

## AESCHYLUS, PERS. 13

ἀμφὶ δὲ νόστῳ τῷ βασιλείῳ  
καὶ πολυχρύσου στρατιάς ἤδη  
10 κακόμαντις ἄγαν ὀρσολοπεῖται  
θυμὸς ἔσωθεν·  
πᾶσα γὰρ ἰσχὺς Ἀσιατογενῆς  
οἴχῳκε, νέον δ' ἄνδρα βαύζει, . . . (Pers. 8–13)  
*But concerning the return of our king  
And of the army, gleaming with gold,  
My soul within, prophesying evil,  
is excessively agitated;  
for the entire strength born of Asia has gone away,  
and it growls that the man is young<sup>1</sup>.*

---

1) I list here treatments of this line that will figure in my discussion. I will hereafter refer to all of these by author's last name. G. Bartolini, *Ad Aesch. Pers.* 13, PP 23 (1968) 416–18; L. Belloni, ed. and comm., *Eschilo: I Persiani* (Milan 1988); H. D. Broadhead, ed. and comm., *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1960); G. Burzacchini, *Note sui Persiani di Eschilo*, *Dioniso* 51 (1980) 133–155; A. J. Carnoy, *Some Cruces of Aeschylus' Persae*, *CR* 31 (1917) 113–17; D. J. Conacher, *Aeschylus' Persae: a Literary Commentary*, in: *Serta Turyniana* (Urbana 1974); R. D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of the Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1964); C. Franco, *Aesch. Pers. 13*, *Dioniso* 56 (1986) 43–46; P. Groeneboom, ed. and comm., *Aischylos' Perser*, trans. by H. Sönnichsen (Göttingen 1960); W. Headlam, *Upon Aeschylus, I*, *CR* 14 (1900) 107; O. Könncke, *Zu Aischylos*, *BPhW* 35 (1915) 1637–40; D. Korzeniewski, *Studien zu den Persern des Aischylos, I*, *Helikon* 6 (1966) 558–61; P. Mazon, *Sur deux passages d'Eschyle et sur une formule d'Homère*, *REG* 63 (1950) 11–13; K. Münscher, *Zu den Persern des Aischylos*, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 43–62; G. Murray, ed., *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Oxford 1955); G. Paduano, *Sui Persiani di Eschilo* (Rome 1978); D. L. Page, ed., *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Oxford 1972); F. A. Paley, ed. and comm., *The Tragedies of Aeschylus* (London 1861); J. de Romilly, ed. and comm., *Eschyle: Les Perses* (Paris 1974); H. J. Rose, *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus* (Amsterdam 1957); L. Roussell, *Eschyle: Les Perses* (Montpellier 1960); J. T. Sheppard, *Notes on Aeschylus' Persae*, *CR* 29 (1915) 33–35; A. Sidgwick, comm., *Aeschylus: Persae* (Oxford 1903); H. W. Smyth, ed. and trans., *Aeschylus I* (Cambridge, Mass. 1922); W. S. Teuffel, ed. and comm., *Aeschylus: Perser*, Dritte Auflage bearbeitet von N. Wecklein, (Leipzig 1886); M. L. West, ed., *Aeschylus: Tragoediae* (Stuttgart 1990); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, ed., *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Berlin 1914).

My text is Belloni's and (but for πολυχρύσου) West's. My translation, offered solely for the purpose of illustrating my interpretation, follows Könncke; Rose – but he is unsure of the subject of βαύζει, and later (p. 161) claims to agree with those who treat the passage quite differently; Sidgwick; Smyth; and Wilamowitz – but he expresses dissatisfaction in his app. crit. Both Könncke and Rose (as well as

The greatest difficulty in line 13 is the sense of the verb βαύζει, but equally troublesome are two closely related matters, the identification of the subject of βαύζει and the interpretation of its object. These three strands of the interpretative problem have been duly isolated and subjected to a seemingly exhaustive battery of philological examinations, but the result has been less than satisfying. I here return to a view of this line that has been much maligned and generally discarded, in the hopes that I might offer new arguments in its defense.

As both my punctuation and translation of the text indicate, I take πᾶσα ἰσχύς Ἀσιατογενῆς, the entire strength born of Asia, as the subject of βαύζει. Other candidates include θυμός (11) and Ἀσία derived from Ἀσιατογενῆς<sup>2</sup>). The latter is the least grammatically feasible, as Groeneboom and others have shown<sup>3</sup>). If we choose θυμός as subject, then we must either take πᾶσα . . . οἴχωνε parenthetically (as is often done) or coordinate the two clauses in lines 12–13 as dual explanations of the anxiety of the Chorus<sup>4</sup>). Broadhead rightly calls these expedients “awkward”, but they are not impossible<sup>5</sup>).

Clearly, however, the choice that is the most natural grammatically is ἰσχύς, the nominative noun that is closest to the verb<sup>6</sup>). Thus, if we are to reject it as subject, taking in its place a nominative that is further afield, then we must find that its combination

---

Groeneboom) suggest that νέον ἄνδρα is a direct quotation, the words that are actually muttered. I see this as a variation on my position, and one that is not without its merits.

2) Page and Dawe (170–71) suggest that the subject has been lost in a lacuna following line 13. Others – such as Roussel and Teuffel – print νύος for νέον and take that as the subject. For my objections to these views, see below.

3) Groeneboom reminds us of the grammatical difficulties in extracting a noun from a compound adjective and pressing it into service – unaided by restatement, pronominal or otherwise – as the subject of the following clause. The need for such gymnastics is particularly unlikely when we do have good nominatives in the vicinity. For those who have taken Ἀσία as the subject, see Groeneboom, and Burzacchini 144–45.

4) Those who choose θυμός include Bartolini, Belloni, Burzacchini, Carnoy, Conacher, Groeneboom, Mazon, de Romilly, Sheppard, and two scholiasts.

5) Broadhead 250. As Burzacchini argues, γὰρ suggests that the clause is explanatory of what precedes, so more easily taken as parenthetical. Some, e.g. Sheppard and Belloni, argue in favor of θυμός that we do find, in Aeschylus and elsewhere, the soul engaged in something like the muttering implied by βαύζει. These are good arguments, but not, I think, so good that they overrule the evidence in the order of the words.

6) Supporters of ἰσχύς as subject include Broadhead, Könnecke, Korzeniewski (559), Münscher, Murray, Sidgwick, Smyth, and Wilamowitz.

with the verb creates a significant breach of good sense. And many claim to have found just that. The Chorus, it is argued, cannot be referring here to the attitude of the army since, as the Elders say in the line that follows immediately, they have no news from the front<sup>7</sup>).

But that response would place the strictures of prosaic reality onto a work of poetic fiction. Of course, the Elders have no idea what the troops are saying about Xerxes, but no more can they know, in lines 584–97, how the entirety of Asia is responding to the defeat of the armament. It is said in defense of that latter passage, and rightly I think, that the present tense verbs are “prophetic” in force<sup>8</sup>). A similar conclusion is even more readily applicable to our passage. Just before line 13, the Persian Elders have told us that their collective *θυμός* is functioning prophetically, *καχόμεαντις* (line 10). We can compare also Clytemnestra’s famous, and famously ill-founded, report about the fall of Troy (Ag. 320–350), the speech about which Wilamowitz asked “was weiss denn Klytaimnestra von dem, was sie erzählt?”<sup>9</sup>) At the very least, these parallels suggest that Aeschylus does not appear unwilling to attribute to his characters information that they cannot possibly possess; and that, therefore, he would not seem to be constitutionally averse to letting the Persian Elders comment on the attitude of the distant troops. More importantly, these passages and the complaints against them illustrate the dangers of an overly prosaic critical approach, an approach that would deprive these dramas of the prophetic commentary of the Persian Elders and the near-divine perspicacity of Clytemnestra<sup>10</sup>).

When we turn to consider the object of *βαύζει*, we confront questions both textual and semantic. In addition to what I have printed above, the manuscripts give us *οἴχωνκεν ἔδον*<sup>11</sup>). Also, emen-

7) Cf. Groeneboom, and Burzacchini 146: “Coro . . . che subito dopo lamenta la totale mancanza di notizie (vv. 14 s.), non può certo essere informato d’alcuno stato d’animo dei soldati.”

8) E.g. by Broadhead.

9) U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aischylos. Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914) 168. For other discussions of the passage, see, e.g., E. Fraenkel, ed. and comm., *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950) ad loc., and R. D. Dawe, *Inconsistency of Plot and Character in Aeschylus*, PCPS 189 (1963) 50.

10) Cf. the comment of O. Taplin, *Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus*, HSCP 76 (1972) 92: “Aeschylus has built up a picture of Clytemnestra as supremely competent and almost omniscient.”

11) Noted with approval by Dawe (170–71) and printed by Page. We also find *ὄχηκεν ἔδον*.

dations have been plentiful, as the repertories attest<sup>12</sup>), but none more influential than Fritzsche's οἴχωνε νυδός, printed by Teuffel and Roussell. One argument against both this conjecture and the manuscript variant is that neither ἐὸν nor νυδός appears elsewhere in Greek tragedy<sup>13</sup>). More troublesome still is that if we accept ἐὸν, then we are forced to conclude that the subject of βαύζει, something like Page's *mulier desiderans*, has been lost in a lacuna after line 13<sup>14</sup>). Finally, either of these readings requires that the verb βαύζει describe the behavior of a woman who laments the absence of her husband. That, as we will see, is highly improbable.

What, then, does our preferred reading mean? I have followed the majority of critics in taking it as a reference to Xerxes, and in particular to his youth and inexperience as king<sup>15</sup>). Against this view it has been argued first that ἄνδρα by itself is too indefinite to refer appropriately to Xerxes, especially since he has just been identified in such effusive detail (lines 5–6)<sup>16</sup>); and second, that the connotations of the phrase are negative<sup>17</sup>), and cannot, therefore, refer to Xerxes since criticism of the king is inappropriate at this point in the play<sup>18</sup>). Sheppard, however, points out that the alternating rhythm in the opening lines of the play, between army and king, leads us to expect a reference to Xerxes in line 13, and therefore goes a long way toward defining the indefinite ἄνδρα<sup>19</sup>). And I hope to demonstrate, in my discussion of βαύζει, that there is noth-

12) N. Wecklein, *Aeschyli Fabulae*, pars II (Berlin 1885); R. D. Dawe, *Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus* (Leiden 1965); and M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990) 381.

13) As Franco points out (44–45). See also J. D. Denniston, ed., and comm. *Euripides: Electra* (Oxford 1939) ad 1206 (cited by Dawe). Dawe's note (170) collects such marginal support for ἐὸν in tragedy that it fails to convince.

14) As Page and Dawe do, following Schütz. Dawe 170 defends the lacuna by claiming that even if we print the text as I do we can make sense of the passage only by positing a lacuna. That, I will demonstrate, is not so.

15) This group includes Belloni, Broadhead, Carnoy, Conacher, Franco, Groeneboom, Headlam, Könnecke, Korzeniewski, Murray, Podlecki, Rose, Sheppard, Sidgwick, Smyth, and Wilamowitz.

16) See Burzacchini 147–8; Dawe 171; and Mazon 13.

17) Of course, those who argue against the hostile connotation of the verb find nothing critical in νέον ἄνδρα. See, e.g., Belloni, Broadhead, Franco, Korzeniewski, and Murray.

18) Burzacchini 147. Mazon does not state this assumption, but de Romilly, in defense of Mazon, does.

19) Sheppard 34. Often played as a trump card in defense of our interpretation are the references, later in the play, to Xerxes as νέος (744, 782). While I do not deny that those lines serve as useful confirmations of our conclusion, I hesitate to treat the dramatic text as synchronically experienced.

ing inappropriate in a critical reference to Xerxes, even this early in the play.

Furthermore, the proposed alternatives to identifying Xerxes as the νέον ἄνδρα are themselves unacceptable. Mazon argues that the phrase means “un homme nouveau (pour moi), un inconnu”<sup>20</sup>), but he derives that rather from his Homeric parallel than from the text of Aeschylus, where it would intrude illogically<sup>21</sup>). Burzacchini suggests that νέον ἄνδρα refers more generally to “la valorosa gioventù partita per la guerra”<sup>22</sup>), but the parallels intended to support this view suggest, in fact, that νέον ἄνδρα is generic only to the extent that it applies the qualities of the group, young men, to the behavior of that specific individual who is foremost in our thoughts, in this case Xerxes.

The verb itself, βαύζει, is the single most controversial word in this line, its rarity inviting a variety of often conflicting interpretations. It is, most basically, an onomatopoetic representation of the sound of barking, βαὺ βαὺ<sup>23</sup>), and as such it is used, but less frequently than ὑλακτεῖν, of dogs. Plutarch preserves Heraclitus’ insight: κύνες γὰρ καὶ βαύζουσιν ὃν ἂν μὴ γινώσκωσι<sup>24</sup>). Theocritus has Polyphemus’ dog, pelted by apples, respond in this way: ἃ δὲ βαύσδει εἰς ἄλλα δερκομένα<sup>25</sup>). And Lucian uses our verb to describe the behavior of a puppy carried grudgingly inside a cloak: κυνίδιον . . . βαύζον λεπτή τῇ φωνῇ<sup>26</sup>). These passages are too few to delineate with much precision a semantic field for the word, but it is worth noting that in the first two of these three examples, βαύζειν clearly conveys a sense of hostility<sup>27</sup>).

The verb is also used, by extension, of people. While again the instances are few, perhaps too few to draw persuasive conclusions, we can detect in most of these usages a note of criticism or hostility. Aristophanes uses it twice, at *Thes.* 173 and 895, both

20) Mazon 12, and de Romilly.

21) Groeneboom simply rejects Mazon’s suggestion, on the grounds that it gives “die höchst unwahrscheinliche Erklärung”.

22) Burzacchini 148.

23) Cf. Herodian, in: A. Lentz, ed., *Grammatici Graeci* (Leipzig 1867) 3. 1. 495.

24) Heraclitus 97 (Diels) = Plutarch *Moralia* 787C. If we accept this reading of the text – and there are variants – this passage also parallels the transitive use of βαύζειν.

25) Theocritus 6. 10–11.

26) Lucian, *Merc. Cond.* 34 (p. 231, 28–31 Macleod).

27) For comments on the hostility in the Heraclitus, see Mazon 12. In Lucian, the yelps of the puppy hardly seem hostile; as it barks, it licks the gravy saturated beard of its caretaker.

times to characterize verbal abuse<sup>28</sup>). Athenaeus uses βαύζειν similarly, coordinating it with a more familiar word for wild or subhuman hostility, ἀργιαινεῖν<sup>29</sup>). In the Greek Anthology, a woman is addressed by the lover who has just left her for another: τοιγὰρ νῦν σὺ μὲν ὄδε μέγα κλαίουσα βαύξεις<sup>30</sup>). The scorned woman not only laments her loss, but barks at the new situation, her former lover in the lap of Naias<sup>31</sup>). Closer to home, Aeschylus uses βαύζειν at Ag. 449 for the utterances of the Argives against their king, who brings death and suffering on his people for the sake of another man's wife. Critics and translators are all but universal in their agreement that here, too, we have the suggestion of hostility<sup>32</sup>).

Thus, when we arrive at the consideration of βαύζει in our passage, we bring with us the presupposition that the word most often connotes hostility<sup>33</sup>). And many critics – offering translations like “mutters against”, or “growls at”, or “murrer verächtlich”<sup>34</sup>) – find exactly that at Pers. 13<sup>35</sup>).

To many, however, that conclusion is unacceptable because, it is argued, the expression of any hostility against Xerxes, at least at this point in the play, “widerspricht dem Sinn und Aufbau des

28) Thes. 173: παῦσαι βαύζων, in response to a rude question; Thes. 895: βαύζει τοῦμὸν σῶμα βάλλουσα ψόγω. J. Taillardet concludes from these two passages that “βαύζειν emporte l'idée d'hostilité” (Les images d'Aristophane [Paris 1962] 276). For another comic usage, see Cratinus 6 K-A, where it seems to refer not to outright hostility, but to an unpleasant sound.

29) Athenaeus, 3.56: ἀλλὰ μὴ βάύζει, εἶπεν, ὦ ἑταῖρε, μηδὲ ἀργιαινοῦ τὴν κυνικὴν προβαλλόμενος λύσσαν ...

30) A. G. 5. 107. 7.

31) And βαύζειν is particularly well chosen to describe the response of this scorned lover. Line 2 – καὶ πάλι γινώσκω τὸν με δακόντα δακεῖν – suggests that it was her aggressively doglike behavior that first got her into trouble.

32) Cf. the scholiast: βοᾷ μετὰ ὀργῆς, δίκην κυνός. Even Burzacchini, who argues against hostility in βαύζει at Pers. 13, recognizes (n.38) that force of the word at Ag. 449. Dissenting without argument, and doing so in order to plead that βαύζει does not connote hostility at Pers. 13, is Dawe 171. One other instance of βαύζειν less clearly conveys hostility, but does not militate against this conclusion. Lycophron (whose diction should hardly serve as a model in any event) has Cassandra lament her unheeded words: τί μακρὰ τλήμων εἰς ἀνηκόως πέτρας ... βαύζω ... (Lycophron, Alex. 1451–53). Cassandra seems to mean that she has been shouting her prophecies, perhaps shrilly and certainly against the wishes of those within earshot.

33) Mazon 12 argues that “le verbe implique toujours une idée d'hostilité”.

34) Conacher 149; Headlam; and Groeneboom, respectively.

35) Others who see the hostility here include Kōnnecke, with “ruft scheltend”; Rose, who calls it “the vox propria for growling or muttering what one dares not say aloud”; Sidgwick and Carnoy, who have “grumble against”; and Wilamowitz, who would prefer to find the sense *sequitur*, but translates with *muttit*.

Dramas<sup>36</sup>). In at least two instances, this desire to avoid hostility, combined with a recognition of the typically hostile sense of the verb, has prompted emendation of the verb<sup>37</sup>). More often, it is not the text but the meaning of the verb that is assailed. Those who would expunge hostility from this line have offered three alternatives, two of them appearing first in scholia: βαύξει is glossed by θρηνεῖ<sup>38</sup>) and by ἀνακαλεῖται<sup>39</sup>), and Murray, supported by Broadhead, has suggested *circumlatrat, ut canes venatorem*<sup>40</sup>).

For none of these suggested translations, however, are persuasive parallels adduced<sup>41</sup>). We find instead that the evidence for the normal semantic range of the verb is often eclipsed by the overriding desire to avoid any expression of hostility toward Xerxes<sup>42</sup>). Clearly, in this case, the burden of proof lies with those who would gainsay the parallels, and their task is to convince us that, despite our predilection to incorporate hostility into our rendering of βαύξει, no such hostility can possibly appear here. Such a demonstration is complicated by the willingness of all to admit that, later in the play, the Chorus does recognize the responsibility of Xerxes for the debacle at Salamis, and that the Elders do hold

---

36) Korzeniewski 558–559. Others in that camp include Bartolini, Broadhead, Burzacchini, Dawe, Münscher, Murray, Paduano, Page, and de Romilly.

37) Münscher, arguing that praise and glorification is wanted here, instead of blame and criticism, proposed ἀγλαεῖ, a conjecture that has escaped the vigilance of Dawe, *Repertory* (op. cit.) 44, and now West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (op. cit.) 381. Bartolini, cited by West, proposes more thorough emendation. Rather than arguing against the likelihood of either of these, I hope to demonstrate the flaw in the motivating premise.

38) Cited with approval by Dawe, Page, and Roussell. Dawe 170 suggests that we might more readily attribute to this verb a sense of lamentation, since elsewhere in *Persians* we find “such an unflattering description of Persian mourning habits” (as at 939, 636). But that sort of view has been laid to rest, let us hope, alongside the claims that *Persians* is a piece of patriotic propaganda, swelling Athenian pride as it belittles the defeated Persians. See, e.g., H. D. F. Kitto, *Poiesis* (Berkeley 1966) 33–115.

39) Accepted by Paley, and Burzacchini 149.

40) Murray; Broadhead 250. See also Korzeniewski 560. Wilamowitz seems to approach this sense when he suggests *sequitur* in his apparatus.

41) Support is often sought in the semantic range of words from other languages, most frequently Latin. Burzacchini, for example, discusses *latrare* at length (149), but nowhere mentions one of our few usages of βαύζειν, the fragment from Heraclitus. In fact, the best support for these proposed meanings might lie in an adjectival form of our word, δυσβαύκτων, a hapax at Pers. 574 (cited by Burzacchini 149), that seems to have something of lamentation in it.

42) Or the evidence of the parallels is simply ignored, as by Broadhead, egregiously, when he remarks that “dogs bark for a variety of reasons” (250).

him accountable for it then<sup>43</sup>). Hence, the most that can be said is that within this Parodos the Chorus of Persian Elders displays a respect, and even reverence for their king that would preclude the expression of any criticism against him, whether originating in their own θυμός or in their imagined perception of the army.

On the other hand, those of us who would retain the better attested sense of the verb face the less daunting prospect of adding contextual possibility to the semantic probability. And, in fact, the presence of hostility in line 13 seems not only possible, but, particularly in light of Aeschylean dramatic technique, it is preferable. Aeschylus is well-known for his thematic foreshadowing; he introduces his themes, in other words, obliquely or allusively, and subsequently develops them more explicitly<sup>44</sup>). We have learned from our observation of this technique that patience often elucidates Aeschylean obscurities more clearly than emendation or special pleading.

Such is certainly the case with *Persians*. Already in the first 11 lines we have seen the Persian Elders move from the dignity of their self-introduction, and their confident references to the might and stature of the king and his armament, to a reflection on their state of anxiety and inner turmoil<sup>45</sup>). This is only the first of several such shifts<sup>46</sup>). While the Elders never, in the course of the play, lose sight of the fact that Xerxes is their king, to whom their allegiance is due, they do recognize that Xerxes is to blame for the Persian suffering, and they are acutely aware of the extent of that suffering. Hence, in one stanza, they can emphasize the personal responsibility of Xerxes for the suffering of Persia (550–554), and in the next refer to him as ἀναξ αὐτός (565, cf. line 5), as they describe his own narrow escape. In the concluding *kommos*, they blame Xerxes himself for the Persian casualties (919–930), yet, in a

43) As at 550–57 and 422–30.

44) See, e.g., A. Lebeck, *The Oresteia* (Washington 1971), and J. I. Porter, *Patterns of Perception in Aeschylus*, in: *Cabinet of the Muses*, edd. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastrorarde (Atlanta 1990).

45) The shift in tone and content is underlined by δὲ, line 8, responding to the μὲν of the opening line.

46) As at 59–64, 94–105 (those stanzas so often maligned for the abruptness of their intrusion, stanzas that should stay where the manuscripts have them), 133–9, and 584–90.

F. Stoessl, *Aeschylus as a Political Thinker*, *AJP* 73 (1952) 118, is so taken by the shifting tone throughout the Parodos that he divides the Persian Elders into two half-choruses, one that represents “the martial, confident party”, while the other is “fearful and pacific”.

show of solidarity, join him in the lament for those dead (1030 ff.). I do not, then, deny that the juxtaposition of reverence toward the king and criticism of his behavior creates a “dissonanza concettuale”<sup>47</sup>), but suggest rather that the dissonance, far from being “intollerabile”, serves as a preview of similarly complex choral utterances throughout the play<sup>48</sup>).

Finally, we do find elsewhere in the Aeschylean corpus, in the Chorus of *Agamemnon*, a striking parallel to the interpretation I have been suggesting. While there can be no doubt that the Argive Elders are loyal to their king, and that they treat him with appropriate reverence, their praise and respect, like that of the Persian Elders, is regularly interspersed with undertones of complaint or dissatisfaction. In the Parodos, for example, the Argive Elders almost simultaneously attribute the expedition both to the will of Zeus and to the promiscuity of a woman (60–62)<sup>49</sup>). While the ambivalence suggested by that passage is hardly oversubtle, later in the play the Argive Elders do confess explicitly that they had their doubts about an expedition fought for Helen (799–804). Thus, we find in *Agamemnon* not only a Chorus of Elders whose loyalty for their king is tinged with criticism, but also an oblique expression of that ambivalence, the loyal support juxtaposed with the hints of disaffection, in the early lines of the Parodos. In both plays, these juxtapositions create moral and thematic complexities that, perhaps, test the bounds of the prosaically logical. Yet to deny them does an injustice both to the texts themselves, and, more importantly, to our conception of Aeschylus’ dramatic capabilities<sup>50</sup>).

Columbia

David Schenker

---

47) It is Burzacchini 147, who calls this dissonance “intollerabile”.

48) While this is not the place to discuss the thematic significance of that complexity in choral attitude, I agree for the most part with A. F. Garvie that the role of the Chorus in *Persians* is to present “the tragedy of Persia as a whole”, while the Queen offers a contrasting concentration on Xerxes himself. Aeschylus’ Simple Plots, in: *Dionysiaca*, ed. R. D. Dawe, et al. (Cambridge 1978) 68.

49) For a full discussion of the duality in the choral attitude toward Agamemnon, see D. J. Schenker, *The Character of the Aeschylean Chorus* (diss. Berkeley 1989) 21–167.

50) My thanks to the University of Missouri Research Council for financial support that expedited this work.