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INTRODUCTION

Attempts to resolve the problem of the authenticity of the Prometheus Bound by examining either the meter or the language of this play have not yet achieved widely accepted results. A recent approach to the problem focuses upon aspects of thematic development within the existing corpus of the dramatist's work.

C. J. Herington, for instance, suggested parallels between the Persians and the Seven Against Thebes on the grounds that the divinity in those plays appears to be united against the stability and simplicity of the cosmos in contrast to the poet's later plays where human and divine cosmos are divided into two opposing camps. More recently, however, S. Ireland, by examining the Prometheus Bound and the Persians from the point of the main characters, demonstrated in more than one respect features that appear to be similar in both plays.

It my the purpose to analyze briefly the inner
structure of the *Prometheus Bound* and to demonstrate the similarities of the temporal movements it exhibits with those of the dramatist's earlier play, the *Persians*. These movements, though they dramatically divide both plays in four apparent units, never create an episodic plot. This continuity is maintained through repetition. By focusing primarily on this stylistic feature, I shall explore first the function of repetition in each play; and second I will consider the possibility that this repetition, in conjunction with the rest of the similarities these plays exhibit, may bring additional evidence in dealing with the problem of the plays' structural unity and hence the authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound*. 
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE PLAYS

The *Prometheus Bound* has frequently been criticized for the lack of dramatic unity. In the Aristotelian view it is the most simple plot whose dramatic structure, divided into four movements, is an inner in unfolding rather than a parallel one. In the first movement we are presented with Prometheus being led by Zeus' minions Kratos and Bia to the place of his bondage. There he remains fixed and motionless throughout the drama. The steady building up towards a climax is marked by a series of encounters that stand in sharp contrast with his immobility. The arrival of the Ocean-nymphs marks the opening of the second movement. In response to their request Prometheus narrates his past services to Zeus, the annihilation the god planned against mankind, and finally a brief account of the origin of the conflict (197-283). Suddenly and as we are still into the second movement Oceanus arrives in an effort to reconcile Prometheus with Zeus; but after he is reminded by
Prometheus of the bitter fates of Atlas and Typho, he abandons his offer and returns home (284-396). The narrative in this movement even after Oceanus' departure and the choral ode of 397-435 is still referring to the past. Now Prometheus, in two remarkable speeches, goes on to expound his gifts to mankind and his own contribution to the civilization of the mortals (436-506). The chorus responds with an ode on the helplessness of man and concludes the song with Prometheus' happier past at the time of his wedding with their sister Hesione (526-60). Suddenly, Io, who in her wanderings stumbled on Prometheus' place of punishment, rushes on stage in a frenzy of madness. The structure of this third movement and the themes that dominate this scene are skillfully worked out to establish a common bond between the two victims of Zeus' cruelty (561-886). Once this link has been established, the greatest importance in this movement centers on the future. Io's destiny and the prediction of the birth of Heracles will dominate the subsequent
account of Prometheus' revelations (700-866). From Io's descendants will come Heracles to free Prometheus from his torments. The renewed indignation that now marks Prometheus' defiance against Zeus in Hermes movement is a result of witnessing Io's unjust suffering (907-1093). In this last movement of the play we return to the emphasis on the present time of the opening movement with the binding of Prometheus and his fall to Tartaros.

This is briefly the structure and the time frame of the play as the drama unfolds towards its climax—a series of encounters with the chorus, Oceanus, Io, and Hermes that at the same time mark the four movements of the play. First, the binding of Prometheus and the arrival of the chorus is set in the present; second, the interaction of the Ocean-nymphs with Prometheus, the Oceanus scene and Prometheus' even longer descriptions in the time past focus on the past; third, Io's scene, and Prometheus' prophecies of her future suffering emphasize the future; and finally Hermes' threats
for immediate surrender in a ring composition bring us back to the present of the opening movement. And within such a dramatic framework, the present, past, future, and present are so skillfully interwoven "that at each turning point", as G. Thompson points out, "our attention with an increasing emphasis is thrown to the future". Thus, the chained Prometheus carries his struggle against an off-stage Zeus through the alternation of aspects of time:

present - past - future - present,

until the final cataclysm and his fall to Tartaros. And, powerful though the movements are, they would fail to prove unity, for, indeed "we are presented with a series of scenes or tableaux, more or less independent of one another". There is, however, an important element that unifies this episodic plot: the recurring insistence on key concepts and terms which, by their repetition, significantly contribute to the thematic unity and finally link the characters together. Thus the structure of the play,
presented through a series of carefully arranged encounters, develops the dynamic liveliness of the drama, the ever, expanding revelations of Prometheus.

In the Persians more than one similarity with the Prometheus Bound can be uncovered. The play, divided into four obvious movements, presents the same straight-line development and the same simple plot construction that characterized the Prometheus Bound. At the beginning the chorus of the Persian Elders sings about wealth, but they are also disturbed by the lack of news concerning the safe return of the army. Though in this first movement of the play the major themes give us the sense that the Persian prosperity belongs to the past, yet the anxiety of the present indicates that the present is the temporal frame that dominates this movement (1-154). After the formal lines detailing the arrival of the queen, Atossa's entrance marks the opening of the second movement. The chorus greets with the hope that the divine powers that granted
the prosperity to the Persians would continue to favor the army (158). In this movement (159ff.) dominated by narratives referring to the past the queen goes on to describe her dream and the omen of the hawk attacking the eagle (159-284). Now foreboding have reached a culmination and it is within this crucial moment that the messenger enters to provide the reality that they were lacking. After a short outbreak of lyric lamentation, the messenger proceeds to announce the disaster (249-531). A choral ode concludes this second lengthy movement (532-97). With its dominant theme of responsibility, it fully justifies the theme of contrast between harmless Darius and disastrous Xerxes that from now on will prevail in the exposition. Thus this song, in connection with the incantation song that raises the ghost from his tomb, marks a splendid transition to the opening of the third movement (598-906). Though ignorant in the beginning, Darius knows the future and that Persia is doomed by fate. A brief stichomythia pro-
vides him with all the knowledge necessary to expound upon the situation, point the moral, advise and foretell the events of the remote future (759-86, 800-42). Having also announced Xerxes' arrival, he declares his own departure and finally returns to Hades. In the fourth and last movement that starts with the antiphonal wail of the chorus we return to the present time of the opening anapests, with renewed link of anxiety and an apprehension of more to come.

Thus this simple plot unfolds in a way strikingly similar to that of the Prometheus Bound: from the initial forebodings of the present (1-154), through the alternation of the past in the second movement (155-597) and the future in the third (598-908), back to the present in the fourth and final movement (909-1076) according to the scheme: present - past - future - present. And just as at every important point in the Prometheus Bound the future is the center of attention, similarly in the Persians the future is the focus amidst the unending anxiety of the Persians and the
Persians and the fear of what is to come.

Thus through a series of disasters this play proceeds towards its climax, wherein Xerxes the object of blame throughout, finally appears in tattered rags on stage. And these structural movements that others have erroneously thought they present Xerxes' fall "in a number of more or less detached tableaux through a lack of necessary sequence of events", establish again continuity and mark the structure through the repetition of key words and ideas.

Under such conditions there is a unity of the plot; after discussing the distinct use of repetition in the plays we will be able to combine our conclusion with the observations I made on the simplicity of the plot and the internal structure to draw some more conclusions about these plays.

In the following chapters I will attempt to establish the organic unity by examining the function of repetition.
REPETITION IN THE PERSIANS

The recurring insistence on key concepts and verbal themes is one of the most dominant features in the Persians. This aspect of style, apart from setting verbally what ultimately will become visual with Xerxes' appearance on stage, effectively demonstrates a unified plot and links together the four movements we noted above. This unity derives from the recurring emphasis on repetition. Once these repeated words are initially established in the forebodings of the opening anapests, with the messenger's report they attain the reality that they were lacking; yet, their full development is postponed until Darius expands upon them in moral terms, just before Xerxes' arrival makes everything visual on stage. Therefore by observing some of these repeated words we can illustrate their gradual unfolding as well as their contribution to the unity of the play.

This increasing crescendo of their meaning is
most effectively revealed by the repetition of the words that emphasize the vast human losses of the Empire. In the lamenting tone of the ode at 532 ff. the chorus refutes the verbal pattern of words connoting "populous" that characterized the army at the outset of the expedition (πολυνάϕως 73) and reaffirms the repetition of "bereft of men" (κόνανδρος 119), which they themselves established. The populous expedition that made Persia "bereft of its men" is now used in sharp contrast to the rich success Asia enjoyed under Darius' guidance over "populous" (πολυνάϕους 889) cities. It is not accidental that Xerxes' name in the ode is thrice repeated:

\[\text{Σέρεης μὲν ᾄγαγεν, ποιοὶ,} \]
\[\text{Σέρεης ὁ ἀπόκλωες, τοτοῖ,} \]
\[\text{Σέρεης ὁ ὅπταν' ἐπίσας δυσφρόνως.} \]

Xerxes succumbing to evil counsellors through his unmanliness (ἀνανδρίας ὑπὸ 755), is responsible for γαῖ' Ἀσίς ἐκκεκεκενώμενα (549, also 718).

Under such conditions the anxiety of both the Elders
and Atossa is well-founded for Σοῦσαν μὲν ἄστυ κε-
νανδρίαν στέψειν (730). Yet, none of the above
sentiments captures the vastness of the disaster
better than lines 759-61:

τοιγάρ σφιν ἔργον ἐστὶν ἕξειργασμένον
μέγιστον, ἀειμνηστον, οἶον οὐδέπο
τὸ ἀστυ Σοῦσαν τῆς ἔξειργασμένης πέδου.

The verbal exposition is by itself proof enough as
the sounds—admittedly a conscious effort for audi-
tory appeal—create the feeling of the disaster
that is by far the greatest Persia had ever met
(760-61). Darius, as Kitto best sums up, "not only
explains the past but also prophesies the future
and brings clearly before us the moral basis of the
whole tragedy, the impious presumption of Xerxes".11

This sentiment, echoed at 729 (μὸς παρμηθῶν δὲ λαὸς
πᾶς κατέφθαρτα δορὶ) is consequently one of the most
important statements Darius has to make. Thus it is
hard to agree with A. Michelini, who admits no
progress in the development of the theme beyond a
certain range of ideas already expressed.12 Instead,
this evidence of the disaster in connection with
his further prophecies (παῦροι γε πολλῶν 800) certainly culminates in the dramatic climax that neither the chorus' mere forebodings nor the messenger's report managed to achieve.

The progressive elaboration of themes, vividly captured in the imagery of the opening anapests, is most effectively brought out by the messenger's account: το Περσῶν δ' ἀνθος οἶχεται πεσόν (252). The idea of emptiness is complete and it is impossible to doubt the sinister meaning of this verbal exposition. The intended meaning, however, was implied at 1 (ταῦτα μὲν Περσῶν τῶν οἰχομένων) and confirmed at 12 (πᾶσα γὰρ ἱσχύς Ἄσιατογενῆς/ὑχωκεν), in order to anticipate, by means of progressive elaboration, situations of the near future (252). What constitutes, therefore, the necessary development of the theme is anticipated beforehand as if lyric should forego the dramatic treatment. Though Darius' utterance is not marked by an exact corresponding repetition of the above expression, yet his double emphasis upon this fact and the further
revelations of the disaster at Plataea (800 ff.) culminate in the effect of the losses best comprehended by Xerxes' anguished καμέ μετ' ἀνδρῶν/τῶν οἷ- μένων/θανάτου κατ' ἐμίρα καλόφας (915-17). The effect is even more powerful when the tragic hero, in the consciousness of his own terrible responsibility, confesses κατείδον δὲ πῆμ' ἀξιότον (1026). His words are not new; they strikingly recall the significant previous occurrences of the messenger's ἀξιόπας (261) and τὸς πῆμ' ἀξιότον (265), but they generally ignore the divine influence that Darius explained in detail. His words, however, follow the path that the ghost foreshadowed in ἀμφοτεῖν ἔχρημένον (829). We are obviously moving towards the theme of tragic knowledge through the extremes of suffering which impressively dominates the Oresteia.\(^4\)

The abundant references to the king's outer display constitute another verbal echo with the recurrence of words that emphasize the tearing of the clothes (125, 198-99, 468, 537-38, 834-36, 846-48, 1017, 1030, 1060).\(^5\) It is an image that
largely contributes to the theme of Xerxes' degradation and is subordinate to the broader theme of wealth. In the chorus' usage of the expression δ' ἐν πέπλοις πέσῃ λαϊς (125) Xerxes is responsible for the rending of the Persian clothes, soon to be singled out of the crowd in Atossa's narrative of the dream: Ἑρέης, πέπλοις βρέχων τὰ ρητά σώματι (199). His humiliation is beyond doubt when he points to the torn symbol of his power: ἄρα ό λοιπὸν τὸ ἑρώτ οι στολάς (1017), for unquestionably his dress is the outer adornment of his authority. The ruin in Xerxes' reign has certainly been completed, but his authority, at least for the sake of historical accuracy, has to be restored. Doubtless "a new life awaits the king as he goes into the palace", and Gagarin was right in observing so; nevertheless, it is not the end of the play that creates such a feeling, but Darius' advise to the queen (κόσμος ὅσας εὔπρεπῆς/λαβοῦσα' ὑπαντάξε παιδα 833-34) in her terrible awareness of the issues that the clothing creates (ἀτιμίαν γε παιδὸς ἄμφι σώματι/ ἐσθημάτων κλόουσαν ἢ νιν ἀμέξει 847-48). Again a
theme anticipated in the chorus' τατά μου μελαγ- 
χίων/φρην ἄμβςεται φόβψ (115-16) gradually obtains
its full dramatic force shortly before it is made
visual with Xerxes' arrerance and his use of the
expression: πέπλον δ' ἐπέρρηξ' ἐπὶ συμφορῇ κακοῦ (1030).

This humiliation, established in the theme
of the king's intellectual weakness, runs through-
out the exposition. Victim of a divine illusion
(373), Xerxes is charged with foolish action in his
failure to perceive both the guile of Themistocles
(οὐ ξυνείς δόλον/Ἡλένος ἄνδρός 361-62) and the
divine vengeance (οὔδε τὸν θεῶν φθόνον 362). The
messenger recalls what thus far (96) has emerged
only ambiguously (δολομητίων δ' ἀπάταν θεοῦ) which Darius
will explain in moral terms. The ghost admits
the divine anger that the messenger suggested, but
sees deeper to the causes that provoked it.

Xerxes' youthful thoughts (ἐμοί παῖς νέος ἵν' ἄν νέ' 
ἀφορεί 782) made him not only embark on the most
hazardous expedition but also led him in the time
of his very victory to defile the images of the gods.
Thus his tragedy, heightened by his offence against the gods ὑπερκύμνης ὑπάτεις (831), is now complete. There is a danger in this military virtue, as there is in ὁσρώσ (73, 718),¹⁹ and indeed, the immediate context where this last word appears argues for this interpretation. Xerxes dared to challenge the divine authority of Poseidon (750) and thus fell victim to the divinely ordained patten, for ἔνω σπεύδη τίς αὐτός, χῦ θεὸς συνάπτεται (742). Once more Darius, by recalling words that have previously been heard, elaborates on the hidden causes of the disaster: Xerxes' defiance against the gods originating in his rash impetuosity (718, 754). Doubtless the tragic catastrophe is completed through the same mechanism by which the chorus justified the word ὁσρώσ (73). Unlike, however, the Elders' suggestion of the general workings of the god's vengeance, the ghost points out Xerxes' share in bringing about his own undoing. It is here that Darius makes the personal guilt of Xerxes clearly hybristic and, by recalling patterns of diction
previously used, strengthens the continuity of the drama.

The inevitable consequence develops directly out of the wealth motif recurrent throughout the play. Even Darius, in the realization of the enormity of his son's action, fears for this aspect of the Empire: ἕδοικα μὴ πολὺς πλοῦτον πόνος/ οὐμὸς ἄνθρωπος γένηται τοῦ φθάσαντος ἀπαγόη (751-52) as Atossa did at 237: πλοῦτος ἐξαρκῆς δῆμοις. Already in the parodos, however, the concept of Persian wealth was developed in an ambiguous verbal theme, as the occurrences of the word interwined with forebodings of trouble to come lead us to observe (3, 9, 45, 52). Ultimately wealth is to lead to disaster, since Xerxes' lust to surpass the achievements of his father brought upon him unexpected calamity. Though Darius too expressed a similar anxiety, by capitalizing on the same subject (ὡς τοῖς θανοῦσι πλοῦτος οὐδὲν ὑφελεῖ 842) he echoes more persuasively the theme of wealth in its capacity to generate woe. Atossa's
vague fear at 163–64: μὴ μέγας πλοῦτος κονίσας οὖν ἀνατρέψῃ ποῦ ἠκούον deepens the ominous significance of πλοῦτος that has so far remained unexplained. The king seemed to ignore this connection, for in his desire to increase πλοῦτος he threw away the great δήμος (825–26). Xerxes’ overreaching ambition, therefore, made him a perfect example of the Solonien lesson that Darius restates as he warns the chorus (820–22):

ἀς οὖν ὑπέρφευ δύνας οὔτα χρὴ φρονεῖν·

οἶροι γὰρ ἔσανθοσ ἐκάρπωσεν στάχυν

ἄτης, ὁδὲν πάγκλαυτων ἐξαμὴ θέρος.21

It is the fate of this wealth that is in Atossa’s heart, but her anxiety—a threat of a wider theme of agony in this play—takes its definite shape as Darius offers the decisive answer.22 This pattern, established initially as a general agony over the delayed return of the army (10, 13, 116) is gradually expanded in the arrival of the messenger’s news (φόβος δὲ πᾶσι βαρβάροις παρῆν 390) to cover all aspects of the empire (πάντα δείκνυειν 600,
also πάντα μεν φόβου πλέξ 603). The nation feels the disaster that excites a new line of fears (787). Undoubtedly this movement of revelation is captured in the language of Darius, in his predictions of the blows still to come. Paradoxically he utters the same verb ταρβω (685) over the safety of his abundant harbour of wealth, but soon he will resume the role of interpreter through his divine knowledge and authority.

Certainly this is explicit in the image of the brutality of the fettering of the Hellespont picked up in the words ζυγόν ἀμφίσαλὼν.23 This transgression of the inviolable boundary is one of the most fundamental conceptions of the king’s tragedy. Its importance is weighted on account of its frequent usage (198-99, 418, 537-38, 864-68, 1017, 1030, 1060). Xerxes, by crossing the Hellespont—once named holy (745)—breaks the law of nature, of how things are, and thus he provokes the divine anger. This is the cause of the disaster, the hybris, as Darius puts it, in Xerxes’ attempts
to yoke Hellas with his empire ζυγὸν ἀμφίβαλτον δοσ-λιον Ἐλλάδι (50) as he bridges the Hellespont (ζυγὸν ἀμφίβαλτον ἀφένι πόντου 72) and tries to unite two inimical people in Atossa’s description of the dream (ζεύγνυσιν αὐτῷ 192). The symbolism of the dream at last is shown justified by the action (ὡς ἐλύσῃ ζυγὸν ἄλφας 594), although the sense remains vague until Darius indicates the threat of such an action (724). Once more the yoking of the Hellespont is developed into a real hybris, the significance of which is reserved for the following part of his narrative (724 ff.). Thus the waters of Salamis are taking the proper revenge when Xerxes, relying primarily on land forces, attempts to master the sea (καὶ τοῦτο ἐξε-πραξε ὡσε Βόσπορον κλῆσι: μέγαν 723). The outcome naturally is picked up by the otherwise insignificant and common word ἡκός that plays such an important role in the messenger’s speeches (429, 435, 465, 513-15). And yet its usage is not by any means limited here. Twice Atossa uses the same
word in the description of Xerxes' motivations ἴκοις ὁμοιῶν ἀνδράσιν διόδοτες...διελθή πολλάκις κλών κα-κῶν (753-57) and twice more as she announces the re-
turn of her son (πόλλ' εἰσέρχεται κακ' 845, also οὐ γὰρ 
τὰ φίλτατ' ἐν κακοὶς προδώσομεν 851). In this play 
κακὸς is a word of prominent importance in its 
function of emphasizing the strongest possible 
contrast between the unscathed Darius and the 
disastrous Xerxes. We witness Xerxes' κακὸν ἀρ' ἐγε-
νόμαν (933) anticipated by Darius' κοῦδεῖῳ κακῶν/κρηπίς 
ἐκεῖν (814-15). Once more with this verbal ex-
position Darius shows his contribution to the full 
development of the theme to be understood in the 
ensuing lamentation of Xerxes. Though the emphasis 
Darius lays on κακὸς is comparatively less than 
that of the messenger, yet with the prediction of 
the calamities still awaiting Persia, he stands as 
another proof for the development of the theme of 
evils.

On the basis of these recurrent elements, 
therefore, it is evident enough that repetition is 
in many respects an important stylistic feature in
the **Persians**: it serves to ameliorate the lack of action that apparently characterizes this play and significantly contributes towards its overall unity.  

This unity arises out of the recurrence of the expressions that reflect those themes, once they are established in the opening anapests as a source of fear and anxiety. The report of the messenger provides exactly what those expressions were lacking—a sense of reality upon which Darius, by a way of continuing the themes those expressions reflect, fully expands, shortly before the arrival of Xerxes shifts the thematic emphasis to the visual. Indeed, we are presented with the recounting and then the spectacle of the inevitable fall of Xerxes in four apparent stages—clearly divided into four movements, but unquestionably in a unified plot secured by the emphasis on repetition of key words and concepts.
REPETITION IN THE PROMETHEUS BOUND

The function of repetition in the Prometheus Bound is similar to its purpose in the poet's earliest play, the Persians, namely to retain the overall organic unity, as certain key words and ideas recur from scene to scene and thus, as M Griffith rightly observes, sustain particular themes of central issue in the play.26 Their pattern of usage, however, as it is applied by one character to his opponent or by other characters to the protagonists, delineates the personalities of the main characters in the play. A closer look at those patterns surprisingly enough reveals not only an unexpected closeness between Zeus and Prometheus but also points to some of the many parallels between Prometheus and Io. Part of this closeness derives from their juxtaposition to one another in connection with their respective relationships to a cosmic order that hangs over them.27 Therefore, by observ-
score the characterization we can define the way the dramatist weaves the pattern of repetition.

The recurring element which most strikingly reveals this closeness is the concept αθαδία28 and closely associated with it δργὴ,29 τραχύτης30 τραχ-χύς,31 θρασος,32 βία.33 The accusation of αθαδία that precisely defines the character of Prometheus is thrice used by Hermes in the play (964-65, 1012-13, 1034-35) and Prometheus seems to acknowledge that there is a basis for the accusation as he tells the chorus μη τοι χλιδὴ δοκεῖτε μηδ’αθαδία/αιγὰν με (436-37). Paradoxically αθαδία is a quality that Prometheus shares with Zeus, as this word is attributed to Zeus' minion Kratos (τὴν δ' ἐμὴν αθαδί-αν/δργῆς τε τραχυτῆτα μη 'πιλησσόμε μοι 79-80). Zeus, therefore, represented on stage through his lackies Kratos and Bia, is depicted as self-willed as Prometheus is overbold. It is the main goal of Oceanus' arrival to mediate in the conflict between Zeus and Prometheus and to advise Prometheus to abandon stubbornness. Thus it is hard to agree with H. G.
Roberston who claimed that Aeschylus wanted to emphasize the clash of their personalities and the conflict between the ἀθωσία of Prometheus and the τραχύτης of Zeus. On the contrary, this very evidence rather proves that both antagonists share the same quality and it is exactly from this similarity that the source of conflict develops. At 190 Prometheus predicts that one day Zeus loosen his unremovable anger (τὴν δ' ἀτάραμνον στορέσας ὀργήν) and will come to him "in unity and friendship" (εἰς ἄρθρον ἐμοὶ καὶ φιλότητα/σπεύσων σπεύδοντι ποθείξει: 191-92), but once again Oceanus turns back the accusation of ὀργή upon Prometheus (ἂς ἐξεῖς ὀργὰς ἀφεῖς 315, also ὀργῆς νοσούσης εἶσιν ἱατροί λόγοι: 387). The references to τραχύτης are even more self-explanatory. They are applied to Zeus by Prometheus (ἂπας ὅ ἐς τραχὺς δόστις ἂν νέον κρατῇ 35) and Prometheus seems to admit the accusation (οἶδ' ὅτι τραχύς καὶ παρ' ἐαυτῷ/τὸ δίκαιον ἔχων ζεύς 186-87). His torments are harsh (τραχεῖ δοϑήσ 1047) as Io’s route has earlier been predicted to be (τραχεῖα πόντου...γνάθος 726). The word refers to both antagonists alternate-
ly at 324 and 311 and its usage largely demonstrates the real basis of the struggle, for both Prometheus and Zeus are blamed for their rough temper as well for their refusal to moderate their behaviour—a fact which is apparent in Io’s scene. Indeed, Zeus’ treatment of Io is the most obvious example of maintenance of supremacy through force; his violence (βία) cannot be gainsaid (ἀλλ’ ἐπηνάγκασέ νιν/Δίος χαλινός πρὸς βίαν πράσασεν τάδε 671-72). Yet Prometheus at 1010 responds to this brutal force as he advises Io to cultivate boldness (θρασυπλάγνως σε χρῆ 730). Thus their destinies are interlocked as both, victims of Zeus’ violence are forced to behave similarly.

This realization is highlighted by another verbal theme common enough throughout the play. Zeus acknowledges no external standards of justice, but rather keeps law within his own will (παρ’ ἑαυτῷ/τὸ δίκαιον ἔχων Ζεὺς 187). \(^{35}\) Again the chorus recalls a similar concept in words of Prometheus (τραχὺς μόναρχος οὐδ' ὑπεύθυνος κρατεῖ 324), for only the tyrant is the sole dominant (ἐλεύθερος γὰρ οὕτις

\(^{35}\)
and not responsible to anyone (οὐδ᾽ ὑπεύθυνος κρατεῖ) 324). Quite paradoxically, Zeus is under the demands of fate. Prometheus too is destined to escape his bond (σπόρος γε μὴν ἐκ τῆς δὲ φύσεις, ἡμεῖς τῷ τῶν ἕμε/λύσει 871-73), but after much torture. Thus he challenges Zeus to hurl his thunderbolt, for his fixed destiny (περιστάλεν 753) did not ordain that he die (πάντως ἐμὲ γ᾽ οὖν θανάσωσι 1053). Not even Zeus can escape same destiny (οὐκ οὐν ἣν ἐκφύγοι γε τὴν περιστάλεν 518); just as Prometheus is not fated to die. Prometheus had doubts of Zeus' lack of control as early as 171 (σκήπτρον τιμᾶς τ᾽ ἀποσυλλατεί), unlike Io (ὃ γὰρ ποτὲ ἔστιν ἐκπεσέν άρχὴς Δία 757) and the chorus (νέοι γὰρ οἱ/ἀκονόμοι κρατοῦσ᾽ ὠλύμ/πον 149) who admitted that Zeus was the master in all things. This restricted power of a deity, as M. Griffith convincingly argued, is not at all unusual in tragedy, for "the overall responsibility for the general workings of the universe cannot be laid on a single person or power", especially since power
is shown to lack correct judgment. It is here that Zeus' fault lies (πρὸς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ κενοφρόνων βουλευμάτων 762). Prometheus too erred voluntarily with a definite goal in view ἐκὼν, ἐκὼν ἡμαρτον· σὺς ἄρνησομαι./θνητοῖς ἀρήγων ἕρόμην πόνους 266-67). Thus he is considered a sinner against a divine order not to be challenged. Surprisingly enough Io also, in her bitter tale of flight from Zeus' love, admits that she missed the mark (ἁμαρτοῦσαν 509). Zeus' wrong attitude, therefore, establishes a complex pattern of hamartia that encircles both Prometheus for bestowing prerogatives to mortals and Io for her escape from his love, before an eventual reconciliation of all under Zeus' supreme authority.  

The abundant references to medical words found only in Oresteia and once in the Persians quite naturally demonstrates that the dominant figures of the play are in need of remedy. The pattern of repetition of such words shows what the chorus has learned in the process of this suffering, κοῦκ ἔστι νόσος/τῆς ἡμετερ' ἀξίωσα μᾶλλον 1069-70). Io
is sick. Like Prometheus' pain that of hers, too, needs a remedy (μῆχαρ 606). Her sickness is the madness (μανία 879), the counterpart of Prometheus' ἄθυμια that ironically she seeks from Prometheus. Her close relation with her doctor is drawn precisely in the common origin of their suffering. Prometheus is also sick (ἐς νόσον/πεσόν 473-74) in his rebellion against Zeus. He feels that his torture is a result of what the gods considered excessive attention to the needs of the mortals ἐπίτοιχι τιμάς ὡπασας πέρα δίκης 30, also μὴ...βροτοῦ...ὡφελεῖ καιροῦ πέρα 507). Zeus too is shown more powerful than just and more irritable than is right. Thus his mistrust and suspicion of friends is interpreted by Prometheus as a sickness inherent in the tyrant's soul (τῇ τυραννίδι νόσημα, τοῖς φίλοις μὴ πεποιθέναι 224-25), while Oceanus who comes in an effort to mediate between them accuses them both of being sick (ὁργῆς νοσοῦσης εἶσιν ἰατρὸι λόγοι 378). Once again this repeated emphasis on disease metaphor underlines the continuity of the plot and serves to
underscore the related characterization of the protagonists of the play.

Prometheus is punished so that he might be taught that his τέχνη is weaker than that of Zeus. This invincible barrier to his escape in the beginning highlights his services to mankind in the most arrogant and self-confident manifestation πάσας τέχνας βροτοία ἐκ Προμηθέως (506). At 110-11 fire is called διδάσκαλος τέχνης/πάσης βροτοῖς πέφυς καὶ μέγας πόρος which may recall the παντέχνου πυρὸς σέλας of 7. To Zeus, as one can draw from Io's transformation, this word refers to the mechanism of ordering through violence. At 87 Kratos in a punning taunt leaves no ground for disagreement ὅτι τρόπῳ τῆς ἐκκυβισθῆσθαι τέχνης. To Prometheus, as again Io's address at 631 reveals, τέχνη serves to define the beneficent nature of his discoveries. It is ironic too, however, Prometheus, who has taught the τέχνας (110, 254, 477, 497) to mankind, is punished by this τέχνη of Zeus.

Impaled on a deserted rock, Prometheus' suf-
ferring shares many qualities with Io's. Prometheus' place of punishment is an uninhabited location on earth (γῆς ἣς κατετάσσει τόπον 417-8, ἀλοιμότερον εἰς ἐρμιόν 2), where he must undergo a severe torture (Θεοίς δοῦναι δίκην 9); but he will reach an end, despite the god's intention. Similarly Io's wanderings will take place on the remotest parts of the earth (γῆς ἔπεις κατακτήσατο καθός 846) through a harsh route (τραχεία πόντου ολυμπησσία γυναῖκα 726) whose end, nevertheless, is expected after a series of sufferings (ἂν τέρματ' ἐκμάθεις δίοι 706). Her pains, like Prometheus', have just begun, and thus their common interests meet, since the outer circumstances of their suffering are similarly depicted.

The repeated echoes of words that emphasize on the need to learn, to be taught constitute another verbal pattern in the play. Their usage largely reveals that the dominant figures take on the role of teacher as they claim that the other has become a lesson through the extremes of suffering. The references to Prometheus are so frequent that they
fully justify the notion that he was a great teacher of mankind (110, 191, 273, 505, 609, 634, 706, 776, 876, 926, 1068). Ironically, however, in Zeus' minion Kratos this ability is almost turned to an insult: the teacher now will be taught to accept the sovereignty and the wisdom of Zeus (ὡς ἄν διδαχῇ τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα/στέργειν 10-11, also ἵνα μάθη σοφιστής ὡς Διός νωθέστερος 62). Zeus therefore punishes Prometheus in order to teach friends and enemies that his newly acquired authority cannot be threatened. Oceanus' words (ἡ σῆ, προμηθεὺς, συμφορὰ διδάσκαλος 391) leave no ground for disagreement; while the chorus' ἔρασον τὰς σὰς προσιδοῦσ' ὅλο/ἀς τά-χας, προμηθεὺς (552-53) illustrate the antinomy in the conflict of power against intelligence--antinomy that is manifested in Io's confrontation with Prometheus. Prometheus takes on the role of teacher as he responds to Io's desire to learn about her future suffering (586, 605, 623, 625). Ironically Io, also resumes the same role in her vivid tale of her past suffering (μαθεῖν γὰρ τῆς ἔχρηζετε/τὸν ἀμφ' ἐκ-τῆς ἄθλον ἔξηγομένης 701-02). Thus, another link
with Prometheus has been established that enhances the justification of her presence in the drama.

Though of infrequent occurrence, the words that refer to justice constitute another verbal pattern that runs throughout the play. Prometheus, by stealing fire goes beyond the standard of justice set by Zeus and consequently pays the penalty (ἀ-μαρτίας...δεῖ θεοῖς δῶναι δίκην 9). Paradoxically, appears to act as unjust as his opponent. This realization, which is apparent only after witnessing Io's unjust treatment, is obvious in her indignation when she, unable to understand the reasons for such treatment, rails against Zeus τι ποτὲ μ', ὦ Κρόνιε παι, τί ποτὲ ταῖσθένεζενας εὔρων ἀ-μαρτοῦσαν ἐν πημοναῖσι (578-79). Thus Zeus who in other plays of Aeschylus appears to be the champion of justice, is shown here as unjust as he considers his opponents.

On the basis of those recurrent elements, therefore, it is evident that the roles of Zeus and Prometheus are depicted in similar ways, while there also exist similarities between Prometheus
and Io. As scholars have convincingly argued, this repetition does not stop here. It rather extends to all persons who in direct or indirect way come in contact with Prometheus. In our case they create a remarkable resemblance between Zeus and Prometheus and make the latter deserving enough of punishment since he is depicted in many ways to be like the former. In the case of Prometheus and Io the same stylistic device establishes a stronger bond between both victims of Zeus’ cruelty and makes Prometheus see better the real nature of his struggle. The outcome is important: these recurrent elements avert to some extent the threat of discontinuity that we talked about at the beginning and link the characters together. Leaving aside the crucial question, i.e., whether or not Prometheus will be released with or without the consent of Zeus, a firmer conclusion can be reached, that Prometheus is punished because he is like Zeus. Soon he will be released since the freeing of Io, whose role we have seen firmly structured in the drama is meant to
foreshadow with the birth of Heracles Prometheus' own release.
CONCLUSION

The immediately preceding analysis has been mainly concerned with an examination of repetition of key concepts and terms in order to demonstrate the unity of the plays under consideration. In the *Prometheus Bound* this unity emerges out of the repetition of key words and ideas, as their recurrence from scene to scene established a reciprocal pattern of relationship not only between Zeus and Prometheus but also between Prometheus and Io. Likewise in the *Persians* the recurring emphasis on key terms and themes, once they were established in the opening anapests, worked against the charge of the lack of unity by linking the various scenes of the play together.

Thus we witnessed the same stylistic feature supporting the dramatic unity of the *Prometheus Bound* and the *Persians*, both of which are attacked for episodic or haphazard structure.

Furthermore, the discussion of the *Prometheus*
Bound in terms of its inner movements has revealed a pattern that surprisingly corresponded closely with that of the Persians. It is a technique that, as G. Thompson pointed out, "reveals Aeschylus at the end of his life absolute master of his art". We argued that this technique can be traced back as early as the composition of the Persians. In addition therefore to the similarities recent research has convincingly established in both plays, such as the linear structure, the inner development of the plot, the focus on a single hero, and finally the emphatic visual statement at the end of both plays, another similarity here has been established which offers an argument in support of Aeschylean authorship for the Prometheus Bound.
NOTES


3. Λέγω δὲ ἀπλὴν μὲν πρᾶξιν ἡς γινομένης ἃσπερ ἄρισται συνεχοῦς καὶ μιᾶς ἀνευ περιπετειας ἡ ἀναγνωρισμοῦ ἡ μετάβασις γίνεται, πεπλημμένην δὲ ἐξ ὡς μετὰ ἀναγνωρισμοῦ ἡ μετάβασις ἔστιν. (Arist. Po. 1452 a 14 ff.).


5. The credit for this idea belongs to G. Thompson as he set it forth in his article "Prometheia" now published in *Greek Tragedy Modern Essays in Criticism*, ed., E. Segal (New York 1982) 118 ff. More recently T. G. Rosenmeyer in a brief comment accepts such a temporal division in Aeschylus' plays without, however, going into detail upon

6. Thompson (supra n. 5) 118.

7. T. G. Rosenmeyer, The Masks of Tragedy (Austin 1963) 53. First, however, to enunciate this problem was Tyrwhitt in his edition of the Prometheus Bound; see further Garvie (supra n. 4) from where I draw this information.

8. The whole treatment of this play in terms of its temporal movements its mine and therefore I must accept responsibility for this argument. Generally speaking I use the same method of argumentation that Thompson (supra n. 5) has established and more recently Rosenmeyer (supra n. 4) in a brief comment has approved.

does not dismiss the idea of unity. Wilamowitz was the first who originated the problem by thinking that the action takes place in three different localities. For a brief analysis as well as an evaluation of Wilamowitz’s theory see H. D. F. Kitto, Greek Tragedy (London 1937) 42, also A. Lesky, Greek Tragic Poetry (New Heaven 1983) 52.


11. Kitto (supra n 9) 41.

12. Michelini (supra n.9) 119.

13. I share Winnington-Ingram’s belief that there is a gradual unfolding of the sinister meaning of the οἰχομένων (R. P. Winnington-Ingram, "A Word in the Persae", HICS 20 (1973) 37-38=Studies in Aeschylus (Cambridge 1983) 198-99); cf. Broadhead (supra n. 9) s. v. l. The opposite view
that o'χομένων means "have perished" and that
the Elders here sound the first tone of doom is
shared by J.T. Sheppard, Greek Tragedy (Cam-
bridge 1937) 45; W. B. Stanford, Aeschylus in
his Style (Dublin 1942) 35; G. Clifton, "The
Mood of the Persae of Aeschylus", GR (1972)
111-17; M. Anderson, "The Imagery of the
Persians", GR 19 (1972) 166-74.

14. A view of A. Lesky, Greek Tragedy (London & New
York 1967) 63.

15. Useful were the following studies which discuss
this image in detail: W. G. Thalmann, "Xerxes'
Rags: Some Problems in Aeschylus' Persians",
AJPh 101 (1980) 260-81; H. C. Avery, "Dramatic
Devices in Aeschylus' Persians", AJPh 85 (1964)
173-84, though his view that Xerxes was brought
to the stage in new clothing cannot be accepted.

In this refutation of Gagarin's opinion I am in
complete agreement with Thalmann (supra n. 15).

18. Ibid.


20. Thalmann (supra n. 15) 271.


22. The preliminaries for the analysis are set by J. de Romilly in a remarkable though brief survey of this pattern in "Fear and Suffering in Aeschylus and Euripides", Oxford Readings in Greek Tragedy, ed., E. Segal (Oxford 1983) and by B. Snell in the Die Entdeckung des Geistes, Greek Trans. (Athens 1981) 141 ff. for the
Danaid Trilogy.

23. Cf. Anderson (supra n. 13) 167; Winnington-Ingram (supra n. 17) 10 ff.; Broadhead (supra n. 10) s. v. 72; Alexanderson (supra n. 10) 4.

24. Michelini (supra n. 9) for a very thorough survey in connection with the word plethos, pp. 86 ff.

25. Kitto (supra n. 9) 43.


27. E. Inove & D. Cohen, "Verbal Patterns in the Prometheus Bound", CJ 74 (1978) 26-33, p. 26. The credit, however, for first noting the repetition in the Prometheus Bound in terms of the reciprocity belongs to A. J. Podlecki. Thus it is curious that both Inove and Cohen fail to mention Podlecki's article.

28. Prom. 79, 436, 1012, 1034.
29. Ibid. 80, 190, 315, 378, 678.

30. Ibid. 31, 186, 311, 324, 1048.

31. Ibid. 80.

32. Ibid. 178, 730, 871.


35. Podlecki (supra n. 33); Inove & Cohen (supra 27).

36. Griffith (supra n. 26) 18.

37. Further see D. J. Conacher, Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound. A Literary Commentary (Toronto 1980) 43,
where the author comments on the problematical line 266.


39. See particularly Winnington-Ingram (supra n. 33) 181; Griffith (supra n. 26) 19; Conacher (supra n. 37) 32; Long (supra n. 38) s. v. 87; Inove & Cohen (supra n. 27) 30; Fowler (supra n. 38) 174.

40. Inove and Cohen (supra n. 27) 28.


42. Podlecki (supra n. 33) and especially his conclusion; Long (supra n. 38).

43. Thompson (supra n. 5) 111.

44. Garvie (supra n. 4).

45. Ibid., and almost all commentators of the play.

46. Ireland (supra n. 2) 68.

47. Ibid. p. 68.
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