Egyptian heritage and rebuilding it with an Argive identity.

It should be remembered that the internal Argive audience is in a state of uncertainty for most of the time. They find strangers on their land, are confronted with their claims of rights to Argive protection and soon after that are required to deal with hostile Egyptians who have followed the Chorus to Argos. Even once the Danaids are accepted, the wariness of the Argive chorus (1034-61) is a clear indication of underlying tension. They had no prior warning of this, no means for preparation or planning on how to deal with a situation which cannot simply be rejected as a matter of course. The presence of the Chorus and Danaus, even before the Herald and Egyptians arrive, is therefore deeply worrying and disturbs the equilibrium of the internal audience.

The positioning of the Chorus, both physically and metaphorically,[529] therefore provides a measure of security for them; the Chorus' activities are limited to the *orchestra* which represents both the sacred shrine[530] and a meadow (ἄλσος, 508), so in a very simplistic sense, the internal audience always know where they are, from which they can derive some form of

---

[529] As discussed above, information and audience situation can result in symmetries between mythological stories, tropes, etc. See discussion on pp. 174 ff.
[530] Lines 190-5, 222-42, 333-4, 345, 355, 423-4.

comfort. The *orchestra* positioning allows the internal audience to feel like they have some control over events. As Easterling has noted, the presentation of Argos in *Suppliants* is primarily through *location* – Argos is identified by its shrines and altars,[531] which communicates a sense of civic belonging and identification.

By granting protection to Danaus and his daughters, the Argive citizens begin the construction of the next stage of the Danaid story. Throughout the course of the play, the Chorus shifts between temporal and spatial layers of belonging. They have fled their homeland and claimed succour in their ancestral home of Argos. Next, their supplication of the gods binds them to the Hellenic theistic system, which the Argives are forced to accept.

Finally, the eventual Argive grant of asylum admits the Chorus into the civic construct of Argos. According to mythological narratives, the Danaids are compelled to marry their cousins the Aegyptiads, kill them, then go on to marry Argives. This is the final stage of belonging that the Danaids must pass through to complete their journey from Libya to Argos. For the final part of their quest to be completed, the different stages of activity in the play must take place. Until the Chorus have been formally accepted by the Argive people, they are in racial limbo, neither Libyan nor Argive. This state of limbo allows them to pass through identities to suit the purposes of the story: outsiders + foreigners = suppliants = metics = future carriers of Argive

---

[531] Easterling (1997a): 32.

progeny. For the internal audience this process will have a direct effect upon their lives and therefore includes an emotional burden. There is no way for this process to be completed without changes to their lives, families, social and civic groupings and the consequent impacts upon Argive society as a whole. These are consequences the external audience would immediately recognise and understand. The mutability of life in ancient Greece affected everyone. The establishment of Athenian democracy at the time of the production was relatively recent and each *polis* operated independently. Alliances and trade relationships were not fixed or immune from political and civic upheavals and the external audience would have instinctively recognised the challenges that the presence of the Danaids would bring.[532] Wiles has noted that 'the rites of Dionysus were not something that the citizen could sit back and decode; the Theatre of Dionysus was part of what made him what he was: an Athenian',[533] and all sections of the audience would have recognised the various dangers posed by the Chorus and the fragility of balance in the world they occupied.

Conclusion

In *Persians* the chorus are trusted male advisers to Xerxes; they have the authority of age and a connection to Darius in their favour and are

---

[532] Gottesman (2014): 88 believes that 'Aeschylus presents that process [the Danaids' supplication] as marred by a theatricality that implicitly undermines the city's political institutions'. He understands the manipulations of the Chorus as publicity stunts that persuade the citizens to vote for their protection, thereby influencing them (the Argives) to 'a bad decision' (91). He suggests that 'Aeschylus is … expressing a concern that supplication might undermine the work of the deliberative institutions' (94), weakening the institutions of democratic power.
[533] Wiles (1997): 21.

appropriately respectful towards other characters. In *Seven against Thebes*, the chorus of female citizens have no direct power over Eteocles but are capable of influencing others through fear. In *Suppliants*, I have demonstrated that the chorus drive the progression of the plot towards an outcome of their own design. The Danaid Chorus actively route news and messages both internally and externally. Their double outsider status,[534] rather than hindering them, is used to leverage influence over other characters. Indeed, the behaviour of the chorus in this play has demonstrated how authority can be manipulated by characters that may be seen as lesser, or 'other'. They were sufficiently bold to issue threats to Pelasgus. The act of the altar supplications supplanted Danaus' authority and responsibility for his daughters shifted to the gods upon whose altars they sought refuge. This is an example of the Danaids' ability to make their environment subservient to their needs, and that, despite being foreigners in Argos, they manage to recognise and seize what power is available to them.   This is highlighted in their interactions with their father, to whom they are respectful and obedient.

Curiously, although head of his household and therefore responsible for his daughters, Danaus does not participate in their conversation with Pelasgus (234-489) until the end of the latter's scene. Similarly, once their aim has been achieved, the Chorus bestow blessings on the Argives (625-709) but by withholding them until after they have been granted asylum, rather than using them as a bargaining tool, the Chorus reveal how they manipulate different

---

[534] As both foreigners and women; see p. 149.

circumstances. Their words foreshadow the coming conflict arising from their presence when they pray for the continuation of new guardians (τίκτεσθαι δ᾽ ἐφόρους γᾶς ἄλλους εὐχόμεθ᾽ ἀεί, 674-5). Ultimately, the external audience know they will be responsible for establishing familial lines in the region through their subsequent marriages to Argives.

By making the Danaids the chorus, with their demands and threats ultimately achieving their acceptance by the Argives, Aeschylus has switched the balance of power from the protagonist to the chorus. It may be that this development would induce shock in the external audience.[535] That a group of foreigners could bring so much danger to a *polis* and yet be rewarded for it (by being granted asylum) may have been an unsettling thought to experience. The Argives, however, show themselves to be willing to offer protection with honour to those who seek it. Pelasgus' obedience to the democratic framework in which the *polis* assembly is situated would also offer a pleasing reflection to the external audience of their own democratic civic system.

The Chorus' contribution to message enabling forms a major part of their influence over other characters. Danaus becomes their conduit for liaising directly with the wider Argive *polis*. The suicide threat by the Chorus is followed by Pelasgus sending Danaus to the city to make offerings at the altars (480-5). In addition, the Chorus have made Pelasgus process their

---

[535] See reference to comment by Bowen (2013): 358 n. 1062-73 on p. 168 above.

intentions in a way which allows him to save face before the assembly. Rather than acting on behalf of women (ἄνδρας γυναικῶν οὕνεχ᾽ αἱμάξαι πέδον, 477) he is instead acting in response to the behaviour of men (καὶ γὰρ τάχ᾽ ἄν τις οἰκτίσας ἰδὼν τάδε ὕβριν, 486-7). When Pelasgus confronts the Herald (911-51), his responses are primed by his encounters with the Chorus. The Herald does not know how foreigners should behave (ξένος μὲν εἶναι πρῶτον οὐκ ἐπίστασαι, 917) and he does not have a sponsor (ποίοισιν εἰπὼν προξένοις ἐγχωρίοις; 919). Pelasgus informs the Herald that, like the Chorus, he is subject to the democratic *polis* (τοία δὲ δημόπρακτος ἐκ πόλεως μία ψῆφος κέκρανται, 943-4). Pelasgus' discussions with the Chorus reinforce his dependency upon Argive custom and civic order, which gives him the strength to summarily repel the Egyptians from Argos (κομίζου δ᾽ ὡς τάχιστ᾽ ἐξ ὀμμάτων, 949).

When the Chorus finally deal directly with representatives of the Argives (1034-61), the encounter is coloured by the behaviour of the Chorus earlier in the play. The Argives fear the return of the Egyptians (φυγάδεσσιν δ᾽ ἐπιπνοίας κακά τ᾽ ἄλγη πολέμους θ᾽ αἱματόεντας προφοβοῦμαι, 1043-4) and the external audience know that the Chorus are willing to sacrifice Argive men for their own protection. The messages and news conveyed by the Chorus show the Argives that the Egyptians will be a formidable force. The Argives' word of caution to the Chorus (μέτριον νῦν ἔπος εὔχου, 1059) presages future bloodshed.

In terms of situating the audience in the mythological narrative, the Chorus have provided an abundance of information to enable the external audience to follow a linear but complex narrative. In the *parodos* they provide an extensive introduction – that they have fled their Nile home (1-5); that they are refugees acting under their own cognisance (6-8) running from forced marriage with their cousins (9-10); that they are helped by their father Danaus (11-13); that they have ancestral links to Argos through the line of Io (15-18, 41-56, 170-4); that they are offering themselves as suppliants (19-22) and that they are observant of the gods (24-9, 40-1); that the sons of Aegyptus are arrogant (30), and that they should be rejected into the sea (33). This information should be sufficient to introduce the narrative, but the Chorus repeatedly emphasise certain points.

References to their connection to Io, and through her to Zeus, are scattered repeatedly throughout their narrative. This has the effect of rationalising the more extreme aspects of their behaviour to the Argives and keeps it uppermost in the latter's minds as their claim for sanctuary rests on this specific point. Their abhorrence towards marriage with their cousins is also frequently raised, both in terms of the Aegyptidae's aggressive ethnicity as well as the concept of marriage for its own sake. This situates their story as being early on in their mythological narrative. This is why the discussions around the content and order of the remaining two plays in the trilogy provoke so much debate.

Placing the narrative at an early stage in the Chorus' mythological narrative opens up questions about how the poet is going to utilise the different mythological strands. In *Suppliants*, the news that the Chorus bring with them defines the response of Pelasgus (and by extension, the wider Argive *polis*). The messages that they give to him informs his understanding of what actions he should take and the 'right' thing to do. The placement of the trilogy in the mythological narrative will affect the dramatic narrative's linear progression, either following a common variant of the myth or branching out into changing scenarios; message enabling directly contributes to this development. Message enabling is more than just the delivery of news and messages; it influences the actions that other characters take and in this way drives the dramatic development of the play.

Chapter 4
Dramatic Strategies and the Expectation of News: *Prometheus Bound*

Introduction

In the previous chapter, we saw how the asylum-seeking Danaids were accepted in their new home in Argos. As outsiders, the Danaids were dependent on the decision of the Argives, although their manipulation of circumstances afforded them some power in influencing that decision. The Danaids' ancestor Io features prominently in the subject of the present chapter, the extraordinary *Prometheus Bound* (*Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης*).[536]

The play is distinctive for the sheer variety of types of messenger figures. Prometheus is the conduit through which all other characters are motivated and directed and as such he may be viewed as the primary messenger figure. His paradoxical status is crucial to the dynamics of both internal and external audiences. There are other messenger-type figures in the play – Oceanos, who fulfils the first function of a messenger (to set out the details of a situation); Hermes, who achieves part of a traditional messenger role (the message from Zeus); the Chorus, who prompt, explain and progress the narrative and Io, a very different type of messenger figure, whose messages are bound with her future and that of her descendants.

---

[536] Although authorship of the play is disputed (see discussion below) references to the extant plays by Aeschylus will occur in the analysis by way of suggesting interesting comparative aspects with the work known to be by him.

The Authorship Debate

The authorship of the *Prometheus Bound* has been in dispute since 1856,[537] with some scholars believing the play may have been written by Aeschylus' son Euphorion,[538] or his nephew Philocles.[539] It is also possible that Euphorion or Philocles completed an unfinished version of the play after Aeschylus' death. The language, style and technical construction of the text is considerably different from the other extant plays.[540] There is substantial linguistic evidence that suggests differences between the play and Aeschylus' extant canon.[541] The question divides scholarship[542] but significantly there is

---

[537] Sommerstein (2010): 228.

[538] The *Suda* ε3800 confirms that Euphorion produced his father's work on four occasions (ὃς καὶ τοῖς Αἰσχύλου τοῦ πατρός, οἷς μήπω ἦν ἐπιδειξάμενος, τετράκις ἐνίκησεν).

[539] Ruffell (2012): 17, Sommerstein (2010), West (1979) and Griffith (1977) discuss the debate on authorship. Ruffell (2012): 13-19 surveys the evidence for and against Aeschylean authorship without declaring favour for either side. Sommerstein (2010): 228-32 concludes that 'what the evidence regarding date does strongly suggest is that the Prometheus plays are very unlikely to have been *produced* by Aeschylus in his lifetime: whether or not they were wholly or partly written by him, they were almost certainly presented to the public by someone else', [Sommerstein's italics]. Griffith (1977): 254 presents a sustained argument against Aeschylean authorship, deciding that Aeschylus' son Euphorion and nephew Philocles were the most likely candidates for authorship of the play which 'might help explain the mistaken attribution' to Aeschylus. He goes on to say that 'nor can we rule out the possibility of multiple authorship, with Euphorion or another member of the family completing a tragedy or trilogy begun by Aeschylus, for production after his death, perhaps even in his name'. West (1979): 131 emphatically rejects Aeschylean authorship: 'the evidence against the Aeschylean authorship of the Prometheus is now overwhelming'.

[540] Sommerstein (2010): 228-32 discusses these in detail.

[541] See Podlecki (2005): 195-200 for a thorough overview of the linguistic evidence and for a deeper analysis Griffith (1977): passim.

[542] An issue described as 'a notoriously dangerous and emotional set of problems' by Taplin (1975): 186. Although Taplin does not state his own opinion on the authenticity of the play directly in this article, he does indicate that generally he believes Aeschylus not to be the author in a later work: '… I had better make clear at the outset my position on the notoriously emotional controversy over authenticity. I do not believe that the play we have is the work of Aeschylus', Taplin (1977): 240; see also *Appendix D* (466-9) where he provides a systematic analysis of issues pertaining to the authenticity debate. Lloyd-Jones (2003) summarises the history of academic dissent on this subject but declines to state outright his own opinion, merely stating that 'certainly we ought to regard the authenticity of the play with caution' (55), later qualifying that statement with 'although I think it likelier that he was [the author]', (70).

no evidence in antiquity suggesting the play was *not* by Aeschylus.[543] The play's particular use of mythology suggests a fit with the Aeschylean oeuvre;[544] the plays by Aeschylus deal with both what might be termed standard mythology but also many key plot points centre on long-established mythological traditions, a second step from the temporal distance between the portrayed mythologies witnessed by the external audience. In *Suppliants*, the Danaids' claims are based on their descendance from Io, five generations past and herself only two generations from Gaia and Uranus. The *Seven against Thebes* is explicitly linked with Cadmus, five generations back from the sons of Oedipus. The *Oresteia* features the ancient chthonic Erinyes; even the historically-based *Persians* looks far back to the origins of the Persian line.[545] The mythology is double-stepped away from the external audience: the 'standard' mythology is supported by the pre-Olympian mythology on which it is based, the story behind the story. This is a particular feature of Aeschylus' use of mythology in his plays and is similar to the thematic construction of the *Prometheus Bound*.

The plot of the *Prometheus Bound* is created from and sustained by multiple instances of news and information sharing. There are many similarities of form and structure that suggest a strong link with the plays known to be by

---

[543] Ancient scholars did doubt authorship of tragedies and comedies. See Lloyd-Jones (2003): 54; Sommerstein (2008a): 228, 432-3; Sommerstein (2010): 228, 231; Hanink and Uhlig (2016): 67. For example, it was doubted if Aeschylus was the author of the lost *Women* of *Aetna* (Αἰτναῖαι): Liapis (2009): 84-5; Sommerstein (2010): 231; Ruffell (2012): 14.

[544] See mythological analysis below, pp. 206 ff.

[545] Darius recounts the history of his line as beginning when Zeus bestowed honour on Susa: ἐξ οὗτε τιμὴν Ζεὺς ἄναξ τήνδ᾽ ὤπασεν (*Pers*. 759-86).

Aeschylus. For example, the effective use of silence in the play is reminiscent of that used in the *Oresteia* and the prevalence of foreshadowing recalls the intensity the same mechanism brings to the *Seven against Thebes*.[546] Nevertheless, including the play in the thesis is not intended to indicate any kind of confirmation that Aeschylus is the author of the *Prometheus Bound*, but given its association with him, and the rationale provided by the analysis herein, it was decided that the play warrants inclusion in the thesis.[547]

Preliminary analysis of the text suggested several narrative similarities contiguous to the six extant tragedies known to be by Aeschylus, such as unusual messenger figures, ambivalent indications of future events (foreshadowing) and the use of mythology to situate the action for both internal and external audiences (although the latter element is a common feature in most extant tragedy). Several aspects of the play enhance its relevance to the thesis. Examples of this are the fact that the play is almost entirely message-driven and the methods of delivering news and messages to Prometheus.

The chapter will consider figures in the play that give and receive news and information and will focus on how a different expectation of news alters the reception of it. As with previous chapters, the present chapter will be organised to demonstrate the most prominent features of the play that are

---

[546] See chapter two, pp. 101 ff. and chapter five, pp. 259 ff. There is of course always the possibility of influence occurring between poets.
[547] See also discussion on p. 48 above on the rationale for inclusion.

relevant to the research questions. Arising from the analysis are occasions where the *Prometheus Bound* displays thematic similarities with Aeschylus' plays. This does not indicate a link between the plays or relate to the authorship debate but is a minor point of interest.

The Text of the Prometheus Bound

As discussed above, the *Prometheus Bound* was preserved in the Byzantine triad.[548] As Podlecki notes,[549] the title features in more manuscripts than any other of Aeschylus' canon.[550] There are three Prometheus plays named in Aeschylus' canon transmitted within the tenth century Mediceus Laurentianus manuscript: *Prometheus Bound* (*Προμηθεύς Δεσμώτης*), *Prometheus Unbound* (*Προμηθεύς Λυόμενος)* and *Prometheus Fire-bearer* (*Προμηθεύς Πυρφόρος*). A fourth Prometheus play, *Prometheus Fire-kindler* (*Προμηθεύς Πυρκαεύς*), was possibly the satyr play of the trilogy that included *Persians*,[551] where Prometheus delivers the gift of fire to satyrs. *Scholia* on the *Prometheus Bound* support the idea that the *Prometheus Unbound* was the second play of the trilogy,[552] although Taplin puts forward the theory that the *Prometheus Bound* was 'composed, or put together, after Aeschylus' death specifically to be a companion piece to *Prom Lyom*

---

[548] See p. 183.
[549] He also includes an overview of the manuscripts' provenance: Podlecki (2005): 69.
[550] The play is mentioned in 101 out of 143 manuscripts discussed by Smyth (1933): 34-5. More up-to-date analyses can be found in Dawe (1964), Radt (1971) and West (1990a).
[551] See p. 171.
[552] Ruffell (2012): 17 notes that *scholia* on *Prometheus Bound* 511 and 522 refer to *Prometheus Bound* as 'the next play' and that 'the most natural interpretation of this is that it refers to the trilogy sequence'; Sommerstein goes further when he says that this *scholia* means 'we know for certain that *Unbound* was its [the *Prometheus Bound*] direct sequel': Sommerstein (2010): 224-5.

[*Prometheus Unbound*]'.[553]   Sommerstein constructs a plausible outline of

the story for the *Prometheus Unbound*,[554] which featured Heracles killing the

eagle that tormented Prometheus (Hes. *Theog.* 520-30) and Prometheus

preventing Zeus from consorting with Thetis (whose son was destined to

grow mightier than his father, Pind. *Olym.* 8.30-45).[555]   Sommerstein

proposes that the play ends with Zeus granting Prometheus his freedom. He

suggests that the first two Prometheus plays actually formed a 'dilogy',[556]

with the third play, *Prometheus Fire-bearer*, being conflated in antiquity with

Prometheus Fire-kindler:[557] 'the reconciliation at the end of *Unbound* could

no more have been followed by a further sequel than could the reconciliation

at the end of *Eumenides*'.[558] Podlecki advances several different theories

about a possible trilogic structure finishing with the interesting theory that the

final play may have focused on Heracles' journey to immortality,[559] on the

basis that Prometheus and Zeus had resolved their differences by the end of

the second play.   Both sets of conjecture are suppositions on possible

narrative progression but Prometheus' mythology is so complex and

---

[553] Taplin (1977): 464.
[554] Sommerstein (2010): 224-8.
[555] See below, p. 207.
[556] A theory proposed by Focke (1930): 263-4. Sommerstein says 'it is almost certain that the other aspects of the final settlement [of the action of the *Prometheus Bound* and the conjectured plot of *Prometheus Unbound*], if included in the Prometheus play-sequence at all, also figured in that play [the *Prometheus Unbound*] and not in a third play to follow', Sommerstein (2010): 227.
[557] Podlecki also acknowledges this possibility, Podlecki (2005): 27. Taplin argues against making assumptions about the other plays based on the *Prometheus Bound* and notes that the presence of 'Prometheus' in the titles does not automatically indicate direct connections between plays, Taplin (1975): 184-6. Taplin supports the theory of Haigh (1896): 395-402 that the poets named their plays themselves. Gantz's research concludes that Aeschylus was probably disposed towards producing connected tetralogies but does not discount the dilogy theory, Gantz (1979): 302.
[558] Sommerstein (2010): 227.
[559] Podlecki (2005): 27-34.

intertwined with the narratives of other major mythological figures that it is difficult to suggest conclusions with any certainty. What can be in no doubt is the popularity of Prometheus in mythological narratives; whatever form was used for the second (and possibly third) play, the figure of Prometheus was the linchpin.

A definitive dating for the *Prometheus Bound* is impossible on present evidence. Griffith's metrical analysis suggests an early date due to the use of long *anceps* (syllables) towards the ends of lines;[560] Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Podlecki both suggest a late date for the play, placing it at the end of Aeschylus' life and possibly intended for production at Syracuse.[561] There is an argument for the play being produced after *Suppliants* in 464/3 B.C.E. as the *Prometheus Bound* shares many elements of the story told in that earlier play, although the connection may be primarily mythological rather than intertextual.[562] The earliest extant references to the play are in Aristophanes'

---

[560] Griffith (1977): 80. Griffith provides an in-depth analysis of the metrical systems in the play and how they compare with the extant work of Aeschylus and other tragedians.
[561] Podlecki (2005): 199-200; Lloyd-Jones (2005): 426-7.
[562] Coined by Kristeva (1984), intertextuality refers to the shaping of a text by another, e.g., through allusion, quotation, etc, that generates deeper understanding. Genette's understanding of intertextuality is 'everything that brings it into relation (manifest or hidden) with other texts. I call that *transtextuality* in the strict (and, since Julia Kristeva, the "classical") sense – that is, the literal presence (more or less literal, whether integral or not) of one text within another', Genette (1992): 81-2. Burian (1997): 193-5 says that 'the mythological cross-references of tragedy are nothing new' and describes how parallels can be found between tragedy and Homeric poetry but notes that such cross-references should be understood not cross-textually but in terms of how the audience receives them: 'allusions call on a cultural competence that the author counts on spectators to share'. See Allen (2000) for an examination of this concept. Burian (1997): 179 considers tragedy to be 'always and inherently' intertextual.

Knights (Ἱππῆς 836, produced 425/4 B.C.E.) and *Birds* (Ὄρνιθες 805, produced 415/14 B.C.E.).[563]

The Mythological Background

Prometheus is a major figure in Greek mythology and due to his benefactions to mortals a significant deity. Hesiod's *Theogony* (c.700 B.C.E.) provides the earliest extant account of Prometheus' mythology.[564] The fourth-century C.E. grammarian and commentator Servius indicates Sappho (seventh-century B.C.E.) also wrote about Prometheus' gift of fire to humans.[565] Podlecki provides a thorough overview of the presence of Prometheus in the ancient sources who include the logographer Acusilaus of Argos (sixth-century B.C.E.),[566] the *Hesiodic Catalogue*[567] and the Sicilian comic poet Epicharmus (fifth century B.C.E.).[568]

Whilst Hesiod says Prometheus was the son of the Titan Iapetus and Clymene[569] and Apollodorus says his mother was Asia,[570] Aeschylus names Themis as his mother (*P.B.* 18, 209, 874). Themis was a Titan and the personification of law and justice. She also possessed prophetic powers and acted as adviser to the Olympian gods. According to the sixth-century B.C.E.

---

[563] Sommerstein (2010): 231.
[564] Hes. *Theog.* 507-616.
[565] Sappho, fr. 207.
[566] FGrH *2*, frag. 13 and 34.
[567] Formerly known as the *Catalogue of Women* (Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος), thought in antiquity to be Hesiod's work but now thought to be dated between 580-520 B.C.E.
[568] P.Oxy 2427 fr.1; 2427 fr.27. See Podlecki (2005): 2-9 for further discussion on these sources.
[569] Hes. *Theog.* 507-14.
[570] Apollod. 1.2.3. Herodotus says Asia was his wife (*Hist.* 4.45).

Cypria (*Κύπρια*)[571] it was Themis who prophesied the fate of a woman whose son would become more powerful than his father, another key point of dissension between Zeus and Prometheus in the *Prometheus Bound* (518-25, 755-70, 947-8). Prometheus refused to divulge the identity of the woman to Zeus, leaving the latter's position open to risk should he father the child.[572] In Hesiod, Themis was the second wife of Zeus and bore him the Horae (Ὧραι; the Seasons), the Moirae (Μοῖραι; the Fates), Diké (Δίκη; Justice), Eunomia (Εὐνομία; Good Order) and Eirene (Εἰρήνη; Peace),[573] all elements which together personify harmonious rule. By naming Themis as his mother, Aeschylus is directly aligning the concept of justice and good rule with the figure of Prometheus via his divine birthright (18, 874).

Prometheus' prophetic and advisory skills are validated by being inherited from Themis. The implication is that although Zeus and Prometheus are fighting, they are both preoccupied with doing what is right, even if they approach it from different angles. Changing the mother of Prometheus to Themis, and having her referenced at key points (18, 209, 874), allows a sense of justice to subtly radiate throughout the narrative. We have already seen that Aeschylus is known to have changed or adapted mythology;[574] Zeus the Toucher (Ζεύς γ᾽ ἐφάπτωρ, *Supp*. 313), for example, is a phrasing unique to

---

[571] Attributed to Stasinus of Cyprus or Hegesias of Salamis. See also Hyg. *Fab*. 54.
[572] The Nereid Thetis, once desired by both Zeus and Poseidon, went on to marry the mortal Peleus and bore him Achilleus, greatest of the Greek warriors of the *Iliad* whose fame and *aristeia* (ἀριστεία, signifying excellence in battle) did indeed outshine his father's.
[573] *Theog*. 901-6.
[574] Burian (1997) discusses the ways that the tragedians worked with well-known stories in different ways.

him.[575] The linking of the Areopagus with the Amazons rather than Ares was another innovation (*Eum*. 685-90), and the myths of Clytemnestra and Agamemnon were also reformulated for the *Oresteia*.[576]

Most significantly, the play reflects an interest in pre-Olympian mythology, the ancient pre-Olympian history of the gods, which is a common thread throughout the surviving plays by Aeschylus, most obviously in the realisation of the Erinyes in the *Eumenides*. The play's interest in pre-Olympian mythology is reflected in the cast (see Table 6) which is predominantly divine.

Table 6 Character Identity in the *Prometheus Bound*

Character	Identity
Bia	Titan personification
Kratos	Titan personification
Oceanos	Titan god
Prometheus	Titan god
Chorus of Oceanids	Titan water nymphs, daughters of Oceanos (χορός Ὠκεανίδων)
Hephaestus	Olympian god
Hermes	Olympian god
Io	Water nymph, daughter of Inachus (Ἰώ Ἰνάχου)

The mythology of Prometheus (and of the other figures in the *Prometheus Bound* to varying degrees) is very complex. The importance of the detailed mythological overview below is to demonstrate how mythological and pre-Olympian mythological narratives impact upon news and messaging. Bringing out the nuances of the various strands of the stories enables a deeper analysis to take place.

---

[575] Collard (2008): 213.
[576] See discussions in chapter five below, pp. 261 ff.

The action of the play is set after the Titanomachy (Τιτανομαχία) wherein Zeus overthrew his father Cronos and the latter's fellow Titans and established his own order, that of the Olympians.[577] Despite helping Zeus during the war (*P.B.* 215-18) the 'brilliant and shifty'[578] Prometheus nevertheless angers him through his disrespect and his persistence in providing assistance to mortals. There are two incidents between Zeus and Prometheus that caused the animosity between them. In the first, Prometheus tricked Zeus, during some kind of test in Mekone, into choosing the less valuable portion of a sacrifice, thus favouring humans by facilitating their consequent receipt of the more valuable portion.[579] As a result of this trick, even though Prometheus was its instigator, Zeus turned against mortals and declined to bestow the gift of fire upon them. Prometheus' second crime was to defy the edict and deliver fire to humans himself.[580] These two factors, along with Prometheus' continuing refusal to reveal the name of the woman who would bear a son more powerful than his father (thereby infecting Zeus' affairs with uncertainty), only increase Zeus' animosity towards him.[581]

In the play Zeus is frequently referred to as a tyrant (τύραννος, 310, 756, 761, 909, 942), both as consequence of his dominance over the Titans and also

---

[577] Hes. *Theog.* 391-719. See also p. 338.
[578] ποικίλον αἰολόμητιν, Hes. *Theog.* 511, translation Wender (1973): 39.
[579] Hes. *Theog.* 535-45.
[580] Hes. *Theog.* 546-70, *WD* 47-55 and *Prometheus Bound* 7-8.
[581] In later mythology, Prometheus himself created men and denying Zeus access to the most beautiful among them, the youth Phaethon, caused another reason for the animosity between them, Apollod. 1.7.1-2; Ov. *Met.* 1.82-5.

over his treatment of Prometheus.[582] The treatment of Zeus in this play is one

of the reasons some scholars reject Aeschylus' authorship of it – the argument

is that such disrespect is unlikely in someone whose other known plays hold

the gods with reverence.[583] As both Ian Ruffell and Sommerstein note,[584] the

portrayal of divine conflict in the *Prometheus Bound* is of the same kind as

that displayed in the *Eumenides*.[585] Both plays feature direct divine conflict

(Prometheus with Zeus and Hermes, and the Erinyes with Apollo and Athena)

and although we cannot know how the Prometheus trilogy played out it is

more than probable that it ended with a resolution of some kind between Zeus

and Prometheus, as the latter hints in the play.[586] Prometheus cannot die so

his imprisonment is the only way Zeus can exert power over him.[587]

Prometheus' enforced immobility on the stage through his shackling (1-81)

---

[582] The ancient Greek word τύραννος means 'absolute ruler' and denotes someone who has achieved power rather than having been born to it – for example, Oedipus' initial rule at Thebes before the secret of his true birth is revealed. It does not necessarily have negative connotations although the context of the *Prometheus Bound* does give this effect. Taplin notes that 'Zeus is presented in human political terms: the analogy with the upstart τύραννος is obvious and sustained, both in the way he came to power and in the way he wields it', Taplin (1977): 469.

[583] See discussions in Podlecki (2005): 34-7 and Ruffell (2012): 44-6.

[584] 'In its handling of the divine, *Eumenides* is the closest surviving Aeschylean tragedy to *Prometheus Bound*; the conflict between the deities is the centre of the play. The complaints of the 'old' gods, the Erinyes, at their treatment at the hands of the new order (460-3, 778-93) are similar to those of Prometheus' account of the new gods in *Prometheus Bound*', Ruffell (2012): 45-6. Sommerstein says that 'the sequence [of the Promethean plays] shows a movement, typical of several known Aeschylean trilogies, from more violent to more restrained methods of effecting divine and human purposes, and that this movement is bound up, as in the *Oresteia* … with an apparent evolution in the nature of Zeus. There is a further link with the *Oresteia* in the direct presentation on stage of a conflict between gods', Sommerstein (2010): 230-2.

[585] See discussions in chapter five below.

[586] Lines 175-7, 186-92, 375-6, 524-5, 770, 989-91.

[587] Ὅτῳ θανεῖν μέν ἐστιν οὐ πεπρωμένον (753); τί δ᾽ ἂν φοβοίμην ᾧ θανεῖν οὐ μόρσιμον (933); πάντως ἐμέ γ᾽ οὐ θανατώσει (1053). One myth says that Prometheus took the immortality of the centaur Chiron to allow the latter to die (Apollod. 2.5.4; Hyg. *Fab*. 54; 144) although as a Titan himself Prometheus was presumably immortal anyway.

emphasises this imprisonment and the accompanying sense of public shaming exacerbates Prometheus' antipathy towards Zeus.

Kratos (Κράτος, 'Strength') and his brother Bia (Βία, 'Violent Force') were the sons of the Titan Pallas and Styx, and were therefore cousins of Prometheus. The assistance of Styx and her sons during the Titanomachy led to Zeus adopting them as his attendants.[588] In the *Prometheus Bound* Bia is silent (referenced at 12) but Kratos (1-87) forces a reluctant Hephaestus to bind Prometheus. Despite their familial relationship with Prometheus, they are loyal to Zeus in the play. Aeschylus has chosen the two personifications wisely, allowing the brutality of Prometheus' punishment to be vocalised by Strength, symbolism which suggests there is no escape for him.[589]

Hermes (944-1079) is also related to Prometheus through his grandfather Atlas, Prometheus' brother (348). In Epic poetry Hermes is portrayed as benevolent towards mankind.[590] In this respect he is Prometheus' counterpoint in the play; perhaps Zeus thought a god who was favourable to mortals would be better able to appeal to Prometheus. Hermes was also associated with boundaries. The location of Prometheus' prison is at the edge of the world (χθονὸς μὲν ἐς τηλουρὸν ἥκομεν πέδον, 1). As Podlecki

---

[588] Hes. *Theog*. 383-98.
[589] Gagné (2013): 201 suggests that 'Kratos and Bia incarnate the raw power of Olympian compulsion, the imposition of violent constraint that is the ultimate guarantee of Zeus's sovereignty'.
[590] Ἑρμεία, σοὶ γάρ τε μάλιστά γε φίλτατόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ ἑταιρίσσαι, Hom. *Il*. 24.334-5. See also Hom. *Od*. 1.38-43, 5.29-31, 10.275-306.

speculates,[591] it is possible that the audience was intended to interpret the locality as bleak and lonely which would be fitting for the misery of Prometheus later vocalised in the play. Hermes' presence at the end of the play allows the seemingly finite boundary of cliffs at the end of the world to be crossed, and Prometheus to disappear to the next stage of his punishment.

Oceanos (284-396) is another Titan, an ally of Zeus (304-5) who attempts to reason with Prometheus. Oceanos was the oldest of the children of Gaia and Ouranos[592] and with his sister-wife Tethys parent of all the world's rivers and streams. As the encircling stream of the earth (τοῦ περὶ πᾶσάν θ᾽ εἱλισσομένου χθόν᾽ ἀκοιμήτῳ ῥεύματι, 138-9) he was also related to boundaries. As well as the physical, earth-related boundary of his reach, Oceanos represents a boundary between the viciousness of Prometheus' binding (1-275) and the commotion of Io's scene (561-886), offering respite from the tension incurred by both segments. The Chorus of the play is comprised of the Oceanids (Ὠκεανίδες), Oceanos' daughters (137-40). In mythology the Oceanids were consorts or mothers of other gods: Metis was consort of Zeus and through him the mother of Athena; Amphitrite married Poseidon; and Clymene was mother of Prometheus, according to Hesiod.[593] Whilst the Chorus are sympathetic towards Prometheus they do not doubt that his actions were wrong (259-60).

---

[591] Podlecki notes that the *hypothesis* to the play refers to the setting being the 'Caucasian mountain' with what seems to be a later addition stating it is actually at 'the European boundaries of Ocean'. Podlecki (2005): 159-60.
[592] Hes. *Theog*. 133.
[593] Hes. *Theog*. 508.

As discussed above, the figure of Io featured heavily in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*.[594] As a figure of contention between Zeus and Hera, Io is a character who suffers extensively at the hands of the gods. Her inclusion mirrors Prometheus' suffering through the actions of the Olympians and their Titan allies. Prometheus does not accept that he has committed a crime (ἀμπλάκημα, 112) and sees himself a victim of Zeus' hatred for humans (120-3, 231-6). Io's only crime is to be desired by Zeus (578-88). Prometheus therefore sees Zeus as oppressor of them both, a view recognised by Io (595-6). Io is a significant figure in mythology for the external audience for she is connected to both Greek and Persian lines of descent: her descendant Perses would be the founder of the Persian royal line whilst other descendants would found and rule Cilicia, Argos, Thrace and Phoenicia.[595] It is Io's descendant Heracles who will release Prometheus from the torture of Zeus' eagle. The wider cultural significance of this, reflecting on both Greece and Persia, is an important aspect of the appropriation of ancient myth in general.

Like Hermes, Io is a reverse messenger figure – rather than bring a message, her presence instigates the delivery of Prometheus' prophecy. She believes that the ghost of Hera's guard, Argos,[596] follows her in the form of the gadfly (366-575). The use of a spectral figure is reminiscent of *Persians*, where the

---

[594] See chapter three above. Lloyd-Jones (2003): 62 agrees with the conclusion of Murray (1958): 49 that the *Suppliants* either belongs to the same period as the *Prometheus Bound* or that each play was written with strong knowledge of the other, suggesting that 'anyone who doubts the authenticity of the *PV* would do well to reread the *Supplices* carefully with the *PV* in mind' [*Prometheus Vinctus*, the Latin transliteration of Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης].

[595] See p. 338.

[596] Argos Panoptes (Ἄργος Πανόπτης, 'many eyes'), Hera's guard tasked with keeping Io after Hera imprisoned her in her bovine form. See Apollod. 2.1.2-3; Ov. *Met.* 1. 622-723.

ghost of Darius takes form to hear about Xerxes and deliver his verdict on his actions (*Pers*. 681-842). The gadfly's pursuit of Io also echoes that of the Erinyes' pursuit of Orestes at the end of the *Choephoroe* (*Choe*. 1048-62). Suffering is enacted on stage, divine suffering inflicted on mortals that leads to further dramatic exposition. Io's departure (877-86) is also reminiscent of the ending of the *Choephoroe* where, like Orestes, she departs the stage in a state of agitation.

Choosing Bia and Kratos to open the play, and Hermes to close it, emphasises the importance of loyalty to Zeus that is one of the central themes of the play. Both Kratos (10-11) and Hermes (1014-35) talk of Zeus' power and rights. They also represent the tangled relationships between the Titans and Olympians, highlighted in the figure of the peacemaker Oceanos who is caught between his loyalty to family and to Zeus.

Narrative Analysis

The complexity of the news and messaging structure in this play and the interweaving of multiple threads of news delivery mechanisms prompts a more linear analysis of the play scene-by-scene. This has the additional benefit of allowing observation of how news and messages are built up as the narrative progresses and how the cumulative effect contributes to a deeper understanding of the issues explored in the play.

The nature of Prometheus' arrival on stage is coded with meaning. He arrives silently – we cannot know if he walked or was dragged by Kratos and Bia –

and is chained with adamantine bonds (ὀχμάσαι ἀδαμαντίνων δεσμῶν, 5-6) to the cliff-face by Hephaestus (4-15). If he was dragged on stage then it would have provided a startling tableau for the external audience,[597] to see a Titan god so ignominiously treated. Prometheus' status is immediately compromised. Collard notes that the hypothesis contained in the medieval manuscripts states that 'the main issue is Prometheus' "being put in bonds"'.[598] The imprisonment of Prometheus, carried out with extreme brutality (ἀδαμαντίνου νῦν σφηνὸς αὐθάδη γνάθον στέρνων διαμπὰξ πασσάλευ᾽ ἐρρωμένως, 64-5), further heightens the shock. The implicit message of this opening scene, for both internal and external audiences, is that the Titan race is completely defeated and the Olympians are now supreme. It is suggestive of the kind of power that Zeus now wields and his ruthlessness towards those who have crossed him. For the external audience watching this scene, the opening must have been shocking, for Prometheus was held in very high esteem by the Athenians.[599] The scene immediately situates the external audience, placing the action of the play at a very definitive point in pre-Olympian mythological time.

Hephaestus' reluctance to participate is an indicator that the division between Zeus and Prometheus is not entirely clear cut and that not all the gods are

---

[597] An interpretation recently staged by King's College London in their production of the play in February 2017 directed by Maria-Pia Aquilina for the annual Greek Play event. See https://www.kcl.ac.uk/artshums/depts/classics/about/greek/index.aspx for production information.

[598] Collard (2008): 238.

[599] 'Athens was uniquely interested in Prometheus: nowhere else was he given such public prominence and personal respect, with an altar, a torchrace, and a festival', Griffith (1977): 17. See also Wilson (2000): 35-6.

against Prometheus: Hephaestus signals faint hope that all is not lost for Prometheus. Hephaestus' objection is based primarily on his links of kinship with Prometheus (15, 39) but perhaps his empathy also draws on his own physical limitations. Hephaestus' desire for leniency is counterpointed by Kratos' viciousness. Kratos' opening words situate the external audience and he delivers a message directly from Zeus, that Prometheus must be bound to the rocks (1-6). Kratos' nature is emphasised by his denouncements of Prometheus and the implacability of what must be done.[600] So the entrance of Prometheus, although he is entirely silent, is nevertheless encoded with a great deal of information. The first scene sets up the figure of Prometheus to be a conduit, a status which will be amplified as the narrative progresses. Prometheus will go on to deliver news and messages to every character he interacts with, as well as the Chorus.

Like the Watchman in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Kratos situates both external and internal audiences and makes clear what is happening and why (1-11). Despite having completed his mission (12-13) Kratos continually badgers Hephaestus and conveys to the external audience the violence used in chaining Prometheus to the rock. His interaction with Hephaestus enables the message that displeasing Zeus could have serious consequences, verbalising the circumstances of the mute Prometheus. Coming after this, Hephaestus' objections to his task (ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἄτολμός εἰμι συγγενῆ θεὸν δῆσαι βίᾳ φάραγγι πρὸς δυσχειμέρῳ, 19) have the effect of immediately portraying Zeus in a

---

[600] Lines 36-8, 61-2, 70-1, 82-7.

negative light, reinforced by his subsequent comments.[601] The two characters create a portrayal at the very start of the play that alludes to Zeus' ruthlessness. Kratos is Zeus' henchman; his very nature allows him to see this aspect of Zeus only as a good thing. The section where Kratos pushes Hephaestus to be more heavy-handed (52-75) emphasises the idea of imprisonment; the verbalisation of the actions taking place on stage reinforces the brutality of Prometheus' treatment.

Words and actions come together to create a very forceful tableau on stage before the external audience. It heightens the misery of Prometheus' predicament and the fact that he is silent the whole time creates tension. Hephaestus identifies a thematic behaviour of Zeus that will be replicated throughout the play by subsequent characters. Kratos and Hephaestus are message enablers for Prometheus' opening monologue – they enable him to lament his circumstances.[602] Their conflicting views on Prometheus – and correspondingly on Zeus – establish the theme of duality that runs through the play and is continued through Io and the Chorus, Oceanos and Hermes and Zeus and Prometheus.

---

[601] Ἅπας δὲ τραχὺς ὅστις ἂν νέον κρατῇ (35); πλὴν τοῦδ᾽ ἂν οὐδεὶς ἐνδίκως μέμψαιτό μοι (63).
[602] Ἴδεσθέ μ᾽ οἷα πρὸς θεῶν πάσχω θεός. δέρχθηθ᾽ οἵαις αἰκείαισιν διακναιόμενος τὸν μυριετῆ χρόνον ἀθλεύσω (93-5).

Apart from Hermes the only other Olympian present in the play is the lame Hephaestus, the god of fire and metalwork.[603] Hephaestus was the son of Hera and is closely linked to Athens, for it was his pursuit of Athena that led to the birth of Erichthonios from the ground of the Acropolis.[604] Hephaestus is also notable for creating Pandora, Zeus' revenge on mortals as beneficiaries of Prometheus' gifts. Given gifts of beauty by Athena, Aphrodite and the Graces, Hermes also endowed her with deception.[605] Thus two gods who played a part in the suffering of humankind bookend the play about the punishment of the latter's benefactor.

The role of the Chorus in the *Prometheus Bound* is relatively small compared with the other plays known to be by Aeschylus. There are only two longer passages (397-435, 526-60) but despite the brevity of their presence, the Chorus' interactions with other characters do help to propagate the messages of the play.[606] The Chorus of the *Prometheus Bound* are the Oceanids, the daughters of Tethys and Oceanos (τῆς πολυτέκνου Τηθύος, 139; πατρὸς Ὠκεανοῦ, 140). Prometheus announces their arrival as being like the sound of birds (φεῦ, τί ποτ᾽ αὖ κινάθισμα κλύω πέλας οἰωνῶν; 124-5) and the Chorus confirm that they are in a flying vehicle of some kind (σύθην δ᾽

---

[603] Hephaestus was born lame: ἀμφιγυήεις Ἥφαιστος (with both feet crooked, lame), Hom. *Il*. 1.607-8, κυλλοποδίων (crook-footed, halting), *Il*. 20.272.
[604] An early king of Athens from which the Athenians derived their claim to autochthonism. See Rosivach (1987) and Bakewell (2013): 120.
[605] Hes. *Theog.* 570-612, *WD* 52-89.
[606] Griffith has demonstrated that the amount of choral lyric found in the *Prometheus Bound* is just 18%, whereas choral lyric in the plays currently known to be by Aeschylus are never less than 42%. Griffith (1977): 123-4.

ἀπέδιλος ὄχῳ πτερωτῷ, 135).[607] It is possible that they entered via a *mêchané* (μηχανή),[608] a crane-like device used to lift actors over the *skene* (σκηνή) and usually deployed to signal the presence of gods.[609] Oceanos probably also enters in this way and this would match thematically with the Chorus' entrance.[610]

The Chorus only really interact with Prometheus – they have very brief interjections during the scenes with Io and Hermes – but they do enable key information to be vocalised. They prompt Prometheus to tell his story during the *parodos* (128-85, interspersed with anapaests (ἀνάπαιστος, a chanted section) by Prometheus) and other sections;[611] and the second choral stasimon (στάσιμον, a choral song; 545-60). They allow him to expand upon his thoughts about Zeus (507-21) and they encourage him to tell Io her fate.[612] They also attempt to persuade Prometheus to tell them his secret about Zeus (519, 821-2) although without success. Although their presence is somewhat muted compared to the choruses in other plays known to be by Aeschylus,[613] they enable narrative progression and provide a link between the different

---

[607] West discusses the logistics of the various options for the arrival of the Chorus. West (1979): 136-8.

[608] As Podlecki notes, the *mêchané* was known to be available from Aristophanes' *Peace* 174 (produced in 421 B.C.E.) but this does not necessarily mean it, or something like it, was not available earlier in the century. Podlecki (2005): 159.

[609] Although Euripides' Medea (Μήδεια, produced in 431 B.C.E.) uses the *mêchané* to aid her escape at the end of the play (τοιόνδ᾽ ὄχημα πατρὸς Ἥλιος πατὴρ δίδωσιν ἡμῖν, 1321-2), it could be argued that Medea is semi-divine as she is the granddaughter of the Titan god Helios (Ἥλιος, Sun).

[610] Τὸν πτερυγωκῆ τόνδ᾽ οἰωνὸν γνώμῃ στομίων ἄτερ εὐθύνων (286-7).

[611] Anapaests: 193-6, 277-83; stichomythic questions: 246-58.

[612] Lines 698-9, 745, 782-5, 819-20.

[613] The choruses of *Suppliants* and *Eumenides* are both dominant, whilst those of Aeschylus' other plays all have significant roles.

aspects of the story. It could be possible that their presence lent visual impact through their appearance and movement, acting as a counterpoint to the static Prometheus, but this can be no more than speculation.[614] Although knowledge about the role of dance in ancient Greek theatre is sparse,[615] it was important, as H. D. F. Kitto notes:

> …etymology tells us something. The Greek verb *choreuo*, 'I am a member of the chorus', has the sense 'I am dancing'. The word 'ode' means not something recited or declaimed, but 'a song'. The 'orchestra' in which the chorus had its being is, literally, a dancing-floor.[616]

Likewise, Albert Henrichs notes that 'all tragic choruses dance'.[617] Athenaeus writes:

> καὶ Αἰσχύλος δὲ οὐ μόνον ἐξεῦρε τὴν τῆς στολῆς εὐπρέπειαν καὶ σεμνότητα, ἣν ζηλώσαντες οἱ ἱεροφάνται καὶ δᾳδοῦχοι ἀμφιέννυνται, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὰ σχήματα ὀρχηστικὰ αὐτὸς ἐξευρίσκων ἀνεδίδου τοῖς χορευταῖς. Χαμαιλέων γοῦν πρῶτον αὐτόν φησι σχηματίσαι τοὺς χοροὺς ὀρχηστοδιδασκάλοις οὐ χρησάμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν τοῖς χοροῖς τὰ σχήματα ποιοῦντα τῶν ὀρχήσεων
>
> Athen. *Deip*. 1.39, 21d-f

> Aeschylus used to invent many dance steps and imparted them to his choreuts. At any rate, Chamaeleon[618] says that first Aeschylus himself arranged his choruses without the use of chorus directors, himself creating the dance movements for the choruses

---

[614] It is plausible that the Kratos actor's mask was striking (ὅμοια μορφῇ γλῶσσά σου γηρύεται, 78).

[615] '… there are no records or descriptions of any performance, no stage directions in the MSS., nothing but the bare words of the text', Kitto (1956): 1.

[616] Kitto (1956): 1. He asserts that choral performance was 'a combination of the three arts of poetry, dancing and singing'. See also Wilson (2000).

[617] Henrichs (1994): 59. Swift (2010): 37 notes that 'a substantial number of Athenian citizens would have had direct experience of *dancing* in a chorus' [my italics], indicating the importance of this function over singing. For surveys of the role of dance in ancient Greek drama see also Lawler (1954) and (1968); Ley (2003); Csapo (2008) and Macintosh (2010).

[618] Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica, c.350-after 281 B.C.E., a peripatetic philosopher.

Therefore, the chorus could well have emphasised their role through their dancing, which would have been particularly arresting when contrasted with Prometheus' stillness.

In the *parodos* (128-85) the Chorus comment on Prometheus' miserable circumstances. Recognising that Prometheus' stance against Zeus has led to his situation they refer three times to the implacability of the Olympian's rule (149-51, 163-7, 184-5).[619]   In the *parodos* they perform three critical functions: firstly, they enable Prometheus to tell his side of his argument with Zeus by asking him to reveal the 'whole story' (πάντ᾿ ἐκκάλυψον καὶ γέγων᾿ ἡμῖν λόγον, 196), important intelligence for the internal audience; secondly, through stichomythic questioning they also enable Prometheus to describe how he gave hope (250) and the gift of fire (252) to mortals, which resulted in his incarceration (255-6). This latter is an important piece of news for both internal and external audiences as it is these indiscretions that lie at the heart of the plot. Thirdly, the Chorus ask the key question: 'What hope is there that he [Zeus] will decree an end [to Prometheus' ordeal]?' (οὐδ᾿ ἔστιν ἄθλου τέρμα σοι προκείμενον; 259). This is tantalising for the external audience, their anticipation increasing when Prometheus encourages the Chorus to join him to hear what will happen in the future (271-3). The answer to this

---

[619] The number three is prominent and of some significance in Greek mythology. Examples in mythology are the natural world – earth (Zeus), sea (Poseidon) and the Underworld (Hades); the Erinyes – Megeara, Tisiphone and Alecto; the Moirae – Clotho, Lachesis and Atropos; the rivers of the Underworld – Styx, Acheron and Cocytus; the Hesperides – Erythia, Aegle and Hespere; the Hundred-handers – Cottus, Briareus and Gyes; and the Cyclops – Arges, Brontes and Steropes. See Lease (1919) for an overview of the symbolism of the number in the ancient world.

question is delayed by some six hundred lines, until Io's scene (871-4), by the

arrival of Oceanos.

The figure of Oceanos (284-396) is distinctive for his ameliorative

characterisation. He comes to offer help to Prometheus, citing foreknowledge

of his argument with Zeus (288-9); by doing this he fulfils the first function

of a messenger in setting out the current situation. Oceanos has knowledge

of Prometheus' past and his troubles and tries to persuade him to recant. Like

Hephaestus, Oceanos has a familial connection to Prometheus (289-92) which

prompts him to sympathise and attempt reconciliation between him and Zeus

(307-24). Also like Hephaestus, Oceanos suggests a sliver of hope – he is

sure Zeus will listen to his argument for Prometheus' freedom (αὐχῶ γὰρ

αὐχῶ τήνδε δωρεὰν ἐμοὶ δώσειν Δί᾽, ὥστε τῶνδέ σ᾽ ἐκλῦσαι πόνων, 338-9).

Oceanos' scene is relatively short but is important for revealing Prometheus'

anger (298-306). Prometheus notes how previously he and Oceanos were

allies (330-1) although, as Podlecki and others have noted,[620] there is no

mythological explanation for this assertion in the context of the Titanomachy.

It does reveal, though, the extent of the betrayal and abandonment that

Prometheus feels: his own race has turned against him.

Oceanos' brief scene (284-396) enables Prometheus to deliver news about his

familial line, the Titans, and his brother Atlas (347-50). Hyginus (64 B.C.E.-

---

[620] See Podlecki (2005): 172 n. 331.

17 C.E.) says Atlas led the Titans against Zeus and for that reason the latter punished him by forcing him to hold up the sky.[621] It is possible that Hyginus extrapolated this interpretation from the *Prometheus Bound* (347-50) although it is more likely that the Prometheus of the play is simply referring to the fact that his brother Atlas supported him in his refusal to tell Zeus his secret.

More explicit is the story of Zeus' revenge against the Titan monster Typhon who defied his rule during the Titanomachy.[622] Prometheus recounts the tale of Typhon's defeat found in Hesiod (*Theog*. 820-80, here called Typhoeus) and he emphasises the monster's invulnerability to the gods (πᾶσιν ὅς ἀντέστη θεοῖς, 354). The stories of Atlas and Typhon also allow a less belligerent Prometheus to contemplate the suffering of others; he is not alone in his misery. They also demonstrate that Prometheus' punishment is not an isolated incident, a subliminal message for both internal and external audiences that even the gods themselves are prey to the capriciousness of Zeus, the central message that the play realises. The story of the downfall of Typhon, once so great and strong, is perhaps also meant as a warning for the disaster that will befall Zeus should he proceed with the marriage to Thetis (907-10). As another Titan, Oceanos' presence enables Prometheus to tell these stories to an internal figure who will appreciate his desperation and the depth of his fall from grace.

---

[621] Hyg. *Fab*. 150.
[622] Typhon is depicted on the shield of Hippomedon in *Seven against Thebes* (493); see Table 2, p. 122.

Oceanos also offers a less judgemental analysis of Zeus' personality. Oceanos is certain Zeus can be persuaded to relent (αὐχῶ γὰρ αὐχῶ τήνδε δωρεὰν ἐμοὶ δώσειν Δί᾽, ὥστε τῶνδέ σ᾽ ἐκλῦσαι πόνων, 338-9). This perspective is markedly different from that of the other figures in the play. Tellingly, the poet has Oceanos deny any disingenuousness (οὐδὲ μάτην χαριτογλωσσεῖν ἔνι μοι, 293-4) which lends authority to his own belief that Zeus can be reasoned with. The voice of Oceanos is one of calm and contrition whilst every other figure in the play becomes embroiled in Prometheus' anger and polemic.[623] The composure of Oceanos is contrasted by the high emotion of the Chorus in the first stasimon immediately after Oceanos' departure, which stems from Prometheus' angry dismissal of him (392).

It is curious that, given their familial relationship, the Chorus and Oceanos do not react or refer to one another; Oceanos is the only figure the Chorus do not interact with at all. The presence of Oceanos and his daughters may represent unity; combined Titan support for Prometheus. At the start of the play, Hephaestus represents Olympians who support Prometheus, acting as a balance to the violence of Kratos and Bia. The presence of Oceanos and the Oceanids, on stage together but separate in all other ways, presents a visual Titan shield for Prometheus. The spectacle of Prometheus being shackled at

---

[623] What Taplin calls Prometheus' 'gigantic defiance' is, he says, one of the reasons for the play's 'high esteem in the eyes of Europe since the Renaissance', Taplin (1977): 466. Hardwick (2000): 128 notes that Prometheus has 'historically been an icon for defiance and humanistic struggle, represented as a victim or appropriated for "causes" rather than being a vehicle for psychological analysis or an example of metamorphosis'.

the start of the play by two Olympians whose masks probably represented their characteristic behaviours would have been striking. That traumatic opening scene is now countered and balanced by allies of Prometheus supporting him on stage.

The first stasimon of the Chorus (397-435) laments for Prometheus' present circumstances and includes an explicit criticism of Zeus (ἀμέγαρτα γὰρ τάδε Ζεὺς ἰδίοις νόμοις κρατύνων ὑπερήφανον θεοῖς τοῖς πάρος ἐνδείκνυσιν αἰχμάν, 402-5). The Chorus say the world mourns for the fate of the Titans (πρόπασα δ᾽ ἤδη στονόεν λέλακε χώρα, 406) and specify the inhabitants of Asia, Scythia and Arabia, perhaps to indicate the breadth of Prometheus' fame; or perhaps the wide number of societies that benefited from his gifts. Lines 425-30 of this choral song are spurious and deal with Atlas' fate;[624] it is possible this section was added to illustrate the trouble brought to Prometheus' direct family, or to create a stronger link with the Oceanos scene. The choral song emphasises the elemental suffering of Prometheus, reflected in the lamentations of the earth and sea (406-14, 431-5), emphasising the chthonic nature of the Titans. The message of this song is the same for both internal and external audiences: that Prometheus' suffering is unjust.

This first stasimon gives Prometheus time to brood in silence and to formulate his next message: in a sense, Prometheus treats the other figures as if he expects them to behave like mortals, to be deferential to him and to listen to

---

[624] Podlecki (2005): 175 discusses the scholarship on this passage.

what he says. This is particularly evident in his retort to Hermes that 'time as it grows old teaches everything' (ἀλλ᾽ ἐκδιδάσκει πάνθ᾽ ὁ γηράσκων χρόνος, 982). This is a reference to the youth of Zeus' reign but also reflects Prometheus' sense of superiority. His partiality towards the mortal race is referred to by every character except Oceanos (see Table 8) and is a message that obviously would have been of significance to the external audience. Prometheus helped mortals not just with fire but with all that they needed to live and thrive (see Table 7). He raised them from their underground homes (κατώρυχες δ᾽ ἔναιον ὥστ᾽ ἀήσυροι μύρμηκες ἄντρων ἐν μυχοῖς ἀνηλίοις, 452-3), literally bringing them from the dark into the light (perhaps conferring a symbolic autochthonism).

Table 7 Prometheus' Gifts to Humans

Gift	Line Reference
Fire (πῦρ)	7-8, 109-11, 252-4
Hope (ἐλπίς)	248-50
Intelligence (ἔννους)	443
Building skills (πλινθυφής)	450
Carpentry skills (ξυλουργία)	451
Astronomy (ἔστε δή σφιν ἀντολὰς ἐγὼ ἄστρων ἔδειξα τάς τε δυσκρίτους δύσεις)	457-8
Arithmetic (ἀριθμόν)	459
Writing skills (γραμμάτων τε συνθέσεις)	460
Animal husbandry (κἄζευξα πρῶτος ἐν ζυγοῖσι κνώδαλα)	462
Using horses for chariots (ὑφ᾽ ἅρμα τ᾽ ἤγαγον φιληνίους ἵππους)	465-6
Sailing skills (θαλασσόπλαγκτα δ᾽ οὔτις ἄλλος ἀντ᾽ ἐμοῦ λινόπτερ᾽ ηὗρε ναυτίλων ὀχήματα)	467-8
Medicine (φάρμακον)	478-83
Prophecy (μαντικός)	484-6
Understanding omens (κληδών) and sacrifices (πυράζω)	485-99
Metalworking skills (ἔνερθε δὲ χθονὸς κεκρυμμέν᾽, ἀνθρώποισιν ὠφελήματα, χαλκόν, σίδηρον, ἄργυρον, χρυσόν τε τίς φήσειεν ἂν πάροιθεν ἐξευρεῖν ἐμοῦ;)	500-3

The long list of his gifts encourages reflection on his circumstances. It sends a very specific message to the external audience, that Prometheus has done

more for them than any other god, Titan or Olympian. His philanthropic bias is suggestive of another kind of message, a more personal one that signals his attitudes and highlights the differences between his own value system and that of Zeus. Prometheus' circumstances invoke sympathy and listing the accomplishments achieved by mortals through his patronage creates an emotional bond with the external audience.

The second stasimon (526-60) reflects on the authority and importance of the gods. Where the first stasimon mourned Prometheus' shackling, the second stasimon talks about Zeus' power (μηδάμ᾽ ὁ πάντα νέμων θεῖτ᾽ ἐμᾷ γνώμᾳ κράτος ἀντίπαλον Ζεύς, 526-7) and the rites and rituals in observance of the gods that protect them (ἀλλά μοι τόδ᾽ ἐμμένοι καὶ μήποτ᾽ ἐκτακείη, 534-5). Now the Chorus criticise Prometheus for his affection for mortals which they cannot match or return (τίς ἐφαμερίων ἄρηξις; 547). Despite their closeness to Prometheus through his marriage with their sister (ὁμοπάτριον, 558) Hesione, here the Chorus do not side with Prometheus completely. Their questioning of the benefit of his actions suggests detachment and presages their later admonition to heed Hermes' threats (πείθου: σοφῷ γὰρ αἰσχρὸν ἐξαμαρτάνειν, 1039). This attitude may be in retaliation for Prometheus' refusal to enlighten the Chorus on what the future holds for him (511-25). This is another delaying tactic by the poet, promising but withholding specific information that is central to the plot from both internal and external audiences.

The closest that Prometheus comes to sharing detail about his future is in the scene with Io (561-886), although he falls short of providing the key detail that Zeus needs (755-68). The exchange with Io leads towards the creation of a Falknerian 'intratext'.[625] Io is tormented by both Zeus[626] and Hera.[627] Prometheus explains Io's journey which encompasses both mythical elements and real-world geography,[628] parts of which may have been recognisable to some of the external audience. The theatre was divinely sanctioned space, albeit for Dionysus rather than Zeus, and as such held divine power. Nevertheless, Zeus' position of authority over the other gods renders a connection through the theatrical space to him. Merging Prometheus' 'meta' prophecy for Io with the power of the theatrical space together creates a metatheatrical moment that blurs the line between the theatrical and external planes. Io is also notable for Prometheus' immediate acceptance of her as a friend (ὥσπερ δίκαιον πρὸς φίλους οἴγειν στόμα, 611). Significantly, Io is the only figure to whom Prometheus does not show anger or resentment.

Io (561-886) is also a key message enabler. She has the largest scene after Prometheus. Io's scene fulfils three important functions. First, her circumstances are equivalent to those of Prometheus in respect of her treatment at the hands of Zeus (640-86). Imprisoned by the gods (as

---

[625] Falkner (1998): 26 examines the self-referential and metatheatrical aspects of ancient drama. The term 'intratext' suggests a melding of internal and external spatialities, a 'play within a play and a representation of texts and readers, plays and spectators'.
[626] Lines 578-88, 645-72, 759.
[627] Lines 596-603, 677-82, 703-4, 877-886.
[628] Lines 705-35, 786-818, 829-76. See Podlecki (2005): 201-9 for a summary of the geographical knowledge in the text.

Prometheus is shackled to rock) in bovine form she is hounded by the stinging gadfly (as Prometheus suffers the pain of his bonds). Her family under threat from Zeus' thunderbolt (κεἰ μὴ θέλοι, πυρωπὸν ἐκ Διὸς μολεῖν κεραυνόν, ὃς πᾶν ἐξαϊστώσοι γένος, 667-8) is reminiscent of the treatment of the Titans, in particular Typhon and Atlas who have already been incorporated into the play's narrative. Io is thus Prometheus' opposite and his affection for her is evidenced by his reluctance to increase Io's distress (φθόνος μὲν οὐδείς, σὰς δ᾽ ὀκνῶ θρᾶξαι φρένας, 628). Her story demonstrates that Zeus treats gods and mortals alike with indifference and feeds into the negative portrayal of Zeus that permeates the play.

Secondly, Io allows Prometheus to demonstrate his gift of prophecy (705-35, 788-815, 828-74). Prometheus' mother Themis validates his prophetic powers and explains how Prometheus came to know the prophecy about Thetis. The intervention of the Chorus (631-4) allows Io to tell the story of her predicament which in turn leads Prometheus to forecast part of her forthcoming journey (705-41). Io makes no comment after this and it is left to the Chorus and Prometheus to advance the narrative, the Chorus actively enabling delivery of the rest of Prometheus' message for Io (706-41). The story of Io's journey is then paused and she is drawn into a discussion on Prometheus' hold over Zeus (755-81). Io's rejection of Zeus is borne from her suffering (πῶς δ᾽ οὐκ ἄν, ἥτις ἐκ Διὸς πάσχω κακῶς; 759) and her lack of emotion at the possibility of Zeus' fall from power provides a denunciation of him to match the condemnation of Hephaestus and Prometheus. Thus,

Zeus is reproached by three ethnic groups – an Olympian, a Titan and a semi-divine water nymph.[629]

This interval with Io enables Prometheus to reiterate the secret he is withholding from Zeus. It also allows Prometheus to deliver a crucial piece of information to both external and internal audiences: Io's descendant will free him (772-4).[630] This is Io's third key contribution. It ensures that Io prompts Prometheus for more information which in turn allows him to expand further on the rest of her journey (786-815). This is a key piece of news for both the external and internal audiences, if not the most important. It aligns Io to Prometheus and further enhances Prometheus' philanthropic profile. It also looks ahead to the next play in the dilogy or trilogy.

The shorter third stasimon (887-906) is a response to the travails of Io. The Chorus enable Prometheus to tell Io's story in a controlled and specific way. Io's scene comes after the Chorus have sung about Prometheus' wedding (555-60). This subliminally primes the external audience to be prepared for Io and her story of an unfortunate match (for her) with Zeus. The Chorus' lament for Io (687-95) allows them to briefly take control of the narrative (λέγ᾽, ἐκδίδασκε, 698). This happens again when they interrupt Io to persuade Prometheus to talk about Io's remaining journey and the ancestor who will free Prometheus (782-5). Prometheus is persuaded (ἐπεὶ προθυμεῖσθ᾽, 786)

---

[629] See note 619 above regarding the possible significance of the number three in the ancient world.
[630] τρίτος γε γένναν πρὸς δέκ᾽ ἄλλαισιν γοναῖς, 'the third after ten others', 774.

but is reminded by the Chorus (819-22) that he must carry out both prophecies. The Chorus have a dominant role in this section of the play and their interlocutions enable Prometheus to deliver his messages in a coherent and ordered manner.

The Chorus also influence the progression of the narrative structure. They use interruption (631-4) as a delaying tactic designed to increase tension (as Pylades does in *Choe.* 900-2),[631] which allows Io to tell her story. The narrative is delayed again (782-5) to allow Prometheus to choose to explore Io's story further rather than answer the Chorus' questions on the secret he holds from Zeus. This helps to extend the expectation of the external audience. Prometheus himself also exploits the delaying tactic (823-6) when his narrative suddenly circles back upon itself as he proves the validity of his prophetic powers (823-6). This section actually picks up where Io left her story (640-86) and matches the circularity of the play's narrative and themes.

This stasimon has been deemed by scholars to be particularly un-Aeschylean given the 'banalities' that are under discussion.[632] A superficial reading suggests simplicity but the stasimon reveals the increasing fear (ταρβῶ, 898) of the Chorus as the full extent of Zeus' ruthlessness becomes apparent. Io's story reaffirms the helplessness of mortals that the Chorus sang of in the second stasimon (ὀλιγοδρανίαν ἄκικυν, ἰσόνειρον, 548-9) and it is this which

---

[631] See discussion on p. 292.
[632] See Podlecki (2005): 188-9.

the Chorus respond to. This corresponds with the theme of human helplessness which underscores the behaviour of all the figures of the play except for Prometheus. It is particularly evidenced in the portrayal of Io, forced to wander the world in torment. Even though Zeus desires her, she must endure until her punishment is complete (848). Io's predicament is the same as Prometheus': she is imprisoned by her transformed shape (674) and tormented by the gadfly.[633] Io's statement that she would rather die once than suffer repeatedly (κρεῖσσον γὰρ εἰσάπαξ θανεῖν ἢ τὰς ἁπάσας ἡμέρας πάσχειν κακῶς, 750-1) is an unwitting vocalisation of Prometheus' exact fate.

Io's declaration may be a subtle message to the external audience that the consequence of a short mortal life is the limit to the suffering that must be endured. Io's statement allows Prometheus to allude once again to the possibility of Zeus' fall (752-6). The stasimon acknowledges the ephemerality of both divine and mortal actions if it is Zeus' will that they should be curtailed, a distinct message for the external audience about the overarching power of the gods. It is followed by Prometheus exalting in the downfall of Zeus that he knows will come if the latter continues on his present path (929-40). This is discussed in more detail below,[634] but this section is another illustration of Prometheus' personality. His belligerent manner,

---

[633] Lines 566, 580, 589, 681, 836, 879. Ovid's version of Io's story is that she was transformed into a cow for protection, to shield her from Hera. Zeus sent Hermes to kill Argus, Io's guard sent by Hera, and so Hera sent the gadfly to Io to deny her respite. Ov. *Met*. 1.583-748.
[634] See section on foreshadowing, p. 243.

somewhat softened during Io's scene, returns. This is a subtle precursor of the scene to follow, where Prometheus must spar with Hermes.

The Olympian god Hermes (944-1079) is the archetypal messenger figure, a messenger god,[635] but one whose unique message is delivered at the end of the play. Hermes is also related to Prometheus through his maternal grandfather Atlas. He is an aggressive messenger figure, mirroring the attitude and demeanour of Kratos in the prologue. The play thus opens and closes with supporters of Zeus denigrating Prometheus. Hermes has come directly from Zeus (947-8) who demands that Prometheus reveal his secret. When this fails he tells Prometheus how his actions will result in his further punishment (1007-35). One of Hermes' recognised functions is to act as a messenger god and as such it is curious both that his role is relatively short (one hundred and thirty-five lines out of one thousand and ninety-three) and that it is placed at the end of the play. The brevity of the role perhaps reflects the structure of a play which has several messenger figures. Hermes' particular message, direct from Zeus, is that Prometheus must reveal his secret knowledge (947-8), although references to this recur elsewhere throughout the play.[636]

Hermes' function is not to reiterate this message, but is a last attempt to extract the secret from Prometheus.[637] Uniquely, the messenger god is not

---

[635] Ἑρμείαν μὲν ἔπειτα διάκτορον, Hom. *Od*. 1.84.
[636] Lines 169-71, 188-9, 519-25, 755-6, 907-19, 929-40, 989-96.
[637] Lines 947-52, 999-1000, 1015-33.

required to deliver a message; he is instead to facilitate the actualisation of another's message. Hermes 'fails his tragic function' spectacularly.[638] The obvious function of the messenger god is subverted by the poet as he becomes a puppet for Zeus. This innovative use melds mythological identity and character function to create an alternative mechanism for message delivery. That Prometheus declines to deliver his own message invalidates Hermes' presence, creating liminal tensions for the character which is reflected in Hermes' increasingly heated exchanges with Prometheus.

The duality of the tension – embodied implicitly in the liminal tension and explicitly through the confrontation with Prometheus – is released by the play's dénouement. Placing the messenger god Hermes at the end of the play also allows the other message-bearing figures to assume more significance in the overall narrative structure. It also supports the idea of Prometheus as messenger figure. Prometheus' refusal to acquiesce dominates the scene and blocks Hermes' function.

Hermes (944-1079) is the final message enabler of the play (944-52); his demands allow Prometheus to once again renounce the Olympian gods (975-6, 1004-6) and reiterate his refusal to share his knowledge (961-3, 989-96), as every other character in the play has also done. Hermes enables Prometheus' messaging when he warns him he must not expect him to make the trip again (μηδέ μοι διπλᾶς ὁδούς, Προμηθεῦ, προσβάλῃς: ὁρᾷς δ᾽ ὅτι

---

[638] Burnett (1985): 34.

Ζεὺς τοῖς τοιούτοις οὐχὶ μαλθακίζεται, 950-2). Now Prometheus is given the opportunity to rail against the Olympians in front of an Olympian who is also Zeus' progeny. When Hermes addresses Zeus as 'father' (πατήρ, 947), he is using the word in the literal as well as the divine sense. Prometheus vents his rage[639] and the *agôn* quickly becomes darker as Hermes warns Prometheus of the consequences of failing to listen to him (1014-35). Hermes does not deliver a message but enables it to be actualised: Prometheus' final words (1080-93) describe how Hermes' prophecy (1015-19, 1062) is beginning to come true.

Hermes embodies another facet of enabling: he enables the presence of Zeus to participate in the action of the play. As messenger of the Olympian gods in general and Zeus in particular, Hermes' sole function in this play is to represent Zeus: the latter never appears as a character in extant tragedy. Nevertheless, the very strong presence of Zeus throughout the text confirms his importance and that he is particularly integral to the internal world of the play.[640] He is indispensable to the plot – every character speaks about him and the plot is based entirely on his direct orders regarding Prometheus. Such is his presence he could almost be imagined as a silent character with the beginning of the shocking convulsions at the end of the play (1080-93) interpreted as his only direct contribution. The spectacle represents a

---

[639] Lines 953-63, 987-96, 1040-53.
[640] Lines 4, 10, 12, 17, 34, 40, 50, 53, 62, 67, 120, 122, 150, 163, 194, 202, 203, 218, 241, 255, 304, 310, 313, 339, 357, 358, 372, 376, 402, 510, 517, 519, 527, 542, 551, 590, 619, 649, 652, 654, 667, 672, 756, 757, 759, 761, 771, 803, 831, 848, 850, 895, 906, 908-9, 928, 930, 938, 941-2, 947, 952, 968, 981, 984, 990, 1002, 1018, 1021, 1033, 1076, 1084, 1089.

temporal 'in-between' space that facilitates Zeus' entry into the theatrical

space.[641]   The ending, where Prometheus describes this cataclysmic

realisation of Zeus' message (1080-93), and where it could be argued Zeus

himself symbolically appears (τοιάδ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ ῥιπὴ Διόθεν, 1089), is the only

viable ending for this play. The consequences of Prometheus' disobedience

towards Zeus are threaded prominently throughout the play and the dramatic

spectacle of the prologue – of Prometheus' undignified shackling – matches

the striking ending.

News, Messages and Message Enabling

The *Prometheus Bound* is a play full of messages and the majority of the cast

facilitate message enabling. Only Bia does not contribute to message

enabling although his perpetual silence is effective in emphasising the

brutality of Kratos.[642] The figures in the play also allow the poet to build a

portrait of Zeus and examine his personality through the perspectives of those

loyal to him, and those who feel he has wronged them.

Unlike the extant six plays by Aeschylus, the *Prometheus Bound* features a

predominantly divine cast. There are, however, many elements within the

Prometheus Bound that suggests it follows similar narrative structures to the

---

[641] Bhabha (1994): 212 discusses how '... the subject of cultural discourse – the agency of a people – is split in the discursive ambivalence that emerges in the contest of narrative authority between the pedagogical and the performative'. Thus the contest between Zeus and Prometheus reflects the tension between gods and humans, the pressures of the real world played out on stage within a protected environment.
[642] See discussion on silence below.

plays known to be by Aeschylus. The preoccupation with pre-Olympian mythology mentioned above is one aspect. Another is how mythology is used to create and perpetuate the narrative focus.[643] Reactions to news and messages which help to progress the narrative are also distinctively Aeschylean within the context of his extant tragedies. For example, the antagonism of Prometheus towards Hermes and the Olympians is reminiscent of the Danaids' argument with Pelasgus (*Supp*. 359-467).[644] Table 8 lists the main news and messages.

Table 8 News and Messages by Subject in the *Prometheus Bound*

News and/or Message	Character and Lines
Zeus as new ruler of the gods	Hephaestus (34-5) Prometheus (96-7, 199-225, 304-5, 439-40, 942, 955-6, 960) Chorus (149-51 unlawful power) Oceanos (310, 389)
Prometheus as transgressor against the gods	Kratos (4-11, 61-2, 70) Hephaestus (29-31) Hermes (945-6)
Prometheus as benefactor to mortals	Hephaestus (28-30) Kratos (36-7, 83-4) Prometheus (107-11, 120-3, 228-39, 248-54, 267, 443-69, 478-506, 612) Chorus (543-4) Io (613-14) Hermes (945-6)
Prometheus' secret about Zeus	Prometheus (169-71, 187-9, 442-506, 755-6, 907-27, 989-96) Prometheus and Chorus (519-25, 928-40, 958) Prometheus and Io (757-70) Hermes (947-9)
Reconciliation between Zeus and Prometheus	Prometheus (187-92) Oceanos (338-9)
Titanomachy	Chorus (164-6, 402-10) Prometheus (199-221, 330, 347-72)
Io's curse	Io (566-88, 596-603, 665-82, 759, 877-86) Chorus (589-92, 898-900) Prometheus (746)

---

[643] See chapters three, pp. 149 ff. and five, pp. 259 ff. in particular.
[644] Discussed in chapter three above, pp. 149 ff.

News and/or Message	Character and Lines
Io's future	Prometheus (707-35, 772, 790-815, 829-52)
Prometheus' punishment	Prometheus (992-4, 1043-52, 1080-93) Hermes (1014-29)
Prometheus' escape	Prometheus (770-4, 853-74)

The analysis reveals that the predominant themes are Prometheus' assistance to mortals, the youthfulness of Zeus' rule, the secret Prometheus is withholding from Zeus, and Io's journey and descendants. The concept of justice (δίκη) is also implied in Prometheus' complaints about Zeus and his treatment of him,[645] as it is in the story of Io, blameless yet suffering so much at the hands of the gods. Prometheus says Zeus keeps justice for himself (οἶδ᾽ ὅτι τραχὺς καὶ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῷ τὸ δίκαιον ἔχων, 186-7), ostensibly leaving none for the characters of the play. Io symbolises the human race and perhaps her suffering is indicative of what might have befallen mortals should Zeus have had his way and destroyed them (βροτῶν δὲ τῶν ταλαιπώρων λόγον οὐκ ἔσχεν οὐδέν᾽, ἀλλ᾽ ἀιστώσας γένος τὸ πᾶν ἔχρῃζεν ἄλλο φιτῦσαι νέον, 231-3). When Prometheus explicitly links his suffering with the decision to help mortals in this way (237-8), there is a subliminal message that mortals (i.e., the external audience) should look upon him more favourably than perhaps they would Zeus.

The list of Prometheus' gifts to mortals comes after Prometheus' shared the news that Zeus wanted to destroy the humans and that no other gods but Prometheus opposed his wish (καὶ τοῖσιν οὐδεὶς ἀντέβαινε πλὴν ἐμοῦ, 234).

---

[645] See also the discussion on Themis, p. 240.

The knowledge that Zeus, de facto king of the Olympian pantheon, actually wanted to destroy the whole human race could have had a polarising effect on the external audience. That the statement comes from another god also confers authority upon it. The gods could be mercurial and brutal in their interactions with humans but to want to annihilate them (ἀιστώσας γένος, 232) was an extreme action.[646] As Podlecki notes,[647] there was a danger that the increasingly independent (thanks to Prometheus' gifts) human race might rely less on the gods; the further knowledge that Zeus wished to destroy them might advance that inclination.[648] This elevates Prometheus' 'crimes' from basic insubordination to dangerous agitation and goes some way to explaining Zeus' attitude towards Prometheus in the play.

The balance of news communication between internal and external audiences in this example is biased towards the latter and this is similar to the use of external messages in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* where the metatheatrical staging of the law court would have been of particular significance to that play's external audience.[649] The question of the secret that Prometheus is keeping from Zeus is another example where the external audience would have had a wider understanding of the context than the internal audience. According to

---

[646] See the stories of Niobe, Menthe, Arachne, Maera, Broteas, Actaeon, Laocoon, the Edonian Lycurgus, Tantalus, Erysichthon and Hippolytus as some examples of the gods' more vicious punishments against humans.

[647] Podlecki (2005): 31.

[648] White has argued that rather than destroy the human race, Zeus merely intended to 'conceal' them: another meaning of ἀιστόω (232) is 'to make unseen'. He suggests that Prometheus has conflated the entire human race with Io's current family which will be superseded by her illustrious descendants following the birth of Epaphus. White (2001): 123.

[649] Discussed in chapter five below.

Pindar, Themis told Zeus and Poseidon directly that Thetis' son would grow to be more powerful than his father.[650]   It is unlikely that members of the external audience would not know who Achilleus was, the son that Thetis went on to have with the mortal Peleus, lauded by Homer as the greatest of the Greek heroes.[651]   Aeschylus has Themis tell her son Prometheus the secret (209, 874) which allows him to use it to bargain for his freedom.

The message – the secret – is repeatedly referred to throughout the play[652] and this is a key element of the portrayal of Zeus in the *Prometheus Bound*. Zeus may have overthrown the Titans and imprisoned Prometheus at the ends of the earth (χθονὸς μὲν ἐς τηλουρὸν ἥκομεν πέδον, 1) for his disobedience but he cannot force Prometheus to tell him what he wants to know. It suggests Zeus' power is limited and the fairly negative portrayal of him is one of the reasons that some scholars believe the play not to be by Aeschylus.[653]   The fact that Zeus' reign is so new is highlighted by Hephaestus, the Chorus and Oceanos as well as, more frequently, by Prometheus,[654] and also undermines his authority as ruler.[655]   Prometheus says that Zeus is already preparing his marriage to Thetis (907-10) and the implication is that Prometheus is delaying matters; again, a circumstance which would have been intolerable to Zeus,

---

[650] Pind. *Isth*. 8.30-45, c.478 B.C.E.
[651] Δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, Hom. *Il*. 7.
[652] 169-71, 187-9, 442-506, 519-25, 755-70, 907-27, 928-40, 947-9, 958, 989-96.
[653] See discussions by White (2001): 108-9, Podlecki (2005): 34-7 and Sommerstein (2010): 228-9.
[654] Lines 34-5, 96-7, 149-51, 199-225, 304-5, 310, 389, 439-40, 942, 955-6, 960.
[655] The theme of 'young' gods usurping their elders is prominent in the *Eumenides*; see chapter five below.

portrayed as having implacable anger.[656] It is feasible that the resolution of the secret would also be obvious to the external audience. Some of the external audience would probably know that the descendant of Io who would eventually free Prometheus was the demi-god Heracles.[657] Heracles has his own complicated history with the gods and his extensive mythological adventures were quite possibly well known to the external audience.

Prometheus himself may be viewed as a messenger figure.[658] Prometheus is the primary role in the play and is the conduit through which all other characters are motivated and directed. His prominence as a messenger figure echoes that of the Chorus in *Suppliants* who similarly direct the action around them. A striking aspect of Prometheus as a messenger figure is the fact that he is a messenger who refuses to deliver his message; the details of the secret he is keeping from Zeus are never revealed in the play.[659] This is the source of the intense frustration and anger of Kratos and Hermes, who see Prometheus' insubordination against Zeus as the worst crime he can commit.

There are additional, important messenger-type figures in the play. The representations of Oceanos and Hermes are of two extremes, one conciliatory (Oceanos) and the other hostile (Hermes). Oceanos (284-396) and Hermes (944-1079) bookend Io's scene (561-886), enabling Prometheus to

---

[656] Lines 160-7, 186, 240-1, 311-14, 934.
[657] Lines 27, 84, 772-4, 870-4. See pp. 251 ff.
[658] Lines 169-74, 197-276, 340-72, 589-92, 705-815, 846-76, 907-27.
[659] Lines 169-71, 188-9, 519-25, 755-6, 907-19, 929-40, 989-96.

demonstrate his prophetic and powerful persona and, crucially, allow him to give full vent to his bitterness before his peers. The placing of their scenes also allows the poet to manipulate the tension. Oceanos and Hermes balance Hephaestus and Kratos, indicators of the duality in the play which is also found in the pairing of the Chorus with Io and Prometheus with Zeus.[660] After Oceanos' departure it might be expected that the internal audience would be anticipating a different ending following Oceanos' assurance that he can negotiate with Zeus (338-9). This serves to create a subliminal temporal tension between the internal and external audiences, the latter knowing that a relenting of Zeus' anger is doubtful.

Conceptual Themes and Dramatic Strategies

The *Prometheus Bound* is dominated by thematic concepts and dramatic strategies which are also found in the plays known to be by Aeschylus. These concepts are fundamental to the development of the news and messages propagated throughout the play. The prevalence of foreshadowing, the clever use of silence and the manipulation of temporalities are intrinsic to the narrative arc. Of the different varieties of news and message communication, foreshadowing is the predominant mechanism in this play. Foreshadowing can be used in different ways – to indicate things that may happen in the life of the play as well as things that may happen in subsequent plays.

---

[660] The issue of Zeus' presence in the play is discussed further below.

A particularly striking feature of the *Prometheus Bound* is the use of silence. As will be demonstrated in the chapter on the *Oresteia* below,[661] silence can be used in a variety of ways to achieve a range of effects. In the *Prometheus Bound*, two characters are notable for their silence. Both instances are in the prologue to the play and this fact makes it even more unusual given the importance of the prologue in situating the events about to take place. Finally, the play features multiple temporalities across mortal and divine planes through which news and messages are delivered to the internal and external audiences.

Foreshadowing

Foreshadowing is threaded all the way through the *Prometheus Bound*[662] and is primarily concerned with the secret that Prometheus holds over Zeus and the consequences should Prometheus' prophecy that Zeus will lose his power come to fruition. Much is made of Zeus' anger with Prometheus in keeping with the overall negative image of him in this text.[663] The Chorus' lamentations for Prometheus, where they describe the land and sea itself groaning for his fate,[664] is a precursor to the final scene where Zeus' presence is realised. Table 9 demonstrates the instances of foreshadowing in the text, most of which are dominated by Prometheus.

Table 9 Foreshadowing in the *Prometheus Bound*

---

[661] Chapter five, pp. 259 ff.
[662] Lines 27, 34-5, 84, 101-2, 169-71,187-8, 511-14, 522-5, 696-7, 743-4, 755-6, 760-2, 907-12, 918-19, 926-7, 958-9, 992-6, 1071-9.
[663] Lines 9, 34, 160-1, 174. See Podlecki (2005): 34-7 on the 'problem' of Zeus.
[664] Lines 406-14, 431-5.

Line ref	Who	Reference
27	Hephaestus	The future birth of Heracles.
33-5	Hephaestus	Prometheus will suffer before he is released.
84	Kratos	Refers to Heracles – a mortal who will rescue Prometheus.
101-2	Prometheus	His powers of foresight.
169-71	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus.
187-8	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus.
406-14	Chorus	Land and sea mourning Prometheus' misfortune (cf. 1080-93).
431-5	Chorus	Land and sea mourning Prometheus' misfortune (cf. 1080-93).
511-14	Prometheus	He will suffer greatly before he is released.
522-5	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus and his loss of power.
696-7	Prometheus	Io's continued suffering.
743-4	Prometheus	Io's continued suffering.
755-6	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus and his loss of power.
760-2	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus and his loss of power.
907-12	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus and his loss of power.
918-19	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus and his loss of power.
926-7	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus and his loss of power.
958-9	Prometheus	The secret he is keeping from Zeus and his loss of power.
992-4	Prometheus	Prometheus' fate if he refuses to reveal the secret (cf. 1080-93).
1014-29	Hermes	Prometheus' fate if he refuses to reveal the secret (cf. 1080-93).
1071-9	Hermes	The effects of Zeus' fall from power on the Olympian gods.

Although Prometheus dominates the foreshadowing in the play, most instances are not related to his prophetic abilities (which might be expected) but to the source of his power over Zeus, the secret he is keeping about Thetis.[665] Prometheus cannot be killed (753, 933, 1053) but he can suffer.[666]

---

[665] Lines 169-71, 187-8, 522-5, 755-6, 760-2, 907-12, 918-19, 926-7, 958-9.
[666] Lines 92-100, 118, 158-9, 274-5, 306, 1093.

Despite this, his suffering is assuaged by the knowledge of potential disaster for Zeus (907-27). The repetition of the secret, and the fact that it irks Zeus so much, is a counterpoint to Prometheus' suffering. It is in a way a comfort for him, because although he bears the humiliation of being chained, he still has some form of power.

Hermes himself has only one instance where he utilises foreshadowing, when he warns Prometheus of the further punishments to follow his incarceration (1014-34). In this case, the action presaged in the foreshadowing (1080-93) takes place very quickly after the threat. Hermes gives no indication that he has delivered an answer from Prometheus to Zeus, so the cataclysm following so quickly suggests Zeus had been observing Prometheus all along, another indicator of Zeus' constant presence over proceedings. Hephaestus suggests early in the play that Prometheus will suffer (πολλοὺς δ᾽ ὀδυρμοὺς καὶ γόους ἀνωφελεῖς φθέγξῃ, 33-4) and Prometheus himself recognises he will not escape without first enduring pain (οὐ ταῦτα ταύτῃ Μοῖρά πω τελεσφόρος κρᾶναι πέπρωται, μυρίαις δὲ πημοναῖς δύαις τε καμφθεὶς ὧδε δεσμὰ φυγγάνω, 511-14). The end of the play is an example of a resolution of foreshadowing: the first part of Hermes' threat (1014-19) is realised at the end (1080-88). The external audience would be aware of the punishments inflicted on Prometheus in mythological narratives and Hermes' scene helps situate this for them.

Despite being an important figure, Io does not contribute to foreshadowing. What does this suggest given Io's long scene with Prometheus (561-886)?

The answer is not due to the largely divine cast but to Io's divine affliction.[667]

Her suffering is so great that she cannot think clearly:

> οἰστρηλάτῳ δὲ δείματι δειλαίαν παράκοπον ὧδε τείρεις
>
> *P.B.* 580-1
>
> … wretched and driven to a frenzy from the terror of the gadfly …
>
> φοιταλέοισιν ἒ ἔ
>
> *P.B.* 598
>
> ... roaming wildly about …
>
> ὑπό μ᾽ αὖ σφάκελος καὶ φρενοπληγεῖς μανίαι
>
> *P.B.* 878-9
>
> … my mind is beset by madness …

Io is too incoherent and distracted to be able to contribute to foreshadowing in the same way that the other characters do. Instead, she becomes a mechanism by which Prometheus' prophesising can be utilised to achieve dramatic impact when he talks about her future wanderings and the eventual birth of Epaphus.[668] This allows Prometheus to give full rein to his prophetic abilities and demonstrates his philanthropy in action, as well as providing the longest projection of foreshadowing in the play.

Foreshadowing in the *Prometheus Bound* is integral to the design of the play. It is a major factor in applying and enhancing tension and contributes to the delivery of news and messages. The inclusion of references to Heracles (27, 84) has a dual function. For the external audience it is confirmation that the standard mythological narrative is being followed, whilst for the internal

---

[667] Buxton (2009): 56 notes that 'Io's arrival is an inversion of the usual pattern; it is an astonishing irruption of mortality into the world of the gods'.
[668] Lines 705-35, 790-815, 845-52.

audience it indicates that there will be an end to Prometheus' suffering, albeit in thirteen generations' time.[669] It also alludes to the events of the next play, the *Prometheus Unbound*, which possibly included Heracles as a character.

Silence

In the prologue, Hephaestus tells us that Bia, the personification of violence, enters with his brother Kratos (Κράτος Βία τε, 12). This is the only reference to Bia in the play. It is extremely probable that the actor's mask was suitably unpleasant, thus emphasising the nature of the personification.[670] The silence of Bia could be part of his personification – he has no need to speak for his presence alone suffices, actions speaking louder than words. It is also possible that his performance may have been expressed physically rather than verbally, although indications from other figures may have been expected if that were the case. For example, later in the play, Prometheus refers to Io's unwritten howling (σὺ δ᾽ αὖ κέκραγας κἀναμυχθίζῃ, 742); a similar example is also found in the *Choephoroe,* where the slave refers to Aegisthus' death cries (ἔα ἔα μάλα, 870). Whatever was the case, Bia's silence does allow the exchange between Kratos and Hephaestus to take place uninterrupted. This provides room for Hephaestus to vocalise his reluctance as he explains what the external audience is seeing and why (12-35), while Kratos' aggression (36-8, 64-5) sets the tone of what is to follow.

---

[669] Hyginus numbers Prometheus' sentence as 33,000 years, *Fab*. 54. Again, the symbolism of the number three is utilised. See notes on pp. 221 and 230.
[670] As was the case with the appearance of the Erinyes in the *Eumenides*; see p. 315.

The silence of Prometheus in the prologue (1-87) is, given his behaviour throughout the rest of the play, very uncharacteristic. Why is the eponymous protagonist silent? Did his journey to the Caucasus involve him being gagged as well as shackled? If this was the case it would have presented quite a striking image for the watching external audience – divine Prometheus, renowned friend of mortals, is portrayed before them most ignominiously. Knowing the gifts and help Prometheus had given to them (see Table 7) must have made the scene particularly poignant. Prometheus falls silent again later in the play (436-8) following Oceanos' exit, which segues into the first stasimon (397-435) that leads the Chorus to lament his predicament.

Whatever the intended purpose, Prometheus' silence is a kind of symbolism of the power of the gods – always present but not always vocal. The spectre of Zeus hangs over the play almost tangibly, his ubiquity in the text casting him as a silent observer. This suggests that Prometheus' punishment was always going to be carried out because he would never relent and reveal the secret to Zeus until the process of the narrative had been completed. Prometheus' punishment is therefore a symbol of the cost of defying Zeus. The punishment is not so much due to Prometheus' helping mortals or his current refusal to divulge the secret, but because he had the temerity to act against Zeus' wishes and to do so without remorse. Prometheus himself knows this to be true when he refers to his future freedom[671] and the 'softening' of Zeus' mood (ἔμπας δ', ὅῳ μαλακογνώμων ἔσται ποθ', 187-8).

---

[671] Lines 175-7, 186-92, 375-6, 770.

Temporalities

Oceanos, Io and Hermes are notable for acting as temporal markers in the text, representing the different stages of Prometheus' ordeal. Oceanos represents a time when Prometheus' punishment could be avoided; Io's scene leads to a fuller understanding that Prometheus' punishment must happen; Hermes actualises the punishment. The three figures represent the passage of time for Prometheus and, as will be discussed below, Io has particular relevance for the temporalities explored in the play.

Despite being the lead protagonist, Prometheus is presumably unable to move around the stage or even change his position.[672] His physical restrictions may be related to the need to contain the power of a god who is constantly present but his position on stage is literally and metaphorically rooted. He is the conduit between immortals and mortals and is the only character with a clear view of both. The restriction of Prometheus and his physical tethering to mortal earth allows the conjunction of mortal and immortal planes and is symbolic of his love for the human race. Prometheus' punishment for helping the human race is to shackle him to the ground from which he saved them (κατώρυχες δ᾽ ἔναιον ὥστ᾽ ἀήσυροι μύρμηκες ἄντρων ἐν μυχοῖς ἀνηλίοις, 452-3). Despite being a god he is bound to an earthly prison. For Prometheus this is the worst fate; his punishment is on display for all to see:

> εἰ γάρ μ᾽ ὑπὸ γῆν νέρθεν θ᾽ Ἅιδου τοῦ νεκροδέγμονος εἰς
> ἀπέρατον Τάρταρον ἧκεν, δεσμοῖς ἀλύτοις ἀγρίως

---

[672] Lines 3-87, 145-8, 167-8, 509-10, 513-14, 525, 618, 770, 989-91.

πελάσας, ὡς μήτε θεὸς μήτε τις ἄλλος τοῖσδ᾽ ἐπεγήθει. νῦν
δ᾽ αἰθέριον κίνυγμ᾽ ὁ τάλας ἐχθροῖς ἐπίχαρτα πέπονθα

P.B. 153-9

If only he [Zeus] had sent me underneath the earth where Hades receives the dead into impassable Tartaros, savagely holding me with unbreakable bonds so that god or other mortal could rejoice. Now I am sport for the wind and suffer to the enjoyment of the hateful [gods].

Through his benefactions to mortals Prometheus is already symbolic of their continuing existence, which presumably would only exacerbate Zeus' anger towards the Titan. The only extant play known to be by Aeschylus to depict gods on stage is the *Eumenides*. As Podlecki has noted,[673] Zeus is 'temporally determined' – the Titanomachy has just taken place and he is at the start of his rule over the Olympians and no doubt wary of any who question him. This may account for his portrayal in the play, in which his anger towards Prometheus may be borne of vulnerability rather than hatred. The pervasive presence of Zeus, articulated through the figures of the play, also brings the divine plane closer to the external audience.

The Past, Present and Future of Io

Io's journey (700-41, 786-818, 846-52) is of particular interest due to the melding of her past, present and future wanderings with Prometheus' prophecies. The account of Io's wanderings creates a complicated merging of spatial and temporal planes. Not only does Prometheus tell Io where she will go (705-35, 790-815, 846-76) he also tells her where she has been (827-

---

[673] Podlecki (2005): 36.

41). This is all told in a non-linear way – the account of her journey to the Caucasus comes in the middle of the account of her future. This convoluted narrative, from the future to the past and back to the future again, creates a halting narrative. Prometheus' prophetic powers have already been established for both external and internal audiences (101, 210, 484-89), and Io recognises him once he has told her his name (ὦ κοινὸν ὠφέλημα θνητοῖσιν φανείς, τλῆμον Προμηθεῦ, τοῦ δίκην πάσχεις τάδε; 613-14), so the purpose of the narrative sudden looping backwards in time is unclear. One possible explanation may be that it is another delaying tactic to increase the tension before a critical piece of news is delivered, that Io's descendant Heracles will save him (871-4). It could also be a device intended to cause confusion and so deflect the close observance of an omnipotent Zeus. It is certain that the journey of Io described in *Suppliants* (538-54) is simpler and more streamlined although as Podlecki points out,[674] that description served a different purpose to Prometheus' account in this play. Here the construction allows Prometheus to showcase his mantic abilities to the full.

Mythological Temporalities

Despite Io's extreme suffering and long journey still to come, her story will end in triumph for both Prometheus and mortals through the eventual birth of the renowned hero Heracles. The references to Heracles (27, 84, 871-4) also serves to manipulate the temporal narratives. Hephaestus is the first to refer to the future demi-god (ὁ λωφήσων γὰρ οὐ πέφυκέ πω, 27), followed by

---

[674] Podlecki also discusses the geographical knowledge in the play, Podlecki (2005): 201-7.

Kratos (τί σοι οἷοί τε θνητοὶ τῶνδ᾽ ἀπαντλῆσαι πόνων; 84). These comments

of Hephaestus and Kratos are temporally situated in the present and their tone

suggests the implausibility of such a person being able to help Prometheus.

Later, when Prometheus clearly states that the 'famous archer' will release

him (σπορᾶς γε μὴν ἐκ τῆσδε φύσεται θρασὺς τόξοισι κλεινός, ὃς πόνων ἐκ

τῶνδ᾽ ἐμὲ λύσει, 871-4) he is corrupting the temporal narrative of Kratos and

recreating it, redefining the past (Kratos' comment) with a successful future.

The narrative of Io's journey replaces the claustrophobically intense

temporality of Prometheus' predicament with the optimistic temporality of

her future, metaphorically an opening of lightness (the future) in a place of

darkness (Prometheus' present). That the father of Heracles is Zeus is another

implicit indicator that Zeus will eventually come to see the benefit of

Prometheus' actions in helping mortals. The narrative of Heracles reveals

that the argument between Zeus and Prometheus, running for such an extreme

length of time, stretches the temporal perspective of the internal and external

audiences. It is an extreme example of the temporal 'double-step' described

above,[675] where mythological narratives are distinctively extended but in this

instance, it is a move forward, not backward.

At the end of the play (1080-93) Prometheus vocalises the beginning of the

next stage of his punishment as prophesied by Hermes (1014-19). The

temporal world of the future that had been described by Hermes is now

---

[675] See pp. 201 and 256.

realised on stage. This is significant: it is another example of a temporal plane being manipulated and changed within the life of the play's performance. What had been described as a possibility has now been realised within a very short space of time (a mere sixty-six lines). This is another indicator that the temporalities of the play are always shifting in response to news and messages. It also has implications for the playing space of the theatre.

The internal audience is presented directly with the consequence of the quarrel between Prometheus and Zeus. As has already been discussed above, it is not inconceivable to imagine that Zeus becomes present through the eruption of the cataclysm, as Prometheus also recognises (τοιάδ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ ῥιπὴ Διόθεν τεύχουσα φόβον στείχει φανερῶς, 1089-90). For the external audience the event is rationalised as a reflection of their normal lives where natural events were manifestations or indicators of the gods' powers. The on-stage cataclysm connects the two temporal planes together, theatrical and real-world. This merging together creates a liminal space where the external audience can process their understanding of what has taken place on the stage – a divinely sanctioned place – and what it means for their own experience of the world they live in.

Conclusion

The *Prometheus Bound* is a play constructed of and by messages and news. Message enabling, silence and foreshadowing present particularly strongly in this play. The unusual arrangement of the play, with the central figure of Prometheus on stage for the entire duration, creates a claustrophobic setting

and possibly resulted in visual and aural elements becoming more significant.[676] Io's appearance as a cow (κλύεις φθέγμα τᾶς βούκερω παρθένου; 588) would have been striking and much is made of Io's screaming.[677] Io's physical appearance is itself a message, from the gods to both the internal and external audiences: this is how those who displease the gods are treated.[678] The figure of Prometheus being on stage the entire time could also be an allusion to the omnipotent figure of Zeus himself.

The contentious portrayal of Zeus is a feature which stands out.[679] Every character in the play affords Prometheus the opportunity to denigrate the Olympian gods in general and Zeus in particular. Prometheus' Zeus is striking for his inflexibility and volatility. The aggressiveness of Kratos and Hermes, along with the story of Io's suffering, only helps to cement this unflattering portrait. A possible reason for the negative portrayal could be linked to the fact that his rule is so young,[680] perhaps a metatheatrical reference to the pitfalls of assuming power, recklessness and folly. The portrayal of Zeus is not redeemed in the play although the Chorus (178-80,

---

[676] The *Vita Aeschyli* 14 states: 'Aeschylus was the first ... to astound his audiences' eyes'.
[677] Lines 565, 589, 742, 877-86.
[678] Buxton (2009): 56 wonders what an ancient audience would have made of such an outlandish appearance: 'it is extraordinarily difficult to answer such a question, not only because of the inevitable plurality of any audience response, but also because of the absence of anything resembling contemporary extra-dramatic testimony. But one inference can be made from the play itself: Io's metamorphosis is no less solid a part of the staged fiction than is the rest of the tale. Significantly, after Io's departure the Chorus dwells on aspects of her fate which have nothing to do with her status as a cow, and everything to do with the exemplariness of her fate for mortal women … within the frame of the tragic genre, her metamorphosis is unquestionably "taken seriously".'
[679] See pp. 206 ff. above.
[680] Lines 35, 149-50, 305, 389, 439, 939-40, 942, 955, 960.

259-61) and Oceanos (307-10, 315-16) agree that Prometheus acted unwisely, which does help alleviate some of the negativity of Zeus' portrayal.

In any event, none of the gods is portrayed at their best in this play – even Prometheus displays a belligerent arrogance, although this serves to underline the extent of his benevolence towards mortals. Only Bia and Oceanos have more favourable portrayals, Bia simply through his silence[681] and Oceanos in his attempts to placate Prometheus and his offer to engage with Zeus on his behalf (325-9). The gods of the *Prometheus Bound* are difficult, intractable and prone to pettiness and infighting – all very human traits. This interpretation is filtered to the external audience through the powerful structure of the dramatic performance, a conceptual interpretation designed specifically to create and propagate ways of thinking about the ancient world.

Overall, the *Prometheus Bound* displays compatibility with the plays known to be by Aeschylus. Significantly, the play is composed almost entirely of messenger figures, none of whom are formally designated messengers. Even the figure of Hermes, a messenger god, is transformed so that his function suits a different purpose. There are also thematic similarities. Io's anguish resonates with the ending of the *Persians* (*Pers*. 908-1078) and *Choephoroe* (*Choe*. 1048-76) where extreme suffering is enacted on stage.[682] She is also very reminiscent of Cassandra in the *Agamemnon* (*Ag*. 1072-330), cursed and

---

[681] Although as discussed above we cannot know what his actions may have been like – the actor's performance may have been a physical pantomime of the concept of violence.
[682] Lines 565-88, 596-608, 877-86.

tormented by a god (although, of course, Io's ending is happier). Cassandra

also uses silence to great effect as does Pylades in the *Choephoroe* (*Choe.*

900-2).[683] Finally, we are reminded of the ghost of Darius in the *Persians*,

prompted when Io suggests the tortuous gadfly is the ghost of her jailor Argus

(678). Prometheus' own prominence and domineering nature recalls the

Chorus in *Suppliants*, as does his reference to a 'record-book of memory'

(788-9) which echoes Danaus' sentiment to his daughters (*Supp*. 176-9).

The appropriation of ancient mythology is also significant. The ancient

audience had access to mythological stories through the propagation of

Homeric and Epic poetry.[684] As has already been discussed, Aeschylus'

specific use of mythology helps situate the external and internal audiences.

He also tends to look back even further into mythological narratives than the

'present' mythology of the plays. For example, in the *Suppliants*, Pelasgus'

autochthonism is emphasised when he is linked to Palaechthon, and the

Danaids' claim rests on their links to Io, both cases being ancient

mythological narratives for the current mythological figures on stage. The

shield devices of the Seven in the *Seven against Thebes* relate to older

mythological narratives known to the 'current' mythological characters of the

Seven.[685] In the *Prometheus Bound*, discussions of the older mythology of

Ouranos, Cronos and the Titanomachy create the same double-step

backwards into pre-Olympian mythological narratives. The 'current' system

---

[683] See pp. 302 ff.
[684] See pp. 12 ff.
[685] See p. 122.

of Olympian gods is examined within the context of their relationship to the 'older' system of the Titan and earlier gods. Through this mechanism the external audience can compare and contrast the mythological narratives, which helps them to situate their own understanding of the role the gods played in their own lives.

There is no on-stage resolution in the *Prometheus Bound*, either to Io's story, the threat hanging over Zeus or Prometheus' imprisonment. This is not necessarily significant given the play was part of a dilogy or trilogy; if taken in isolation, the plot of Aeschylus' *Choephoroe* ends without resolution. The murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus has been accomplished, but the play ends with Orestes' pursued by the Erinyes – a cliff-hanger ending evocative of the ending of the *Prometheus Bound*. Podlecki highlights the absence of 'learning through suffering'.[686] But the suffering Io learns a great deal about her future; and does Zeus not suffer from Prometheus' actions, if only through fear of what the much-heralded secret may reveal? The eventual reconciliation between Zeus and Prometheus is surely a lesson about the nature of conflict. The process of such suffering may be refracted through the overly-aggressive nature of Kratos and Hermes in the play. The play opens and closes with violence, and both Prometheus and Io are suffering and will continue to do so after the play has ended. The lesson of tragic suffering is that resolution can only be found after a period of penance has been observed and completed.

---

[686] Podlecki (2005): 195. See discussion on catharsis on p. 269.

The distinctive contribution of the *Prometheus Bound* to the thesis centres on the innovative use of news and messaging and the number of significant messenger figures. In particular, the unusual deployment of the Olympian messenger god himself is remarkable. Hermes' role as a message actualiser extends the message enabling concept, resulting in a sophisticated message delivery system that enhances the news and messaging analysis of the thesis.

The final scene of the play where Prometheus vocalises the cataclysm (1080-93) seeds its own implicit message in the external audience. Despite Prometheus' status as a Titan god, despite his powers, despite his help for the human race and despite his defiance towards the Olympians in general and Zeus in particular, he is still under Zeus' command and power. Throughout the play Zeus has shown that he is, and remains, all-powerful (τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα, 10; νέοι γὰρ οἰακονόμοι κρατοῦσ', 149; νέος γὰρ καὶ τύραννος ἐν θεοῖς, 310; ψευδηγορεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταται στόμα τὸ Δῖον, 1032-3), a message of reassurance and stability for the external audience who were so reliant on the gods for their way of life.

Chapter 5
Temporal Transitions and Spatiality: The *Oresteia*

Introduction

The importance of time and space has already been established within the context of messaging. We saw in chapter one how the Messenger of *Persians* has a uniquely multi-spatial presence in that play that allows him to operate internally within the context of the Persian army and externally with the spectators in the theatre through his metatheatrical occupancy of reflexive space, in which he is simultaneously present internally and externally.[687] The Chorus of the *Seven against Thebes* (chapter two) also inhabit a multi-temporal space which allows multiple layers of connections between internal and external audiences.[688]

The focus of this chapter will be an examination of temporality and spatiality in the only extant tragic trilogy, Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (Ὀρέστεια) of 458 B.C.E. This chapter will bring together these two concepts and examine how they operate in tandem. The unique opportunity of examining a trilogy in this context will facilitate an enhanced understanding of how these concepts operate across a sustained unit of work. The chapter will study how

---

[687] Metatheatricality is defined as something that reflects back on the genre (here, ancient tragedy) whereas reflexive space relates to the real world; in this instance, the Messenger figure is a theatrical character reconstructing the Battle of Salamis of 480 B.C.E., an historical event. See also p. 89.
[688] See also pp. 134 ff.

connections are made through news and the unique process of message enabling. The concept of message enabling is unique to the present study and is one of the major parameters of the research framework. It operates as a key instrument in bringing together the concepts of temporality and spatiality.

The theory of space and time within the context of ancient tragedy is constantly evolving, depending on the angle of examination. This can range from the physical space of the theatre[689] to the conceptual space of the performance,[690] both within the performance and within the realm of the spectators, as well as the space in between the two. This study of the trilogy will examine how space and time can be analysed across an extended, connected body of work and look at how the meshing of different types of spatialities and temporalities achieves different effects.

The Trilogy

The trilogy collectively known as the *Oresteia* (Ὀρέστεια) comprises *Agamemnon* (Ἀγαμέμνων), *Choephoroe* (Χοηφόροι) and *Eumenides* (Εὐμενίδες)[691] and was produced with the lost satyr play *Proteus* (Πρωτεύς) in 458 B.C.E., winning first prize.[692] The *choregos* was Xenocles of Aphidna.[693] The trilogy does not survive in one single manuscript. As

---

[689] On which see Wiles (1997).

[690] See Calame (2009), Bakola (2014) and de Jong (2014).

[691] When referencing line numbers of individual plays of the trilogy, the abbreviations *Ag.*, *Choe.* and *Eum.* will be used in line with standard academic referencing conventions for these ancient sources.

[692] Sommerstein (1989): 18.

[693] Confirmed by an inscription found on the Acropolis; Werner (1948): 293 and also noted in Sommerstein (2010): 121.

Collard notes,[694] the *Agamemnon* survives only in fragmentary manuscripts or edited copies; the *Choephoroe* is found in another, the Laurentian manuscript,[695] which also includes the *Eumenides*.[696] *Eumenides* appears in four other manuscripts which Podlecki discusses in his introduction to the play.[697] As Collard confirms, the manuscripts are incomplete or damaged and this is reflected in texts,[698] where multiple instances of missing and emended text are present in all three plays.[699] The satyr play *Proteus* survives in only six fragments which between them contain seventeen words.[700] It tells the story of Menelaus and Helen visiting Egypt which is recounted in Book 4 of Homer's *Odyssey* and is possibly referenced in the *Agamemnon* (674).[701]

Analysis of the Oresteian Universe in Mythology and Epic

Mythological representation is important to the question of news and messaging affecting the perceptions of the internal and external audiences. The mythological point at which the poet chooses to anchor the dramatic action has significant influence on the understanding of both audiences. The

---

[694] Collard discusses the manuscripts in his edition: Collard (2002): lxiii-lxiv.

[695] Smyth (1933): 48.

[696] The text of *Eumenides* appears in the tenth century C.E. Mediceus Laurentianus manuscript, as does *Suppliants* (see p. 154). Garvie (2016): 26 comments that 'of all the surviving Greek tragedies *Supplices* and *Choephori* are exceptional in that for them we may safely say that M [Mediceus Laurentianus] presents the one and only transmitted text'.

[697] Podlecki (1989): 51-3.

[698] He cites West's Greek text as the most authoritative rendering: West (1998) and West (1990a).

[699] *Agamemnon* (22, 195, 251, 288, 369, 383, 433, 519, 539, 546, 557, 800, 871, 1002, 1115, 1150, 1234-5, 1455-61, 1470, 1474, 1475-80, 1521-2, 1537-50, 1595-7, 1657-8, 1664, 1672-3); *Choephoroe* (1-10, 124, 160, 165, 207, 228, 237, 284, 370, 378, 415, 449, 555, 750, 803, 822, 831, 864, 1006, 1032, 1040, 1045); *Eumenides* (76, 119, 203, 213, 353, 359, 405, 457, 473, 478, 592, 633, 638, 685, 751, 774, 791, 802, 805, 821, 945, 960-1, 1027, 1029, 1032, 1041, 1044).

[700] Sommerstein (2010): 121.

[701] Weir Smyth (1926): 455.

story of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra's conflict is presented in Books 3, 4 and 11 of the *Odyssey*. The *Odyssey* portrays Orestes' devotion to his father as a model for Telemachus to follow, and Aegisthus is declaimed as the sole murderer of Agamemnon (*Od*. 3.193-8, 255-308) rather than Clytemnestra. The avoidance of Clytemnestra's role in the murder here lends weight to this theory;[702] a matricide cannot be recommended as a model of virtue. Clytemnestra is, however, deemed 'hateful' (μητρός τε στυγερῆς, *Od*. 3.310) and in Book 11 the ghost of Agamemnon reveals the full extent of her treachery to Odysseus (*Od*. 11.405-56). The story is also found in Pindar, who emphatically states Clytemnestra's role in the murder of Agamemnon and Cassandra.[703] Aeschylus' appropriation of the mythological narrative has created an enduring tableau of bloody, familial strife.[704]

The mythological narrative of the story is that Agamemnon, beseeched by his brother Menelaus for help in restoring Helen to him after she has left him for the Trojan Paris,[705] sacrifices his daughter Iphigeneia for fair winds to sail to Troy (details reprised in *Ag*. 40-6, 122-247).[706] The Greeks are away in Troy for ten years,[707] during which time Clytemnestra has plotted Agamemnon's

---

[702] As noted by Sommerstein (2010): 136-7.
[703] Pindar, *Pythian Ode for Thrasydaeus of Thebes*, 11.15-40, c.474 B.C.E.
[704] In his introduction to Icke's adaptation of the *Oresteia* for the Almeida Theatre in 2015, Simon Goldhill points out 'After Aeschylus, no-one ever again could simply say "be like Orestes, my son …"'. Icke (2015): 5.
[705] Hom. *Il*. 2.160-2; Hom. *Od*. 17.118-19; Apollod. 3.7.
[706] Iphigeneia's sacrifice is first mentioned in the Epic Cycle by Proclus (410/12-485 C.E.) in his summary of the *Cypria*; see Apollod. 2.23 and Kinkel (1877): 19. Modern productions of the *Agamemnon* are sometimes preceded by stagings of Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*: Hardwick (2001).
[707] Hom. *Il*. 2.134, 294, 329.

murder,[708] possibly with her cousin-in-law Aegisthus.[709] Aeschylus' trilogy starts with the events dramatised in the *Agamemnon* when the king returns to Argos (810-957) and is murdered by Clytemnestra (1343-5) along with his concubine Cassandra (1444-6).

In the second play of the trilogy, Orestes kills his mother Clytemnestra (896-930, 965-1006) and Aegisthus (869, 875-84) in vengeance for his father's death (269-306, 380-5), supported by his sister Electra (363-71, 394-9), and sees the arrival of the Erinyes (Ἐρινὺς, 1048-62). In the final play of the trilogy, despite support from Apollo,[710] Orestes cannot escape the Erinyes sent at the behest of his mother's ghost (94-139) and Athena convenes a court at Athens (470-88) to determine his guilt or innocence of matricide (566-753), with the goddess herself casting the deciding vote in Orestes' favour. The Erinyes are placated (916-26) and offered eternal sanctuary in Athens (927-37) as protective deities (Σεμναί [θεαί], 'revered goddesses', *Eum*. 1041).[711]

Neither Homer nor Aeschylus mentions the version of Clytemnestra's myth where she is married to Tantalus, another son of Thyestes and by whom she has a child.[712] In this version, Agamemnon murders them so that he can marry

---

[708] Hom. *Od*. 3.234-5, 24.96-7.
[709] Possibly under the influence of Nauplius: Palamedes, Nauplius' son by Clymene, was falsely accused of treachery by Odysseus and stoned to death during the Trojan War. In his revenge for his son's death, Nauplius influenced Clytemnestra to begin a relationship with Aegisthus. Apollon. *Argon*. 1.133-8, Apollod. 2.1.5., 3.2.2; see also Hom. *Od*. 1.28-43, 1.298-300, 11.405-56.
[710] Lines 64-93, 203-34, 576-81.
[711] As Sommerstein notes, the name Εὐμενίδες ('kindly ones') does not appear anywhere in the play. Sommerstein (2010): 131.
[712] Eur. *Iph. Aul*. 1149-52; Paus. 2.18.2; Apollod. 2.16.

Clytemnestra but no variations on the myth that are currently known suggest that this disturbed Clytemnestra as much as did the death of Iphigeneia.[713] Chrysothemis, the fourth child of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra,[714] is also excluded from Aeschylus' trilogy but is present in the *Iliad* (Hom. *Il*. 9.140-5), where she is named alongside her sisters Laodice (the name of Electra in Epic poetry) and Iphianassa (another name for Iphigeneia).[715] Chrysothemis is restored to the family by Euripides in his production of *Orestes* (408 B.C.E., 20-5) and by Sophocles in his *Electra* (c.418-410 B.C.E., 154-60). Iphigeneia is also known as Iphianassa in Sophocles' *Electra* (154-60).

These naming variations are one aspect which demonstrates how malleable the mythological stories were for the ancient writers. It may suggest that Aeschylus' decision to exclude Chrysothemis from his trilogy's storyline may not have been deemed overly significant by his original audience. Alternatively, her absence may have a linear narrative rationale. In Sophocles' *Electra*,[716] Chrysothemis is chiefly notable for her attempts at brokering a truce between Electra and Clytemnestra. The narrative of the *Oresteia* may have been complicated by her inclusion which would affect the binary opposition of two against two: Orestes/Electra -v- Clytemnestra/Aegisthus. As for Electra, the *Choephoroe* is the first time she

---

[713] Hughes' description of Iphigeneia's sacrifice is vivid in his rendering of the trilogy. Hughes (1999): 14-16.

[714] See Appendix 4, p. 346.

[715] The *Cypria* (14) records Iphianassa as a fourth daughter of Agamemnon. Monro (1884): 8.

[716] Sophocles *El*. 328-472.

appears with that name in ancient texts. In this play she is supportive of Orestes' plans; in the later plays by Sophocles and Euripides, Electra plays a larger role in the killing of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. Aeschylus may have chosen this more passive role for her in order to focus on a binary tension between Orestes and Clytemnestra, a pattern which is echoed throughout the trilogy.[717]

The three plays also alter other mythological narratives. In the *Agamemnon* for example, Pleisthenes is named as the father of the Atreidae (1569). Although he was part of the Atreid family line, he may also be known either as the brother of Atreus and Thyestes or the son of Atreus.[718] This may be an attempt to break the genealogical link with Pelops, polluted by his actions in the deception and murder of Myrtilus.[719] Another mythological variation in this play is that Cassandra's gift of prophecy is given by Apollo (1202-12). Other versions of her myth say she was either born with the gift or it was bestowed upon her as a child.[720]

Finally, the Erinyes belong to an ancient mythological strand. Hesiod says the Erinyes are the daughters of Gaia (Γαῖα, 2.135)[721] whilst Aeschylus says

---

[717] See Table 17, p. 308.
[718] Apollod. 3.2.1-2, *Ep.* 2.10; Bacchyl. *Dith.* 15.
[719] Myrtilus assisted Pelops in winning the hand of Hippodameia, whose father Oenomaus set her previous suitors to an impossible chariot race which always ended in their deaths. Myrtilus sabotaged Oenomaus' chariot, resulting in Pelops' victory. Myrtilus died, either at the hand of Pelops or by accident, but before he died he cursed Pelops' line, a curse which was never lifted despite Pelops seeking purification. Apollod. 2.6-8; Paus. 8.14.10.
[720] Apollod. 3.12.5; *The Sack of Ilium,* 1.521 (Epic Cycle), attributed to Arctinus (c.8 B.C.E.).
[721] Hes., *Theog.* 190.

they are daughters of Night (Νύξ, 321, 790, 962). The effect of Aeschylus'

change is to give a sinister edge to their portrayal; Night, born from the void

of Chaos (Χάος),[722] is also the mother of Fate (Μόρος), Doom (Κήρ), Death

(Θάνατος), Blame (Μῶμος), Misery (Ὀιζὺς), Retribution (Νέμεσις), Deceit

(Ἀπάτη) and Strife (Ἔρις). It acts as a subliminal message for both internal

and external audiences that the Erinyes are to be feared. Later mythology

numbers the Erinyes as three,[723] named Megaera,[724] Tisiphone[725] and

Alecto;[726] in the play, the chorus follows the tragedic pattern of twelve

members (*Eum*. 46, 585).

Casting the Erinyes as the Chorus allows Aeschylus to gain maximum,

sustained impact from their presence, helped in no small part by their

appearance.[727] The shock of their unpleasant appearance on stage would have

been amplified by their number:[728]

> ὑμᾶς θ᾽ ὁμοίας οὐδενὶ σπαρτῶν γένει, οὔτ᾽ ἐν θεαῖσι πρὸς
> θεῶν ὁρωμένας οὔτ᾽ οὖν βροτείοις ἐμφερεῖς μορφώμασιν

> <div align="right">Athena, Eum. 409-12</div>

> … you who are like nothing that has been born, neither
> belonging to gods or humans …

> ἄπτεροί γε μὴν ἰδεῖν αὗται, μέλαιναι δ᾽ ἐς τὸ πᾶν
> βδελύκτροποι

---

[722] Hes., *Theog.* 123-5.

[723] Adrasta, daughter of Necessity (Ἀνάγκη), is sometimes included as a fourth. Hes. *Theog*.1.84; Curtis (1829): 697.

[724] Megaera's name first appears in Virg. *Aen.* 12.845-8.

[725] Tisiphone's name first appears in a fragment of Lucilius, c.1 B.C.E.

[726] Alecto's name first appears in Virg. *Aen.* 7.342.

[727] Apocryphally, the terrifying appearance of the Erinyes was said to have caused women in the audience to faint and suffer miscarriages, perhaps more a mark of the seriousness of their identity and function rather than their actual appearance; see *Vita Aeschyli* 9.

[728] See also discussion below on p. 315.

Pythia,[729] *Eum.* 51-2

… wingless, black and disgusting …

The brief examples above demonstrate the fluidity of the myths.[730] Whilst Philips rightly states, 'literary uses of myths should not normally be confused with the myths themselves',[731] the freedom and flexibility offered by the ability to alter familiar stories allowed the poets to exploit a pool of mythological characters who could be interpreted in myriad ways. The present discussion seeks to explore how those manipulations are affected by the news and messages threaded throughout the play and the characters' interactions. The relationships between characters can subtly affect reception of the messages and news being conveyed. In addition, the representation of myth helps to situate the internal and external audiences. Mythological stories also formed the basis of religion, the stories explaining and interpreting how the ancient Greeks lived their lives.

---

[729] The Pythia (Πυθιάς Προφητις) was the priestess of Apollo at Delphi, so named after the dragon Python (Πύθων), who was the earliest deity to inhabit the shrine and was killed by Apollo who wanted to claim it for himself. He buried the dragon under the *Omphalos* (Ὀμφαλός) and initiated the Pythian Games in its honour; see Hes. *Theog*. 485-500, Paus. 2.13.7 and 10.16.3. Lloyd-Jones has noted that Aeschylus chose to lessen the more violent aspects of Apollo's acquisition of the shrine in this play. Lloyd-Jones (1976): 61.

[730] As Vernant and Vidal-Naquet have noted, no single version of a myth can be considered an authoritative one. Rather, mythological stories share a common code of elements and conventions. Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1981): viii.

[731] Philips (1978): 158. He goes on to clarify: 'all later Greek and Roman culture acted toward Homer as if his poems were myths, so that they became what I call, for want of a better phrase, pseudo-mythical sources. This is not myth or folk literature in the technical sense, but it has functioned for later western civilization as if it were … there was an Agamemnon outside the largely literary tradition, but most of what Homer or Aeschylus says about him is wholly fabricated by the poet, a literary use of mythical material', (159).

Religion in the Oresteia

Ancient theatre production was a wholly religious process, a form of religious ritual organised in honour of the god Dionysus within the context of democracy.[732] Murnaghan points out that 'the chorus is key to what the community that produced and witnessed tragedy saw itself as doing: honouring Dionysus with collective singing and dancing'.[733] Along with the various political and civic offices instigated through the inception of democracy, ritualised theatrical festivals were an intrinsic part of ancient Greek identity.[734] Murnaghan also notes that

> choral activity in democratic Athens was both more focused and more inclusive than in other cities: more focused because it was tied almost exclusively to the worship of Dionysus, and more inclusive because the Dionysian festivals were organized in such a way as to extend choral participation to a very large number of citizen men.[735]

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.) claimed ancient tragedy could create catharsis (κάθαρσις) for the external audience (*Poet*. 1449b). Catharsis is the process whereby the pity and/or fear induced by watching tragedy results in a

---

[732] Burian (2011): 99 observes that 'fifth-century tragedy was performed at festivals of the god to allow for the possibility that characteristics associated with Dionysus in all our ancient sources – the loosening of tongues, the confusion of hierarchy, the spirit of equality, the openness to new, exhilarating and dangerous experience, and not least the sense of liberation – are all consonant with the ideas and spirit of innovation that permeate Athenian democracy'.

[733] Murnaghan (2011): 245.

[734] In his introduction to Carter's monograph, Mark Griffith states that 'fifth-century tragedy was BOTH (a) a specifically Attic art-form, designed for a very Athenocentric performance context AND (b) a conspicuously (and increasingly) panHellenic phenomenon, appreciated by audiences (and readers) all over the classical and Hellenistic Greek world' [his emphases], Carter (2011): 3. Stewart (2017): 197 confirms that 'not all Greeks came to Athens as spectators; many were themselves active competitors in all forms of music, including tragedy, and they came to Athens precisely in order to develop a panHellenic reputation'.

[735] Murnaghan (2011): 249.

releasing action on the psyche, clearing away tension.[736] In the case of the *Oresteia*, the catharsis is internalised within the Oresteian universe by the transformation of the Erinyes into the Eumenides.

That the divine Erinyes formed the chorus of the final play in the trilogy is significant to the modern interpreter, as scholarly research has come to view the chorus as fundamental to the religious framework of tragedy.[737] For the ancient audience, the chorus were often outsiders in terms of character connections and interactions and predominantly situated in the *orchestra*. In the *Eumenides*, the chorus are literally and figuratively divine personifications creating a metatheatrical bond with the internal and external audiences. They began as 'outsiders' and became, through their physical interment beneath Athens (*Eum*. 916-1047), literal 'insiders', the transference of power occurring within the boundaries of the Theatre of Dionysus into the ground itself.[738] This act would have had particular resonance for the Athenian citizen audience whose belief in Athenian autochthonism was

---

[736] Precise interpretation of the word is disputed; for discussions see Golden (1962) and (2017), Schaper (1968), Nichev (1970) and Kruse (1979).

[737] Calame *et al.* (2001) has explored the function of female choruses in terms of their ritualistic function. See also Swift (2010), Billings *et al.* (2013), Calame (2013), Gagné and Hopman (2013).

[738] Griffith (1995): 64 links the events of the *Oresteia* explicitly with Athenian autonomy and civic identity: 'As for the *Oresteia*, does it not depict the near-miraculous resolution, through the institution of the court of the Areopagus, of a familial and religious impasse too difficult, too bloody, and too entrenched, for any other city to manage? By the end of the third play, as the Furies agree to join the torchlit procession out of the orchestra, how can we refrain from feeling the glow of patriotic, and specifically democratic, pride at the transformation that has been brought about? Whether we read the trial and its verdict as an idealized triumph of legal process over vendetta and blood-feud, as the instantiation of a new kind of divine justice on earth, or as the crude reassertion of male domination in the home, in the city, and on Mount Olympus – and each of these interpretations has good claims to being valid and 'correct' for this trilogy – by any account, the ending of the *Eumenides* represents a ringing endorsement of Athens and its political system.'

deeply embedded within their culture and was a tenet of what it was to be 'Athenian'.[739]

The divine cast of the *Oresteia* is divided between the 'old' gods (the Erinyes) and the 'new' (Athena and Apollo). The lineage of the Erinyes is rooted in ancient mythology, affording them superiority to Zeus by this virtue alone. Religious observance binds all the figures of the trilogy: it is directly responsible for the death of Iphigeneia and is therefore indirectly responsible for the deaths of Agamemnon, Cassandra, Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. Crimes or acts arising from religious instruction (as with these deaths) can only be purified by religious rite – as testified by Orestes before Athena, where he says he had received many rites of purification during his journey to Athens (445-52).

The Erinyes' presence in the final play is a powerful tool demonstrating the importance of ritual function in ancient society. As noted above,[740] the Erinyes were known from Epic poetry. The Erinyes appear in the *Iliad* as avengers of murder: Amyntor sends them to his son Phoenix,[741] and they avenge the death of Epikaste.[742] According to mythology Alcmaeon was also pursued by the Erinyes for his murder of his mother Eriphyle.[743] Like Orestes, he received purification from Phegeus of Psophis but this was not sufficient

---

[739] For discussion on this see also p. 123.
[740] See p. 297.
[741] Hom. *Il*. 9.453-4.
[742] The Homeric form of Jocasta's name, Hom. *Od*. 11.280.
[743] Diod. *Lib*. 16.64.2.

for the Erinyes, and he was eventually successfully purified by the river god Achelous. It seems purification of matricide was dependent on divine purification rather than that of humans only, as demonstrated by Aeschylus' Athena (*Eum*. 470). Although it was only Athena's vote that tipped the balance in favour of Orestes' acquittal, the fact that she is a divine being is significant. The message of the Erinyes' transformation into Σεμναί [Θεαί] (*Eum*. 1041) is that the foundation of the external audience's society depended upon the ancient, ritualistic processes that underpinned their present civic practices.

Religious connections are felt and observed at all levels of Agamemnon's palace. In the second play of the trilogy, the Chorus sing their prayers to the gods for Orestes' success (*Choe*. 783-837). They specifically address Apollo (807-11) and Hermes (812-18). This is a direct link to the start of the play where Orestes prays to Hermes (1-5) and emphasises he has Apollo's authority and support to pursue the plan to kill Clytemnestra (269-73). The Chorus repeatedly refer to the interior of the palace (μυχὸν, 801; μέγα ναίων, 806; τοῖς τ' ἄνωθεν, 834). This connects Orestes' actions with the gods through the medium of the chthonic interior. Bakola suggests that an 'interior' space in ancient tragedy does not just represent an idea of a building or construction, but has a much deeper symbolism.[744] Her observation that the *skene* represents what might be called an 'other' space, the dark, hidden

---

[744] Bakola (2014): 5.

or private,[745] is particularly pertinent to our understanding of the role of the physical space of the palace itself in the *Oresteia*. As Bakola has noted,[746] the Argive palace space in the *Oresteia* is strongly associated with death.

An alternative interpretation is to consider the space as somewhere between life and death; the palace is instead diseased with the blood ties that form the foundation, disintegrating with each successive death.[747] The Watchman, Electra, Cilissa[748] and the Chorus all vocalised the stress and difficulty of living under the rule of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. The pattern of the entrances and exits throughout the first two plays results either in death[749] or the propagation of lies and deceit.[750] It is only when Orestes leaves Argos to escape the Erinyes and is finally cleansed of his pollution (*Eum.* 752-3) that resolution of the damaged space is realised. The pattern of negative messaging throughout the trilogy, and in particular false messages, contributes to this spread of pollution.

The Erinyes' acceptance of their new role in Athens (*Eum.* 900-1020) seals Athena's motion and their new home (*Eum.* 1033-43) represents a cleansed

---

[745] Bakola (2014): 8-9.
[746] Bakola (2014): 10, 31.
[747] The process of blood destruction begins with Tantalus, the grandfather of Atreus and Thyestes. In one variation of his myth, Tantalus killed his son Pelops and fed him to the gods to test their wisdom (Apollod. 1.9). Gagné (2013): 346 affirms that 'the misfortunes of Agamemnon and his children can be linked to the horrible crimes of Atreus and Thyestes, and these crimes in turn tied to the crimes of Pelops and Tantalus four generations back'.
[748] Κίλισσα, 'a Cilician [woman]'.
[749] *Ag.* 944-57, 1322-30, 1343-5; *Choe.* 837-47, 875-84, 929-30.
[750] *Ag.* 315-16, 599-612, 855-913; *Choe.* 579-84, 676-718, 770-3.

Argive palace, granted by Athenian proxy. This idea is similar to Revermann's 'new conceptual order', brought about by the transformative process of the Erinyes' conversion to Σεμναί [Θεαί] (*Eum.* 1041).[751] The 'redemptive nature'[752] of the *Eumenides* allows the transformation to symbolically flow from Athens to Argos. Revermann's assertion that the Erinyes are spatially liminal refers to their ability to hover between worlds,[753] simultaneously below and above ground. The aetiological narrative of the *Eumenides* creates a new world for the external audience, itself simultaneously real (because they are sitting in the theatre) and removed from reality (by participating in the creation of the theatrical space).

The 'Oresteia' or the 'Agamemnoniad'?

A notable feature of the *Oresteia* is that the plays are rarely staged in their formal trilogic structure. Either single plays are produced more frequently, or the trilogic story is transformed into a single play.[754] The Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama (APGRD) includes a database of performance history.[755] A basic keyword search reveals the *Agamemnon* to be by far the most popular for production (see Table 10). In addition, a

---

[751] Revermann (2008): 241.
[752] Revermann (2008): 251.
[753] Revermann (2008): 243-4.
[754] For example, the recent Almeida Theatre production of Robert Icke's *Oresteia* in 2015. Production photographs are available on their website: http://www.almeida.co.uk/whats-on/oresteia/29-may-2015-18-jul-2015.
[755] See http://www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk/research-collections/performance-database/productions.

rudimentary academic library search finds 8,251 returns for *Agamemnon*, 1,691 for *Choephoroe*, 329 for *Eumenides* and 1,474 for *Oresteia*.[756]

Table 10 Performance Figures for the *Oresteia*[757]

Primary search term	15th C	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C	21st C
Agamemnon		4	4	17	43	670	190
Choephoroe		1	1	8	18	446	115
Eumenides		1	1		14	412	110
Oresteia					1	177	43

The dominance of the *Agamemnon* may be due to the fact that the play can be understood on its own as a distinct story with an ostensible ending.[758] It encapsulates the larger themes of the trilogy; amongst these are the issue of Agamemnon's departure for the Trojan War (and the effects of that war in general), familial loyalty, and the nature of justice and revenge.   The *Choephoroe*, even though it deals with the concept of justice, is less popular than the other two plays. This raises the question of whether gender bias has any role to play in interpretations of the trilogy. The first play features the murder of a man, the second play features the murder of a woman by a man in retaliation and the final play stages the trial and subsequent exoneration of that man (*Ag.* = male emphasis; *Choe.* = female emphasis; *Eum.* = male emphasis).[759] Table 11 illustrates the major events of each play and whilst

---

[756] The Arts and Social Studies Library at Bristol University http://www.bris.ac.uk/library/, accessed 3 September 2017 using 'articles' and 'books' as search parameters.

[757] Source: Archive for the Performance of Greek & Roman Drama, Oxford http://www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk/research-collections/performance-database/productions, accessed 6 September 2017.

[758] Taplin notes that all three plays could plausibly stand on their own: 'the three plays of the *Oresteia*, while closely linked in many ways, stand each as a complete and self-sufficient unity', Taplin (1977): 463, although I believe that they work together better narratively as a trilogy.

[759] See further brief discussion on gender in the *Oresteia* below, p. 301. Allan and Kelly (2013): 109 point out that the crimes of women in tragedy are often in response to the crimes of men.

the pursuit of appropriate justice is the overarching theme of the trilogy, the importance and influence of the gods is also of major significance, highlighting the importance of the religious aspect as discussed above.

Table 11 Major Events of the *Oresteia*

Agamemnon	*Choephoroe*	*Eumenides*
- A divided court - Victory at Troy - Death of Iphigeneia - Treachery – Clytemnestra - Death of Agamemnon - Death of Cassandra - Justice for Iphigeneia - Power of Clytemnestra	- Electra's grief for Agamemnon - Orestes' return - Power of Clytemnestra - Treachery – Orestes, Cilissa - Death of Clytemnestra - Death of Aegisthus - Justice for Agamemnon	- Apollo's support for Orestes - The pursuit of the Erinyes - Orestes' trial - Athena's judgement - Installation of the law court at Athens - Pacification of the Erinyes - Installation of the Eumenides

All the major events described above are affected or influenced by the concomitant temporalities and locations. The different kinds of messaging evidenced throughout the trilogy support, enhance and enable different layers of meaning and understanding. The following section will examine these messages and their impact more closely.

The Messages of the *Oresteia*

The expansion of the various themes of the trilogy discussed above is developed through the mechanism of messaging. There are a variety of message types in the *Oresteia*. These include foreshadowing, false messages, explicit messages of news and implicit messages relating to temporal connections, historical or mythological events and the personal history of the characters. The messengers that Aeschylus employs usually deliver specific

news that has direct consequences on the action following their scene(s) (see

Table 12).

Table 12 Aeschylean Messenger Map

	Persians	*Seven Against Thebes*	*Suppliants*	*Agamemnon*	*Choephoroe*	*Eumenides*	*Prometheus Bound*
Is there a messenger?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No. A silent Herald.[760]	No
Identity of messenger	Royal messenger	Theban	Herald accompanying sons of Aegyptus	Argive herald	Can Cilissa be considered a messenger?	No speaking characters who could fulfil the role	Could Oceanus and Hermes fulfil a dual function to form a Messenger character?
Relationship to main characters	Loyal to Xerxes	Scout	Royal herald	Loyal to Agamemnon	Nurse to Orestes	The Herald	Oceanus is sympathetic; Hermes is not.
Main episode[761]	249-514	792-819	882-951	503-37, 551-82, 636-80	734-82	566	Oceanus (284-396); Hermes (944-1079)
Textual presence	249-514	792-819	882-951	503-82, 613-80	734-82	566	Oceanus (284-396) Hermes (944-1079)
Actions and substance of message(s)	News of defeat	Brings news of battle	Aggressive and violent	Traditional character for a messenger; brings news of the army's suffering, Agamemnon's victory and Menelaus' disappearance.	Persuaded by the Chorus to trick Aegisthus	Athena instructs the Herald to make a proclamation.	Oceanus knows Prometheus' past and tries to persuade him to recant. Hermes knows Prometheus' future and tries to persuade him to recant.
Influence, outcome or effect	Brings bad news of Xerxes' defeat and loss of the army during the return journey.	Brings bad news	Threatening behaviour which increases the power of the soldiers	Brings good news that Agamemnon is returning home	Gets Aegisthus to return to the palace un-armed	Superficially the Herald has no discernible influence but his silence effects a contrast: the vocal messengers are primarily gods. Notable for being a silent character instructed to speak but who remains silent.	Oceanus – none. Hermes – fails to persuade him.

---

[760] The significance of silence is discussed below.

[761] The impact of a messenger is also threaded through the progression of action as a result of the news they deliver, as discussed in expanded analyses throughout.

The temporal placement of the activity of the three plays, and their relation to the mythological narrative constructed by Aeschylus, inform and enhance the themes of vengeance and justice explored across the trilogy. Message enabling facilitates this process and temporal analysis helps to reveal the complexity behind the messages. The following section will examine message enabling in more detail.

Message Enablers in the *Oresteia*

Chapters three and four explained the concept of message enabling and showed its dramatic importance and its role in leading the internal and external audiences through the narratives that it constructs. The principle behind message enabling is that characters have the ability, through the delivery of news and messages, to alter or influence subsequent actions or circumstances. This function has already been examined through the agency of the Danaids in chapter three above.[762] The next section of this chapter will exploit the unique opportunity of considering the message enabling mechanism across the connected trilogy of the *Oresteia*.

The analysis will begin by situating the key message enabling characters within their dramatic contexts. The message enablers in the *Oresteia* represent key points through the trilogy and together connect the three plays thematically. The universe of the *Oresteia* is claustrophobically tight and

---

[762] See pp. 176 ff.

figures can be viewed in terms of their status.[763] The social status of the palace personnel as represented in the first two plays – the royal family as well as the palace slaves including the Nurse, the Watchman and the Herald Talthybius[764] – stand opposite the divine cast of the final play which also includes the Pythia (a divine agent), Athenian jurors and the Herald. The counterpart of *Agamemnon*'s Watchman (1-39) is the *Choephoroe*'s Cilissa (734-82), both emblematic of the tensions between the Argive palace slaves. The division is also geographical, between Argos (*Ag.* and *Choe.*) and Athens (*Eum.*). In the final play, Orestes is cast as a foreigner in Athens, of noble birth but nevertheless a matricide.

In the *Eumenides*, the emphasis also moves temporally and spatially: Argos -v- Athens; royal rule -v- democracy; mortals -v- gods; vengeance -v- justice. The obligations of the different casts are also notable. In the first two plays activity is centred on the Argive palace, although Aegisthus, as a nominal usurper, could be considered an outsider.[765] Although he is Agamemnon's first cousin and as such is an insider, the long-running estrangement between Atreus and Thyestes, and Aegisthus' subsequent cuckolding of Agamemnon, suggests he should occupy an outsider's role. The loyalties are simple and clearly delineated (see Table 13). The character obligations of the final play

---

[763] Griffith (1995): 65 observes that the *Oresteia* 'provides perhaps our most extensive and subtle representation of competing class interests in the early Athenian democracy'. See further pp. 65-8 for his overview of the different levels of status in democratic Athens during the fifth century B.C.E.

[764] One of Agamemnon's heralds, along with Eurybates. Hom. *Il*. 1.320-48 *passim*.

[765] Although he is part of the extended Argive royal family (see Appendix 4 , p. 342).

are clearly of a different nature. The inception of the law court at Athens,

divinely ratified, seeks to resolve the issue of justification for murder;

Orestes' guilt is not questioned but the circumstances that led to his actions

and the moral design that lay behind them is. The final play encourages

debate within both internal and external audiences.

The reception of news and messages is influenced by the status of the

deliverer. Table 13 shows the balance of loyalties within the *Oresteia*.

Table 13 Loyalties in the *Oresteia*

Loyal to Agamemnon	Loyal to Clytemnestra	Neutral
Apollo	Aegisthus	Athena
Chorus – old men of Argos	Chorus – the Erinyes	Cassandra
Chorus – palace slaves	Slave	Pythia
Electra		Servants
Herald (*Ag.*)		Herald (*Eum.*)
Nurse		
Orestes		
Pylades		
Watchman		

These can be further broken down in terms of 'outsiders' and 'insiders' in

respect of Agamemnon's family (Table 14).

Table 14 Oresteian Insiders and Outsiders

Agamemnon		*Choephoroe*		*Eumenides*	
Insider	**Outsider**	**Insider**	**Outsider**	**Insider**	**Outsider**
Agamemnon	Watchman	Clytemnestra	Chorus	Orestes	Pythia
Clytemnestra	Cassandra	Orestes	Slaves	Clytemnestra's ghost	Erinyes (chorus)
Aegisthus?	Chorus	Electra	Nurse		Apollo
	Herald	Pylades			Athena
	Aegisthus?	Aegisthus?			Temple servants
					Herald

Even allowing for the 'insider'/'outsider' categorisation, the balance is

overwhelmingly in favour of Agamemnon. The purpose of considering the

message enablers as insiders or outsiders is to highlight the extent of their

influence. In addition, the status of a character affects their perspective and corresponding actions. The next section will expand upon this concept to highlight how this mechanism works.

Oresteian *'Outsiders'*

As mentioned above, 'outsiders' are those who stand outside Agamemnon's house. In the *Agamemnon*, the key characters are the Watchman (1-39) and Cassandra (1072-330). Both these characters are outsiders, in that they are external to the Atreid line. The Watchman's designated role in the play is as a guard (φύλαξ) whose responsibility is to alert the palace of the Greeks' return.[766]

At one hundred and thirty-nine lines, the Watchman has the shortest presence in the play, but his scene literally and figuratively starts the story of the *Oresteia* when he announces sight of the beacon signalling the fall of Troy (ὦ χαῖρε λαμπτὴρ νυκτός … εἴπερ Ἰλίου πόλις ἑάλωκεν, 22, 29-30). The Watchman emphasises his fear (12-19), implying that Clytemnestra's unwomanly rule (ὧδε γὰρ κρατεῖ γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζον κέαρ, 10-11) is responsible for an unsettled court (κλαίω τότ᾽ οἴκου τοῦδε συμφορὰν στένων, 18). The Watchman is loyal to Agamemnon and looks forward to his return (γένοιτο δ᾽ οὖν μολόντος εὐφιλῆ χέρα ἄνακτος οἴκων τῇδε βαστάσαι χερί, 34-5). He enhances this feeling of unrest by declaring his

---

[766] Καὶ νῦν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τό σύμβολον, αὐγὴν πυρὸς φέρουσαν ἐκ Τροίας φάτιν ἁλώσιμόν τε βάξιν (8-10).

principle of refusing to gossip about what he knows (36-9). The use of the ox metaphor (βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ μέγας βέβηκεν, 36-7) is illustrative of his compulsion to keep silent. Evoking imagery of one of the largest domesticated animals demonstrates the strength of his resolve.[767] The ox metaphor is also a reflection on the perceived power gained by Clytemnestra during Agamemnon's absence; the Watchman is too wary of Clytemnestra to speak plainly (35-9). The Watchman's scene not only serves to deliver the obvious message (the beacon flares) but also to demonstrate the effect of Clytemnestra's rule, hinting at the tensions simmering beneath the surface.

The subliminal messages of the Watchman's scene reflect the poor morale of the palace staff. He hints that there are possibly cliques within the palace (ὡς ἑκὼν ἐγὼ μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ κοὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι, 38-9). The Watchman's scene carries a clear implication of a gossiping palace (37-8) which indicates the tensions already in place. This is a clear message to the external audience who are drawn into the events of the play by the Watchman in the prologue.[768] The external audience are primed to view the coming activities through dual perspectives. The play and trilogy begins at a point in time saturated with deceit.

The Watchman's speech (*Ag*. 1-39) delineates the environment of the internal audience and locates the trilogy's starting point in the mythological narrative.

---

[767] Animal imagery is prominent throughout the play (36, 39, 50-4, 56, 113, 122, 125, 127, 135-6, 137, 141-4, 158, 233, 607, 717-36, 795, 824, 841, 827, 957-60, 1316, 1382).
[768] As noted by Raeburn and Thomas (2011): 71.

As an outsider (of the palace) and also an insider of sorts (as an Argive), the Watchman's dual perspective allows him to comment objectively on Clytemnestra's rule whilst understanding the impact that Agamemnon's absence has had on the palace. His physical positioning on the roof of the palace (στέγαις Ἀτρειδῶν, 3),[769] whilst obviously essential for his role as a lookout, also imbues his position with a god-like perspective, overseeing the palace as a whole which is echoed in his observations of his life there (12-19, 34-9); he is a watchman in every sphere. This is not to suggest that Aeschylus intended any kind of deification of the Watchman, but to observe that the location of his position enhances and amplifies his dramatic role. His physical position matches his verbal overview and subliminal understanding of events at the palace and also lends it authority.

This dual observatory function, announcing the beacons (22-5) whilst he has also been watching the palace (12-19, 34-9), enables the figure of Clytemnestra to be introduced in a specific way – with a taint of suspicion. His speech postpones her arrival on stage, which has the effect of enhancing the tension surrounding her character. The delaying effect of his speech further allows the Chorus to sing about Iphigeneia's death and the Trojan War (104-257) before Clytemnestra's first appearance (264), thereby completing the story introduction begun by the Watchman (8-11).

---

[769] Raeburn and Thomas note that στέγαι means 'dwelling' not 'roof' but as the Watchman says he has been lying on his elbows (ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην, 3) the implication is that he is on the roof rather than, say, looking through a window. Raeburn and Thomas (2011): 66.

The figure of Cassandra also acts as a linking device with other characters. Ostensibly a neutral figure, she is passionately engaged with the activity of the play (from her own perspective, telescoped from her experience of the war at Troy), but despite her distress she is still able to offer insight. Brought to Argos by Agamemnon as a slave (950-7, 1035-8),[770] her isolation from her home is representative of Agamemnon's separation from the palace and is also a reflection of the isolation felt by the Watchman. Her refusal to engage with Clytemnestra connects back to the comments of the Watchman (38-9) and reaffirms for the external audience the sense of separation in the palace. Her identification of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra as bull and cow (ἄπεχε τῆς βοὸς τὸν ταῦρον, 1125-6) also connects thematically with the Watchman's ox metaphor.

Cassandra represents the face of the Trojan defeat (1156-9, 1167-71) for the internal Argive audience. Her prophecy of the murder of Agamemnon (1114-18, 1125-8) and herself (1149) at Clytemnestra's hand (1100-11, 1166-7) is a core message that signals what is to come for both the internal and external audiences. Whilst the internal audience may be unsure about how accurate her predictions might be, the external audience, possibly familiar with key aspects of her mythological narrative, will receive them as narratological indicators. The scene helps shape the responses of the internal and external

---

[770] Seaford links Cassandra's presence temporally with Helen's wedding to Paris. Seaford (2012): 190-2.

audiences towards the activities of Clytemnestra; they begin to form a judgement about where her actions will be taking her.

The external audience have already been primed to consider Clytemnestra's motivation in the demonstration of the power balance between Agamemnon and Clytemnestra. Clytemnestra's masculine portrayal[771] is contrasted most tellingly with Agamemnon's reluctantly agreeing to bow to her wishes and walk on the purple tapestries (πορφυρόστρωτος πόρος) (910-49),[772] an act he knows to be hubristic at best and potentially impious (καὶ τοῖσδέ μ᾽ ἐμβαίνονθ᾽ ἁλουργέσιν θεῶν μή τις πρόσωθεν ὄμματος βάλοι φθόνος, 946-7). Mueller notes that

> purple was a symbol of eastern luxury. As a soft, overly expensive substance, these textiles blur the boundaries between man and woman ... as well as between man and god: the cloth prevents the king from walking the earth, as humans do ... but most saliently, the purple garments undermine the distinction between Greek and barbarian, victor and vanquished, just as they call into question the economic integrity of the *oikos*.[773]

---

[771] Lines 10-11, 274, 278, 351, 585, 1401, 940-4, 1045, 1423, 1437.
[772] Possibly actually a 'rich brilliant crimson' rather than purple, Irwin (1974): 28, quoted in Mueller (2016): 205 n. 31. Mueller also intriguingly suggests that the smell of the tapestries may have been part of their importance for the performance. 'Ancient audiences were well aware of the strong odor generated by *porphyra* dye, an embarrassing feature of this luxury good that provided fuel for Roman satirists, many centuries later'. Therefore, 'given the visual and dramaturgic emphasis placed on the tapestry in the earlier scene, is there not a hint here that she [Cassandra] may actually have *smelled* [Mueller's emphasis] the putrefaction wafting off of its *porphyra*-stained threads?' Mueller (2016): 56. See Mueller (2016): 205 n. 31 for further references for scholarly discussions of *porphyra*.
[773] Mueller (2016): 50. Mueller links Clytemnestra's usurpation of Agamemnon's role in Argos as indicative of an emphasis on the transition of wealth. In making Agamemnon take the unwise action of walking on the tapestry, Clytemnestra 'seeks to assimilate Agamemnon to the posture of an eastern monarch, whose wealth equals the sum total of the resources of his kingdom. It is a dangerous move, politically and rhetorically, for she cannot elide the fact that in his absence, she has overseen this great wealth. Her house, the house to which Agamemnon returns, already has the appearance of a western outpost of Priam's – or, perhaps, in contemporary terms, Xerxes' – vast empire, with the *phthonos*-provoking fabrics spread out for all to see.'

This is representative of Clytemnestra's ability to manipulate and imbues her dramatic characterisation with an ominous patina.

Prophecies were the means by which the gods communicated with mortals. Using the mechanism of prophecy within the play, but passed from mortal to mortal, reflects the fact that the present problems in Argos stemmed from the actions of humans (Iphigeneia's sacrifice, 205-47), directed by human interpretation (Calchas' reading, 248-9) of divine prophecy. It reveals the gods to be at a remove from the internal audience – both prophecies related in the play are spoken by ordinary characters, not priests. Although of divine origin, the prophecies are transformed from divine messages into conduits of human action. This forces the focus of the effects on to the human perpetrators rather than interpretations of divine judgement. This therefore emphasises the two actions of Agamemnon against Clytemnestra – the death of Iphigeneia and the bringing of Cassandra into the home.

Cassandra's prophecy allows her a small measure of control over her fate – she foretells her death and chooses to go and meet it without further demur (ἀρκείτω βίος, 1313-14). Her knowledge allows her an advantage over Agamemnon in that she can call for justice for her murder (τοῖς ἐμοῖς τιμαόροις ἐχθροῖς φονεῦσι, 1322-30). The effect is twofold: for both the internal and external audiences, Cassandra is displaying a nobility of spirit (ἰοῦσα πράξω: τλήσομαι τὸ κατθανεῖν, 1290; ἥκει τόδ᾽ ἦμαρ: σμικρὰ κερδανῶ φυγῇ, 1301) that her murderers are obviously lacking. The implicit judgement of Clytemnestra (αὐτόφονα, 1091; θῆλυς ἄρσενος φονεὺς ἔστιν,

1231-2) condemns her before she has even carried out the murders of Agamemnon and Cassandra. Cassandra also foretells the coming murder of Clytemnestra by Orestes (1280-2, 1324-6), a narrative device that moves the story along whilst simultaneously functioning as a specific message for the internal and external audiences. The role of foreshadowing in the *Agamemnon* is well served by this strong theme of prophecy that runs throughout it and the whole trilogy.

The figure of Cassandra (*Ag.* 1072-330) can be viewed as a dual conduit; her perspective on the Trojan War (1156, 1167-71, 1285-7) provokes sympathy from the external audience, not only for her own predicament but also for Agamemnon's fate. The tragedy of her prophecy of her own and Agamemnon's deaths[774] is tempered by those she has already witnessed at the fall of Troy;[775] the implication is that Argos (through the figure of Agamemnon) will also fall and the loss will be similarly tragic for those left behind. This notion echoes through the *Choephoroe* (the misery of Electra) and *Eumenides* (the Erinyes' pursuit of Orestes).

Cassandra's story is an eyewitness account, which lends significant authority to her scene, as it does for the Messenger in the *Persians* (266-7) and the Scout in *Seven against Thebes* (39-41).[776] Her scene situates Agamemnon's murder in the story arc; his death cries are heard immediately after it (1343,

---

[774] Lines 1139, 1160-1, 1246, 1222-36, 1260-1.
[775] Lines 1167-72, 1285-7.
[776] See pp. 8, 72.

1345). In addition, Cassandra's scene completes the story arc, moving the focus from Iphigeneia's sacrifice to Clytemnestra's corresponding act of murder. The figure of Cassandra explicitly links the murder of Thyestes' children with the horror to come,[777] and reveals the lies behind Clytemnestra's outward behaviour (ὡς δ᾽ ἐπωλολύξατο ἡ παντότολμος, ὥσπερ ἐν μάχης τροπῇ, δοκεῖ δὲ χαίρειν νοστίμῳ σωτηρίᾳ, 1236-8). Her vision of the presence of the Erinyes (1186-93) is likewise an indicator of expectation for both audiences as the trilogy progresses. Like the Watchman, Cassandra is a vital part of the trilogy's overall structure. She clearly positions the current circumstances as deriving from past crimes which will in turn incur further crime through Orestes' acts of vengeance. Her scene reveals the cyclical nature of the polluted bloodline that lies at the heart of the *Oresteia*.

Situating Agamemnon's murder within the narrative arc as Cassandra does (1343, 1345) allows Clytemnestra to reappear on stage (1372) in triumphant mode, in keeping with the overall portrayal of her and her perceived masculinity.[778] Clytemnestra's declamation of the murders of Agamemnon and Cassandra (1372-577) is a grim messenger speech,[779] reminiscent of that of the Messenger in *Persians* where he is describing the nature of the Persians' deaths at Salamis (*Pers*. 459-65). She revels in the brutality of their

---

[777] Lines 1191-3, 1217-26. As does Clytemnestra herself after Agamemnon and Cassandra are dead (*Ag*. 1500-4).

[778] *Ag*. 10-11, 274, 278, 351, 585, 940-4, 1048, 1401, 1423, 1437.

[779] Raeburn and Thomas discuss evidence from visual art for scenarios of Agamemnon's murder; Raeburn and Thomas (2011): xxv-xxvii.

deaths.[780]   Like the *Persians*' Messenger (424-6), Clytemnestra evokes

imagery of catching fish in nets to describe Agamemnon's entrapment (1381-

2).[781]

Cassandra's representation as a slave indicates the depth of her fall as a

member of Trojan royalty (1305-6). It is another slave (875-87) who acts as

a key message enabler in the *Choephoroe*, message enabling transforming a

seemingly insignificant figure into one of importance. Although having only

twelve lines, the house slave (οἰκέτης) still plays a pivotal role in the action

of the play. He announces the death of Aegisthus (876-7) and informs

Clytemnestra that the dead are killing the living (τὸν ζῶντα καίνειν τοὺς

τεθνηκότας λέγω, 886). The slave thus rises from his low status to become

someone who directs activity. This last line reads like a riddle;[782] whether

Clytemnestra is intended to infer that 'the dead' refers to Orestes is

unknowable (thereby providing advance warning of what awaits her) but the

external audience would most likely have realised the inference. The opacity

of the statement also plays into the deception of the Chorus. Nevertheless,

the comment is vague enough to encourage Clytemnestra to act. It also refers

to Orestes' representation of his father in his quest for vengeance against

Clytemnestra and Aegisthus.

---

[780] Κἀκφυσιῶν ὀξεῖαν αἵματος σφαγὴν βάλλει μ᾽ ἐρεμνῇ ψακάδι φοινίας δρόσου, χαίρουσαν οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἢ διοσδότῳ γάνει σπορητὸς κάλυκος ἐν λοχεύμασιν (1389-92); ἐμοὶ δ᾽ ἐπήγαγεν εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς (1446-7).
[781] In his commentary, Sommerstein notes that an Aeschylean fragment also uses a tunny-fish reference, Sommerstein (2008a): 63 n. 71.
[782] As suggested by Collard (2002): 192.

Agamemnon lives through Orestes' actions; Orestes and Electra's united presence and their libations at his grave (*Choe.* 315-509) assert his continued presence in this play and recall the theme of justice. The slave's assertion that he is shouting to the deaf indicates the lack of activity that greets news of Aegisthus' death; this could suggest that the slave's grief or emotion is not matched by anyone else in the internal audience (κωφοῖς αὐτῶ καὶ καθεύδουσιν μάτην ἄκραντα βάζω, 882-3). The house slave's news of Aegisthus' death also prompts Clytemnestra to admit her duplicity in the deaths of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra in this play (δόλοις ὀλούμεθ᾽, ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκτείναμεν, 887),[783] as foretold by Cassandra (*Ag.* 1236-8). The mixture of message delivery mechanisms by the house slave – announcements, delivering information, requesting assistance – suggests a complexity of characterisation that, although brief, is highly effective in conveying the emotional reactions of the internal audience to the external audience. Similarly, Cilissa the nurse plays a key role in influencing activity when she delivers news that will lead directly to Aegisthus' death (734-82).

The Chorus identify Cilissa as Orestes' childhood nurse (τροφὸν δ᾽ Ὀρέστου, 731), indicating to the external audience the likelihood of her agreeing to help them based on their connection. The Chorus have already said they are keen to support Orestes (πότε δὴ στομάτων δείξομεν ἰσχὺν ἐπ᾽ Ὀρέστῃ; 720-1) and

---

[783] As she did in the *Agamemnon*, 1379-98.

invoke Peitho[784] and Hermes[785] to assist with the murder of Clytemnestra (549-50) and Aegisthus (575-6). Cilissa's scene immediately follows this ominous prayer, suggesting that she will be the instrument of persuasion. Cilissa thus falls into the category of a messenger (and message enabler) whose message influences events. But Cilissa is a messenger figure who does not deliver her message on stage.

Once the Chorus have ascertained the message from Clytemnestra for Aegisthus that Cilissa is supposed to deliver (766-9), they persuade her to change it (μή νυν σὺ ταῦτ᾽ ἄγγελλε δεσπότου στύγει, 770). The Chorus do not divulge the finer details of Orestes' plan though (777-80), perhaps sensing Cilissa would be unable to act normally if she knows Orestes is alive, given her deep affection for him, demonstrating that withholding information can be as important as delivering it. Cilissa agrees without reservation (ἀλλ᾽ εἶμι καὶ σοῖς ταῦτα πείσομαι λόγοις, 781) and departs. By changing Clytemnestra's message to Aegisthus (769-73) Cilissa fulfils her message enabling function, by enabling the Chorus to directly participate in his murder (869, 875-84).

In delivering a false message and conveying Aegisthus to his death, Cilissa's collusion is a direct backwards link to the secrecy alluded to by the Watchman

---

[784] Πειθώ, the personification of persuasion.
[785] Νῦν γὰρ ἀκμάζει Πειθὼ δολίαν ξυγκαταβῆναι, χθόνιον δ᾽ Ἑρμῆν καὶ τὸν νύχιον τοῖσδ᾽ ἐφοδεῦσαι ξιφοδηλήτοισιν ἀγῶσιν (725-9).

(*Ag*. 35-8). It confirms again the split loyalties of the palace staff,[786] and the external audience's knowledge of what will happen to Aegisthus demonstrates the broader consequences of his actions. Cilissa's conduct is balanced by the loyalty of the house slave (975-84), the sole figure in the trilogy apart from the Herald (*Ag*. 503-680) who does not denounce Clytemnestra. The division between the staff is reinforced when the slave alerts Clytemnestra to Aegisthus' murder (878-9), warns her to be on her guard (883-4) and ultimately brings her back to the stage (885), creating multiple perspectives within the scene. Although she is technically an outsider, Cilissa is loyal to and acts for the (male) Atreid line. In a sense, she crosses the social boundary that separates her from the royal family.

Oresteian *'Insiders'*

Orestes' lifelong friend Pylades is a figure who has only three lines (900-2) but is still crucial to the continuation of the storyline in the *Choephoroe*. Through his mother Anaxibia, Agamemnon's sister, Pylades is a cousin of Orestes and in some myths marries Electra.[787] Pylades is constantly by Orestes' side;[788] his silent presence imbues his character with connotations of steadfastness and strength.[789] His presence provides Orestes with security and reassurance and allows Orestes' deception of Clytemnestra to succeed.

---

[786] See Table 13, p. 66.
[787] See Appendix 4, p. 346.
[788] Pylades is named at 20, 561, 714, 899.
[789] Nisetich notes that Pylades' silence is a traditional aspect of his characterisation.
Nisetich (1986): 50. See also the discussion on silence below, p. 302.

Although he is so important to Orestes,[790] he is not mentioned elsewhere in the trilogy.

Pylades' presence also possibly allows greater emphasis on the fact that Orestes was sent away from Argos for his own safety (to live with Pylades' father Strophius, 679),[791] enhancing the characterisation of a dangerous woman begun in the *Agamemnon*.[792]   The implication is perhaps that Clytemnestra would have brought about the death of Orestes if he had stayed at home – she could not have him present when she murdered Agamemnon, for he would surely have retaliated there and then. In addition, his absence would have allowed Clytemnestra to feel a measure of safety and to enjoy more fully her time with Aegisthus in Agamemnon's ten-year absence at Troy. Clytemnestra does not seem to feel the same depth of affection for Orestes or Electra that she did for Iphigeneia – the complexity of familial relationships no doubt compounded by the passage of time as her grief and rage over Iphigeneia's sacrifice evolved during Agamemnon's decade-long absence.

Pylades is not of low status but nor is he a major figure;[793] his words are crucial to strengthening Orestes' resolve. His single brief statement is

---

[790] Pylades is mentioned in Eur. *Ores.* 33; *Elec.* 82-5; *I.T.* 69-116; Soph. *Elec.* 16-17.

[791] In other accounts Orestes is smuggled away following Agamemnon's murder, i.e., in Soph. *Elec.*, 11-14 and Eur. *Elec.*, 16-18.

[792] When Orestes rebukes Clytemnestra for sending him away, she denies it was for gain (*Choe.* 913-17).

[793] Griffith (1995): 94-5 also examines Pylades' role in terms of connections through the 'xenia-network', the reciprocal hospitality framework used by aristocratic families, perhaps most famously illustrated in the *Iliad*, where the Argive Diomedes (one of the Epigoni; see

powerful and particularly striking for its reminder that the gods' laws must be

observed:

> ποῦ δὴ τὰ λοιπὰ Λοξίου μαντεύματα
> τὰ πυθόχρηστα, πιστὰ δ᾽ εὐορκώματα;
> ἅπαντας ἐχθροὺς τῶν θεῶν ἡγοῦ πλέον
>
> *Choe*. 900-2

> Then where's the future for Loxias' oracles,
> sent by the Pythia, and the pledges sworn on oath?
> Consider all men your enemies rather than the gods.

It serves to remind both the internal and external audiences that the

circumstances of Orestes' execution of his mother were on Apollo's

instruction (269-70, 557-9). This divine overseeing of Orestes' actions is an

example of the beneficence the gods' protection can provide. Orestes acts

with divine collusion, reinforcing the unspoken co-dependency between gods

and men.[794] Orestes must carry out Apollo's prophecy to prove his devotion

and trust to the god, an action replicated in the final play when Athena must

demonstrate to the Erinyes that they will receive the same qualities from the

Athenians if they accept her offer of residence.

---

n. 331, p. 121 above) and the Trojan ally Glaucus of Lycia exchanged their armour on the battlefield due to the guest-friendship bond of their respective grandfathers, Oeneus and Bellerophon, Hom. *Il*. 6.119-236. Griffith suggests that Pylades' presence indicates 'subtly but insistently that "outside" support, provided from other aristocratic families through the *xenia*-network, is a precious and indispensable component of the social order: without it, an elite may not be able to protect and maintain its position, support itself in exile during hard times, and reassert its claims after periods of absence or exclusion from its own *polis*'.
[794] Vellacott has a different interpretation, that Orestes' actions are not derived from Apollo but from his own desire to achieve revenge and that it is this that gives man power: 'man must learn, by obeying rather than destroying his own nature, to recognise the absolute authority of an internal voice closer to him than any divine command', Vellacott (1977): 116. This statement, however, denies the strength of the link between the ancient Athenians and their gods. The link may be addressed but it always remains irrevocably in place.

Pylades' words prompt Orestes to remember again the direction of Apollo to execute Clytemnestra (καὶ γὰρ κτανεῖν σ᾽ ἔπεισα μητρῷον δέμας, *Eum.* 84).[795] They strengthen Orestes' resolve to enable him to continue with the killing and so allow Clytemnestra's death to take place.[796] As noted above, Pylades' lines also remind the external spectators that they are similarly bound to the gods and that their directions (through oracles and omens) must be obeyed and honoured. This theme is echoed by the Erinyes in the final play, where the challenges to their right of vengeance against Orestes is perceived as a lack of respect.[797] As ancient goddesses, the Erinyes are acutely affected by the immorality of this defiance.

The ghost of Clytemnestra (94-139) in the *Eumenides* is the final major message enabler and 'insider' of the *Oresteia*. As in the *Agamemnon*,[798] Clytemnestra's personality in the *Choephoroe* is overtly masculine (599, 662, 766, 768). She has saved up her grief and anger over Iphigeneia's death (*Ag.* 1412-25) during Agamemnon's absence of ten years (*Ag.* 40-1). She views the death of Agamemnon less as a murder than a justified execution.[799] Once he is dead, she exults in her power and daring (*Ag.* 1372-98) and believes her actions will also right the wrong of the murder of Thyestes' children (*Ag.* 1501). Clytemnestra has only behaved the way she has because Agamemnon

---

[795] Sommerstein suggests 'it is as if Apollo had spoken', Sommerstein (2010): 130, 170.
[796] Vellacott proposes that Pylades' lines reveal the inherent weakness of Orestes' character, Vellacott (1984): 155-6.
[797] *Eum.* 208, 421, 538-65, 747, 778-92, 808-22, 837-47, 870-80.
[798] Lines 10-11, 274, 278, 351, 585, 1401, 940-44, 1045, 1423, 1437.
[799] Μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς Δίκην, Ἄτην Ἐρινύν θ᾽, αἷσι τόνδ᾽ ἔσφαξ᾽ ἐγώ (1432-3).

made her do so (*Ag.* 1496-1500);[800] she is caught up in the cyclical effects of

the ancestral fault identified by Gagné:

> the crime that now unfolds on stage is but one rung in an
> old, endless ladder of misery. It is in that cycle of recurrent
> violence that Clytemnestra locates the acts that have been
> committed. Agamemnon repeats the atavistic crime of his
> father, a murder of a kin child, something that Clytemnestra
> presents as a calamity for the house (1521-9). The crime of
> Agamemnon repeats the crime of Atreus.[801]

In the *Choephoroe*, Clytemnestra takes the news of Orestes' alleged death

remarkably calmly (*Choe*. 691-99); this is later revealed by Cilissa to be a

front for a happy realisation that there are now no obstacles to hinder her and

Aegisthus' reign (πρὸς μὲν οἰκέτας θετοσκυθρωπῶν ἐντὸς ὀμμάτων γέλων

κεύθουσ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἔργοις διαπεπραγμένοις καλῶς κείνη, 737-40).

The presence of the Erinyes is foreshadowed in the *Choephoroe* when

Clytemnestra warns Orestes to beware her vengeance (ὅρα, φύλαξαι μητρὸς

ἐγκότους κύνας, 924). The threat is carried through in the *Eumenides*, where

Clytemnestra's ghost exhorts the Erinyes to take no rest during their pursuit

of Orestes (a chase that began in *Choe*. 1048-62) and avenge her (*Eum*. 94-

105). Her ghost suggests she is ostracised in Hades for her murder of

Agamemnon and Cassandra (ἐγὼ δ᾽ ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν ὧδ᾽ ἀπητιμασμένη ἄλλοισιν ἐν

νεκροῖσιν, 95-6) and has no gods protecting her (οὐδεὶς ὑπέρ μου δαιμόνων

μηνίεται, 101). Once again, Clytemnestra, through her ghost, is preoccupied

---

[800] Seaford has noted that revenge for homicide was relatively unusual in ancient society, Seaford (2012): 202.
[801] Gagné (2013): 400-1.

with the process of appropriate justice.[802] Clytemnestra lived her life by a specific code of justice that allowed her to commit murder; her ghost now takes refuge in the same concept, but she is now the murder victim.

The figure of Clytemnestra's ghost (*Eum*. 94-139) has a similar dual function to that of the Watchman. The ghost brings the Erinyes, previously seen only by Orestes in the *Choephoroe* (*Choe*. 1048-62), to the stage (*Eum*. 127-231) and visible to internal and external audiences. It enables the portrait of the Erinyes begun by the Pythia earlier in the play (*Eum*. 34-58) to be completed and reminds them of Clytemnestra's devotion in life to their shrine (106-9). This narrative strand may have had particular connotations for the external audience, who could have recognised the Erinyes as ancient chthonic goddesses, known from both Homer[803] and Hesiod.[804] Of the first generation of gods and therefore older than Zeus and his progeny (νέος δὲ γραίας δαίμονας, *Eum*. 150), the Erinyes demand respect on several counts:

Rights:
        ἀλλ᾽ ἔστιν ἡμῖν τοῦτο προστεταγμένον
                      Eum. 208; see also 538-65, 747
        But this is our prescribed duty

Purpose:
        βροτοκτονοῦντας ἐκ δόμων ἐλαύνομεν
          Eum. 421; see also 778-792, 808-22, 837-47, 870-80
        We drive murderers from their homes

---

[802] Diké (Δίκη) is personified throughout the *Oresteia*: 250, 383, 772, 911, 1432, 1607, 1615, 1669 (*Ag*.); 61, 144, 148, 244, 307, 311, 330, 398, 461-2, 497, 642, 646, 788, 805, 868, 884, 935, 949, 955, 988, 990, 1027 (*Choe*.); 231, 271, 414, 511, 516, 550, 610, 785, 804, 815 (*Eum*.).
[803] Hom. *Od*. 15.234, 17.475-6, 20.78; Hom. *Il*. 9.454, 15.204.
[804] Hes. *Theog*. 184.

Power:

       πάντ᾽ ἐφήσω μόρον

                              Eum. 502; see also 711-12

       We send death to all men

Athena has to work hard for them to accept her terms (794-955).[805] Clytemnestra's ghost reminds the Erinyes that she worshipped them diligently in life (106-16), thereby reminding the external audience of their cult.[806] The portrait of the Erinyes, raised to action by Clytemnestra, is brought full circle and completed by their transformation at the end of the trilogy (*Eum*. 927-1031).

The Impact of Veracity in News and Messages

I have discussed the ability of news and messages to determine actions and events. This ability is particularly powerful when the news or messages being conveyed are untruthful. The Watchman of the *Agamemnon* begins the trilogy with ominous insinuations about the state of relations in the Argive palace (35-9). In the *Choephoroe*, Cilissa's treachery is an overt deception before both internal and external audiences. This raises questions about the truth status of the news and messages delivered throughout this play. The internal audience always has a different perspective to that of the external

---

[805] Burian (2011): 112-13 emphasises the democratic nature of Athena's approach to the Erinyes: her 'persistence in the patient work of persuading the Furies to accept a new role as benefactors of the *polis* ratifies the value of [democratic] discourse as a substitute for violence'. He notes however that 'democratic discourse and the political legitimacy of the decision-making process are not in themselves enough to resolve all conflicting claims'; 'the age-old, female, pre-political values and sanctities that the Furies represent' must also be included and so 'the expansive lyric *agôn* begins with the goddesses of younger and older generations talking at cross-purposes, and ends with the mutual recognition of benefits given and received on both sides'.

[806] Brown (1984) discusses the history of cults for the Eumenides.

audience but for Cilissa's scene, the internal audience is split into those who

know about Orestes' return, and those who do not, on Orestes' side; and those

who know nothing on Clytemnestra's side. Cilissa herself, although an

instrument of Orestes' plan, does not know anything other than that she must

change her message. This may raise questions in the minds of the external

spectators as to which character can be trusted: was the Watchman (*Ag.* 1-39)

being entirely truthful or was his interpretation biased (or limited by lack of

knowledge)? Does Orestes have other motives for the murder of

Clytemnestra and Aegisthus aside from avenging Agamemnon (*Choe*. 269-

306)?[807]

At the start of the final play, the rousing of the sleeping Erinyes by

Clytemnestra's ghost because Orestes is mocking them (ἐγκατιλλώψας, 110)

is clearly a false message; Orestes' reaction to the Erinyes at the end of the

second play was fearful (*Choe*. 1048-62). The mockery is designed to enrage

the Erinyes for the lack of respect being shown to them (which we

subsequently learn in the third play is a preoccupation for them).[808] Table 15

identifies the pattern of false messages in the trilogy and how they impact

upon events.

---

[807] Gagné (2013): 415 suggests that 'ancient crimes continue into later generations. The murder by Orestes, and the punishment he has suffered on stage, are ultimately the consequences of crimes committed generations before. This in no way denies the responsibility of Orestes for his acts; it places it in a larger chain of causality'.
[808] *Eum*. 208, 421, 538-65, 747, 778-92, 808-22, 837-47, 870-80.

Table 15 False Messages in the *Oresteia*

Play	Character	False Message	Lines	Effect	Consequence
Agamemnon	Clytemnestra	Joy at Agamemnon's return.	855-913	Tricks the internal audience into thinking she is happy Agamemnon has returned – or perhaps just Agamemnon?	The murder of Agamemnon and Cassandra.
Choephoroe	Orestes	The death of Orestes.	674-90	Clytemnestra thinks there is no longer any barrier to her rule of Argos.	The deaths of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra.
Choephoroe	Clytemnestra	News of the death of Orestes.	691-99	Her fake lament validates Orestes' deception of her.	Cilissa's confirmation that the lament was false ratifies the murder of Clytemnestra.
Choephoroe	Cilissa	Influenced by the Chorus, she changes Clytemnestra's message to Aegisthus.	769-82	To allay Aegisthus' fears and trick him into proceeding without his armed guard.	The murder of Aegisthus, leaving Orestes free from threat to carry out the murder of Clytemnestra.
Eumenides	Clytemnestra's ghost	Tells the Erinyes that Orestes is mocking their laxity in pursuing him.	110-13	Rouses the Erinyes from their sleep.	Renewed pursuit of Orestes.

It is interesting that Clytemnestra has a false messenger role in each play of the trilogy and that, with the single exception of Orestes in the *Choephoroe,* all false messengers are female.[809] In the case of each false message the effect is to influence the thinking and actions of the internal audience, whilst the external audience would have awareness of the deception taking place.

The false messages help shape the direction of activity from within. The constant shifts between honesty and deception could have required close attention from the external audience and undermined their certainty about what was taking place. The prevalence of false messages destabilises the narrative which has the effect of creating unease for both internal and external audiences.

Considering the status of the message enablers in terms of their relationship to the Atreid line affords a deeper connection with the mythological narrative and enhances its messages. The message enablers in the *Oresteia* create links between the plays that stand in their own right within their own units, allowing each play to stand on its own merit as a contained story. The links between them connect thematically, knitting the strands of the individual

---

[809] Goward (2005): 85-90 briefly discusses gender issues in Greek tragedy. See also Rabinowitz and Richlin (1993), Minchin (2007) and Calame (2009) for examination of gender issues in ancient texts. As Hall (2010): 14 and 19-20 has noted, tragic theatre was very much a male activity although part of the dynamic of tragedy is concerned with how it is challenged internally by strong female characters. The women of extant Aeschylean tragedy tend to be portrayed fairly negatively and, with the exception of Clytemnestra, no individual woman overtly directs activity in the same way that male characters do. That false messages are delivered by female characters perhaps plays into a negative stereotype that was prevalent in Greek thought, that feminisation was 'lesser'; see Wiles (2000): 70-88 for further expansion on this in terms of Aeschylean theatre.

plays into a trilogic whole. The trilogy allows the creation of an 'other' world in which events theoretically make sense – cause and effect operates within and across the trilogy, played out to the bitterest end. Manipulating temporalities and corresponding spatial planes allowed Aeschylus to explore loyalties and priorities as concepts which were simultaneously fixed and flexible.

The Significance of Silence

As explored earlier in chapter four, another method Aeschylus used to create impact was in the use of silence.[810] Silence can be as powerful and effective as the spoken word. Table 16 shows how populous the stage of the *Eumenides* was with silent figures in comparison with the earlier two plays in the trilogy.

Table 16 Silent Figures in the *Oresteia*

Agamemnon	*Choephoroe*	*Eumenides*
Clytemnestra's servants (908) Aegisthus' soldiers (1651)	Servants (712, 719)	Herald (566) Trumpet player (566-70) Jurors (570, 708-10) Young/old women (1027) Children (1027)

In the *Agamemnon*, the Watchman (1-39) modifies his speech and claims silence as a refuge (τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα σιγῶ, 35) from internecine palace strife. He emphasises the strength of his resolve through the ox metaphor (βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ μέγας βέβηκεν, 35-6). Imagery of trapping the tongue is also found in Sophocles[811] and this method vividly demonstrates the serious nature of

---

[810] The comic poet Aristophanes comments on Aeschylus' habit of using silent characters, *Frogs*, 911-30.
[811] Soph. *O.C.* 1050-3, as noted by Raeburn and Thomas (2011): 71 n. 36-9.

the secrets being concealed. It is a metaphorical lock which illustrates the power of withholding information.

The silence of Cassandra is used to great effect as she is present on stage for some considerable time before she speaks. She arrives with Agamemnon at line 783 but is silent until line 1072. She refuses to respond to Clytemnestra and the Chorus (1035-68) and the Chorus describe her as a 'wild animal' (τρόπος δὲ θηρὸς ὡς νεαιρέτου, 1064). For the external audience who may recognise the myth of Cassandra, her silent but perhaps striking presence could have been a sign of ominous foreboding: her 'madness' may be representative of her fear and the events she knows are to come. When she does finally make a sound, it is a shriek (ὀτοτοτοῖ πόποι δᾶ, 1072), a stark contrast that is amplified by her extended silent presence up to this point.

Pylades' brief scene in the *Choephoroe*, the shortest in the trilogy, is afforded considerable power by the fact that he otherwise remains silent throughout the play. There is scholarly debate over whether Pylades' silence is as a result of Aeschylus attempting to follow the so-called 'three actor rule'[812] but his otherwise silent presence strengthens the authority of his speech, making it both more remarkable and memorable than if he had been a regular

---

[812] Sommerstein notes that this was probably more prevalent during the Hellenistic period: there are no scenes in extant tragedy where there are four speaking parts present at the same time (excluding children). Rather than a rule, Sommerstein suggests it may have been to achieve parity between performances rather than a dictated convention of production; Sommerstein (2010): 170. Nisetich provides a summary of additional scholarship on this point, Nisetich (1986): 48. See also Schlesinger (1930) and Marshall (2003): 261-70.

contributor. Pylades' silence can be viewed as being symptomatic of his emotional distance from the activity of the play. The simplicity and coolness of Pylades' statement also serves to balance the heightened emotion of Orestes, Clytemnestra and the house slave. Delaying Pylades' pivotal announcement, and keeping it short, emphasises that the argument is Orestes' alone. Despite their strong bond from their years growing up together, Pylades is only there to support Orestes, not to participate or judge, nor to influence the internal audience. His silence is Orestes' strength: when that strength falters (898-9), Pylades speaks succinctly and with brevity and Orestes is satisfied (κρίνω σὲ νικᾶν, καὶ παραινεῖς μοι καλῶς, 903) and his resolve stabilised.

A different kind of silence is that of the Herald (κῆρυξ, 566) in the *Eumenides*. The Athenian Herald is an intriguing character.[813] The identification of the Herald in his designated professional role makes his silence more notable. The function of a herald figure is usually to declare information,[814] but in this case he is completely silent: he is in a sense a messenger figure that has no message. Keeping the Herald silent allows Athena to have full control of the proceedings and signals her authority over the people whose identity bears her name. Naming the Herald allows visual explanation for the jurors

---

[813] See Table 12, p. 277.
[814] Gottesman (2014): 8-9 notes that for council meetings 'the Herald stepped forth and announced the meeting open with the ritual call "Who wishes to speak?"'; presumably the herald fulfilled a similar function for the court here, particularly given it was the first of its kind and therefore would probably have been based on existing, familiar structures. Aristotle also confirms that it was the herald who proclaimed the number of votes (*Ath. Pol.* 69.1).

entering the stage (570) and is indicative of the inclusion of the Athenian

people into the trial proceedings. It demonstrates how the actions of the

divine figures (Athena, Apollo and the Erinyes) created the Athenian

judiciary which is nevertheless placed within a democratic construct.[815]

Silence can convey its own messages to the internal and external audiences

and can be very effective at enhancing atmosphere. Silence can conceal

motivation but it can also reveal, when the silence is broken, critical

information that connects the strands of the story and advances the dramatic

narrative. Rather than functioning as an absence, silence can instead be

considered an ancillary support to the system of news and messaging in the

trilogy.

Temporalities and Spatialities

Mapping Space and Time

My analysis of message enabling demonstrates how characters can assert

influence over events and the actions of others. The 'outsiders', the

Watchman and Cassandra (*Ag.*), and the Slave (*Choe.*), help to create the

temporal world of the play by providing narrative ballast, while the 'insiders',

Pylades (*Choe.*) and Clytemnestra's ghost (*Eum.*), help to solidify the

temporalities by inciting direct action: Pylades helps Orestes come to terms

---

[815] Burian (2011): 112 notes that 'Athena's announcement that the Furies' prosecution of
Orestes for matricide must be adjudicated by a court of citizens, even after both parties
have expressed their willingness to have her decide alone, demonstrates that the legitimacy
of the political order depends on a process of decision-making through argument and
persuasion, not on decrees from above'.

with killing his mother, whilst the latter's ghost incites the Erinyes' pursuit of the former. Clytemnestra's ghost occupies the space of the Underworld. The presence of her ghost adds another temporal layer to the temporal construction of the dramatic space and in a sense, brings the divine plane closer to the mortal plane – the in-between space of Hades is occupied by neither gods nor the living.

The use of false messages and foreshadowing can exert wider influence by manipulating temporalities, as demonstrated by the example of Cilissa (734-82) in the *Choephoroe*. The identification of Cilissa as Orestes' childhood nurse brings the distanced space of Orestes' early life into the scenic space of the stage, a time from the past when Agamemnon and Iphigeneia still lived. Like Electra and Pylades, Cilissa is a solid link to Orestes' childhood and emphasises the distance now between him and Clytemnestra. Cilissa's tears (κεκλαυμένην, 731) and grief (ὥς μοι τὰ μὲν παλαιὰ συγκεκραμένα ἄλγη δύσοιστα τοῖσδ᾽ ἐν Ἀτρέως δόμοις τυχόντ᾽ ἐμὴν ἤλγυνεν ἐν στέρνοις φρένα, 744-6) because she thinks Orestes dead reveals a deep connection between them. Cilissa is aware of the grim Atreid history and connects it with the present circumstances, linking her scene thematically with the first play of the trilogy.[816] The knowledge strengthens the temporal connections within the play and reconnects Orestes to his familial line after his long absence. Her explicit loyalty towards Orestes (φίλον δ᾽ Ὀρέστην, 745) is an indication to the external audience that Orestes will be able to count on her support.

---

[816] *Ag.* 3, 123, 202, 310, 400, 451, 1088.

Pylades, Orestes' faithful companion, creates links between the divine (Apollo) and mortal (Orestes) within the internal space of the play. This reminds the external audience of Apollo's patronage of Orestes. Apollo occupies a divine plane in obvious contrast to Orestes, but his patronage sublimates the mortal spatial plane and it becomes transformed by Orestes' reception of it into a quasi-mortal/divine plane. As we saw earlier,[817] when Pylades does finally speak, it is to ask Orestes if he has remembered Apollo's directions and the oath they took (900-1). By reminding Orestes of Apollo's involvement – and his support – he strengthens Orestes' resolve. These lines bring the distanced space of the past into focus in the internal present.

Temporal Connections

Electra, Pylades and Cilissa represent the temporal past in the internal space of the *Choephoroe*. Cilissa acted as both nurse and laundress for Orestes (755-60); Pylades grew up with him at the court of Strophius (*Ag.* 879-81); and his sibling Electra shares his history (130-40, 235-63). Together they are Orestes' past, temporally occupying a distanced space that encroaches upon the turbulent present which contains the duplicitous Clytemnestra. Clytemnestra represents Orestes' present and future, itself a complex temporal arrangement spanning the trilogy containing the tragedy of Iphigeneia's death (the distant past; *Ag.*), the murder of Agamemnon and Cassandra (the recent past; *Choe.*) and the eventual pursuit of the Erinyes (the future; *Eum.*). Philip Vellacott interprets Orestes' character as being

---

[817] See p. 293.

'relentlessly persuaded' by others,[818] but the emotional impact of the influential characters of his childhood on the vengeance-seeking adult should not be under-estimated when measured against his present circumstances, pursued by gods both benign and malevolent as a result of his mother's actions. Another interpretation of her motivation is the completion of the cyclical narrative of murder and revenge. The circularity of the reciprocal violence of the trilogy is explored by Seaford in terms of a Heracleitian 'unity of opposites',[819] which is reflected in the binary connections scattered and contrasted throughout the trilogy (see Table 17).

Table 17 Binary Oppositions in the *Oresteia*

Atreus	Thyestes
Iphigeneia	Cassandra
Agamemnon	Clytemnestra
Clytemnestra	Cassandra
Clytemnestra	Orestes
Erinyes	Orestes
Apollo	Athena
Above earth	Below earth
Sacrifice	Murder
Vengeance	Justice
Young gods	Old gods
Necessity	Desire

The literary system of chronotopes,[820] a term coined by Mikhail Bakhtin,[821] refers to a method of examining how the temporal elements of a narrative come together.[822] Paul Monaghan notes that Bakhtin's interpretation is

---

[818] Vellacott (1984): 151-2.
[819] Heracleitus, son of Blosun of Ephesus, a pre-Socratic philosopher fl. c.500 B.C.E.
[820] The word is derived from Greek: χρόνος (time) and τόπος (space).
[821] Bakhtin and Holquist (1981).
[822] Whilst Seaford (2012) takes the concept from Mikhail Bakhtin, he has redesigned an alternative model. He analyses the issues at the heart of the *Oresteia* in terms of a monetisation that depends upon the contrast between actions deriving from desires for materialistic wealth and actions of benign intent (193-202). He argues that the heart of the *Oresteia*'s problems is the accumulation of personal wealth, expressed through a range of

primarily referring to time in literature and in a theatrical context he interprets Bakhtin's version of the chronotope as the 'space-time-action matrix of the performance event'.[823]

Wiles' view of the chronotope is one primarily dealing with internal space: 'The Aeschylean chronotope maps in space a historical procession', being 'characterised as a journey to a destination'.[824] For Wiles, it is the passage of time moving through its space which characterises the chronotope. This is reflected in his interpretation of the created chronotope of the Thebes of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannos* of 429 B.C.E., contrasted with the actual chronotope of contemporary Athens. In Wiles' analysis, the internal theatrical chronotope becomes directly analogous with the world outside of the theatrical performance,[825] each chronotope interacting and supporting the other. Wiles also identifies a further chronotopic structure, predicated on the dialogic interaction between a chronotope focused on the play's protagonists and a chronotope focused on the chorus.[826] The role of the chorus in bringing in so many different layers to the text such as recounting mythology, internal

---

examples including Agamemnon's war spoils to Clytemnestra's extravagance with expensive cloth (202). Aegisthus is also associated with corrupting wealth in the *Odyssey*, 3.270-5.

[823] Monaghan (2016): 13.

[824] Wiles (2016): 98.

[825] 'We recreate the play when we read it or view it, but we must understand the chronotopes of our own world if we are to avoid being dogmatic. We cannot look into Sophocles' text to find the eternal verities of human nature, because the play is built of chronotopes, and chronotopes are subject to history. The human being is not an essence, but a function of time and space', Wiles (2016): 104-5.

[826] Wiles' analysis of the Bakhtinian dialogic philosophy is that there should be distance between the dramatic figure and the author and/or spectator, in contrast with Aristotle's monologic view that the spectator should be subsumed into the author/dramatic figure, excluding the notion of performance, Wiles (2016): 95-6.

history, geographical knowledge and so on, and their ability to transport the

external audience to another timeframe or period during their odes, supports

Wiles' interpretation of the chronotope focused on the passage of internal

time. Protagonists tend to be internally temporally static (for example,

Agamemnon (*Ag.* 810-974) does not recount specific events that took place

at Troy) and therefore create contrasting chronotopic scenarios, perhaps

creating what may even be identified as chronotopic *agônes* (ἀγώνης).[827]

Patrice Pavis considers the chronotope as 'a unit in which temporal and spatial

indices form an intelligible, concrete whole'.[828] When viewed in this way,

the chronotopic structure, or Monaghan's 'chronotopic performance event',

consists of

> a layering, in actual three-dimensional space (the theatre of
> Dionysus, for example) and real time, of aural, visual,
> spatial, and kinetic performance textures – both experiential
> and referential – woven together in constantly shifting and
> more or less sophisticated ways, such that they act upon the
> senses of the spectators.[829]

When applied to the *Oresteia*, the chronotopes of Wiles and Pavis represent

a multi-layered, chronotopic structure that is both drawn from the Oresteian

universe and also feeds and sustains it. The messaging processes in the trilogy

are essential for this to take place and for the effective temporal and spatial

interactions between the internal and external audiences. They allow these

---

[827] Ἀγών ('contest'); see Barker (2009) for an examination of the concept in tragedy, Epic and historiography.
[828] Pavis (2003): 14 and quoted in Monaghan (2016): 14.
[829] Monaghan (2016): 14.

chronotopic systems to function which help create further levels of interpretation.[830]   Martin Puchner's 'double allegiance',[831] the interface between the performance as an aesthetic work of art and the performance as a representation of the world external to it, encapsulates the intrinsic duality of the chronotopic *Oresteia*.

Aetiological Chronotopes

As explained in the introduction,[832] aetiology refers to the origin of a name, a story or an event. The tension between the 'unity of opposites' discussed above creates a space for aetiological chronotopes, where the narrative of the dramatic text creates the meaning or *aition* (αἴτιον) of a story.[833] The blending of space and time (the chronotope) becomes aetiological because it is the merging of the two that results in the explanation, or *aition*.[834] The past, the present and the future are intertwining within the same space.   The consequences of this for the internal audience are that they must look to the presence of the gods appearing before them to make sense of their situation. That the Chorus are the personification of some of the oldest gods,[835] much older than Athena or Apollo, makes their situation harder. The primordial

---

[830] Seaford's analysis relies on his own interpretation of the chronotope. His interpretation of a monetised chronotope is characterised by its limitlessness. In his model, Clytemnestra is driven to her actions not so much by the actions of Agamemnon, but because her character desires completion of the narrative, Seaford (2012): 193-4.

[831] Puchner (2002): 521; also quoted in Monaghan (2016): 12.

[832] See pp. 28 ff.

[833] Seaford (2012): 24 uses the example of the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* where the rituals of the Eleusinian Mysteries are established by the hymn in conjunction with contemporary public festivals, resulting in an aetiological chronotope.

[834] But as Revermann notes, the aetiological narrative of the *Eumenides* is sustained and not closed, Revermann (2008): 253.

[835] See p. 297.

Erinyes have more power and authority than the younger gods by virtue of their age alone and this is a constant source of frustration for them.[836]

The figure of the goddess Athena is the most significant temporal-spatial mechanism in the trilogy. In a most effective trope that is still used, her presence is saved until the end of the trilogy where her symbolism will be most powerful. An Olympian goddess of war and wisdom, Athena's links with her eponymous *polis* were ancient, with one of her myths at the root of the Athenians' belief in their unique autochthonism.[837] It has been suggested that the Athenian embrace of an ancient autochthonic heritage was in fact a late construct (early to mid-fifth century B.C.E.) which helped underpin ideas of democratic ideology and was possibly utilised by dramatists for this very purpose.[838] Athena's presence in this context, at the dawn of the Athenian judicial process, is used to validate Athenian ideals and authority and sanctifies Athenian hegemony. As patron of Athens, Athena's corporeal presence may also have created a (perhaps subconscious) emotional bond with the ancient external audience, enhancing their acceptance of her authority in the action taking place – and thereby reinforcing the authority of the dramatised version of Athenian history.

---

[836] See p. 297.
[837] Arising from the birth of Erichthonius on the Athenian acropolis, Apollod. 3.14.6. Rosivach discusses the etymological evidence for the term, Rosivach (1987): 294-7.
[838] Rosivach (1987): 303-5.

The figure of Athena temporally links the internal and external audiences. The internal audience is temporally connected with the external audience through a shared experience that crosses the temporal divide. For the duration of the active performance of the trilogy in 458 B.C.E., the two sets of audiences shared a unique connection. The fact that some citizen audience members present would also have participated in previous dramatic productions as *choreuts* would have strengthened the temporal connection between internal and external, blurring the divide.[839] The figure of Athena, universal internally and externally, unites the two audiences.

The criss-crossing events of the trilogy form a flexible line of time that stretches from the past (Iphigeneia's death; the Trojan War) to the present (Agamemnon and Cassandra's deaths; Clytemnestra and Aegisthus' deaths) and into the future (Orestes' trial; the inception of the Areopagus; the transformation of the Erinyes). Past, present and future enter a state of flux – the deaths in the first two plays become the past of the third play; the events of the third play become the future for the internal audience whilst simultaneously being the past for the external audience. Athena is key to this past-present-future cycle, the goddess becoming a symbol of constancy in a changing world. Her presence halts the maelstrom of trauma that had engulfed the trilogy up to these final scenes of the *Eumenides*. The complex

---

[839] See p. 220 on the role of the *choreut*.

circularity of time and space within the trilogy is part of its identity as a

masterpiece of the dramatic form.[840]

External Audience Perceptions

The external audience absorbs the events represented on stage within the

context of their own knowledge (or otherwise) of the various mythological

stories which influences their judgement of what they are seeing.   The

characters of the *Oresteia* cannot resolve their problems on their own; they

must be adjudicated by a higher authority (the gods). It is only through the

intervention of Athena that the cycle of murder and revenge is broken. This

is the only way the internal figures can regain control of events that have

passed beyond rationality. Part of the external audience's perception process

is the visual imagery presented by the production.

The semiotics of stage design and costume are as powerful as the spoken

words. Wyles has examined how tragic costume worked as a language in

ancient performance and was manipulated physically and verbally to create

meaning.[841]   There are numerous references to costume throughout the

trilogy. These references send messages to the audience(s) and are another

way in which the perceptions of the internal and external audiences may be

---

[840] Much of the temporal complexity is provided by the *Agamemnon*; Gagné (2013): 394-5 notes that this play 'is indeed without parallels in the extant corpus of Greek tragedy for the richness and intricacy of its temporal texture. The play is filled with an astounding variety of references to past and future … the thick apparatus of proleptic allusions, hints, and activations of the events of the past presents the audience with an intricate and constantly changing picture of the play's relevant time.'
[841] Wyles (2011).

manipulated.[842]   A good example of the power of ancient costume may be found in the famously fearsome appearance of the Erinyes.[843]

> ἆ, ἆ. δμωαὶ γυναῖκες, αἵδε Γοργόνων δίκην φαιοχίτωνες καὶ πεπλεκτανημέναι πυκνοῖς δράκουσιν

> Orestes, *Choe*. 1047-50

> … ah, these grim women, like Gorgons with their dark clothing and snake-entwined hair …

In terms of the staging, Andújar has noted the extreme contrast between the beginning and end of the *Oresteia*: the trilogy begins with the lone figure of the *Agamemnon*'s Watchman but ends with a plethora of people at the end of the *Eumenides*. The personnel on stage for the final scene comprises Athena, Apollo, the Herald, the jurors (570, 708-10), the Erinyes and the processional escort (προπομποί, 1033-47), the latter groups comprising what Andújar has called a 'choral swarm'.[844] Visually, this mass of people could have been a challenging spectacle for the external audience and may have rendered the figures as indistinguishable from each other (although distinctive costumes such as those of the Erinyes' could have helped). It is perhaps indicative of the isolation of the dramatic figures at the start of the trilogy: the four deaths (and the history behind them) in the first two plays create a vacuum of

---

[842] *Ag*. 239, 936, 1264-6, 1269, 1383; *Choe*. 10-11, 24-5, 27, 29, 81, 998, 1010, 1015, 1040-50; *Eum*. 50-5, 193, 370, 404, 644, 1028.

[843] See also discussion on p. 266. *Vita Aeschyli* 130-2; Pollux 4.110; Easterling (2008): 222-3. Revermann puts forward the intriguing idea that the Erinyes were not necessarily 'old and monstrous … but young and beautiful' with the terror deriving from their immense power. Revermann (2008): 244-5. Mueller (2016) examines the physical elements of ancient theatre and how clothing and props can contribute to the delivery of information. See also p. 285 n. 773 above for her interpretation of the tapestry scene in the *Agamemnon* (906-74).

[844] Andújar (2016).

pollution that is only finally healed by the resolution of Orestes' guilt and the

inclusion of the transformed Erinyes in the *Eumenides*. Alternatively, it may

be representative of an overtly Athenian presence for the final play of a trilogy

that had, in the earlier two plays, been set in Argos.[845]

In the *Eumenides* the external audience are shown how the Erinyes are

dragged up from beneath the earth to pursue Orestes. This refers to the role

of the gods in civic society and their importance. The distanced space of the

mythical world of the play aligns with the evolving space of the internal

audience's own experience and knowledge; where the two come together

forms a metatheatrical space that engenders understanding. This allows their

understanding of the concepts of justice and honour to develop as the trilogy

progresses. This is epitomised in the dramatic recreation of the origins of the

court of the Areopagus (*Eum*. 681-706).[846] The recreation creates a new kind

of temporality,[847] which encompasses civic, social and legal spheres. For the

external audience, this new temporal space sits between the created space of

---

[845] An effect enhanced by the visuals on display; Blok (2017): 270, in her examination of citizenship in the classical period, notes how the invitation to the Erinyes to 'live among the Athenians and to be honoured with crimson cloaks in a procession … has such striking similarities to the role typical of *metoikoi* in the Panathenaic and other *pompai*, as attested in the lexica, that we may infer that the audience was expected to recognise a practice that by then was familiar'.
[846] The Areopagus was reformed by Solon in 494 B.C.E. and again by Ephialtes in 462 B.C.E., the latter resulting in the removal of the majority of the court's constitutional powers and leaving it with the primary function of judging homicide cases. See Gottesman (2014): 125-31. Sommerstein provides a brief analysis of the political ramifications surrounding the Areopagite court, Sommerstein (2010): 286-9. MacLeod (1982) also expands upon the political aspects of *Eumenides* in this respect.
[847] See Widzisz (2011) for expansion on the temporalities of the Areopagus scene.

the stage and the real space of their own experience.[848] This merging of the two spaces helps embed the elements of both into the minds of the audience.

The perception of the civic and legal systems is enhanced by the dramatic performance which puts the history of the legal process into a civic context. Blanshard notes that the rituals and environment of the Athenian law court located it as a space that functioned 'in the city' and 'as the city';[849] like the theatre, the law court takes on a spatial duality.[850] The internal theatrical space operates internally but also recreates an external plane recognisable to the external audience. For the external audience, the role of the Areopagus was inextricably bound with civic life.[851] In the same way that tragedy is an exercise in catharsis,[852] civic participation in legal processes effected a 'rebirth' of sorts.[853] The associated ritualistic elements are similarly recast as being underpinned by ancient rites entwined in mythology. The

---

[848] Although it was still a fairly new system for Athens; as Wiles notes, 'democracy in the Aeschylean period was a new thing, the role of the Areopagites still unclear', Wiles (2016): 98. Gottesman (2014): 210 suggests that the civic institution of the court was how the Athenians 'made sense of their history'; Wohl (2015): xii also takes this view, saying that the plays 'shape political sensibilities, create political attachments, structure political feelings. They provide their audience with a framework for both understanding and experiencing their political present. Why "political"? Because fifth-century Athenians were "political animals" in general and were watching these plays as a collective body, on an occasion that was itself (among other things) political.' Watching the plays, the Athenians were thus engaging in a process that unconsciously blended their civic experience with the dramatic which together created the structure of their lives.

[849] Blanshard (2014): 245.

[850] Gottesman (2014): 3 describes how 'the courts also attracted the passions and interests of Athenians. There the vote of panels consisting of hundreds of ordinary citizens decided whether an accused would live or die, or go into exile and lose everything. It was also great entertainment.'

[851] As noted by Carey, 'courts …[are] part of the political life of the city; part of the life of the individual litigants, so that a litigant's whole life is relevant to the trial; they are subject to the ordinary rules of decency and the ordinary rules of law', Carey (1994): 178.

[852] Aristot. *Poet.* 1449b6. See Schaper (1968) for an analysis of Aristotle's use of the term and Golden (1962) and Kruse (1979) for a re-evaluation.

[853] Blanshard (2014): 246.

transformation of civic space into a civically-administrated mechanism for addressing crimes of homicide represents another form of catharsis for the internal audience.[854]

Conclusion

The *Oresteia* features several different types of messages. There are superficially straight-forward deliveries of news, such as that by the Herald (*Ag*. 522-37) or the Watchman (*Ag*. 22-5). These kinds of direct messages are the foundation for the dramatic structure of the plot and allow other types of messages to progress the action. Direct messages from figures such as these can usually be relied upon to be genuine. Other figures can be used to create different outcomes. The Watchman of the *Agamemnon* creates the atmospheric space of the trilogy; Pylades, the linchpin of the *Choephoroe*, provides support to Orestes at his most critical moment. Prophecies are also strongly influential, being responsible for the deaths of Iphigeneia (*Ag*. 248-9) and Clytemnestra (*Choe*. 269-75; *Eum*. 203) whilst Agamemnon's death is foretold through prophecy (*Ag*. 1125-9). Again, these kinds of messages, sent directly from the gods, can be relied upon to be true although crucially the human interpretation of them is subject to debate.[855]

---

[854] As noted by Cohen (1995): 3, 'the principal of blood vengeance … is transformed and incorporated within the new framework of civic institutions where it will help preserve Athens from enemies within and without'.

[855] Such as Themistocles' divisive interpretation of the Delphic oracle during the Persian wars: Herod. *Hist*. 7.138-43.

Using false messages to advance key parts of the plot reveals the importance of news and messages to bring about specific conclusions. False messages bring about change, in both character and plot point and can have significant consequences. In the *Agamemnon*, Clytemnestra's lies lull her husband into a false sense of security. Orestes also lies in the *Choephoroe*, as does Cilissa; the result of their lies is the death of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. These are all key actions that link together and allow the narrative to progress.

In the trilogy, false messages directly determine the narrative path. They may also raise doubts in the minds of the internal and external audiences regarding the truth status of messenger figures. As has been seen with the case of Cilissa, the veracity of messages can have a significant impact on subsequent events. The fact that the Chorus compelled her to change her message (*Choe*. 770-3, 779-80) reveals the power that can be gained through exerting influence over others. Cilissa's action led directly to Aegisthus' death and indirectly to the death of Clytemnestra. Clytemnestra's marshalling of the servants to help in her deception of Agamemnon (*Ag*. 909-13, 944-5) is another example. The manipulation of others in this way also allows the primary instigator to feel that they are not wholly responsible for what may occur, that the burden of guilt is shared.

The use of foreshadowing across the trilogy significantly contributes to the progression of the story across the three plays. Several characters across the trilogy voice comments laced with ominous overtones (see Table 18).

Table 18 Foreshadowing in the *Oresteia*

Line ref	Who	Reference
Ag. 14-19	Watchman	Fear in Agamemnon's palace
Ag. 34-9	Watchman	Fear of Clytemnestra
Ag. 580-2	Herald	The death of Agamemnon
Ag. 605-12	Clytemnestra	Iphigeneia's death; the death of Agamemnon
Ag. 854	Agamemnon	Clytemnestra's treachery; his death
Ag. 975	Chorus	Death of Agamemnon and Cassandra
Ag. 1069-71	Chorus	Cassandra's death
Ag. 1100-11	Cassandra	The death of herself and Agamemnon
Ag. 1258-60	Cassandra	Clytemnestra's treachery; the death of herself and Agamemnon
Ag. 1284-5	Cassandra	Orestes' return to avenge Agamemnon
Choe. 103-5	Electra	Death of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus
Choe. 143-4	Electra	Orestes' return; death of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus
Choe. 560-5	Orestes	Trickery towards Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, leading to their deaths
Choe. 679-90	Orestes	Trickery towards Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, leading to their deaths
Choe. 773	Chorus	Changing Cilissa's message which leads to the death of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus
Choe. 1020	Chorus	Erinyes' pursuit of Orestes
Eum. 230-1	Chorus	Implacability of the Erinyes' justice
Eum. 260	Chorus	Implacability of the Erinyes' justice
Eum. 502-5	Chorus	Implacability of the Erinyes' justice

The foreshadowing applies a pervasive sense of disaster from the perspectives of both internal and external audiences. False messages contribute to this, as they are used as indicators for where the story is going for the external audience and for the internal audience too, who each know different things at different times across the three plays. The false messages endow a sense of predetermination which is in keeping with the nature of the Atreid curse in the internal distant past, from which the internal present is entirely derived. The trilogy is founded in falsity, from the trickery of Clytemnestra towards Agamemnon to the deception employed by Orestes and the Chorus in the murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus.

The manipulation of temporalities in the *Oresteia* through the use of false messages and foreshadowing significantly contributes to the effects of its layered spatiality. As discussed above, it begins with Clytemnestra's treachery in the *Agamemnon*. The portrayal of her personality in this play is offset by the portrait of Agamemnon and Cassandra, who are both represented as honourable. This is demonstrative of how messaging can lead to understanding and ultimately to a transformation of perspectives. The disconnect between the two characters of Clytemnestra and Agamemnon returns the external and internal audiences temporarily to the events of Aulis ten years previously.

The figure of Iphigeneia is transformed within the play into the figure of Cassandra: young women both doomed to die for the Trojan War, Iphigeneia symbolically exiting the stage (in the diegetic space) to enable her father to sail and thus lead the Greek armies, and Cassandra entering as an enslaved former princess representing Agamemnon's spoils from that war. Within the Oresteian universe, Agamemnon's arrival at Troy is framed by the death of Iphigeneia and his exit (both literally and metaphorically) is framed by the death of Cassandra. This transformation closes the triadic loop of murder: Agamemnon kills Iphigeneia for the purposes of war; Clytemnestra kills Cassandra and Agamemnon in revenge for Iphigeneia's death; Orestes kills Clytemnestra in revenge for Agamemnon's death. The binary oppositions are resolved and order is restored.[856] Both Clytemnestra and Orestes say they are

---

[856] See p. 308 above.

exacting justice rather than revenge, a dichotomy that allows for personal and civic resolution. Orestes' repeated vow to obey Apollo's oracle reflects a thematic device underpinning the trilogy's narrative.[857]

As well as embodying the dead Iphigeneia, the figure of Cassandra in the *Agamemnon* could also be considered a physical representation of Apollo's prophetic persona. The Chorus emphasise the connection when they say they cannot understand her visions (*Ag.* αἴνιγμα, 1112; καὶ γὰρ τὰ πυθόκραντα: δυσμαθῆ δ᾽ ὅμως, 1255). Divine oracles required priests to decipher them.[858] Cassandra's story also emphasises the vicious nature of the gods when their plans are foiled.[859] The Erinyes identify Apollo's oracle as the primary motivator of Orestes to kill Clytemnestra (202-3) which Orestes (241) and Athena both refer to (799). This validates Orestes' actions and allows the external audience to understand the consequences of fulfilling directions from the gods. Orestes trusted Apollo to defend him and his trust was repaid, demonstrating the gods could be benevolent as well as capricious.

The delivery of news and messages is revealed to be crucial to the multiple temporalities and spatialities that provide so much depth in the trilogy. The temporal shifts throughout the trilogy serve to keep the internal perspectives in a state of perpetual motion; the distanced past is repeatedly brought into

---

[857] *Choe*. 269-96, 568-9, 900-3, 939, 952, 1030-1; *Eum*. 235-43, 465-7, 594.
[858] Such as the Pythia at Delphi. Lloyd-Jones (1976) provides an analysis of the history of the Delphic oracle. See also p. 267 above.
[859] *Ag*. 1202-12; see p. 265 above.

the present. Ancient mythology is combined or contrasted with Epic poetry[860]

to create a multi-liminal internal space that shifts between mythology, Epic,[861]

history and invention.[862]   This helps to create an internal world that reflects

all these various elements and uses them to fashion a narrative of familial

tragedy within the context of ancient fifth-century B.C.E. values.

Wiles' observation that 'in the *Oresteia*, the spatial journey from Troy, via

Argos and Delphi, to Athens is a historical journey from monarchy to

democracy' further emphasises that theatrical tragedy was a reflection of the

'real' world.[863]   Performance is a human endeavour, affected by those

performing and those receiving the performance, as Monaghan confirms

when he writes that 'the membrane surrounding the performance event is

porous'. This 'membrane' is affected by the 'social realities', or 'the world

of daily, lived experience, the culture we live in, its history, traditions, social

practices, and so forth'.[864]   The external audience thus receive the

performance within its own context and within the context of their own

lives.[865]

---

[860] As displayed in the discussions around the versions of the Agamemnon/Clytemnestra myth discussed above; see p. 261.

[861] Athenaeus said Aeschylus called his plays 'slices from the banquet of Homer' (ὃς τὰς αὑτοῦ τραγῳδίας τεμάχη εἶναι ἔλεγεν τῶν Ὁμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων), *Deip*. 8.347e.

[862] Aeschylus uses some words that are not found outside his work. See Raeburn and Thomas (2011) lxi-lxv. Sommerstein also notes how Aeschylus has appeared to create 'a new myth with new meaning' in his treatment of the Areopagite council. Sommerstein (2010) 145.

[863] Wiles (2016): 98.

[864] Monaghan (2016): 13.

[865] 'Theatre is a triangular interaction between the performance, the world of social, lived experience external to the performance and the physical/mental space of spectator experience', Monaghan (2016): 12.

The *Oresteia* is a work of great breadth and complexity, but it is fundamentally a story of grief, revenge and justice, very human emotions which any member of the external audience would have been able to appreciate on a purely humanistic level. The exploration of the wider consequences of human action, and the prominence of active gods in the trilogy, reveals the deep connection between mortals and divine agency. Whether one's action is morally right or wrong, the gods' opinions must be considered. The shifting temporalities in the *Oresteia*, working in conjunction with the news and messaging system, allow both internal and external spectators to move backwards and forwards through time, and ultimately create a complete and complex Oresteian universe in which to consider the themes of justice and revenge.

Conclusion

The aims of the thesis were to identify and analyse how news and messages are created and conveyed in the plays of Aeschylus; consider how those news and messages contribute to the narrative and dramatic structure; investigate how mythology and/or historical content contributes to news and messages, and helps situate the internal and external audiences; and to draw conclusions from the analysis to demonstrate what these aspects indicate about relationships with space and time. The thesis has demonstrated that news and messages are embedded within the plays of Aeschylus in complex ways and are vehicles for driving the narrative, and has identified new ways of examining the role of news and messages in ancient tragedy. The conclusion will evaluate the extent to which these aims have been met, provide an overview of each chapter, and consider how the research may be of future benefit.

News and Message Construction and Delivery Mechanisms

I have shown that Aeschylean news and messages convey much more than their primary function of delivering information, and that they have considerable impact across the wider themes of their plays, especially regarding audience knowledge and expectation. The thesis establishes that news and messages can be delivered in a variety of ways and by a wide variety of figures not exclusively formally identified as messengers; that what Buxton identifies as 'socially marginal … "neutrals"' ('newsbringers') are in fact

essential to the structure and delivery of the narrative.[866] The four priorities set out above are intertwined within each of the plays to varying degrees. Each play has embedded or explored messaging and news functions in different ways, and the structure of the thesis reflects that. The question of who knows what and when has also been shown to be fundamental to examining the impact of news and messages.

How News and Messaging Drives the Narrative

The thesis analysis demonstrates how dramatic structure and formal versatility combine to create multiple resonances which reveal meaning. The analysis illustrates new ways of interrogating the narrative structure of the plays by problematising the notion of the messenger figure, considering the development of the type, and examining alternative news and message carriers. The delivery of messages and news within the plays is a complex process. Messaging therefore relies upon elements and language embedded within the texts that are activated by combinations of scenes and activities on stage.

The Formal Messenger Figure

The work began with examining the role of the formally-identified messenger figure in chapter one. Through the research I have demonstrated that a messenger-identified figure is not the only means of conveying news and messages within Aeschylean tragedy. The only messenger-identified figure

---

[866] Buxton (1994): 33.

326

in the extant canon of Aeschylus, the Messenger of the *Persians*, was a useful

starting point for examining the role of news and messaging in the remaining

plays. This Messenger can be viewed as a benchmark for the news and

messaging delivery system. I discussed how the Messenger is distinctive for

the way in which he delivers his message. I hope to have shown, however,

that his role is much wider than that, and that he functions as a cypher for both

the internal and external audiences.

Alternative Messenger Figures

The techniques used to deliver news and messages show development across

the plays examined. This work began in the examination of the *Seven against

Thebes* in chapter two. From the starting point of a messenger-identified

figure, I have shown that figures often considered ancillary to the main cast

have important messaging functions in their own right. The research aim was

developed further in chapter three, where the rise to prominence of the Chorus

recasts their 'traditional' role and in chapter four, where the parameters of

messaging figures were recalibrated through a divine cast.

Internal and External Audiences

The examination of news and messaging systems also demonstrated that

internal and external audiences could interpret news and messages in different

ways. I have shown that the technique of using pre-Olympian mythology,[867]

the ancient history that predates the 'current' mythology placed as the

---

[867] See p. 10 and discussions above in chapters four (pp. 206 ff.) and five (pp. 261 ff.).

'present' in the plays, as a mechanism for situating the internal and external audiences provides a foundation of familiarity from which the poet can choose to build a narrative that may deviate from the expected route. The levels of understanding differ between the internal and external audiences; in chapter one, we saw how meaning for the internal audience in the Persian court would have been vastly different to that of the external audience, that is, the spectators in the theatre.[868] A less pronounced difference is explored in chapter five, where the perspectives of the internal and external audiences of the *Oresteia* would have diverged at various points; for example the court scene and transformation of the Erinyes in the *Eumenides* probably had considerably different resonances for each. The entire process was a new experience for the internal audience, whereas the external audience were (becoming) familiar with the Athenian civic and judicial processes.[869]

Space and Time

The research indicates that the shaping provided by space and time contributes to the news and messaging mechanisms in the plays examined and vice versa. The effectiveness of news and message delivery affects and is supported by temporal and spatial changes, the combination of which allows the creation of multi-faceted news and message items. This is particularly evident in the *Seven against Thebes*, discussed in chapter two, where the use of space was especially striking. In chapter four, we saw how the cataclysm

---

[868] See discussion on p. 91.
[869] See discussion on p. 317.

vocalised by Prometheus in response to Hermes' message transformed the internal space of the *Prometheus Bound*. In chapter five, I showed how the constant temporal changes between past, present and future in the *Oresteia* allowed the internal space of the plays to evolve as the narrative progressed.

The Contribution of Mythological Narratives

Mythological stories, and how they are used and/or changed by the poet, are important for both understanding and enhancing news and messages. The research has shown that the changes to mythological stories not only helped situate the external audience into the narrative of the trilogy but also acted to draw the attention of the external audience, alerting them to the subtle resonances of the changes. Aeschylus' use of pre-Olympian mythology, where the most ancient mythological stories underpin the plays' 'current' mythological frameworks, proved to be particularly important for enhancing the news and messaging in his plays. These aspects were explored in depth in chapter two,[870] chapter three,[871] chapter four[872] and chapter five.[873]

---

[870] In *Seven against Thebes* Aeschylus altered the myth of Oedipus, by having his children born by his mother rather than his second wife. *Seven*: 70, 203, 372, 654, 655, 677, 695, 725, 752, 775, 785-91, 801, 807, 833, 868, 989, 1004. See discussion on p. 105.

[871] In *Suppliants*, the alternative mythology of the Danaids described by Apollod. 2.1.4, where Danaus himself takes the throne on arrival in Argos, is significantly different to the version Aeschylus provides. See discussion on p. 155.

[872] In the *Prometheus Bound*, the changes are subtler, changing Prometheus' parentage, perhaps to enhance his identification as a god of prophecy; see discussions on p. 206 and 251.

[873] In the *Oresteia*, each figure has subtle changes to their own mythology which helps facilitate the news and messages they enable; see discussion on p. 261.

Chapter Overviews and Contributions to the Thesis

Chapter 1 – Messages and the Messenger

The thesis began with an examination of the earliest extant tragedy, the *Persians* (*Πέρσαι*) of 472 B.C.E.   This play was chosen to be the first examined because it is the only one to feature a formal messenger figure and therefore stands as a comparator for analysis of the other plays.   It is also the earliest play chronologically and as such seemed appropriate to take first place in the analysis.   The *Persians* raises special questions because it is complicated by being a dramatic reconstruction of an historical event known to the external audience – and unique as it is the only extant tragedy to do so. The play is important to the thesis threefold: (i) because it allows examination of a formal messenger figure; (ii) because its status as an account of a recent historical event affords consideration of the ways in which the internal and external audiences were handled and how they might be expected to respond to messaging about the impact of events in the recent past; and (iii) because of the juxtaposition of different spaces within the dramatic framework.   This play shows that the impact of news and messages can be used to make links between lived experience and judgements subsequently made about historical events known to the external audience as well as in mythological stories.

The debate about whether the play is a triumphant celebration of Athenian/Hellenic pre-eminence or a sympathetic insight into a vanquished

enemy's worst nightmare has never been settled.[874] This unresolved question is sustained through nuances of understanding and emotion that are framed by the delivery of news and messages and the responses to them. The play is an imaginative construction of events at a foreign court as the Athenians may have wished it to be, portrayed as torn apart by the misery of defeat. The portrayal reflects cultural and historical Greek rituals such as wailing and hair-pulling as manifestations of mourning.[875] As the only extant Aeschylean play to feature a definitively-identified 'messenger' figure, *Persians* is also a benchmark against which his other plays' news and messaging strategies may be considered. A dramatic eyewitness to the fictionally recreated Battle of Salamis of 480 B.C.E., the Messenger (*Pers.* 249-513) is particularly important because he focalises the battle taking place in the diegetic space. This helps create the cognitive link between the distanced space of the real battle and its recreation.

Chapter 2 – Alternative Messengers and the Importance of Space

The first chapter showed how news and messages shaped complex responses to events in the recent past, events which had been experienced by many of the spectators. The second chapter examined a mythological narrative in which a messenger figure influences events. The *Seven against Thebes* (Ἑπτὰ

---

[874] See p. 98 above. Nevertheless, 'Aeschylus' portrayal of the Persian court shows sensitivity to the human condition and the tragic forces that cut across cultural divides', Gruen (2011): 352.

[875] *Pers.* 936-40, 946-7, 955, 966, 1040, 1042, 1046, 1048, 1050, 1056-7, 1062, 1066, 1068, 1070. The phrase 'Μαριανδυνοῦ θρηνητῆρος' (*Pers.* 937) refers to the Mariandyni, renowned for their ritual laments. See Alexiou *et al.* (2002): 58 and Bachvarova and Dutsch (2016): 96.

ἐπὶ Θήβας) of 467 B.C.E. is important for the thesis because of the way it uses temporal layers to explore perception in terms of news and message delivery. This play is dominated by multiple shifts between temporalities, facilitated by the recurring appearances of the army Scout (39-68, 375-652, 792-819). The figure of the Scout is used to create a temporal loop between the immediate past and the present. The internal and external audiences are repeatedly crossing between the spatial planes of the activity in the Theban palace and the activity outside its gates. These movements between time, point and place result in the creation of a different kind of news and messaging system. The internal and external audiences are drawn into the play at different points from each other. This signifies that meanings for the internal audience can be different from those for the external audience. The cumulative effect of this is immersion into a multi-layered spatial framework. This play also has a preoccupation with death and particularly with the ancient gods, a major theme of Aeschylean tragedy. The seven Argive warriors, so vividly and extensively brought to life by the Scout, are nevertheless destined to die, as is Eteocles. Additional tension is provided by the Chorus, young women of Thebes.[876] Ostensibly powerless, their terror and agitation infects the protagonist Eteocles, simultaneously enhancing the impact of events that take place off-stage and increasing the emotional impact upon the external audience. The Chorus attain the status of message-bringers and transform the perceptions of the internal audience.

---

[876] Παρθενών, *Seven*, 109.

Chapter 3 – The Dynamics of News on Choral Dualities

A longer and more complex analysis of the chorus as primary interlocutors and influencers can be found in the examination of the third play, the *Suppliants* (Ἱκέτιδες) of 463 B.C.E. *Suppliants* facilitated an in-depth analysis of the message enabling concept and built on the importance of ancient mythological narratives already established by the *Seven against Thebes*. The play is important for showing how the chorus dominates events and the way that they are able to shape the narrative. The Chorus of *Suppliants* are notable for their attitude towards authority and their ability to influence those around them to achieve their desired outcomes, events all the more striking given their identity as young, foreign women (*Supp*. 996-1005). Remarkably, they evolve into a collective protagonist, asserting authority over Pelasgus, the ruler of Argos and affecting their acceptance into Argive society and its concomitant protection through the force of their will. Through the mechanisms of message enabling the Chorus can directly influence the plot development and understanding of events for both internal and external audiences. They direct the activities of the men around them, assigning their father Danaus the role of negotiator and manipulating Pelasgus to act in accordance with their wishes and support their case for acceptance in Argos.

The Chorus are directly responsible for disseminating news and messages throughout the play. Much of the Chorus' authority is rooted in their descent from Io. Their proclaimed ownership of Io's mythology and lineage is the basis upon which they stake their claim to Argive protection. Once their aim

has been achieved, the Chorus pray for protection for the land they are to settle in, free from trials such as war and famine.[877]   The only internal audience present for this abundance of praise is Danaus who would surely recognise the solipsism in their words; for the external audience, the Chorus' prayers are correct and proper for the circumstances but must be tainted by knowledge of the Chorus' prior ruthlessness in achieving their aims. Manipulation by the Chorus extends from the space of the play into the space of the theatre. Their increasing assertion of internal power reveals them to be dominant over all other figures in the play. Through their repeated emphasis of her story,[878] the Chorus also connect their own time with that of Io, thus enhancing the internal and external audiences' understanding of interlocking temporalities.

Goldhill has noted that choruses are rooted in the space they occupy, *Suppliants* being the exception that proves the rule. He says that in this play, the appeal for asylum is based upon 'the grounds of a genealogical and spatial connection, an appeal to be considered "rooted" in Argos', a rootedness which he suggests goes back to Homeric poetry and which allows the external audience to experience a sense of belonging with the characters on stage.[879] This connection is reinforced by the repeated references on the mythology of the line, which foreshadows their own future, where mythology indicates they will marry and subsequently kill Argive husbands. In this play, Aeschylus'

---

[877] *Supp.* 634-73, 659-60, 664-6, 679-87, 689-92.
[878] *Supp.* 16-17, 29, 41, 44, 141, 162, 170, 275, 292, 299, 300, 535, 540, 573, 1064.
[879] Goldhill (1996): 246.

deployment of mythological narratives provides opportunities to cross past, present and future temporalities. Playing with myth is also central to the next play examined in the thesis, the *Prometheus Bound*.

Chapter 4 – Dramatic Strategies and the Expectation of News

The *Prometheus Bound* (*Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης*), produced no later than 430 B.C.E., is important for the thesis for a number of reasons. It is steeped in ancient pre-Olympian mythology which provides a multi-layered thematic narrative from the perspective of both the internal and external audiences. There are multiple messenger figures and perspectives within the play, delivered through the news and message delivery system, stretch far into the distant future thus manipulating temporalities both within and outside the space of the play. The world of the play is constructed entirely from and within mythology, with no corresponding contemporary allusions to the world of the external audience except, perhaps, for the geographical knowledge displayed.[880] The construction of the *Prometheus Bound* is created by the layering of several strands of news and messages relating to Prometheus' own story, the story of Io and the theological construction of the ancient world. With the exception of the Chorus, every figure in the play delivers news or messages, predominantly through the mechanism of message enabling.

---

[880] In his translation of the play, Podlecki devotes an appendix to the geographical representation, Podlecki (2005): 200-9.

The play has been constructed so that it is the interaction between figures that allows the conveyance of news and messaging. Every figure is influential and, with the exception of Io and the Chorus of Oceanos' daughters, they are all divine beings. Prometheus and Oceanos are Titans, the oldest race of gods and the news and messages are as much about the power struggle between the Titans and the 'new' Olympians, led by Zeus, as about Io's story and Prometheus' future. Prometheus himself, unusually for a protagonist, is a messenger figure, delivering news and messages of equal if not more importance than any other figure. The most striking message enabler is Hermes, whose transformation from message-giver to catalyst for its actualisation is an innovation of Aeschylean technique that can also be found in *Suppliants* (in the ascendancy of the Chorus' power) and the *Oresteia* (in the transformation of the Erinyes into the Σεμναί [Θεαί], 'revered goddesses', *Eum.* 1041).

The intersection between space and time is used slightly differently in the *Prometheus Bound* than in the other plays examined; Io's whole life story is mapped out, beginning with her account to Prometheus of how she came to be in her present predicament through Hera's anger, followed by Prometheus' prophesising not only her immediate future but that of thirteen generations of her descendants in order to deliver the key piece of news that will signify the end of his own incarceration. Rather than viewing this as an anomaly in Aeschylean practice, it may be evidence of a distinctive variation in his

techniques when constructing the time and space of his plays.[881] Examination of the news and messaging function across an extended space-time arrangement is explored in more detail in the final chapter of the thesis, which concerns the only extant tragic trilogy, the *Oresteia* (Ὀρέστεια) of 458 B.C.E.

Chapter 5 – Temporal Transitions and Spatiality

The *Oresteia* is crucial in the overall argument of the thesis not least because it is a complete trilogy that allows observation of the news and message delivery system across an extended and complete body of work.[882] The trilogy facilitates a stronger analysis of the development of news and messaging systems, encompasses multiple temporalities and features a wide range of messenger figures. There is also considerable variety in the types of news and messages, how they are delivered and the outcomes they achieve. The trilogy is built around a system of false messaging and foreshadowing that not only advances the narrative across the three plays but is also responsible for imbuing a sense of inevitability and tension for both internal and external audiences. Through the manipulation of temporalities, the internal and external audiences are enveloped within a fluid Oresteian universe where multiple layers of meaning are revealed simultaneously. This generates ambivalence and creates a complex presentation which prompts the audience to think more deeply about the issues explored in the play.

---

[881] This may have implications for the authorship debate.
[882] See chapter five above for details on the missing or emended text, p. 261.

Implications of the Research

The research model presented in the thesis will be useful for conducting comparative work by other ancient dramatists, to help with scholarly analysis, and to aid the continuing interpretation and adaptation of the ancient dramatic texts. The complexity of Aeschylus' work is illuminated by the deeper analysis herein and opens up many avenues for further exploration such as analysis of the work of his fellow tragedians Sophocles or Euripides.

Looking Back

This thesis demonstrates that understanding news and messaging strategies is essential for exploring the construction of ancient dramatic texts and their multiple layers of meaning. The overarching themes the dramas explore are recognisably part of the human condition and experience: the use and abuse of power; national and/or civic identity; social issues; religion; loss; misfortune; death.[883] The multi-layered structure embodying past, present and future is part of the reason for the longevity of the plays; receiving the classical past is 'a two-way process of understanding, backwards and forwards, which illuminates antiquity as much as modernity'.[884]

---

[883] Porter (2017): 161 notes that '... we should imagine the past not as some historically transcendent object, present to us today just as it was on the day it was born, but as a monumentally idiosyncratic and terrifying difficult object that contains innumerable pasts, presents, and futures – very like our own'.

[884] Martindale (2013): 171. As Porter suggests, '... we need ... more and deeper appreciations of the layers that make up historical time, including our own but that also give us the freedom to invade the past and to see how the past invades us freely and unpredictably today', Porter (2017): 155.

Comparative analysis of the work of other tragedians is one of the possibilities for further work in this area. This could be used to explore connections between plays, myths or, more broadly, ideas about the ancient world. There are a number of different perspectives or research questions which could be explored through the research model. Using the model to examine the 'Theban plays' of Sophocles,[885] for example, may be particularly useful to reveal connections (or otherwise) between those plays' narratives and/or the use of mythology in ancient texts.

Looking Forward

A modern presentation can only follow or adapt the ancient original by properly understanding the nuances embedded within the ancient text. The research will be useful for those engaged in the reception of the ancient texts, to aid continuing interpretation in the modern theatrical approaches to the work of Aeschylus, both in its original form and in adaptation. This will be of particular relevance to theatre practice and to translation and reception studies, where modern reproductions of ancient drama are often adapted to reflect contemporary issues and in any case have to communicate in a different cultural context. For example, the adaptation of the function of the chorus is one of the most common changes made in modern reproductions of ancient theatre. The chorus is often reduced in number and even partially

---

[885] *Antigone* (Ἀντιγόνη, produced in 443/2 B.C.E.); *Oedipus the King* (Οἰδίπους Τύραννος, produced in c.429 B.C.E.); *Oedipus at Colonus* (Οἰδίπους ἐπὶ Κολωνῷ, produced posthumously in 401 B.C.E.).

Conclusion

removed from the stage.[886]   The analysis contained in the thesis can help

inform how such changes are realised, how they may affect the overall vision

for the modern production and how they link with the original play texts.

Subsequent interpretations of the play texts are part of a process that began

with the original productions.[887]   This sustained exploration of the tragedies

through the centuries thus continues the work of the ancient poet, creating a

tensile thread between the original productions and all subsequent

interpretations, resulting in the plays being 'known everywhere and known

forever'.[888]   This thesis shows how a particular direction of enquiry can

illuminate aspects of Aeschylus' work and continue to bring out new points

of interest with which modern and future audiences can continue to engage

---

[886] As in the Sherman Theatre's 2012 production of Gwyneth Lewis' *Clytemnestra* directed by Amy Hodge, where a chorus of only three does not act as a collective, one of them even exiting the stage on occasion. See
http://www.shermantheatre.co.uk/performance/theatre/clytemnestra/ for production information. Modern productions tend to adopt very contemporary veneers for both content and imagery; the Almeida Theatre's 2015 production of Robert Icke's *Oresteia* places the action in a twenty-first century setting with video and digital communication used prominently. It also mixed up the spatialities of the trilogy; for example, Electra and Orestes interact with Cassandra but later in the production it is revealed that Electra was only a figment of the psychologically-damaged Orestes' imagination. See
https://almeida.co.uk/whats-on/oresteia/29-may-2015-18-jul-2015 for production information including performance photographs. King's College London staged the *Prometheus Bound* as their annual Greek play in February 2017 which also featured a twenty-first century setting involving the use of video media as part of the set design. See
https://www.kcl.ac.uk/artshums/depts/classics/about/greek/index.aspx for production details.
[887] Stewart observes that 'the dissemination of a tragedy can be said to have begun at the very moment of its first performance', performed as it was before a wide array of Greeks from across the Hellenic world: 'beyond the play's first performance is a continuous process by which text, poet, and performers move in search of new audiences in other centres. This can be said to have begun within the lifetimes of the three main tragedians and, in the case of Aeschylus and Euripides, was initiated by the poets themselves', Stewart (2017): 197.
[888] Stewart (2017): 198.

340

and adapt, thus ensuring ripples of meaning continue to flow between the ancient past, the present and the future.

Appendix 1 Danaid Genealogy

Gaia = Uranus

Cronus = Rhea Mnemosyne Crius Oceanus = Tethys Cyclopes Iapetus Themis Hundred-handers Theia Hyperion Phoebe = Coeus

Demeter = Zeus = Hera Hades Hestia Poseidon = Amphitrite Inachus = Melia Leto Hecate Asteria
= Persephone

Persephone Pallas = Styx Aegialeus Io = Zeus Phoroneus = Peitho / Cerdo / Teledice / Laodice

Bia Nike Kratos Zelus Egypt Epaphus = Memphis Car Apis Niobe = Zeus Apollo Artemis

Eileithyia Ares = Aphrodite Hebe = Heracles Hephaestus = Aglaia/Charis Aphrodite Megara

Libya = Poseidon Lysianassa Argos Pelasgus
Argos Pelasgi tribe

Eros = Psyche Phobos Deimos Harmonia = Cadmus Belus = Anchinoe Agenor = Telephassa
Africa and Egypt

Danaus = Europa Phineus Cepheus Aegyptus Cilix Phoenix Thasus Phineus Cadmus = Harmonia Europa = Zeus
Libya = Aithiopis Arabia and Cilicia Phoenicia Thrace = Asterius
= Dryads Egypt

Poseidon = Amymone 50 daughters Hypermestra = Lynceus 50 sons Echion = Agaue Autonoe = Aristaeus Ino = Athamas Semele = Zeus
Nauplius = Clymene Abas = Aglaia Argos Pentheus Actaeon Learchus Melicertes Dionysus

Palamedes Oeax Nausimedon Acrisius = Eurydice Rhadamanthys = Alcmene = Zeus Minos = Pasiphae Sarpedon
Nauplia Argos Aegean Lycia

Danae = Zeus Proetus = Stheneboea/Anteia Heracles = Megara = Deianeira Minotaur
Tiryns Tiryns

Perseus = Andromeda Lysippe Iphinoe Iphianassa Megapenthes
Tiryns Perses Anaxagoras Argos
Persian line

Catreus Glaucus Androgeos Deucalion Ariadne = Zeus Acalle = Apollo Xenodice Phaedra = Theseus
Crete Idomeneus = Hermes

Althaemenes Apemosyne Clymene = Nauplius Aerope = Atreus Oenopion Staphylus Thoas Cydon Acamas = Laodice Demophon

Palamedes Nausimedon Oeax Menelaus = Helen Agamemnon = Clytemnestra Naxos Miletus Garamas Munitius

Nicostratus Hermione = Orestes Chrysothemis Iphigeneia Electra = Pylades
Tisamenus Medon Strophius

342

Appendix 2 Danaids and Aegyptiads

Danaus and Elephantis	Aegyptus and Argyphia
Hypermestra	Lynceus
Gorgophone	Proetus
Danaus and Europe	Aegyptus and [unknown]
Automate	Busiris
Amymone	Enceladus
Agave	Lycus
Scaea	Daiphron
Danaus and Atlantia or Phoebe	Aegyptus and Arabian women
Hippodamia	Istrus
Rhodia	Chalcodon
Cleopatra	Agenor
Asteria	Chaetus
Hippodamia	Diocorystes
Glauce	Alces
Hippomedusa	Alcmenor
Gorge	Hippothous
Iphimedusa	Euchenor
Rhode	Hippolytus
Danaus and an Ethiopian woman	Aegyptus and Phoenician women
Pirene	Agaptolemus
Dorium	Cercetes
Phartis	Eurydamas
Mnestra	Aegius
Evippe	Argius
Anaxibia	Archelaus
Nelo	Menemachus
Danaus and Memphis	Aegyptus and Tyria
Clite	Clitus
Sthenele	Sthenelus
Chrysippe	Chrysippus
Danaus and Polyxo	Aegyptus and Caliadne
Autonoe	Eurylochus
Theano	Phantes
Electra	Peristhenes
Cleopatra	Hermus
Eurydice	Dryas
Glaucippe	Potamon
Anthelia	Cisseus
Cleodore	Lixus
Evippe	Imbrus
Erato	Bromius
Stygne	Polyctor
Bryce	Chthonius

Danaus and Pieria	Aegyptus and Gorgo
Actaea	Periphas
Podarce	Oeneus
Dioxippe	Egyptus
Adite	Menalces
Ocypete	Lampus
Pylarge	Idmon
Danaus and Herse	Aegyptus and [unknown]
Hippodice	Idas
Adiante	Daiphron
Danaus and Crino	Aegyptus and Hephaestine
Callidice	Pandion
Oeme	Arbelus
Celaeno	Hyperbius
Hyperippe	Hippocorystes

Source: Apollod. 2.1.5

Appendix 3 Promethean Geneaology

Gaia = Uranus

Cronos = Rhea   Mnemosyne   Crius   Oceanus = Tethys   Iapetus   Themis   Cyclopes   Hundred-handers   Theia   Hyperion   Phoebe = Coeus

Demeter = Zeus = Hera   Hades   Hestia   Poseidon   Pallas = Styx   Pleione   Clymene =   Leto   Hecate   Asteria

Hephaestus

Theog. 508   *P.B.* 19, 209-10, 874

Zelus   Bia   Nike   Kratos   Hesione

Apollo   Artemis

Menoetius   Atlas   Epimetheus = Pandora   **Prometheus** = Pronoia / Hesione

Pyrrha ------ = ----- Deucalion

Zeus = Maia   Taygete   Electra   Alcyone   Merope   Celaeno   Sterope

Hermes

Orseis = Hellen   Amphictyon   Protogeneia = Zeus

Erechtheus

Apollo -- Creusa = Xuthus   Dorus   Aeolus = Enarete

Ion   Achaeus

Architeles   Archander

Cretheus   Sisyphus   Athamas   Salmoneus   Deion   Magnes   Perieres   Calyce = Aethlius   Opus

Endymion = Asterodia

Paion   Eurycyda   Aetolus = Pronoe   Epeius = Anaxiroe

Xanthippe = Pleuron   Calydon = Aeolia

Agenor = Epicaste   Protogeneia

Demonice   Porthaon = Euryte

Zeus = Alcmene   Melas   Oeneus = Althea

Heracles = Deianeira   Gorge   Toxeus   Meleager

Iole = Hyllus   Makaria   Glenus   Ctesippus   Oneites

Cleodaeus

Bibliography

Alexiou, M.*, et al.* (2002) *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Lanham, MD; Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield

Allan, W. and A. Kelly (2013) Listening to Many Voices: Athenian Tragedy as Popular Art in A. Marmodoro and J. Hill, ed. *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 77-122

Allen, G. (2000) *Intertextuality*. London, Routledge

Allen, T. W. (1908) The Epic Cycle. *The Classical Quarterly* 2 (1), pp. 64-74

Andújar, R. (2016) *Swarming the Stage: Secondary Choruses in Greek Tragedy*, Bristol University Classics Research Seminar, Bristol University, 6 December 2016

Arnott, P. D. (1991) *Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre*. London, Routledge

Bachvarova, M. R. and D. M. Dutsch (2016) Mourning a City "Empty of Men": Stereotypes of Anatolian Communal Lament in Aeschylus' *Persians* in M. R. Bachvarova, D. M. Dutsch and A. Suter, ed. *The Fall of Cities in the Mediterranean: Commemoration in Literature, Folk-song, and Liturgy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 79-106

Bakewell, G. W. (1998) *Persae* 374-83: Persians, Greeks, and ΠΕΙΘΑΡΧΩΙ ΦΡΕΝΙ. *Classical Philology* 93 (3), pp. 232-36

Bakewell, G. W. (2013) *Aeschylus's 'Suppliant Women': The Tragedy of Immigration*. Madison, WI and London, The University of Wisconsin Press

Bakhtin, M. M. and M. E. Holquist (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX, University of Texas Press

Bakola, E. (2014) Interiority, the 'Deep Earth' and the Spatial Symbolism of Darius' Apparition in the *Persians* of Aeschylus. *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 60, pp. 1-36

Barker, E. T. E. (2009) *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Barrett, J. (2002) *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy*. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press

Bertman, S. (1966) The *Telemachy* and Structural Symmetry. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 97, pp. 15-27

Bibliography

Bhabha, H. K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London, Routledge

Biles, Z. (2003) Perils of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*. *Phoenix* 57 (3/4), pp. 191-208

Billings, J*., et al.*, eds. (2013) *Choruses, Ancient and Modern*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Blanshard, A. J. L. (2014) The Permeable Spaces of the Athenian Law-court in K. Gilhuly and N. Worman, ed. *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 240-75

Blok, J. (2017) *Citizenship in Classical Athens*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Blondell, R. (2002) *The Play of Character in Plato's Dialogues*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Boegehold, A. L. (1963) Toward a Study of Athenian Voting Procedure. *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 32 (4), pp. 366-74

Bosher, K. (2006) *Theater on the Periphery: A Social and Political History of Theater in Early Sicily*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan

Bowen, A. J. (2013) *Aeschylus: 'Suppliant Women'*. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxford, Oxbow Books

Bowra, C. M. (1940) Sophocles on His Own Development. *The American Journal of Philology* 61 (4), pp. 385-401

Bridges, E. (2015) *Imagining Xerxes: Ancient Perspectives on a Persian King*. Bloomsbury Studies in Classical Reception. London, Bloomsbury

Broadhead, H. D. (1960) *The 'Persae' of Aeschylus*. University Press: Cambridge

Brock, R. (2013) *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*. London, Bloomsbury Academic

Brown, A. L. (1984) Eumenides in Greek Tragedy. *The Classical Quarterly* 34 (2), pp. 260-81

Burgess, J. S. (2004) Performance and the Epic Cycle. *The Classical Journal* 100 (1), pp. 1-23

Burian, P. (1997) Myth into *Muthos*: the Shaping of Tragic Plot in P. E. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge

Companions to Literature Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 178-208

Burian, P. (2011) Athenian Tragedy as Democratic Discourse in D. M. Carter, ed. *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 95-117

Burnett, A. P. (1985) *Rhesus*: Are Smiles Allowed? in P. Burian, ed. *Directions in Euripidean Criticism: A Collection of Essays*. Durham, Duke University Press, pp. 13-51

Buxton, R. G. A. (1994) *Imaginary Greece: The Contexts of Mythology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Buxton, R. G. A. (2009) *Forms of Astonishment: Greek Myths of Metamorphosis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Calame, C. (2009) *Poetic and Performative Memory in Ancient Greece: Heroic Reference and Ritual Gestures in Time and Space.* Pratiques poétiques de la mémoire. Washington, DC, Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University

Calame, C. (2011) Myth and Performance on the Athenian Stage: Praxithea, Erechtheus, Their Daughters, and the Etiology of Autochthony. *Classical Philology* 106 (1), pp. 1-19

Calame, C. (2013) Choral Polyphony and the Ritual Functions of Tragic Songs in M. G. Hopman and R. Gagné, ed. *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 35-57

Calame, C*., et al.* (2001) *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role and Social Function*. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield

Carey, C. (1994) Legal Space in Classical Athens. *Greece & Rome* 41 (2), pp. 172-86

Carter, D. M. (2011) *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Cohen, D. (1995) *Law, Violence, and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Collard, C. (2002) *'Oresteia'*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Collard, C. (2008) *'Persians' and Other Plays.* Oxford World's Classics. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Constantinidis, S. E., ed. (2016) *The Reception of Aeschylus' Plays Through Shifting Models and Frontiers*. Metaforms: Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity, Vol. 7. Leiden, Brill

Csapo, E. (2008) Star Choruses: Eleusis, Orphism, and New Musical Imagery and Dance in M. Revermann and P. Wilson, ed. *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 262-90

Csapo, E. and W. J. Slater (1994) *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press

Curtis, T. (1829) *The London Encyclopædia, or Universal Dictionary of Science, Art, Literature, and Practical Mechanics*. London, T. Tegg

Dawe, R. D. (1964) *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Dawson, C. M. (1970) *Aeschylus: 'The Seven against Thebes'*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall

de Jong, I. J. F. (1991) *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*. Leiden, Brill

de Jong, I. J. F. (2014) *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Easterling, P. E. (1997a) Constructing the Heroic in C. B. R. Pelling, ed. *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 21-38

Easterling, P. E. (1997b) Form and Performance in P. E. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 151-77

Easterling, P. E. (2008) Theatrical Furies: Thoughts on *Eumenides* in M. Revermann and P. Wilson, ed. *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 219-36

Ehrenberg, V. (1950) Origins of Democracy. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 1 (4), pp. 515-48

Emlyn-Jones, C. (1986) True and Lying Tales in the 'Odyssey'. *Greece & Rome* 33 (1), pp. 1-10

Falkner, T. M. (1998) Containing Tragedy: Rhetoric and Self-Representation in Sophocles' *Philoctetes. Classical Antiquity* 17 (1), pp. 25-58

Farmer, M. C. (2016) *Tragedy on the Comic Stage*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Favorini, A. (2003) History, Collective Memory, and Aeschylus' *The Persians*. *Theatre Journal* 55 (1), pp. 99-111

Fischer-Lichte, E. (2010) Performance as Event - Reception as Transformation in E. Hall and S. Harrop, ed. *Theorising Performance: Greek Drama, Cultural History and Critical Practice*. London, Gerald Duckworth & Co pp. 29-42

Fischer-Lichte, E. (2014) *Dionysus Resurrected: Performances of Euripides' 'The Bacchae' in a Globalizing World*. Blackwell-Bristol Lectures on Greece, Rome and the Classical Tradition. Chichester, John Wiley and Sons Ltd

Focke, F. (1930) Aischylos' *Prometheus*. *Hermes* 65 (3), pp. 259-304

Foucault, M. and J. Miskowiec (1986) Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. *Diacritics* 16 (1), pp. 22-27

Fowler, R. L. (2013) *Early Greek Mythography*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Gagné, R. (2013) *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Gagné, R. and M. G. Hopman, eds. (2013) *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Gantz, T. (1979) The Aischylean Tetralogy: Prolegomena. *The Classical Journal* 74 (4), pp. 289-304

Garvie, A. F. (1986) *Aeschylus: 'Choephori'*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Garvie, A. F. (2009) *Aeschylus: 'Persae'*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Garvie, A. F. (2016) Editing Aeschylus for a Modern Readership: Textual Criticism and Other Concerns in S. E. Constantinidis, ed. *The Reception of Aeschylus' Plays Through Shifting Models and Frontiers*. Metaforms: Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity, Vol. 7. Leiden, Brill, pp. 23-50

Genette, G. (1992) *The Architext: An Introduction*. Berkeley, CA; Oxford, University of California Press

Golden, L. (1962) Catharsis. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 93, pp. 51-60

Golden, L. (2017) *Aristotle and the Arc of Tragedy: 'Oedipus Rex', 'Othello', 'Death of a Salesman'*. New York, NY, Radius Book Group

Goldhill, S. (1996) Collectivity and Otherness - The Authority of the Tragic Chorus: Response to Gould in M. S. Silk, ed. *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 244-56

Goldhill, S. (1997) The Language of Tragedy: Rhetoric and Communication in P. E. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 127-50

Gottesman, A. (2014) *Politics and the Street in Democratic Athens*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Gould, J. (1996) Tragedy and Collective Experience in M. S. Silk, ed. *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 217-43

Gould, J. (1999) Myth, Memory and the Chorus: 'Tragic Rationality' in R. G. A. Buxton, ed. *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* Oxford, Oxford University Press pp. 107-16

Goward, B. (2005) *Aeschylus: 'Agamemnon'*. London, Duckworth

Grethlein, J. (2010) *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Griffin, J. (1998) The Social Function of Attic Tragedy. *The Classical Quarterly* 48 (1), pp. 39-61

Griffith, M. (1977) *The Authenticity of 'Prometheus Bound'*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Griffith, M. (1995) Brilliant Dynasts: Power and Politics in the *Oresteia*. *Classical Antiquity* 14 (1), pp. 62-129

Griffith, M. (2007) The King and Eye: The Rule of the Father in Aischylos' *Persians* in M. Lloyd, ed. *Aeschylus* Oxford Readings in Classical Studies Oxford, Oxford University Press pp. 93-140

Gruen, E. S. (2011) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton, NJ; Woodstock, Princeton University Press

Haigh, A. E. (1896) *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*. Oxford, Clarendon Press

Hall, E. (1996) *Aeschylus: 'Persians'*. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxford, Aris & Phillips Ltd

Hall, E. (1997) The Sociology of Athenian Tragedy in P. E. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 93-126

Hall, E. (2010) *Greek Tragedy: Suffering Under the Sun*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Hanink, J. and A. S. Uhlig (2016) Aeschylus and his Afterlife in the Classical Period: "My Poetry Did Not Die With Me" in S. E. Constantinidis, ed. *The Reception of Aeschylus' Plays Through Shifting Models and Frontiers*. Metaforms: Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity, Vol. 7. Leiden, Brill, pp. 51-79

Hardwick, L. (2000) *Translating Words, Translating Cultures*. London, Duckworth

Hardwick, L. (2001) Rehabilitating *Agamemnon*. Retrieved 24 September 2016, from http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/e_archive/2001/may.htm

Hardwick, L. (2013a) Against the 'Democratic Turn': Counter-texts; Counter-contexts; Counter-arguments in L. Hardwick and S. Harrison, ed. *Classics in the Modern World: A Democratic Turn?* Classical Presences. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 15-32

Hardwick, L. (2013b) The Problem of the Spectators: Ancient and Modern in A. Bakogianni, ed. *Dialogues With the Past: Classical Reception Theory & Practice*. Vol. 1. London, Institute of Classical Studies; School of Advanced Study, University of London, pp. 11-26

Hardwick, L. (2016a) Cultural Spaces in the Recent Translation and Performance of Greek Drama in P. Monaghan and J. Montgomery Griffiths, ed. *Close Relations: Spaces of Greek and Roman Theatre*. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 155-76

Hardwick, L. (2016b) Voices of Trauma: Remaking Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* in the Twentieth Century in S. E. Constantinidis, ed. *The Reception of Aeschylus' Plays Through Shifting Models and Frontiers*. Metaforms: Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity, Vol. 7. Leiden, Brill, pp. 280-303

Harvey, D. (2005) Tragic Thrausmatology: The Study of the Fragments of Greek Tragedy in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries in F. McHardy, J. Robson and D. Harvey, ed. *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens: Greek Tragic Fragments*. Exeter, University of Exeter Press, pp. 21-48

Helm, J. J. (1972) The Lost Manuscript Tau of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and *Eumenides*. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 103, pp. 575-98

Henrichs, A. (1994) "Why Should I Dance?": Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy. *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 3 (1), pp. 56-111

Hesk, J. (2000) *Deception and Democracy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Hesk, J. (2007) The Socio-political Dimension of Ancient Tragedy in M. McDonald and M. Walton, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 72-91

Hopper, R. J. (1963) Athena and the Early Acropolis. *Greece & Rome* 10 (Supplement: Parthenos and Parthenon), pp. 1-16

Hughes, T. (1999) *Aeschylus: 'The Oresteia'*. London, Faber

Hutchinson, G. O. (1985) *Aeschylus: 'Septem contra Thebas'*. Oxford, Clarendon

Icke, R. (2015) *'Oresteia'*. London, Oberon Books

Irwin, E. (1974) *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry*. Toronto, Hakkert

Issacharoff, M. (1981) Space and Reference in Drama. *Poetics Today* 2 (3), pp. 211-24

Kinkel, G. (1877) *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Collegit, Disposuit, Commentarium Criticum Adiecit* Leipzig, Teubner

Kitto, H. D. F. (1956) The Greek Chorus. *Educational Theatre Journal* 8 (1), pp. 1-8

Kovacs, D. (2005) Text and Transmission in J. Gregory, ed. *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Maldon, MA, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 379-93

Kristeva, J. (1984) *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York, Columbia University Press

Kruse, N. W. (1979) The Process of Aristotelian Catharsis: A Reidentification. *Theatre Journal* 31 (2), pp. 162-71

Lattimore, R. A. (1951) *The 'Iliad' of Homer*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Lattimore, R. A. (1967) *The 'Odyssey' of Homer*. New York, NY, Harper & Row

Lavery, J. F. (2003) Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 611 ss. *Hermes* 131 (1), pp. 17-33

Lawler, L. B. (1954) *Phora*, *Schêma*, *Deixis* in the Greek Dance. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 85, pp. 148-58

Lawler, L. B. (1968) *The Dance of the Ancient Greek Theatre*. Iowa City, IA, University of Iowa Press

Lease, E. B. (1919) The Number Three, Mysterious, Mystic, Magic. *Classical Philology* 14 (1), pp. 56-73

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963) *Structural Anthropology*. New York, NY; London, Basic Books

Ley, G. (2003) Modern Visions of Greek Tragic Dancing. *Theatre Journal* 55 (3), pp. 467-80

Ley, G. (2007) *The Theatricality of Greek Tragedy: Playing Space and Chorus*. Chicago, IL; London, University of Chicago Press

Liapis, V. (2009) *Rhesus* Revisited: The Case for a Fourth-Century Macedonian Context. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 129, pp. 71-88

Liddell, H. G. and D. Scott (2013) *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*. Cincinnati, OH, Martino Publishing

Lightfoot, J. L. (2007) Nothing to do with the *Technitai* of Dionysus? in E. Hall and P. E. Easterling, ed. *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 209-24

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1976) The Delphic Oracle. *Greece & Rome* 23 (1), pp. 60-73

Lloyd-Jones, H. (2003) Zeus, Prometheus, and Greek Ethics. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101, pp. 49-72

Lloyd-Jones, H. (2005) *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Lloyd, M. (2005) *'Andromache'*. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Warminster, Aris & Phillips

Loraux, N. (2002) *The Divided City: On Memory and Forgetting in Ancient Athens*. New York, NY; London, Zone Books

Lowe, J. C. B. (1962) The Manuscript Evidence for Changes of Speaker in Aristophanes. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 9 (1), pp. 27-42

Macintosh, F. (2010) *The Ancient Dancer in the Modern World: Responses to Greek and Roman Dance*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

MacLeod, C. W. (1982) Politics and the *Oresteia*. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102, pp. 124-44

Marshall, C. W. (2003) Casting the *Oresteia*. *The Classical Journal* 98 (3), pp. 257-74

Martindale, C. (2013) Reception - A New Humanism? Receptivity, Pedagogy, the Transhistorical. *Classical Receptions Journal* 5 (2), pp. 169-83

McHardy, F. (2005) From Treacherous Wives to Murderous Mothers: Filicide in Tragic Fragments in F. McHardy, J. Robson and D. Harvey, ed. *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens: Greek Tragic Fragments*. Exeter, University of Exeter Press, pp. 129-50

McHardy, F*., et al.* (2005) *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens: Greek Tragic Fragments*. Exeter, University of Exeter Press

McLoughlin, K. (2011) *Authoring War: The Literary Representation of War from the 'Iliad' to Iraq*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Minchin, E. (2007) *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Mitchell, L. G. (2006) Greeks, Barbarians and Aeschylus' *Suppliants*. *Greece & Rome* 53 (2), pp. 205-23

Monaghan, P. (2016) Introduction: Space, Theatre, and Close Relations in P. Monaghan and J. Montgomery Griffiths, ed. *Close Relations: Spaces of Greek and Roman Theatre*. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 1-34

Monro, D. B. (1884) The Poems of the Epic Cycle. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 5, pp. 1-41

Mueller, M. (2016) *Objects as Actors: Props and the Poetics of Performance in Greek Tragedy*. Chicago, IL, The University of Chicago Press

Mulhall, S. (2013) Orchestral Metaphysics: *The Birth of Tragedy* between Drama, Opera, and Philosophy. *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 44 (2), pp. 246-63

Murnaghan, S. (2011) *Choroi achoroi*: The Athenian Politics of Tragic Choral Identity in D. M. Carter, ed. *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 245-67

Murray, R. D. (1958) *The Motif of Io in Aeschylus' 'Suppliants'*. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press

Neils, J. (1996) *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*. Madison, WI; London, University of Wisconsin Press

Nichev, A. (1970) *L'énigme de la Catharsis Tragique dans Aristote*. Sofia, Académie Bulgare des Sciences

Nisetich, F. J. (1986) The Silencing of Pylades (*Orestes* 1591-92). *The American Journal of Philology* 107 (1), pp. 46-54

Papadopoulou, T. (2011) *Aeschylus: 'Suppliants'*. Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy. London, Bristol Classical Press

Pavis, P. (2003) *Analyzing Performance: Theater, Dance, and Film*. Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press

Pfister, M. (1988) *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Philips, F. C. (1978) Greek Myths and the Uses of Myths. *The Classical Journal* 74 (2), pp. 155-66

Podlecki, A. J. (1970) *The 'Persians' by Aeschylus*. Prentice-Hall Greek Drama Series. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, Inc

Podlecki, A. J. (1989) *'Eumenides'*. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Warminster, Aris & Phillips

Podlecki, A. J. (2005) *Aeschylus: 'Prometheus Bound'*. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Warminster, Aris & Phillips Ltd

Porter, J. I. (2017) Reception, Receptivity, and Anachronism in *Marius the Epicurean* in C. Martindale, S. Evangelista and E. Prettejohn, ed. *Pater the Classicist: Classical Scholarship, Reception, and Aestheticism*. Classical Presences Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 149-62

Pratt, L. H. (1993) *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*. Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press

Puchner, M. (2002) The Theater in Modernist Thought. *New Literary History* 33 (3), pp. 521-32

Rabinowitz, N. S. and A. Richlin (1993) *Feminist Theory and the Classics*. New York, NY; London, Routledge

Radt, S. (1971) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Vol. III: Aeschylus* Gottingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Raeburn, D. A. and O. R. H. Thomas (2011) *The 'Agamemnon' of Aeschylus: A Commentary for Students*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Rainio, K. (2009) Kurt Lewin's Dynamical Psychology Revisited and Revised. *Dynamical Psychology*, pp. 1-20

Rehm, R. (2002) *The Play of Space: Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton, NJ; Oxford, Princeton University Press

Rehm, R. (2016) Aeschylus in the Balance: Weighing Corpses and the Problem of Translation in S. E. Constantinidis, ed. *Voices of Trauma: Remaking Aeschylus' 'Agamemnon' in the Twentieth Century*. Metaforms: Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity, Vol. 7. Leiden, Brill, pp. 131-46

Revermann, M. (2006) The Competence of Theatre Audiences in Fifth- and Fourth-Century Athens. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126, pp. 99-124

Revermann, M. (2008) Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, Chronotopes, and the 'Aetiological Mode' in M. Revermann and P. Wilson, ed. *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 237-61

Revermann, M. and P. Wilson (2008) *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Rhodes, P. J. (2003) Nothing to do with Democracy: Athenian Drama and the Polis. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 123, pp. 104-19

Richardson, S. (1996) Truth in the Tales of the *Odyssey*. *Mnemosyne* 49 (4), pp. 393-402

Richardson, S. (2006) The Devious Narrator of the *Odyssey*. *The Classical Journal* 101 (4), pp. 337-59

Ridgeway, W. (1926) Euripides in Macedon. *The Classical Quarterly* 20 (1), pp. 1-19

Roselli, D. K. (2011) *Theater of the People: Spectators and Society in Ancient Athens*. Austin, TX, University of Texas Press

Rosenbloom, D. S. (2006) *Aeschylus: 'Persians'*. London, Duckworth

Rosivach, V. J. (1987) Autochthony and the Athenians. *The Classical Quarterly* 37 (2), pp. 294-306

Ruffell, I. (2012) *Aeschylus: 'Prometheus Bound'*. Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy. Bristol, Bristol Classical Press

Russell, F. S. (2000) *Information Gathering in Classical Greece*. Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press

Rutherford, R. B. (2012) *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Sage, M. M. (1996) *Warfare in Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook*. London, Routledge

Schaper, E. (1968) Aristotle's Catharsis and Aesthetic Pleasure. *The Philosophical Quarterly (1950-)* 18 (71), pp. 131-43

Schein, S. L. (1996) *Reading the 'Odyssey': Selected Interpretive Essays*. Princeton, NJ; Chichester, Princeton University Press

Schlesinger, A. C. (1930) Silence in Tragedy and the Three-Actor Rule. *Classical Philology* 25 (3), pp. 230-35

Schmitz, T. A. (2007) *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction*. Oxford, Blackwell

Schuren, L. (2014) *Shared Storytelling in Euripidean Stichomythia*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology. Leiden; Boston, MA, Brill

Scodel, R. (1993) *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press

Seaford, R. (2012) *Cosmology and the Polis: The Social Construction of Space and Time in the Tragedies of Aeschylus*. Cambridge; New York, NY, Cambridge University Press

Segal, C. (1994) *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the 'Odyssey'*. Ithaca, NY; London, Cornell University Press

Segal, C. (1997) *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' 'Bacchae'*. Princeton, NJ; Chichester, Princeton University Press

Smyth, H. W. (1933) Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Aeschylus. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 44, pp. 1-62

Sommerstein, A. H. (1973) *Aristophanes: 'The Acharnians', 'The Clouds', 'Lysistrata'*. London, Penguin

Sommerstein, A. H. (1989) *'Eumenides'*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Sommerstein, A. H. (2008a) *Aeschylus: 'Persians'; 'Seven against Thebes'; 'Suppliants'; 'Prometheus Bound'*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press

Sommerstein, A. H. (2008b) *Aeschylus: Fragments*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA; London, Harvard University Press

Sommerstein, A. H. (2010) *Aeschylean Tragedy*. London, Gerald Duckworth & Co Ltd

Stewart, E. (2017) *Greek Tragedy on the Move: The Birth of a Panhellenic Art Form c.500-300 BC*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Swift, L. (2010) *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Swift, L. (2013) Conflicting Identities in the Euripidean Chorus in M. G. Hopman and R. Gagné, ed. *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 130-54

Taplin, O. (1975) The Title of *Prometheus Desmotes*. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 95, pp. 184-86

Taplin, O. (1977) *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford, Clarendon Press

Taplin, O. (1997) The Pictorial Record in P. E. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 69-90

Taplin, O. (2007) *Pots & Plays: Interactions Between Tragedy and Greek Vase-painting of the Fourth Century B.C*. Los Angeles, CA, The J. Paul Getty Museum; Getty Publications

Taplin, O.*, et al.* (2003) Ancient Greek Tragedy on the Stage. *Arion* 11 (1), pp. 125-75

Thomson, G. D. (1941) *Aeschylus and Athens. A Study in the Social Origins of Drama*. London, Lawrence & Wishart

Tomlinson, R. A. (1972) *Argos and the Argolid: From the End of the Bronze Age to the Roman Occupation*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul

Torrance, I. C. (2007) *Aeschylus: 'Seven against Thebes'*. Duckworth Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy. London, Duckworth

Turyn, A. (1942) The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus. *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America* 1 (1), pp. 107-11

Ubersfeld, A. and P. Debbeche (1999) *Reading Theatre*. Toronto Studies in Semiotics and Communication. Toronto, ON, University of Toronto Press

van Wees, H. (1992) *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology. Amsterdam, J.C. Gieben

van Wees, H. (2004) *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London, Duckworth

Vellacott, P. (1977) Has Good Prevailed? A Further Study of the *Oresteia*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 81, pp. 113-22

Vellacott, P. (1984) Aeschylus' *Orestes*. *The Classical World* 77 (3), pp. 145-57

Vernant, J. P. and P. Vidal-Naquet (1981) *Tragedy and Myth in Ancient Greece*. Brighton, Harvester

Walcot, P. (1977) Odysseus and the Art of Lying. *Ancient Society* 8, pp. 1-19

Weir Smyth, H. (1926) *Aeschylus II*. The Loeb Classical Library Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press

Wender, D. (1973) *Hesiod: 'Theogony'; 'Works and Days'. Theognis: 'Elegies'*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books

Werner, O. (1948) *Aischylos: 'Orestie'*. München, Ernst Heimeran-Verlag

West, M. (2011) The Homeric Question Today. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 155 (4), pp. 383-93

West, M. L. (1973) *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique, Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart, Teubner

West, M. L. (1979) The Prometheus Trilogy. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 99, pp. 130-48

West, M. L. (1987) *Euripides: 'Orestes'*. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxford, Aris & Phillips

West, M. L. (1990a) *Aeschyli Tragoediae: Cum Incerti Poetae Prometheo*. Stuttgart, Teubner

West, M. L. (1990b) *Studies in Aeschylus*. Stuttgart, Teubner

West, M. L. (1998) *Aeschyli Tragoediae: Cum Incerti Poetae Prometheo*. Stuttgart, B.G. Teubner

West, M. L. (2002) 'Eumelos': A Corinthian Epic Cycle? *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 122, pp. 109-33

White, S. (2001) Io's World: Intimations of Theodicy in *Prometheus Bound*. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 121, pp. 107-40

Whitman, C. H. (2011) *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. New York, NY, W.W. Norton & Co.

Widzisz, M. A. (2011) *Chronos on the Threshold: Time, Ritual, and Agency in the 'Oresteia'*. Lanham, MD; Plymouth, Lexington Books

Wiles, D. (1997) *Tragedy in Athens: Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Wiles, D. (2000) *Greek Theatre Performance: An Introduction*. Cambridge; New York, NY, Cambridge University Press

Wiles, D. (2016) *Oedipus*: The Chronotope in P. Monaghan and J. Montgomery Griffiths, ed. *Close Relations: Spaces of Greek and Roman Theatre*. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 95-105

Williams, R. (1977) *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Williams, R. (2006) *Modern Tragedy*. Peterborough, ON; Plymouth, Broadview Press

Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City, and the Stage*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Wilson, P. (2008a) Costing the Dionysia in M. Revermann and P. Wilson, ed. *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 89-127

Wilson, P. (2008b) Music in J. Gregory, ed. *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing pp. 183-93

Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1983) *Studies in Aeschylus*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Wohl, V. (2015) *Euripides and the Politics of Form*. Martin Classical Lectures. Princeton, NJ; Oxford, Princeton University Press

Wyles, R. (2011) *Costume in Greek Tragedy*. Bristol, Bristol Classical

Zajko, V. and H. Hoyle (2017) *A Handbook to the Reception of Classical Mythology*. Wiley Blackwell Handbooks to Classical Reception. Hoboken, NJ, Wiley Blackwell

Zeitlin, F. I. and J. J. Winkler (1990) *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*. Princeton, N.J.; Oxford, Princeton University Press

Electronic Resources

A Dictionary of Classical Mythology, University of Patras
http://mythreligion.philology.upatras.gr/pages/en/dictionary.html

Archive of Performances of Greek & Roman Drama, Oxford
http://www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk/

Arts and Social Studies Library, Bristol University
http://www.bris.ac.uk/library/

Arts and Social Studies Library, Cardiff University
http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/libraries

Classical Art Research Centre and the Beazley Archive, University of Oxford
http://www.cvaonline.org/pottery/default.htm

Institute of Classical Studies Library: Joint Library of the Hellenic and Roman Societies
http://library.icls.sas.ac.uk/

Perseus Digital Library, Tufts University
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/

POxy: Oxyrhynchus Online, University of Oxford
http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/

Suda on Line: Byzantine Lexicography
http://www.stoa.org/sol/

Theoi Classical Texts Library
http://www.theoi.com/Library.html