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INTRODUCTION

The Persae by Aeschylus is the only extant Greek Tragedy whose plot and characters are derived from known historical incidents. It is, however, not the only play to have been written with a historical theme. The Sack of Miletus, the Phoenician Women and the Persians attributed to Phrynichus, an older contemporary of Aeschylus, are known to us by title and by fragments.\(^1\) Because of the paucity of examples and what little we do know of the events surrounding the production of Phrynichus', Sack of Miletus, we can conjecture that the unpopularity of historical drama stems from a number of reasons, among which the most important were the political repercussions, the stifling of artistic freedom and the limitations imposed upon artistic license.

The negative results that could arise due to the political climate can be seen in the fining of Phrynichus for his production of Sack of Miletus and our few examples of this genre demonstrate the inhibiting nature such a possibility imposed on the poet. That similar inhibitions curtailed the poet's artistic license seems also to have hindered the genre's growth. As Broadhead points out, a poet who uses material from recent events must adhere closely to those events and therefore his scope for rising above the particular is reduced.\(^2\)
This being the case, would a poet faced with a possible fine, wish to compose a drama that must both adhere to the historical particulars and still conform to the strictures of Tragedy?

Analyses of the Persae have often enough clearly shown that it is truly a tragedy, does conform to that genre's rules and does have universal application. Yet the very fact that the play is indeed a tragedy calls into question its historicity. After all can a poet truly compose a tragedy wholly within the strictures of fact? Should we expect him to do so? Can the Persae be trusted anymore than Richard III or Henry VIII?

Simply put, a true tragedy cannot conform, in every respect, to the strictures of fact. We must be aware of dramatic techniques which lead to historical distortion and inaccuracy as in the case of Aeschylus' idealized portrait of Darius, who acts as a dramatic foil for the impetuous Xerxes. Conversely, we may also realize that Aeschylus' emphasis on the importance of the single naval engagement of Salamis distorts historical reality. Nevertheless, we should not be blind to the fact that his is a first-hand account of the battle, which is of immeasurable value to the historian. Finally we have every right to test the poet's knowledge and description of contemporary customs and court practices.
It must be remembered that Aeschylus was presenting a play on a historical theme only eight years after the event and to an audience who, for the most part, knew many of the facts from participation and experience. A concise statement concerning the tragic and historical aspects of the *Persae* has been made by Lattimore:

> It is useless to argue that Aeschylus was a poet, not a historian, and therefore did not feel himself bound by actualities. Dramatic foreshortening may be conceded, but we have not right to assume that the Athenians would award first prize to a tragic poet for dealing wildly with known facts in a contemporary theme...  

Given that the *Persae* is a significant drama for historical research and that it is our sole survivor of this genre of tragedy, never large and probably unpopular, the following questions inevitably emerge: why was this tragedy written when it was and why was it written the way it was?

Bloomfield maintains that the *Persae* was written solely to glorify the Athenian state. It is true that Aeschylus uses epic catalogues to magnify the greatness of Persia (16-56) and by so doing calls into contrast the meagre resources of Greece, especially of Athens, which, however meagre, were nevertheless sufficient to defeat the might of Persia. This same technique is employed to exaggerate the overwhelming losses suffered by the Persians (301-330) and in particular the Persian nobility who are associates of the King (955-999). The poet also uses exaggeration in his description of the flower of Persia's
youth who were slaughtered on Psyttaileia (447-64). In all these passages detailing the enormity of Persia's loss, it is implied, and rightly so, that this victory was for the Greeks, especially the Athenians, one of great magnitude.7

In connection with Aeschylus' mythologizing of history Murray has suggested that this play was written for a public celebration in commemoration of the Athenian national victory at Salamis.8 This may be true, but we have no concrete evidence for assuming such a celebration was ever held. Some critics maintain that Aeschylus not only extols Athens but even exercises extreme chauvinism by slighting and ridiculing the Persians. Bloomfield claims that Xerxes' entrance and lamentation with the chorus (908-1076) are pitiable, ridiculous and undramatic.9 It is believed by Sedgwick that the concern shown by Darius and the Queen for the King's garments (833-36) is a sneer aimed at oriental luxury.10 By making such claims these critics refuse to concede that the poet was, or even could have been, aware of the importance of the physical appearance of the Persian king and refuse to admit the possibility that Aeschylus was attempting to portray accurately the oriental penchant for showing excessive grief.

Finally there is the view that Aeschylus' depiction of the Battle of Salamis is an allegory for the total victory of Greek over Barbarian. In propounding this theory Lattimore states that the victory at Salamis symbolizes
every naval engagement of the war and that the destruction of the Persians on Psyttaleia is synonymous with their defeat at Plataea.17 Aeschylus, by focusing on a single disaster gives an organic unity to the play and by using the engagement at Salamis makes it clear that the victory of the Greeks was truly an Athenian victory. That Aeschylus does focus on Salamis and claims the Athenians to be the true victors cannot be denied; however, the equation of Psyttaleia with Plataea seems extremely hypothetical.

The theory that the play was designed to glorify Athens never adequately explains the nature of Aeschylus' presentation of historical material, nor does it examine the reason why the play was presented in 472. It is necessary then to consider the political events of this time.

That an Athenian poet could not divorce himself from the realities of the political arena is aptly pointed out by Stoessl.12 He states that, since the poet must apply to an archon for his play to be produced and the play itself was judged by a select cross section of the citizenry, the poet himself must be attuned to the political currents of his day. Furthermore we may note that it was not uncommon for certain figures in Athenian history to use the artist to further their political careers. This is particularly true of the leaders in the decade following the Persian Wars; certainly the value of art as propaganda was appreciated by both Cimon and Themistocles.
Cimon is said by Plutarch to have placed the newly discovered bones of Theseus in the recently completed shrine to that hero. The theme of Theseus was further exploited by Cimon through the painter Polygnotus, who is reported to have included the adventures of Theseus in a painting at Delphi and as a major part in the depiction of the battle of Marathon in the Stoa Poikile.\(^{13}\)

Themistocles preferred to cultivate the literary artist. Some scholars maintain, on the authority of Plutarch, that the poet Simonides of Ceos was employed by Themistocles to sing his praises.\(^{14}\) However tenuous this link may be between Simonides and Themistocles, the latter's relationship with the tragedian Phrynichus is more secure. Their association spans perhaps twenty years, dating from Themistocles' archonship in 493, when Phrynichus' Sack of Miletus was probably produced, to at least 476 when Themistocles acted as choregos for Phrynichus' Phoenician Women.\(^{15}\) In both cases these historical dramas are believed to have been presented to support the policies of Themistocles. The first to deplore the desertion of Miletus by the Athenians during the Ionian revolt; the second to remind the Athenians of their victory over Persia and the leader responsible for that victory.\(^{16}\)

The date (476) of this last production is noteworthy, for this is the last time that Themistocles' name is mentioned in an official capacity. In fact his last official
act, as recorded by Thucydides, was his embassy to Sparta in 479/8 where with the help of Habronichus and Aristeides (supposed political rivals) he tricked the Spartans and by delay acquired the time needed to repair the fortifications of Athens. The suggested reasons for his downfall are varied, ranging from excessive pride to extortion and treachery. But what is important is that after his fall from favor he may have resorted to the pen of the poet to remind his fellow citizens of his past accomplishments, no doubt hoping that their faith in him would be restored.

Because of the similarity of theme between the Persae and Phoenician Women and the closeness in time of their production some scholars, in particular Podlecki, include the Persae as another example of Themistocles' attempts to enhance his political standing through the work of the artist. Unfortunately this assumption draws us into the difficulties in establishing a plausible chronology for Themistocles' career from the production of Phoenician Women in 476 until his refuge with the Persian King, which logically must be dated no earlier than 465. Since Aeschylus' Persae was presented in 472, for our purposes the year 471/0 in Themistocles' career takes on added significance. This date has been held to be either the year of Themistocles' ostracism or of his condemnation and flight. Whichever occurred in that year, it is clear that Themistocles' political fortunes were waning and that the
Persae could very well have been another example of the use of art for propaganda. In the one case it would have reminded the Athenians of the services of their ostracized leader; in the other, it would have warned them against exiling such a patriotic citizen.

Before examining the internal evidence for the supposition that Aeschylus intended in the Persae to support Themistocles' career, I should mention that the choregos for the Persae was the young Pericles, an Alcmaeonid and future leader of the democratic faction. Lenardon has pointed out that to some it seems incredible to assume an Alcmaeonid would desert the aristocratic faction and lend his support for a production of a play benefiting their enemy Themistocles. But at other times members of the aristocratic party did support Themistocles. Further, the alliance between the aristocratic Alcmaeonidae and Philaidae was at best a shaky one, especially since the death of Xanthippus, father of Pericles. Finally, Pericles himself was later aligned with the democratic leader Ephialtes, upon whose assassination, he assumed leadership of the faction once headed by Themistocles. In doing so he carried on the latter's anti-Spartan policy and developed the Confederacy of Delos, step-child of Themistocles, into the Athenian Empire. Could this not then have been Pericles' first move in his wooing of the ónmos, which had previously supported Themistocles and later traditionally backed an aggressive
foreign policy? This support is understandable in that the political power of the οἷος rested on their role as crew-men in the fleet.

We must now focus on some of the internal evidence to support the theory that Aeschylus in the Persae supported if not an exiled leader than a fallen hero.

Ἀρετή μὲν, ὁ δὲ σωτῆρα, τοῦ παντὸς κακοῦ
φανεῖς ἀλάστωρ ὁ κακὸς δαίμων ποθὲν
ἀνὴρ γὰρ Ὑλην ἐξ Ἀθηναίων στρατοῦ
ἔλθων ἔλεες παιδὶ σὺ Σέρεῃ τάδε (353-56)

In these lines Aeschylus is clearly reminding his audience of Themistocles' ploy to lure the Persian fleet into the narrows. That his audience recognized this is hard to deny, but Aeschylus does more than merely remind his audience. He equates Themistocles with the divine, κακῶς δαίμων; an evil certainly for the Persians but in no way for the Greeks. By so doing he has to some extent made Themistocles the human agent of the divine will, a will that throughout the play consistently works against the Persians and on behalf of the Greeks. In addition by mentioning the deception ὁλον(360), he again focuses on the agent of that deception, Themistocles.

Whether to interpret Aeschylus' use of κακῶς δαίμων and ὁλον as a negative allusion commenting on Themistocles' alleged duplicity as a politician and man or as a boast about the craftiness of a Greek who, in the manner of Odysseus, was able to deceive the gullible barbarian depends
entirely on a subjective reading of Aeschylus' attitude toward Themistocles. Regardless of which interpretation one uses, it cannot be denied that Aeschylus, by alluding to the human agent of the divine, is commenting on the gods' punishment of the hubristic Xerxes, who dared to shackle the sea (742).

Lattimore states that we should not make too much of this single reference to the hero of Salamis. He is right to warn against overemphasizing one passage, although most scholars have either accepted or rejected the theory that Themistocles pervades the Persae on the authority of this single allusion. Podlecki, however, enumerates several other passages, some credible, others not, which he maintains are references to Themistocles. For example he suggests that the statement made by the chorus: ὃργῆν τὴν τῶν αυτῶν ἔστι, ἐνακριβῶς σαπεῖν. (240) alludes to Themistocles' convincing the Athenians to use the revenues of the new vein of silver discovered at Maroneia to build the fleet which defeated the Persians. This is possible, but in no way certain, for could the poet be sure his audience would make such a connection without a more obvious reference? Yet, the more politically aware member of the audience could have very well made such a connection and it is possible that Aeschylus was addressing this remark to such a spectator.

In the exchange between the Queen and messenger Podlecki rightly sees an allusion to Themistocles.
Who in the audience would not have remembered that their stout defense (\( \varepsilon\sigma\kappa\alpha\sigma\pi\sigma\alpha\ell\varepsilon\) was engineered by the very man who led them during that trying period?

Such interpretations of this type of "allusions" to Themistocles can, however, be taken too far. For example, Podlecki states that Aeschylus (42-43; 770-71) purposely avoids mentioning the presence of the Ionian fleet in the Persian flotilla at Salamis in order to remind his audience of Themistocles' attempts to convince the Ionians to desert. Perhaps, but it seems much more probable that the poet wished not to remind the newly acquired allies, some of whom could very well have been present at the performance, of their role in this battle.

In trying to discover why Aeschylus wrote the _Persae_ when he did one cannot help but attempt to distinguish between fact and fiction in this historical drama. The poet's obvious distortion of the importance of Salamis clearly exmphasizes the Athenian role in the victory. His exaggerated list of Persian casualties further embellishes the victory yet at the same time dramatically heightens the effect of the tragedy both from the standpoint of the Persians within the play and the Athenian audience watching it.
It has been shown that the political fortunes of Themistocles may have been a decisive influence in the poet's decision to enhance the victory of Salamis. Even so, without conceding this, I suggest that Aeschylus, by emphasizing the importance of this naval victory, may be supporting the expansionistic foreign policy of the young Delian Confederacy whose commanders as well as the play's choregos, Pericles, followed the policy previously established by Themistocles. We have also seen that other elements of the play could not fail to jog the memory of the citizens concerning the author of that victory. The subject, the defeat of Xerxes at Salamis, could not help but include Themistoclean elements and the poet by emphasis often brings them to the fore.

Yet we must not lose sight of the fact that the Persae is, in a real and true sense, a tragedy and that its historical distortions must be recognized as dramatic devices. Also, although this historical tragedy was written from a Persian perspective, its theme of divine vengeance for the ills of man has a universal application to Greek as well as Barbarian. Therefore, we must keep in mind that this is a tragedy while we consider the nature of Aeschylus' portrayal of Persia, his tragic hero Xerxes, and then, because the play was based on recent events, examine the historical accuracy of his representation.
CHAPTER 1
EPIC CATALOGUES

In this and the following chapters the references to Persian religious practices, kingship and people made by Aeschylus in the Persae will be examined. An examination of these historical aspects of this drama will, at most, allow us to judge about the historicity of the poet's description of the Persians and, at least, allow us to understand how this poet and the Athenian populace perceived the Persians. This examination should also tell us about the importance of accurate portrayal in the composing of a historical drama.

One of the most striking features of this play is the enumeration of Persian commanders and casualties. Aeschylus on three separate occasions (21-55, 302-328, 955-999) catalogues the commanders of the Persians and their fallen nobility. It behooves us to examine these catalogues closely to learn their significance to the dramatic effect and also how the use of true Persian names accentuates the tragedy by giving it the appearance of reality.

The chorus in the first catalogue (21-55) gives not only the names of seventeen Persians, but also a brief geographical list that depicts the enormity and extent of the Persian domains. Why does the poet choose, at this time, to do so? To understand its dramatic usefulness we cannot
consider this catalogue in isolation nor can we separate it from the parados, which in its entirety establishes the tone for the coming revelation of the tragedy. The chorus itself had previously set the stage for the King's return and the messenger's report.

άμφι δὲ υστρω τῷ βασιλεῖω
καὶ πολυχρόσον στρατιᾶς ἡδή
κακάμαντις ἀγαν ὀρεσολοπεῖται
θυμὸς ἐςωθεὶν

(8-11)

The return (νοστίῳ) of the King and his gold-laden (πολυχρόσον) army brings to these elderly counselors only evil forebodings (κακάμαντις) that trouble their hearts (ἀρεσολοπεῖται). It is in this first catalogue that Aeschylus, through the chorus, sets before the audience living examples, the embodiment of the chorus' fears: leaders who are rich in power and men who are kings, servants of the great king (24) and contingents which are dispatched from the land of Egypt (33-34), Asia Minor (41, 49) and Babylon (52). This is a host whose fate is known to the audience and is feared by the chorus. Later we learn that the land which supported the host, the parents who bore them and the wives who love them mourn them as lost.

οὗς περὶ πᾶσα χθών Ἀσιάτις
θρέψας κἀθωσ στένεται μαλακῷ,
tοκέες τ᾽ ἀλοχοῖς ἀ' ἡμερολεγόν
τείνοντα χρόνον τρομέοντα

(61-64)

By listing the men, by name, whose fate is bemoaned and feared, Aeschylus intensifies the calamity to come, makes
it more personal and at once more tragic. We now anticipate
disaster and await the final outcome for the army and
especially those who are the youthful bloom of Persia.

So prepared for disaster the reader, as no doubt the
original audience, awaits expectantly for news of this mar-
velous host and these illustrious leaders. Yet, before it
comes, the forebodings of doom and destruction are further
enhanced by the entrance of the queen and the relating of
her prophetic dream. Finally a messenger arrives; he states
that, although the king is safe (299), many noble Persians
have lost their lives. Again seventeen are listed (302-28)
and of this number five are among those whose fate pre-
viously concerned the chorus. The tragedy is driven home.
Five of Persia’s best, Ἀρτέμιδας, Ἀρδαμῆς, Ἀρκτῖς,
Ἀδλομάρδας and Θάρυβλος have perished as well as countless
more and yet those who are reported to be slain are but a
fraction of the total number.

πολλῶν παρόντων ὀλίγῳ ἀπαγγέλλω κακό (329-30)

In this passage the messenger is apparently only
reporting concerning those whom he saw die or heard to have
perished. His report is believable (discounting its poetic
trappings) and, as an eyewitness, he lends depth to the
account of this disaster, whose final import and devastating
effect are brought to fruition in the kommos between Xerxes
and the chorus.
ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ πρὸς τὸ ἁγαλαν
σάτορι περσῶν (922-24)

Not only has Hades been stuffed full of dead but conversely the land of Asia has been stripped and has sunk to its knees.

Ἀσία δὲ χθὼν, βασιλεῖ, γαῖας
αἰνῶς αἰνῶς ἐπὶ γόνυ κεκλεταί. (929-30)

After informing the king of the tragic consequences of his action upon the empire, the chorus point out that he himself has lost many friends, allies and counselors (955-57). They, by asking news of twenty-seven men by name, point out to Xerxes the magnitude of his personal loss and they also reinforce their previous claim (929-30) that the empire itself has been struck a mortal blow.

From this brief discussion it is apparent that these catalogues of fallen serve to emphasize the magnitude of Persia’s loss; they also aid in setting tone and building anticipation, until finally they reinforce the personal tragedy of Xerxes. Yet Xerxes was a historical figure and his tragedy was a historical reality. Therefore, this tragedy will be made more real and intense if it can be established that the names listed are of known commanders and confidants of the King. Obviously these names are foreign sounding and they add an oriental flavor to the tragedy, but are these or any of the others Persian? Are they historically accurate? Are they really the leaders of the host and friends of the king?
Aside from Aeschylus, Herodotus is our main source for this campaign and for the Persian leaders. Unfortunately few of the leaders mentioned by Herodotus are also mentioned by Aeschylus. In fact only ten are listed by both: Arioamardos, Arsames, Artaphernes or Artaphrenes, Megabates, Syennesis, Pharnouchos, Astaspes, Pharandates, Artabes and Seisames. Thus, if one feels that a more reliable account is to be found in Herodotus, it does not lead one to place great confidence in Aeschylus' lists of names. However, even if we concede that Aeschylus as an eyewitness, participant and contemporary should be considered more reliable, other problems arise. In particular, how many of these ten or better yet of the fifty-three names can one claim to be Persian or Iranian. Obviously many are not and were not meant to be so considered. For example, Syennesis (326-27) is a Cilician and Pegastagon (35) an Egyptian. Thus, if Aeschylus was attempting to be historically accurate, we should be able to establish the authenticity of these names, if not historically then linguistically.

According to Kent Old Persian names fall into four categories. The first, or typical Indo-European name, consists of two stems in which the initial stem limits or determines the final one. The second type is a compound consisting of a stem plus an inseparable or prepositional prefix. The third category is of hypocorisms (nicknames) where the name is limited basically to the first stem of an
original compound. The last type is of appellatives which can indicate qualities or perhaps occupations of the bearer.

In attempting to determine which of the names mentioned in the Persae are truly of Iranian origin we are confronted with two problems, neither of which can be ignored. One is a phonological problem, i.e., what are the Greek equivalents for the sounds in Old Persian. The second is our lack of evidence for Old Persian names. It is best to limit ourselves first to the available written evidence, namely the inscriptions, from which we can determine what noun and adjective stems were known to be used for names in Old Persian and what stems could possibly have been used. Within this limitation, let us determine how many names mentioned both by Herodotus and Aeschylus could have been Iranian.

Of the ten names mentioned by both authors one, Syennessis, is, as we have seen, of non-Iranian origin. Another, Pharnouchos, may possibly be of Iranian origin; however, although no direct evidence supports this claim, phonological assumptions determine it to be quite probable. Six of the remaining eight names are attested. Of these, both stems for two are found in the inscriptions while the remaining four have one stem which can be verified.

The first name in which both stems can be verified is Ἀράιναμαρδος, whose old Persian equivalent may very well be Harāiavamardun(iya). The initial stem of this name, Harāiva,
is the name of a particular Persian province known in Greek as Ἀρποὶ which by contraction could easily have become Ἀρπο. This province is recorded in various Persian inscriptions among them the autobiography of Darius at Besitun. 32 The final stem Mardun(iya) is in all probability equivalent to the Greek Μαρδωνος with suffix ἰα Μαρδόνος, for a Persian ɣ-stem noun is always found to be rendered as a Greek ο-stem. 33 In addition, the name itself (Marduniya) does appear in the Persian inscriptions. 34 Although it is not found in the inscriptions in this compound form, it does conform to the rules for compound names noted above, that the initial stem Haraiva limits the second Mardun(iya) "vintner" or "vintner's son." 35

 Unlike the first, the second name, Ἀραδός, is not a compound but a hypocoristic name found, in many inscriptions, as Aršama "having the might of a hero." 36

 Two of the remaining four names, Ἀρταφρές and Ἀρτάβις, contain the stem Arta "law, right, or justice," This stem was a popular one and is found in the inscriptions in such names as Artaxšaça (Ἁρταξέρξης) and in Artavardiya. 37 The old Persian inscriptions give us no clue as to the authenticity of the second stem in Ἀρταφρές, even though the sound of φρ is found in old Persian as fr as in Fravartiš; Greek φράδρης. 38 This final stem has also been called a variant of farnah, which adequately exemplifies the phonological problem, but, if correct, then both stems
are verifiable.\textsuperscript{39} 'Արտաբա, however, is interesting in that արտաբ meaning "a Persian or Egyptian measure" is a Persian loan word artaba. It may be that Aeschylus, knowing the word, simply coined the name or conversely it may very well be a hypocoristic Persian name meaning "portion or measure of justice." Unfortunately we have no evidence to support either supposition, but Stonecipher has determined it to be a compound name արտա + պա "he who sustains the right."\textsuperscript{40} If we accept this judgment, it is indeed an actual Persian name.

The final two names present the same problem in that only one stem in each compound name is attested to in the inscriptions. For Մեգաբա, the initial stem մեգա, old Persian baga, is found in Bagabuxša, Greek Μεγαβυγος at Besitun.\textsuperscript{41} I can find no evidence in the inscriptions for the second element բա, however, it is most probably the perfect passive participle of պա (as in 'Արտաբ) պատ.\textsuperscript{42}

The last name to be examined, 'Աստածու, has previously been listed (following Broadhead) as mentioned by both Aeschylus and Herodotus. The assumption, however, that 'Աստածու is the same as 'Սադու is not be confidently maintained, since the initial Ս as in Vištaspā (USARTS ) and Vindafarnāh ("Vindafarnāh") are transliterated as ū or ū respectively.\textsuperscript{43} Only the second element in 'Աստածու, aspa "horse," can be attested in the old Persian inscriptions as in Vištaspā.\textsuperscript{44} Therefore, we are forced to
conclude that the initial stems of these names, though similar, are not equal and that only nine names are mentioned by both authors.

I find no evidence in the inscriptions for the remaining two names, Ἐφαράνδας and Σεισάμης, however, if we accept Stonecipher's explanation that the former is a variant of Ψαρανδάτης (farnah + data), we can include it and determine that six names are used by both authors which are very likely to be actual Persian names. In addition, Ὀστάδας, mentioned only by Aeschylus, brings his total to seven verifiable names of Iranian origin.

What of the remaining forty odd names? How many of them are truly Iranian? By using the same sources and techniques, six additional names can be so identified as Iranian.

The first of these six names, Ὅστεμβάντης, is the only one that presents any real difficulty. Its initial root ἀρτα, previously discussed, and its final element βάρα, "bearer" (cognate to Greek φόρος) are both found in the inscriptions and together apparently would mean "he who carries justice." This compound form, however, does not occur and the inclusion of μυ (μ) between the two roots cannot be adequately explained, especially in light of Ἄρταβς and the Persian loan word Ἀρτάβ. Nevertheless its two old Persian roots are often used and give it the appearance of authenticity.
'Αρσάκης, like numerous others, only allows us to verify the initial root ἄρα (previously identified in the discussion of 'Αρσάκης), yet there is a strong possibility that this is a hypocoristic name containing that root plus the suffix (a)ka. A third name, 'Ομβάρης, presents a similar problem. We can only claim Iranian origin for the final element, bara, seen also in 'Αρτεμβάρης. The initial element may be an inseparable or prepositional prefix, but even so, because of our insufficient knowledge of Greek transcriptional practices, we cannot state with certainty what the Persian equivalent would be. It is possible that ov is a rendering of the old Persian va(h)u "good"; if so we then have a compound name meaning "bearer of good." Of the remaining three names, two include the more common compound type 'Υσταίχυας, Μιτρογάθης, and one, Μάρδαν(Mardun(iya)), which we have already seen in the compound 'Αριάμαρδος, is best considered an appellative. The initial root in 'Υσταίχυας, Višt, we have encountered in discussing 'Αστάξης. The second element appears to be ῥαθμα "brave," found in the name of a Sargatian rebel Cıçantaxma, Tritäixches, in Darius' monument at Besitun. The final name, Μιτρογάθης, at first appears thoroughly Iranian. The first element Mitra (Mišra) is found in numerous Achaemenian inscriptions and from later evidence was a common root in Persian names. The second root gādu "place, throne or place of battle" is also well attested;
however, the resultant combination Ἰἱραγαθυ „he of the
place of Mithra” does not occur in the inscriptions. 51
Two other problems also arise with gaθu. First, old Persian
θ is transcribed in Greek as Σ as in Σαταγαθυ, Θαταγυ,
and as Greek θ as in παραθ; παραθυ. 52 Consequently, in
the case of gaθu, we have no way of knowing how it sounded
to a Greek ear. If as then our interpretation is possible;
if as it is untenable. Second, the Persian θ-stem is
normally transcribed as a Greek θ-stem not, as here, as an
a-stem. This last problem can be remedied by assuming the
first root to be gaθa "hymn" as does Stonecipher; however,
it does not remedy the problems with Greek rendering of
Persian θ. 53 Even so, the more secure initial stem of the
compound sufficiently proves the name’s Iranian origin.

Thus, by using old Persian inscriptions evidence, we
are able to determine that thirteen names (Ἀριστομένος,
Ἀριστόκρατος, Ἀριστίππος, Ἀρταγερίνη, Ἀρτεμιδώρος,
Ἀρτάσικος, Μάρτυρ, Μεγαβάτης, Μετρογάθης, Ὀλβάρθης,
Μαραντόχις) are apparently legitimate Iranian names that
adhere to the classification of old Persian names as given
by Kent. To this list we should add a fourteenth, Φαρσυόκος,
which consists of farnah plus the suffix (u)ka or uxā. 54
While admitting our lack of information about old Persian
names and the phonological problems inherent in the Greek
forms, we can still conclude that Aeschylus’ accurate
rendition (26.4%) of the names is phenomenal.
If, however, we go one step further and use other sources, namely Avestan and Sanskrit parallels as well as Stonecipher's phonological aids, we increase this total by six. The names derived in this fashion are the following: 'Այգաբադիս, possibly from Avestan ḫaxta plus Old Persian pata; 'Ադեն, from younger Avestan adavi plus suffix a; 'Ածոտան, which is probably 'Անտրաς and may contain the old Persian inseparable prefix ham + myastrā a Gatha-avestan root; Δοτάν, a variant of Δατάν which is a hypocoristic form of old Persian dāta plus a shortened form of a word beginning with m; 'Իւատος, a hypocoristic form from Avestan Yima plus suffix (a)iya. Δαδάν should also be included, for it is most likely another hypocoristic name formed from the old Persian dāta + aka.

These six additional names, if we accept them, bring the total of verifiable Iranian or Persian names to twenty, thereby raising the percentage of Aeschylean accuracy to 37.7%. This is a surprisingly high percentage for a poet who might be imagined to be only concocting names that sounded foreign to the Greek ear. Before discussing the significance of the percentage of accuracy, let us examine three other names found in these catalogues.

The three names to be so examined are 'Արաբοս, Σουσακάννης and Σούσας. The first, 'Արաբο, can be seen in the name of a Persian province Arabāya, found in six separate Achaemanean inscriptions. Both of the other
names display a Persian root, Çūšā, found in the inscriptions of Darius at his capital of Susa as Çūšayā.57 There are several possible explanations: (1) this may simply be an attempt by Aeschylus to add a more varied flavor of the orient to his catalogue; (2) it is a correct reproduction of proper Persian names; or (3) the names of Persian Commanders. Given the nature of Persian names discussed above, the second alternative seems highly unlikely; the first given the nature of the catalogues, quite possible and the third is probable, for they could be names given, by the Persians themselves, to mercenary or loyal subject commanders meaning "that man from Arabia or Susa." Even so belief in this possibility depends upon acceptance of Aeschylus' historical accuracy, especially if one subscribes only to the first alternative.

We have previously mentioned how the use of foreign-sounding names did and still does given an oriental flavor to this tragedy. We have also seen that in twenty cases Aeschylus was, in all probability, using names of Iranian origin, which can best be understood as an attempt by the poet to add authenticity to this Persian tragedy.58 It should also be recognized that many more of the names in these catalogues could quite possibly be of Iranian origin; however, as previously stated, we are hindered by our lack of evidence both for Persian names and for Greek transcriptional practices.
That these men were indeed the commanders of the Persian forces cannot be ascertained with any confidence. Even if we assume Herodotus to be our best source, the six true Iranian names (Ἀρίσταρχος, Ἀρσένης, Ἀρταγένης, Ἀρτάβης, Μεγαβάτης, Φαρανδάκης) found in both authors does not mean that they are the same persons. If, on the other hand, we presume Aeschylus' accuracy and historical intent, then both authors do corroborate each other and the authenticity of these men is increased. Furthermore the necessity of an accurate portrayal of the facts in a historical drama based on recent events is brought out more clearly, and, at least in Aeschylus' case, it now seems to have been of great importance. Yet, the acceptance of the authenticity of these names should not only be based on the fact that in the Persae Aeschylus strove to use legitimate Iranian names, but also upon the author's accuracy in other areas such as his depiction of Persian religious practices and Kingship.
CHAPTER II
KING LIST AND SACRIFICE

When examining the *Persae* for historical information one must carefully distinguish those passages used by the poet to establish the historical credibility of his play from those purposely invented and used to establish the tragic and philosophic issues raised in the play. From the previous discussion on the catalogue of names, we have already seen that these two aims are not necessarily separate. Even so, one can distinguish certain passages that pertain to the actual history of the Persian monarchy from those dramatically invented to develop the characters of Xerxes and his dramatic foil Darius. For a more precise understanding, let us look at some passages that illustrate both the problems inherent in finding historical information in the *Persae* as well as ascertaining the value of such information.

After Darius' ghostly appearance both he and the queen, on numerous occasions, express surprise that Xerxes would have dared to undertake the invasion of Greece and they condemn the means used by him to accomplish that invasion. These statements by implication contrast Xerxes with Darius and two are particularly significant for the illustration of the distortion of history for dramatic purposes.
Δα. καὶ τὸδ᾽ ἐξέρρηκεν, ὡστε βῶσπόρον κλῆσαι μέγαν;
Ατ. δὲ ἔχει οὖν ἡγήμων ἡ πού τίς δαιμόνων ἐξενήψατο.
Δα. ψεῦ, μέγας τίς ἄλαθε δαίμων, ὡστε μη ἡμοεῖν καλῶς
(723-725)
Εὐρέως δὲ ἐμὸς παις νέος ἐὼν νέᾳ ὑμοῖς ὑπάνει,
κοῦ νημονεῖς τὰς ἐμὰς ἐκεῖσολάς. (782-783)

In the first passage Darius expresses amazement that Xerxes would be so bold as to yoke the Hellespont and, as he later states (749-750), to believe he could master the gods. Through this statement Aeschylus uses Darius as his mouthpiece to express his opinion that Xerxes has, by this hubristic act, provoked the gods and insured his own ultimate defeat. Darius, in the second passage, claims that youth caused Xerxes to forget the admonitions, which Darius later relates to the chorus (790), not to attack Greece. Both of these statements develop Darius' character as one who never foolishly usurped the power of the gods, nor was so rash as to attack Greece or even contemplate such folly. This characterization of Darius is in contrast with that of his rash and hubristic son who, unlike his godlike father (714), brought great ruin upon the Persians (Ὣκαῖν βασιλεῖ).

Unfortunately such a Darius is blatantly unhistorical. Herodotus relates how Darius himself bridged the Bosporus and transported his army into Europe to attack the Scythians and that he erected stelae to commemorate his action.60 Aeschylus' chorus, the queen and Darius appear to have no recollection of this nor of Darius' subsequent retreat and defeat.61 It is also related by Herodotus that Darius,
after his defeat at Marathon, planned a second attack which was cut short only by his death. 62 This is obviously not the same Darius who bemoans a son whose rash acts might offend the gods, nor is it the same man who, to seize the Persian throne, slew a reigning monarch.

These seemingly historical passages are not completely representative of all those in the Persae that at first appear to contain pertinent information about the Achaemenidae. Other passages, like those previously mentioned describing the geographical extent of the Empire and enumerating the Persian nobles in Xerxes' train, contain enough accurate information to stimulate inquiry since their veracity seems immediately compelling. One passage is of particular interest for in it Darius lists his predecessors on the throne.

\[\text{Xenophon, The Persian Wars, II.9.15-16} \]

Thus, according to Aeschylus, the first rulers of the Median and Persian Empire were Medus followed by his son, Cyrus, the son of Cyrus and Mardus; at this point a suspect line lists a sixth and seventh occupant of the throne, Maraphis and Artaphrenes, who are succeeded by Darius himself.
At first the list of kings encourages skepticism; after all Aeschylus' name for the first ruler of the Empire is an eponym. Thus Aeschylus' lack of knowledge of the Median Empire seems to be confirmed. But we need not automatically assume that our author and his audience knew as little or less than we do today.63 It may be that the Median King, Cyaxares (Μῆδος) and Astayages (ᾆλλος ὁ ἐκείνος πατὴρ) were known well enough that the poet needed only to refer to their being leaders of the host and their chronological position for the audience to know of whom he was speaking.64 Neither argument can be proven or disproven; however, the fact remains that Aeschylus was aware that the Medes were originally the dominant partner in the Empire.

Aeschylus' next three occupants of the throne, Cyrus, the son of Cyrus and Mardus are confirmed by Herodotus and Darius, although Herodotus calls Mardus, Smerdis (Σμέρδος) and Darius Gaumata (Gaumata).65 In both these sources Mardus is described in disparaging terms, which confirm the statement by Aeschylus that Mardus was a disgrace to his country (774).

Aeschylus, Herodotus and Darius himself clearly state that Darius became king after Mardus.66 What is troublesome about Aeschylus' account is his assertion that Maraphis and Artaphrenes preceded Darius. Broadhead, following most commentators, maintains that this line is an interpolation, yet both he and Podlecki correctly point out the difficulty
in explaining why it was inserted. Notwithstanding this difficulty it seems best to consider it as spurious. First, these additional kings are nowhere else mentioned, not by Herodotus, the inscription at Bisitun nor any other ancient author. Second, except for this questionable line, Aeschylus' account of the succession of kings to the throne corresponds exactly with Herodotus' and Darius' accounts. Third, the very source for Herodotus, as well as for Aeschylus, was probably a copy of Darius' account, for it is known that that king had copies made to be displayed in the provinces of the Empire. Copies have been found written in cuneiform on a stele in Babylon and in Aramaic on papyrus recovered at Elaphantine. Therefore, it is logical to assume a copy, in Greek, for the satrapy of Ionia (Yauna). If this is so, then Aeschylus himself or his fellow countrymen could have been acquainted with the document, either first hand or through Ionian informants. Given the Athenian advance in Ionia and the uncanny accuracy of our poet's king list, it is quite probable that he did in fact use such a document for his source.

It therefore can be said that Aeschylus, when not forced by his own dramatic techniques to subvert the facts, is often accurately presenting and corroborating specific information about Persian history. We have just seen this to be the case in the list of kings and earlier in his catalogues of names. The verification of this information
is hindered by our lack of knowledge and not Aeschylus',
while a belief in their historical veracity depends almost
entirely upon one's preference for Herodotus or for
Aeschylus.

Before a discussion of Aeschylus' representation of
Persian Kingship, which contains both historical and
religious aspects, it would perhaps be profitable to examine
how a purported Persian religious rite is presented in the
_Persae._

The scene in question is the sacrifice by the queen
to the nether gods and especially to the _daimon_ of Darius,
conducted expressly for the purpose of calling forth the
spirit of Darius.

\[\text{ἄλλο, ἦς φίλοι, ἔοιεῖν ταῖς ὑπερήμονις}
\text{ἡμῶν ἔξιστε, τὸν τε δαίμονα}
\text{Δαρείου ἀνακαλεῖσθε ...} \quad (619-621)\]

It is quite unfortunate that little direct information
comes down to us about the nature of Achaemenian religion.
We do, of course, have the statements of Herodotus, yet
nowhere does he give any indication that the Persians
practiced ancestor worship or that they considered their
kings divine.\(^69\) This, coupled with the Greek character of
the invocation and offerings of the queen (610-618), makes
one suspicious of the verisimilitude of this "Persian"
sacrifice.\(^70\) But, before one can state categorically that
this sacrifice is not Persian in nature, it is best to look
again at Herodotus and some later information.
In his description of Persian religious ritual, Herodotus says precisely that the Persians use no libations, garlands or fires during sacrifice and also that they set up no temples or altars. It may well be true that the Persians used no libations or garlands when sacrificing to Ahura-Mazda, or the Zeus of Herodotus' account, but his inclusion of fire in this list raises doubts concerning his accuracy, especially when one considers the importance of the Sacred Fire to the Achaemenids of his time and to their religion, Zoroastrianism. The Eternal Flame, the fire from heaven, was under the guardianship of Ashu Vahistu (Best Righteousness) second in the celestial group of the Amesha Spentas (The Undying Beneficent Ones) who are the creation of Ahura-Mazda and through whom he acts. Herodotus' second statement that the Persians set up no temples or altars is contradicted by the ancient inscriptions as well as by the archaeological remains at Naqsh-i-Rustan, the ancient burial grounds of the Achaemenian kings, and on the plains about Persepolis.

Darius in his biography at Besitun states:

As before, so I made the sanctuaries (āyadana) which Gaumata the Magian destroyed.

(DB1.63) In the Babylonian version the controversial āyadana is translated as "house of the gods." Among the remains at Persepolis is an open air altar and a shrine similar to the one at which the king worships on a tomb relief at
Naqsh-i-Rustan, where there can also be found a fire altar and what has been termed a fire temple, similar to one at Pasargadae. Even in light of Herodotus' assertion concerning the absence of temples and altars this evidence cannot be ignored.

Clearly we should assume one of two hypotheses to be true: either Herodotus was wrong (or at least inaccurate in many respects), or he was unaware of other practices pertinent to Persian religious rituals. In light of our own imperfect knowledge, it is best to accept the latter. If we do so, it then follows that Aeschylus' account, although undoubtedly Greek in character, may also accurately portray certain Persian practices unknown to Herodotus.

To determine this we must examine the lines describing the sacrifice to the daimôn of Darius.

The offerings to the spirit consist of milk (γάλα), honey (μέλι), drops of water (ὕδρηλαίς), wine (ἀμπέλου γάνος), something of the olive (ἐλαίας) and finally garlands (πλεκτά). As I mentioned before, elements of the sacrifice, namely water, wine, honey and milk, are used to call on the spirit of the dead in other Greek sources. Yet the
Iranian haoma sacrifice contains many like elements. The haoma was an intoxicating sacred drink of the Persians, which the king each year on the feast of Mithra must consume until intoxicated, for it was the drink that "drives away death" and brings immortality to the guardian spirit (fravashis). Associated with the consecration of this sacred drink were the blessing of the sacred water (zaogra), the offering of milk and butter (gao jöyva, gao hudah), the sacred cake (draonah) and the oblation (myazda).

In this list there are two striking similarities to the ritual described by Aeschylus. First, there is the sacrifice of the sacred water (zaogra), the "drops of a virgin spring" (Ωδὴ ηλικίας πυρὸς ἐν οἴνοις 613), which is nowhere else mentioned in our Greek sources as a libation to the dead. Herodotus correctly points out the Persian conception of the sacredness of water and, therefore, the inclusion of this non-Greek element in a description of a Persian sacrifice is not unnatural. Second, there is the offering of milk (gao jöyva) paralleled by γάλα (611). Last, there is the draonah, quite possibly a honey cake, an echo of which can be seen in μέλι (612).

Do these similarities mean that Aeschylus was aware of the haoma ritual? Do we have here information gathered from sources overlooked by Herodotus? From our knowledge it is impossible to say with certainty and at first, since the haoma sacrifice was not concerned with the raising of
the dead, it appears not to be the case. Before dismissing
the above possibility we must remember that the haoma
ritual was designed not only to rejuvenate the body but
also to insure immortality to the guardian spirit,
(fravashis) united after death with the soul (urvan). The
fravashis was believed to be the guardian spirit of a true
believer, a righteous man, who with Ahura-Mazda would one
day triumph over evil, the lie (drag).\textsuperscript{81}

These spirits were held sacred by the Persians and the
king as priest included them in the sacrifices to Ahura-
Mazda and the other gods.\textsuperscript{82} In this context their worship
is akin to the Greek worship of heroes, such as that of
Oedipus at Colonus. Therefore, it seems quite possible that
Aeschylus, hearing of the haoma ritual, confused it with the
Persians' worship of the travashis and saw in this amalgam a
parallel to the Greek worship of the hero.

That it is portrayed as a Greek sacrifice to the
\textit{δανῳνες} in no way lessens its similarities to known Persian
ritual, and it is only our imperfect knowledge concerning
Persian sacrifice to the travashis that stops us from claim-
ing it as a true representation of Persian ritual practice.
Even so, our lack of knowledge, as Gow said, does not mean
that such a sacrifice did not exist and that Aeschylus was
not accurately reporting it.\textsuperscript{83} Indeed, the similarities with
known Persian ritual tend to support such a conclusion.
CHAPTER III

KINGSHIP

Having examined the Iranian relationships of Aeschylus' Persian names and the possibility of his true depiction of Persian religious practices, we must now focus on his portrayal of Persian kingship, its court practices, the accoutrements, the divine status and the powers and prerogatives of the king. This portrayal is significant, since, as we noted in Chapter One, the *Persae* by its depiction of Persia's defeat is a paean to Athens and its democracy. Therefore, it becomes necessary to observe what the poet and consequently his audience knew of the nature of Persian kingship and how adequately they understood the inherent differences in their respective societies.

A number of passages in the *Persae* describe the clothing and symbolic royal attire of the king, and as well point out a number of Persian court procedures. Concerning the clothing of the king, Aeschylus writes

σου δ’, ὡ γεραία μῆτερ ἡ ξέρειον, φίλη
ἐλθοῦσ’ ἐς οἴκους κόσμουν ὅσις εὐπρεπῆς
λαμβοῦσ’ ὑπαντίας παῖδα. παντὶ γὰρ
κακῶν ὑπ’ ἄλγους λακάδες ἀμφὶ σώματι
σπευρασχοῦσι πολλάκιν ἐσθημάτων 835-36

In these lines Aeschylus shows that the Persian king's garments, though in tatters, are elaborately worked (πολλάκιν ἐσθημάτων) and that the clothing to be brought to
Xerxes by the queen mother should be a comely adornment (κοσμού...εὑρετής). Such a description is not unexpected since it appears that the attire of the king was noteworthy beyond all else in luxury and that in the Achaemenid period the king commonly wore a purple fringed white tunic, cloak of gold and other suitable adornments. 84 That Darius orders the queen to take these garments and go to meet her son, the king, brings out an important aspect of Persian court procedure. It shows a concern for the person of the king in that he should at all times, especially before his subjects, maintain a proper and royal bearing. The practice of clothing the king in the most elaborate of garments highlights the inviolable person of the king and his almost divine status. 85 These two facets of the Persian monarchy can also be detected in Atossa's response.

 sûly the thought of her son's possible death, his flight and his defeat were all terrible calamities (σομψοόδ); however, the queen expressly states "but this calamity stings most of all" (μάλιστα). It is obvious that she is expressing more than just motherly concern; she is voicing concern for the image of the king, an image of inviolability, an image supported by the richness of his clothing. 86
Other passages show similar knowledge of Persian practices. As has been mentioned, the person of the king was inviolable. Consequently, it develops that he was not to be harmed, touched nor even seen by his subjects, unless he so wished. That this care for the safety of the monarch would extend to his refraining from combat can be seen in the accounts of Alexander's battles, in which the king is kept from the front lines and, when threatened with bodily harm, flees. This custom of keeping the king from battle is also noted by Aeschylus.

\[
\text{Exomizes d' anphona xakwv orwv bado} \\
\text{echan ywv elxev pandeis euaghe strato} \\
\text{upheidw dxyov ayxv pelagidas al} \\
\text{(465-67)}
\]

Aeschylus could simply be relating a historical event to lend credibility to Xerxes' actions in the succeeding lines (467-71), where Xerxes flees in disorder. He could be contrasting the king not entering the fray with the Greek leaders' active involvement in the battle. Finally, he could be honestly reporting an event that neither he nor his audience would consider unlikely for a Persian King.

It should be noted that Atossa does not even consider the fact that Xerxes refrained from combat; instead she is stricken solely by his defeat (472-97). By her not mentioning what the Greeks would consider cowardliness in themselves, it appears that Aeschylus is not concerned with contrasting Xerxes' conduct with that of the Greek commanders. If he were, he would not have passed up the chance of having
Xerxes' own mother condemn him on these grounds. However, it may be that he and his audience were aware that, as a rule, Persian Kings refrained from combat. This is possible when one considers Atossa's lack of concern for Xerxes' non-combatant role (472-97) and how the chorus speaks of Darius' conquests, made while never leaving home (865-66). These lines (472-97) can best be explained by maintaining that Atossa is stricken by her son's and Persia's defeat and that the chorus (865-66) is contrasting that defeat with the successes of Darius. In both cases, Aeschylus develops the hubristic character of Xerxes in contrast to the godlike Darius. Yet these lines nevertheless portray a customary Persian practice and are not simply used to give credence to Xerxes subsequent actions nor to enhance the king's character. Aeschylus has depicted accurately elements of Persian kingship as well as court practices.

The portrayal of these practices can also be found in the chorus' statement, "My Queen, I prostrate myself" (ἐμὴ προσκύνημαι, 152). We must note that this obeisance is done not to the king but to the queen, and supports Herodotus' statement about the nature of proskynesis, namely that it is a practice which shows respect to one's social superior. Yet it should be noted that in this case the verb προσκύνημαι is inaccurate. This can be seen from an example of a noble (not a commoner for whom προσκύνημαι might
have been correct), like the nobles of the chorus, performing an act of proskynesis before the king on a frieze at Persepolis. Here a Median noble with hand covering mouth bows only at the waist. Perhaps our author was either misinformed or purposely denigrating this Persian practice. Considering Aeschylus' accuracy in other areas and his sympathetic attitude the former seems more logical and this misconception would explain the pains taken by Herodotus (I. 134) to explain the true nature and various forms of proskynesis.

Aeschylus completes the picture of the king's dress and Persian court practices by describing some of the ceremonial accoutrements of the king. For instance, after his return and while Xerxes is lamenting with the chorus, this exchange takes place.

X. τόνδε τ' οίστοδέχυμονα
Ch. τι τόδε λέγεις σεσωμένον
X. θησαυρὸν βελέσσαν (1020-22)

Nothing else can be meant by "treasury for holding arrows" but the royal quiver, symbol of the prowess of the monarch in war, which he is often shown carrying on the Persian charic. Earlier Aeschylus evokes a feeling and flavor of the orient by having the chorus call upon Darius, using exotic terms.

κροκάβαπτον ποδὸς εὐμαρίν ἀετῶν
βασιλεῖσσον τιήρας
Θᾶλαρον τιφαύσκων (660-63)

It is noteworthy that, though saffron dyed slippers may be common to all nobility, the peaked tiara (φάλαρον τιήρας) of
royalty is not.\textsuperscript{94} We know from the frieze at Persepolis that it was strictly kingly attire, which was used to emphasize the difference between king and subject, even though that subject be of noble birth.\textsuperscript{95} The adjective βασιλείας reinforces this idea and it is later clearly stated by Xenophon quoting Tissaphernes, "...It is possible for the king alone to wear the upright tiara." (\ldots τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἕαυτῷ τῇ κεφαλῇ τιάραι βασιλεῖ μονὸς ἔξεστιν ὁρθὴν ἔχειν...).\textsuperscript{96}

Before discussing the Aeschylean divinity of Persian kings, a summary of the aspects of Persian kingship so far found in the Persae is in order. We have a king whose body and person are sacrosanct and who is protected from harm at home and in battle, whose position and possible divinity are symbolized by his elaborate clothing, his ceremonial attire such as the tiara, and certain court practices like proskynesis. This is a king whose royal quiver is a symbol of his prowess in war and whose defeat and disgrace are a blow to national pride and to his own position.

It is fact that the Persian king was a theocratic ruler, who ruled by the favor of Ahura Mazda, through whose protection and aid he was able to rule a vast empire containing many kings and many nations. That these Achaemenid kings were ever considered gods is difficult to prove. One scholar seems to imply that they were, but the bases for this assumption are derived from later sources and Sassanian practices.\textsuperscript{97}
There is, however, one thing of a divine nature that is associated with all Persian kings, including the Achaemenid, and it is the Iranian concept of *xvarnah* or *farnah* "the royal splendor."\(^{98}\)

The *xvarnah* of the Persian king is thought to be the recipient of the divine aid given to the ruler by Ahura Mazda, aid which bestows upon the King the power and the right to rule.\(^{99}\) The symbol of this divine aid is believed to be the "nimbus of fire" and the burning and radiant countenance of the king.\(^{100}\) This divine infusion was believed to be contained in the bones of the dead king.\(^{101}\) Others maintain that the *xvarnah* of the Persian monarch is the special divinely inspired *fravashis* of the king.\(^{102}\)

Given the divine source of this special aid and the belief in its continued existence after death, it is not outlandish to assume that the *fravashis* of the king was both the recipient and the manifestation of this divine aid (*xvarnah*), and therefore the living symbol of it. Indeed the winged nimbus with figure enthroned, which hovers over the Persian king on numerous monuments, could very well be, as Miss Taylor claims, the symbol of the king's *xvarnah*.\(^{103}\) Therefore, although one may hesitate to claim divinity for the monarch, a claim to the divinity of the king's *fravashis* seems altogether reasonable. The *xvarnah* then is not just the "royal splendor," but the "royal splendor that is divine."
Since this *xvarnah* was the essence of every king's divine aid which allowed him to be king, it would seem that the kingship itself, not the king, was divine. Thus the king, since his *xvarnah* was immortal, was considered godlike even in death.

The Iranian concept of *xvarnah* sheds some light on the Aeschylean perception of the divinity of the Persian king. This concept and the Greek term *daimon* appear in some cases to be, if not synonymous, at the least similar. Aeschylus frequently uses this term in the *Persae* and in most cases *daimon* is used to describe a certain spirit, evil and perverse, which has sided with the Greeks, driven Xerxes to his destruction and inflicted great suffering on Persia.

> ἀλλ' ἔδε δαίμων τες κατέφθει ρε στρατὸν (345)
> δόει ξει θυμίς δε πού τες δαίμονων ἐξουσίατο (724)
> ὦ δυσπόθυτε δαίμων, ὦς ᾳμνα βαρὺς
> ποδότιν ἐνήλου ποιεί τεσσαρχὴν γένει (515-6)

The messenger (345) claims that the Persian host was destroyed not by ships and men, but by a spirit. Atossa (724) says that Xerxes was aided by a spirit when he yoked the Hellespont, implying that the influence of that spirit was evil. This act is in fact the reason Darius gives for his son's downfall (739-52). Finally the chorus (515-16) calls this spirit a bearer of woe, whose leap burdens the entire Persian race. It is clear that this meaning and use of *daimon* does not parallel the Iranian *xvarnah*, but rather
represents a divinely sent spirit of destruction, atē of Aeschylean Zeus.

That this is not the only meaning used by Aeschylus of daimon is apparent when one examines other instances of the word.

\[\text{Ωμνος ἐπευφημεῖτε τὸν τε δαίμονα Δαρείου ἀνακαλεῖσθε} \ldots \ (620-21)
\]

\[\text{ἀλλὰ χρόνιοι δαίμονες α'γονοὶ} \ (628)
\]

\[\text{ἀλλὰ σῇ μοι ἡ τε καὶ ἄλλοι χθόνιων ἄγεμονες δαίμονα μεγαλῇ ἰόντ' αἰνέστατ' ἐκ ἄδμων} \ (640-42)
\]

These statements, either by the queen (620-621) or by the chorus (628, 640-642), are an attempt to call the spirit of Darius to their aid. There is no evidence for us to claim that they are worshipping Darius' spirit as a god, but it does appear that Aeschylus was aware not only of the sanctity of the fravashis and the sanctity of the Persian king's remains, but also of the Persian practice of sacrificing to the fravashis of the dead. Can it be that Aeschylus is trying to present this concept by using the only comparable Greek word, δαίμων?

This is a tempting supposition and, if true, would do much to support the contention that Aeschylus and his audience knew much more than has been credited to them.

In addition to this specific use of daimon, the similarity of the propitiatory offerings for a daimon with those for the Zoroastrian haoma and that the haoma sacrifice
concerned the rejuvenation of the king (possibly the immortality of his fravashis) must not be forgotten. We, however, must not overlook Aeschylus' penchant for tampering with known historical facts to heighten the dramatic and tragic quality of his work.104 Even if we accept that Aeschylus was portraying a Persian religious practice in this sacrifice (609-632), it does not prove that this type of sacrifice was used by the Persians to call upon or pray to the xvarnah/fravashis of a dead king. We have no other external evidence to support such an assumption, but, as Gow cogently points out, this does not prove that such a sacrifice did not take place and, one should add, for such a purpose.105

A clue to the nature of this sacrifice and to its national character can be observed in the queen's sacrifice to the earth spirits.

... γαπάτον τοῖς θεοῖς θεοίς
τιμᾶς προεύθυνσι
τὰς θεοτρόφους (621-622)

Even clearer evidence is found in the chorus' use of χανοντο (628) and χανοντο (640). To the Greeks a χανοντοσ δαιμων was a protective spirit closely associated with the area of his burial. It was a friendly spirit who cared for and watched over the land, whose aid was sought through sacrificial animals slaughtered in a pit and by libations poured into the ground. Such a chthonic spirit was Oedipus to the Attic town of Colonus and it is as such a spirit that Aeschylus has portrayed Darius.106 Like any chthonic spirit
Darius must first be supplicated with sacrifices before he is called upon to aid the land of his resting place. Like many such Greek spirits, once called upon, Darius serves an oracular purpose at the insistence of his queen and old friends. 107

Even with this decidedly Greek flavor the sacrifice and attendant rites seem to be a synthesis of Persian and Greek rites. The offerings for sacrifice and the oriental style of dirge for the chorus (632-680) reinforce this idea. Yet when all is said, one cannot but believe that what began as a Greek sacrifice with Persian elements ends with the depiction of a Greek cult to hero and chthonic deity fine dramatic technique but not entirely factual.

Therefore, it is possible that Aeschylus is either imposing Greek customs and rites on the Persians or is fusing similar rites which have no apparent connection or, knowingly, is portraying similar rites stemming from an ancient and dim Indo-European past.

Are there passages that do attribute to the Persian monarch the godlike qualities inherent in that monarchy, while clearly showing a proper understanding of that monarchy? The answer is yes. The chorus, when Atossa enters for the first time, in exalted fashion proclaims:

\[
\text{Θεοῦ μὲν εὐνάτειρα Περσῶν, θεοῦ δὲ καὶ}
\text{μήτηρ ἔφυς} \quad (157)
\]}
She is hailed as wife and mother of a god but, as Broadhead points out, this fulsome claim must be balanced by Aeschylus' attribution of only godlike qualities to the King.\textsuperscript{108}

At no other point does Aeschylus call the Persian king a god. He calls Darius "a blessed king equal to a god (\textit{μακαρίτας ἱσοδαίμων βασιλεὺς}, 634) a king of "godlike council" (\textit{θεομήτωρ}, 655) and finally he is said to live a life "like a god" (\textit{ὡς θεὸς}, 711). Xerxes is treated in the same manner; he is called "equal to a god" (\textit{ἰσθεῖος}, 80). Is this a blatant contradiction or is the first example (157) just excessive praise given to the queen to heighten the dramatic effect of her entrance?—an entrance made in what we can assume to be elaborate and, to a Greek, clearly oriental garb. From the evidence of the play, one is inclined to believe the latter is the case.

This excessive praise coincides well with the concept of Achaemenid kingship already presented, namely that these kings were not god-kings, but were imbued with a quasi-divine aura, symbolized graphically in the winged nimbus and conceptually in \textit{xvarnah}. This aura was further propagated through the concepts and practices previously detailed, all of which were designed to establish the superiority of king to subject. Therefore in conjunction with our previous conception of Persian kingship we must now realize that Aeschylus and his audience also attributed a godlike or quasi-divine aura to the Persian King. We cannot, however, add to our
picture any new concepts; we can only reinforce the quasi-divinity suggested in the first part of our discussion. There is still one more area left to be explored: what does Aeschylus tell us concerning the powers and prerogatives of the Persian King?

It should first be pointed out that Aeschylus was aware of the extensiveness of the empire; one only has to read the opening choral ode to understand this. He also knew the official title of the King.

\[ \text{Βασιλῆς Βασιλέως ὕποχοι μεγάλου} \] (24)

This is surely meant to mean King of Kings (\textit{Βασιλέως Βασιλέων}) which is an accurate rendition of the Iranian \textit{xσāyaeiya-xσāyaeiyānām}. Aeschylus was also aware of the absolute aspect of Persian kingship; however, like most Greeks, he viewed it as a tyranny and contrasted it to Athenian practices.

\[ \text{κακῶς ἐξ κράτος} - \text{οὐχ ὑπεσθενὸς πόλει} \] (213)

Obviously we cannot expect the king to give an account of his administration (\textit{ὑπεσθενὸς}) and certainly not to the \textit{polis} which was a purely Greek concept foreign to Persia. Nor can we fail to realize that this is diametrically opposed to the Athenian democracy's practice. 109 Aeschylus enhances his portrayal of a tyrannical Xerxes by having him threaten to strip his captains of their rank, if they fail to blockade the Greeks (371).
Though these lines paint Xerxes as a whimsical and ruthless lyrant, just as Herodotus does, they do point out the power and authority of the Persian king, a power and authority no Greek monarch held. Still it is not a complete picture. As Olmstead points out, paradoxically using Herodotus as his source, the authority of the Persian king was limited and in times of peace his right of summary execution was tempered by the idea that one must always weigh the good against the bad.\textsuperscript{110} It should be noted that Aeschylus does have some idea of the limits of Xerxes' power, for he does mention the possibility of revolt when news spreads of the king's defeat (584-594, 531, 715). He also seems to be aware of the importance and power of the king's advisors, whose nagging tongues convince Xerxes to undertake the invasion of Greece (755-756). The advice of his ministers, however, must be understood as the instrument of Zeus working through atē, and the possibility of revolt is not an expression of the Persian idea of losing the favor of Ahura Mazda, but rather a dramatic device used to enhance the personal tragedy of Xerxes. Again we see that a reader of this play must be aware of Aeschylus' use of Greek dramatic techniques, yet he must also recognize that this use does not necessarily mean that his representation of Persian customs, practices and kingship is inaccurate. For to Aeschylus, Xerxes is not only a king but the symbol of Persian kingship.
This last point is extremely important to keep in mind when examining Xerxes' personal reasons for the expedition. 

πάσα γὰρ γένοιτ' ἀν Ἐλλάδος βασιλέως ὑπηρέτος (234)

This desire for conquest and expansion is right and proper for a Persian monarch. It shows his subjects, if he is successful, that he has the support of the gods and it also establishes his right to rule in the eyes of the nobility. At first glance it appears that Aeschylus accepts the divine right of the Persian king to rule and conquer, for he has Darius say,

ἐξ οὗτε τιμὴν Ζεὺς ἅνας τὴν ἄκαμαν ἐν ἄνδρᾳ κόρης Ἀσσαθος μελοτρόφου ταχείων ... (762-64)

It also seems that Aeschylus realizes the strong position and influence that the advisors of the king possessed. Atossa, in her reply to Darius' inquiry into why he has been summoned, claims that Xerxes undertook the invasion of Greece because his nobles compared his unwarlike behavior to Darius' acquisition of untold wealth and power (754-756).

Darius' beliefs on the origin of his right to rule have previously been mentioned, yet the continued maintenance of that rule seems to depend on physical manifestations of divine aid, in other words the defeat of the enemy, the evil lie, ἀραύγα. Consequently it is fact that every new king before Xerxes attempted to expand the empire. Cambyses undertook the conquest of Egypt and the invasion of Ethiopia and Cyrene and Darius, after he quelled the revolts
following his accession, conquered Thrace and attacked the area north of the Danube. They did so to make manifest their right to rule and to placate an unruly nobility.

This rite of passage for every new Persian monarch, important to their conception of the cosmic ruler, was considered by Aeschylus and Herodotus after him as an example of hybris in the case of Xerxes. Therefore, we are made to understand this desire for conquest as a manifestation of Xerxes' hubristic nature and, in the Greek view, an intrinsic part of his tragedy. Even so, we must realize that Aeschylus, however inadvertently, is not so much focusing on the character of the individual as he is representing the nature of the Persian monarchy.

In the passage quoted above (762-764) Darius, the spokesman of the poet, states emphatically that his rule and, for that matter, his family's rule were ordained by Zeus. The concept of a god-ordained kingship is not limited solely to Persia and the east, for at one time it was prevalent in Greece and, at this time, still existed to some extent in Macedonia. It is possible that this concept derives from the common Indo-European origins of both people, but one cannot say for certain. Rose, in particular, discounts all evidence for divine kingship in Greece, claiming it to be late and influenced by Greece's contact with Persia. If he is right, and it is dangerous to discount his ideas, it still remains uncertain whether Aeschylus did have information
concerning the Persian conception of kingship. Yet, because of his knowledge of Persian ceremony and court practices and the probability that Aeschylus was aware of the contents and claims of the Besitun inscription, it appears that this is indeed the case.

In this same speech Darius mentions an important duty of the Persian king.

\[ \text{δίκαντες ἡμεῖς, οὗ κράτη τὰ ἐξομεν,} \]
\[ \text{οὐχ ἂν φανεῖμεν πὴνατ' ἔρξαντες τόσα.} \] (785-786)

Darius is portraying himself as the protector of his people, responsible for their welfare and safety, just as before when he called himself the "keeper of flocks" (μελητρόφου, 763). Again this is not solely a Persian concept; it is rather Indo-European and was also considered by the Greeks a king's duty.\(^7\) As before the reader is left with a choice whether to consider it a manifestation of Aeschylean knowledge of Persian customs or an example of the imposition of a Greek concept upon the Persians. If one does not ignore the weight of evidence, the possibility of the former becomes very real.

In his representation of Persian kingship Aeschylus has accurately portrayed a king who is responsible for the welfare and safety of his people and for whom the right to rule was divinely sanctioned. In addition, his Persian monarch's body is inviolable and his safety is of great importance. He shows us a king surrounded by ceremony and one whose
ritual attire symbolized his roles in peace and in war. Finally, his king was considered godlike and one who was honored after death, though obviously not as a Greek chthonic spirit.

That Aeschylus portrays the desire for conquest as an act of hubris, not as an attempt by the king to maintain his right to rule, does not detract from the historical accuracy of his presentation; neither do his misunderstanding of the king's cosmic role and his assertion that Xerxes' defeat is a result of a hubristic act and not the loss of the favor of Ahura Mazda. Indeed it is rather an expression of the genius of the poet to rise above the historical niceties and by extension to create a historical drama of universal significance.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The cumulative effect of this survey appears to justify the claim that, with respect to Persia, her customs, religious rites and kingship, this tragedy is truly a historical drama and, although limited at times by the strictures of his art, Aeschylus has nevertheless followed his perception of the facts. In some respects his perception could possibly be more, rather than less accurate than ours.

His diligence in using names of Iranian origin has been adequately shown and it is our lack of knowledge of old Persian and the Greek system of transliteration, not his lack of knowledge of the names of Persian participants in the battle, that is apparently at fault. Also, though it has a flavor decidedly Greek, the sacrifice of the queen and chorus to the δασμων, i.e. xvarnah, of Darius is similar in many ways to other Iranian rites (haoma) and also exhibits a knowledge of the Iranian reverence for the fravoshis. Therefore it now appears that the onus is on us to disprove the historical accuracy of this sacrifice, if we still wish to maintain that it is Greek and Greek alone.

This representation of Persian customs and religious practices, coupled with Aeschylus' accurate portrayal of Achaemenid kingship, tells us much about accuracy in the
composition of historical drama. This accuracy in turn does much to explain the seeming unpopularity of this tragic form, since along with the limited scope imposed by factual representation we must also realize that factual representation was demanded of the poet by the audience and in Aeschylus' case by the poet himself. Thus the chances of offending the screening Archon and/or the people undoubtedly increased because the poet was, by the nature of historical drama, forced to cope with the facts, facts that could please or enrage the Athenian populace.
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56 Kent, pp. 169-170.
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71 Herodotus, I.132 and 131.
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80 Herodotus, I.139.
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NOTES

CHAPTER III

84 These colors were symbols of his function as warrior (purple or red) and that of priest (white). See Widengren, p. 244 and Cf. Curtius III.3.17-18.
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88 Arrian (II.11.2-5) describes Darius' position and flight from Issus. Later (III.2.5) the king's position at Guagamela, his flight (III.13.3) and the importance of his safety to his subjects (III.16.1-2) is detailed. Cf. Xen. Ana. I.8.21-23.

89 Cf. Herodotus, VIII.97 ff.

90 This was also true in Sassanian times. Ammianus Marcellinus (XIX.7-8) states, "For even the king of the Persians himself, who is never compelled to take part in battle ... rushed into the thick of the fight like a common soldier -- a new thing, never head of." Widengren, p. 250.

A frieze from the treasury at Persepolis. See Olmstead, pl. XXX.

Gow, figure 2, p. 142.

Broadhead, p. 171, supports this interpretation of Φάλαρον.

Cf. Gow, figure 3, p. 143.

Xen. Ana. II.5.23.

Widengren, pp. 245-248.

Widengren, pp. 245-246 and Kent, p. 208.

DB 1.11-12: "Saith Darius the king: By the favor of Ahura Mazda I am king; Ahura Mazda bestowed the kingdom upon me." DB 1.25: "... Ahura Mazda bore me aid..." Kent, p. 119.

Widengren, pp. 246-247. On the radiant countenance of the king, see Plut. Vita Alex. 30.3. This radiance is also mentioned by Aeschylus, though attributed to the queen.

' αλλ' ὸδε θεών ζωον οφθαλμοις φῶς ορμᾶται μήτερ βασιλέως (150-151)

Widengren, p. 247.


Taylor, "The Proskynesis and the Hellenistic Ruler Cult," p. 56; for examples of the nimbus see Olmstead, pl. XVI.
I speak here of his distortion of Darius' deeds, which I discussed in Chapter II, and of his fore-shortening of events to have Xerxes arrive at Susa on the heels of his messenger.

Gow, p. 138.

Cf. Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus, 1518-1555.

Podlecki, Persians, p. 78, mentions but does not develop this idea.

Broadhead, p. 69, note on 157.

Cf. Podlecki, Persians, p. 43.


Cf. Herodotus VII.8a-10g on Xerxes and his counsellors and Widengren, pp. 244-245 and p. 255 point 4, provides other references.

Kent, p. 192 and p. 119, DB I.34; "...The lie waxed great in the country."

On Cambyses, see Herodotus II.1; III.1-16, 19-26; on Darius, Herodotus IV.83-98, 118-143.

Cook, Zeus, vol. II, pp. 1123-1134, discusses what he considers to be symbols of the divinity of early Greek kings, in particular the symbolic divinity of the eagle topped sceptre. Compare the Egyptian vulture and the winged nimbus
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