

# THE HERITAGE OF WESTERN GREECE

Series Editors

Heather L. Reid, *Morningside College*

Davide Tanasi, *University of South Florida*

The cultural and intellectual heritage of Western Greece—the coastal areas of Southern Italy and Sicily settled by Hellenes in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE—is sometimes overlooked in academic studies. Yet evidence suggests that poets, playwrights, philosophers, and other maverick intellectuals found fertile ground here for the growth of their ideas and the harvesting of their work. The goal of this series is to explore the distinctive heritage of Western Greece from a variety of disciplinary perspectives including art history, archaeology, classical literature, drama, epigraphy, history, philosophy, and religion.

# Philosopher Kings and Tragic Heroes

## Essays on Images and Ideas from Western Greece

edited by  
Heather L. Reid  
Davide Tanasi

Parnassos Press  
2016

## Shaping Audience Perspectives through Deictic Patterns: Aeschylus's *Persae*

### Introduction

In Aeschylus's *Persae* historical irony and dramatic irony reverberate in multiple and shifting ways, enacting a brilliantly vertiginous fusion of historical and dramatic event. To explain the play's achievement of these effects we have organized our observations along two major axes: first, the specific logic and workings of two types of deictics within the play – pointing language that situates audiences and orients or shapes their sympathies (at least while they are at the theater); and, relatedly, the ways in which the play problematizes its own interpretation by dislocating and relocating, and by enacting, and indeed interrogating, history-as-event.

In 458 BCE, fourteen years after the premiere of the *Persae*, Aeschylus presented the *Oresteia* at the Theater of Dionysus in Athens. In *Agamemnon*, Clytemnestra and the other characters visualize the fall of Troy as “over there” and news of its fall moves from Troy to Argos. Thus the palace in Argos is the center of the here-and-now; all speakers are either already in the palace or arriving there from Troy. The beacons that signal the fall of Troy move, as well, along the peaks of mountains, creating a pathway from Troy to Argos suggestive of the homeward journey of those who went to Troy.

At a likely first performance of the *Persae* at the same theater in 472, as part of a prize-winning tetralogy of apparently thematically unrelated plays, Aeschylus introduces a dramatic strategy that he may have adapted from Phrynichus's *Phoenissae*: like his predecessor, he sets all the action not in Greece and specifically not in Athens but at or near the Persian court.<sup>2</sup> As Gruen and others note, Aeschylus makes all his characters Persian: in the course of the play no individual Greek is even named.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, news of their defeat travels in a direction opposite from that of *Agamemnon*, namely eastward, from Greece to Persia, first via a messenger who portrays himself as an eye-witness of the momentous battle of Salamis, “over

there," and later by King Xerxes himself, when he returns unaccompanied and in rags (γυμνός...προπομπῶν, 1036) and tells his abbreviated version of the same event in response to the Chorus' interrogation (966ff).

Later in the paper we will consider the pragmatics of a likely/probable second performance of the *Persae* in Syracuse. Important recent scholarship presents persuasive (if not iron-clad) evidence for its being staged there.<sup>4</sup> How would an ancient audience in Hieron's theater have experienced the locations, dislocations, and transports that structure the play? Would the ancient association of the Sicilian victory over Carthage in the battle of Himera with the Athenian victory at Salamis, as reported by Herodotus (7.165-167) and adverted to by Pindar in *Pythian* 1, have allowed for a *metaphorical* equation of these battles?

Aeschylus transports his first audience from Athens to Susa and gives them a Persian insider's perspective on the battle at Salamis – insofar as they can identify with the chorus of Persian elders, the Persian Queen Atossa, and even the ghost of Darius as he receives second-hand news of the disaster. The deictics indicate what is present here and now and what is at a distance. The term 'deixis' refers to the linguistic role of situating a referent or action in time and space.<sup>5</sup> The deixis-bearing parts of speech are pronouns, adverbs, and verbs. Pronominal deixis is often associated with the three persons of conversational discourse: first person (proximal deixis), third person (distal deixis), and second person (intermediate deixis). Deixis is opposed to anaphora (the function of reactivating a prior referent) and cataphora (the function of invoking a subsequent referent). All types of deixis presuppose some fixed point or *origo*, the deictic center, which serves as the locus of deictic perspective. The *origo* is where the I, here, and now all intersect. Playwrights and poets manipulate deictic systems to transport audiences vicariously across space and time.

Bühler's breakthrough (1938) was to distinguish ocular deixis (what he calls "*demonstratio ad oculos*") from imaginative deixis ("*deixis am Phantasma*").<sup>6</sup> Most of the deictics we discuss – in the *parodos* and the messenger's speech and the lamentation – are of the second type. Analyzing them helps us to trace what we surmise

would be the experience first of an Athenian audience in 472 and then of subsequent audiences, including those at a probable re-performance in Syracuse. Through this displacement and vicarious transport, what was proximal to the Athenians becomes distal, and what was distal, proximal. In the messenger's speech and in Xerxes's brief recapitulation of the battle the playwright couples deictics with geographical detail to produce specific poetic effects. Our findings support interpretations of the play that find a high degree of audience identification with the defeated Persian foe, an enhanced capacity to empathize with them that counterbalances any tendency to exoticize, 'orientalize', or even demonize, them.<sup>7</sup>

### Parodos (1-154)

As they enter, the first-person choral speakers introduce themselves as "we who are here before you are the famous Faithful" (in Svenbro's translation). With the deictic *τάδε*, modifying *πιστὰ* – the very first word of the play – they situate themselves and the action of the play in the Persian court at Susa,<sup>8</sup> where Queen Atossa will soon arrive by chariot.<sup>9</sup> The entire *parodos* sustains this placement of the deictic center or *origo* at the Persian court, and the Chorus, using several types of deictics, removes audiences from their literal, historical location and transports them imaginatively to that court. Such vicarious transport is irresistible: the linguistic force of deixis overrides any ideological resistance, though once the transport is achieved, the playwright complicates the audience's perspective by other techniques, as we shall see.<sup>10</sup> Thus, it is useful to set forth and take into consideration the impact of the relocation at Susa on our reading of the play.

Of the Persians, who have *departed*  
for the land of Greece, we are called the Trusted,  
the guardians of the wealthy palace rich in gold,  
whom our lord himself, King Xerxes  
son of Darius, chose by seniority  
to supervise the country.  
But by now the spirit within me,  
all too ready to foresee evil, is troubled  
*about the return of the King*  
and of his vast army of men;

for all the strength of the Asiatic race  
*has departed*, and <in every house  
*the woman left behind*> howls for her young husband;  
 and no messenger, no horseman,  
*has come to the Persian capital.*  
*They left* the walls of Susa and Agbatana  
 and the ancient ramparts of Cissia  
*and went*, some on horseback,  
 some on board ship, and the marching infantry  
 providing the fighting masses. *Persae* 1-21<sup>11</sup>

Alongside their self-reference as *Τάδε...πιστά*," the Chorus repeatedly uses verbs of motion outward from their *origo* at Susa in the direction of Greece, as in lines 1 and 2 (*Περσῶν τῶν οἰχομένων* / *Ἑλλάδ' ἐς αἶαν*," with the Persians who have departed for the land of Greece"), and in line 13 (*οἰχωκε*, "the strength ... has departed). Verbs of leaving, such as "they left the walls and went" (18: *προλιπόντες ἔβαν*), reinforce the *origo* at Susa: they designate the Chorus as those who have stayed, those left behind. In addition, the Chorus repeatedly uses the lexically deictic noun *nostos* to refer to the anticipated and yearned for *return* to Persia of the military forces and of Xerxes, as in 8-11, and they describe wives and mothers yearning for a young husband or a son, even howling (13: *βαῦζει*), another example of emotions oriented in the direction of Greece.

In the catalogue that follows, the Chorus presents their march as if this is the very moment of departure (cf. *Iliad*, Book 2). As M. Hopman remarks, "the Chorus' action in the parodos ... symbolically reenacts the march of Xerxes's army (16-64)."<sup>12</sup> The Elders dramatize their account with the use of visualizing and emotional phrases, such as "fearsome to behold" (27: *φοβεροὶ... ἰδεῖν*) and "terrifying to combat" (27: *δεινοὶ... μάχην*) and, with the exception of *ἔπεμψεν* (34), they use the present tense for nearly all verbs of motion: *σοῦνται* (25); *ἔπεται* (41, 57); *κατέχουσιν* (43); *ἔξορμῶσιν* (46), *στεῦνται* (49), *πέμπει* (54).<sup>13</sup> Their internal audience is made to feel present as the men set out, "eager to impose the yoke of slavery on Greece" (49). We will find a corresponding march in the opposite direction in the messenger's account of the return (480-514) of "not many" of the army to their home (510) and in the final procession to the palace of Xerxes and the Chorus, in lamentation.

As the Chorus concludes its account of the departure, we find the same directional verb, οἴχεται (60) and the same notion that those left behind yearn for the return of the departed. This combination brings about a westward orientation of the Chorus in the direction of Greece:

Such is the flower of the men of Persia's land  
that has departed,  
for whom the whole land of Asia,  
which reared them, sighs with a longing that burns,  
and parents and wives count the days  
and tremble as the time stretches out. 59-64<sup>14</sup>

The longing of the Persian wives who have sent off their warrior husbands and been "left behind, a partner unpartnered" (μονόζυξ, 137) is also the theme of the choral ode at 126-37, which sustains the opposition between here and there. As Hopman astutely observes, the Chorus represents multiple perspectives on the events: She writes (67), "Through the seamless blending of various perspectives into a powerful song-and-dance performance, the multi-referential chorus complicates and challenges polar divisions between old and young, male and female, and Greek and Persian."<sup>15</sup>

### Deictic Patterns in the Messenger's speech (249-514)

From his appearance until his exit, the Persian messenger's account of the Battle of Salamis and its aftermath intermingles distal and proximal deixis. Initially, in considering his account an embedded narrative or *mise en abyme*, we assumed that he was relocating his internal audience of Atossa and the Chorus vicariously at Salamis, to eyewitness the battle, much as Aeschylus relocates his Athenian audience to Susa for the duration of the play. But careful study of the verb-forms and other features convinced us that, in the messenger's speeches, vicarious transport occurs only to a limited extent, and that proximal, here-and-now deictics, including present tense verbs and quoted speech, are mostly reserved for the *aftermath* of the battle.

The messenger recounts many details of the battle as a historical narrative, using the aorist and emphasizing the events he narrates.

His single instance of direct discourse (402-5: "Come on, sons of the Greeks, for the freedom of your homeland, for the freedom of your children, your wives, the temples of your fathers' gods, and the tombs of your ancestors! Now all is at stake!"<sup>16</sup>) highlights his presence at the event and allows those left behind to *overhear* the Greek commander exhort his fleet, but not necessarily to relocate with the narrator at the site of the Battle as it is taking place. Despite the proximal deictics in the commander's exhortation of his men and despite the use of imperfects, which, as Egbert Bakker shows, reinforce the sense of the speaker as an eyewitness,<sup>17</sup> the battle description falls short of vicarious transport.<sup>18</sup>

The messenger does present the current state of the fallen Persian and allied leaders with sufficient vividness for Atossa and the Chorus to visualize their compatriots' battered corpses, as if they were present with the messenger at this later point. Only in his description of the fallen do his listeners relocate vicariously to Salamis, and this is after the defeat. Atossa and the Elders were already oriented toward Greece from the time of the men's departure. Now, in preparation for the formal lament, they gain more information, more insight and indeed imaginative *access* to events that have recently occurred "over there" – in the geographical region around the Bay of Salamis, where the corpses remain, left behind by Xerxes.

The poetic effect of this vicarious experience is to produce lamentation on the part of the internal Persian audience. In narratological terms, the Persian longing for the return of their men is attenuated until the appearance of the messenger bearing (bad) news and of a (tattered and defeated) Xerxes, who then unites his people, represented by the (erstwhile critical) Elders, in collective mourning.

The establishment (and frequent reinforcement) of the *origo* at Susa emphasizes a marked geographical distance between the Persian court and Salamis, where the Persian and Greek forces engage. The Chorus' perspective on events, in this sense, appears equidistant from both sides in the conflict. This is reflected in their gnomic meditations, which speak to the common condition of Persians and Greeks:



But what mortal man can escape  
the guileful deception of a god?  
Who is so light of foot  
that he has power to leap easily away?  
For Ruin begins by fawning on a man in a friendly way  
and leads him astray into her net,  
from which it is impossible for a mortal to escape and flee. 93-100<sup>19</sup>

The Chorus' universalizing musings co-exist with their particular, local fears on behalf of the flower of Persian youth, whom they describe in the diction of *anthos* and *pothos*, terms that could equally apply to the Greeks, reminiscent as they are of Iliadic similes of the Achaean army and of early elegiac exhortation.<sup>20</sup> As in Callinus and Tyrtaeus,<sup>21</sup> the Chorus captures the intense longing of parents and wives for their men away at war:

And beds are filled with tears  
because the men are missed and longed for:  
Persian women, grieving amid their luxury, every one,  
loving and longing for her husband,  
having sent on his way the bold warrior who was her bedfellow,  
is left behind, a partner unpartnered. 132-37<sup>22</sup>

There is throughout the play a striking and diagnostic toggling between what we might call the characterization of Persians-as-Persians on the one hand, and, on the other, of Persians-as-mortals like everyone else, as generic humans. The play offers at the very least a kind of double-consciousness, as the chorus and Atossa move between these domains – one is the socio-cultural-political (Persians vs. Greeks) and the other anthropological, viewing humans *qua* humans.

Atossa reports her dream: a kind of primal vision, in which the Greek and the Persian are actually two sisters of one *genos*, between whom a *stasis* has arisen. She envisions their original unity by undoing the difference between 'there' and 'here' – between the territory of the Greeks and the home of the Persians. Their separation from each other is imagined as purely contingent, fortuitous.

There seemed to come into my sight two finely dressed women, one arrayed in Persian, the other in Doric robes, outstandingly superior in stature to the women of real life, of flawless beauty, and sisters of the same stock: one, by the fall of the lot, was a native and inhabitant of the land of Greece, the other of the Orient. I seemed to see these two raising some kind of strife between themselves... 181-89<sup>23</sup>

This mobility of perspective prevents any straightforward essentializing of the Persian subject position: Helen Bacon offers an early, incisive criticism of the view that Aeschylus is trafficking in any simple "orientalizing" stereotyping:

There are, of course, many general, and somewhat more formulaic, references to foreign customs and manners in Aeschylus – particularly to the wealth, luxury, emotional violence, and lack of political freedom of Persians, Phrygians, and foreigners in general. Such references have sometimes been interpreted as implying that Aeschylus thought of foreigners as naturally "inferior" to Greeks. I... disagree... with this view... Aeschylus may criticize a foreigner or a foreign institution, but of inferiority as a natural characteristic of foreigners, nationally or individually, there is little talk in Aeschylus.<sup>24</sup>

More recently, Erich Gruen gives an eloquent refutation of the "orientalizing" interpretation of the play, in a book that responds to Edward Said's influential theories about self and other in the context of colonialization. Gruen writes (16):

Are we to infer Athenian swaggering, a chauvinistic bellicosity, reveling in the deserved distress of the defeated? The dolorous mourning of the Persians, to be sure, pervades the play. For some, the poet here calls attention to barbarian weakness of character, emasculating their males by having them lament like hysterical females. But that may miss the point. Greek men also mourned in Attic tragedy. Aeschylus went beyond patriotic caricature. Triumphalism hardly captures the tone of the tragedy. The poet refrains from proclaiming the success of Hellenic values over Persian practices... It would be absurd to imagine that Aeschylus, who had fought in the Athenian ranks, wept for Persia—or expected his audience to do so. This is no antiwar drama. Nor does it resolve itself into a humanitarian reflection on the universal suffering wrought by conflict among the nations. The play transcends an antithesis of Greek and barbarian, but stops short of dissolving distinction.<sup>25</sup>

While we appreciate Gruen's important refinement of readings of the play as either a "triumphalist" or an "anti-war" drama, we would argue that the *Persae* does create for its audiences a possible space for reflections on universal suffering, precisely through its perspectivalism. In our view (as we suggest further below), it creates and sustains a tension between the generic human on the one hand and (in Gruen's words) the "antithesis of Greek and barbarian."

The Chorus' stichomythia with Atossa begins by underscoring Athens and its people as remote, and yet intelligible; in fact, it is Xerxes who seems more puzzling to his mother. Atossa's complete innocence even of Athens's location gives Aeschylus the opportunity to offer an assessment of Athens from an outsider and for an outsider.

Queen: Where in the world do they say that Athens is situated?

Chorus: Far away, near the place where the Lord Sun declines and sets.

Queen: And yet my son had a desire to conquer that city?<sup>26</sup>

Chorus: Yes, because all Greece would then become subject to the King.

Queen: Do they have such great numbers of men in their army?

Chorus: And an army of a quality that has already done the Medes a great deal of harm.

Queen: Why, are they distinguished for their wielding of the drawn bow and its darts?

Chorus: Not at all; they use spears for close combat and carry shields for defense.

Queen: And what else apart from that? Is there sufficient wealth in their stores?

Chorus: They have a fountain of silver, a treasure in their soil.

Queen: And who is the shepherd, master and commander over their host?

Chorus: They are not called slaves or subjects to any man.

Queen: How then can they resist an invading enemy?

Chorus: Well enough to have destroyed the large and splendid army of Darius.

Queen: What you say is fearful to think about, for the parents of those who have gone there. 231-45<sup>27</sup>

The hallmark of this play, in its deictic operations, is that the Athenian audience for the play is put in a position to see themselves from two places, both distantiated and mirrored; this creates an ambivalence, expressed here in Atossa's incredulity at Xerxes's

desire to conquer them. Is she incredulous because the Athenians are so impressive or so unimpressive? We might say that we see Atossa go through a process of coming to know Athens, going from a blank slate to disbelief that keeps heightening as she hears of their total devastation of the Persian force. Aeschylus affirms Athens' remarkable victory and at the same time allows the Athenian audience to see that victory through a mother's anguished focalization.

Atossa's questions, however, broach a wider terrain. As she inquires after motivations and consequences, she enters, one might say, the territory of the historian. From what vantage point or location can one know what questions to ask of a historical event? The deictic operations through which the *Persae* situates its spectators in relation to the action take on special force, given that it is our only surviving play about an event in which members of its original audience, its playwright, and, quite possibly, some of its actors took part. We might say that, strikingly, Aeschylus uses Atossa's innocence and curiosity to raise ethical assessments of a historical event in which he himself participated.

In foregrounding the 'here and now' of the play's internal audience as it awaits the outcome – the question of how and when the news will travel – the drama focuses on the mediation of the event through Atossa's exchange with the chorus of elders – her inquiries and their responses, and their collaboratively imagined version of what is transpiring ('history' rendered as 'news'). Similarly, the Messenger's eyewitness report,<sup>28</sup> interleaved with the Chorus' horrified questions, enacts a complex, perspectively-inflected unfolding of what can only be known retroactively as the full extent of the Persians' defeat.

And I can also tell you, Persians, what kinds of horrors came to pass; I was there myself, I did not merely hear the reports of others. 266-67<sup>29</sup>

The messenger provides access to his internal audience for the recent disastrous events in the Bay of Salamis and the current state of the corpses of those Xerxes left behind. What might be straightforward narration in the hands of a historian, here is developed as progressive revelation. The focus is as much on the

reception as on the telling, as – with each question and response – the interspersed reactions bring the horror *home*. The problem of understanding a momentous historical event – signaled by the exchange with Atossa, and recognizing its significance – converges with the reversal and recognition that the play dramatizes.

Unlike Phrynicus's *Phoenissae*, in which everything is already known, the *Persae* is set at the moment of discovery. The play's attention is not on preparations for battle (as in Herodotus), nor on action in battle (as in e.g. *Septem*), but on the impact of the reversal; not so much on any of the agents in the event as on the *audience* for it. The emphasis is on subjectivized event – on event as subjective experience – multiplied, complexly so. Telling and hearing are experienced as a wound. In a sense, there is no present, or the present is elided – between anticipation and retrospection – and this is reflected in the deictic terms of: what a good life we had *here, then*.

The problem of recognizing the significance of the event is highlighted by the proliferation of superlatives that saturate the speeches of the last half of the play. The chorus and the messenger insist on the vastness, the totality, of every aspect of the disaster; *πᾶς, πᾶν* ("all") and derivatives are pervasive:

It is terrible to be the first to announce terrible news, but I have no choice but to reveal the whole sad tale (*πᾶν...πάθος*), Persians: the whole of the oriental army (*στρατὸς...πᾶς*) has been destroyed! 253-55<sup>30</sup>

...

I assure you, all those forces (*πάντα... ἐκεῖνα*) are annihilated and I myself never expected to see the day of my return. 260-61<sup>31</sup>

...

Otototoi! It was all in vain  
that those many weapons, all mingled together (*παμμυγῆ*),  
went from the land of Asia to the country  
of Zeus, the land of Hellas! 268-71<sup>32</sup>

...

The shores of Salamis, and all the region near them (*πᾶς...τόπος*), are full of corpses wretchedly slain. 272-73<sup>33</sup>

...

Raise a crying voice of woe  
for the wretched fate of <our loved ones>,  
for the way <the gods> have caused

total disaster (πάντα παγκάκως)! Aiai, for our destroyed army! etc.  
280-83<sup>34</sup>

A concentration of alpha-privatives suggests the inexpressible, immeasurable enormity of the reversal:

I myself never expected (ἀέλπτως) to see the day of my return. 261<sup>35</sup>

...

Truly this old life of ours  
has proved itself too long, when we hear  
this sorrow beyond all expectation (τόδε πῆμ' ἀελπτον)! 262-64<sup>36</sup>

...

<Raise a crying voice of woe  
for the wretched fate (ἀπότμοις) of <our loved ones>... 280-81<sup>37</sup>

And the dense network of superlatives, as in the Messenger's exchange with Queen Atossa, is extended into Atossa's speech as well:

How utterly loathsome (πλειϊστον ἔχθος) is the name of Salamis to my ears! 284<sup>38</sup>

I have been silent all this time because I was struck dumb with misery by this catastrophe. The event is so monstrous (ὑπερβάλλει γὰρ ἦδε συμφορά) that one can neither speak nor ask about the sufferings it involved. 290-93<sup>39</sup>

Aiai, this is truly the most towering disaster I have ever heard of (κακῶν ὑψιστα δὴ κλύω τάδε), a cause for shame and for shrill wailing to the Persians! 331-32<sup>40</sup>

...

Our sufferings were so multitudinous (κακῶν δὲ πλῆθος) that I could not describe them fully to you if I were to talk for ten days on end: you can be certain that never have so vast a number of human beings (πλῆθος τοσουτάριθμον ἀνθρώπων) perished in a single day. 429-32<sup>41</sup>

What possible misfortune could be even more hateful (τῆσδ' ἔτ' ἔχθίω) than the one we have heard of? 438<sup>42</sup>

It is characteristic of lament to speak in superlatives and absolutes,<sup>43</sup> but here their use points to the limitations of the 'involved audience' in terms of its capacity for historical understanding. The view from 'here' must be coordinated with the

view from 'elsewhere'. How would these superlatives sound from another vantage point? Darius, viewing the situation from (so to speak) 'everywhere' or perhaps beyond any 'where', makes clear that these superlatives are premature (which is to say, inadequate because overestimated) – that something definitively worse and more crushing is in the future, namely: the defeat at Plataea.

Dramatic irony and historical irony converge. In this way, the play theorizes the problem of the reception of historical event – we might say it is interested in the *case* of the Persians as much as in the Persians *per se*. Inasmuch as Atossa and the chorus lay out a generic mortal axis of experience and perspective, they offer an intriguing and perhaps disquieting mirror for audiences who might otherwise be predisposed to dis-identify (to so speak) with *barbaroi*. For example, Atossa reflects:

Still, we mortals have no choice but to endure the sorrows the gods send us; 293-94<sup>44</sup>

Even to put it this way is to reify the profound inquiry the play offers into the case of Salamis, the overturning of communal expectations.

The *Persae* offers an inquiry into subjectivized historical experience – here, the case of defeat, the processing (*on both sides*) of disaster. Especially in its deictic operations, the *Persae* produces the space for critical reflection – not least about how the play might speak to any potential audience. Certainly, as Peter Euben has argued, Salamis “elaborated and helped shape” a democratic ethos in Athens, in which tragedy played a crucial role.<sup>45</sup> Of tragedy in general, he observes, “One thing that distinguished it from other political institutions was its ‘theoretical’ character [...]. Thus, it simultaneously validated the city’s institutions and made them problematic.”<sup>46</sup> Of the *Persae* in particular, he suggests, “the point of the play is not that Persia should remember Athens but that Athens should remember Persia, for both its political dissimilarities and its human similarities.”<sup>47</sup> In this, Euben aligns with Nicole Loraux, who trenchantly observed, “We miss any sense of tragedy’s specificity if we think that the Athenians heard in the *Persae* only a eulogy for their city.”<sup>48</sup> She continues:

If, however, as I believe, every tragedy deals with the staging of mourning, then we can imagine that the citizens of Athens, invited in their capacity as hearers of a tragedy, to take part in a production of a drama that resembled a long lamentation, were able to respond to the latter in the appropriate manner. In other words, they were able to resist the immediate pleasure of being the cause of the suffering represented on the stage, because, in the cries of the defeated enemy, tragedy taught them to recognize something that touched them above and beyond their identity as Athenians.

With Loraux's words in mind, our reading proposes the final *kommos* between the chorus and Xerxes as a distillation and culmination of the deictic pressures structuring the play. As much as the chorus were left behind at the beginning of the play, longing to be reunited with the warriors who went away, in the end, those longed-for warriors *become the ones who have been left behind*. Where the chorus initially described the army's departure in the aorist (17-18: καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν Κίσσιον ἕρκος προλιπόντες ἔβαν), in the lament the perfect tense describes them (1002: βεβᾶσι γὰρ τοῖπερ ἀγρέται στρατοῦ): "they are gone".

M. Hopman, with Oliver Taplin, observes that the play follows the overall design of a *nostos* plot, achieved with the return of the defeated Xerxes. She notes that, "the story of a queen and people waiting for the return of their king echoes the plot of the *Odyssey*."<sup>49</sup> We draw attention to the lament itself as performing, via ritual, the 'return' home of those lost at Salamis: the *kommos* reanimates the fallen warriors, both naming them and locating them in response to the repeated question, "Where are they?" – in order to bring them back, figuratively, from Greece to Persia. The lament resists the anonymity that is otherwise the fate of those who end in a watery grave. As it recalls those who are gone, it revives and sharpens (rather than assuaging) the *pothos* for them on the part of those who survive them. While the insistent questions oblige Xerxes to confirm that the soldiers are lost, the lament recovers them, in their individual specificity, into the context in which that can have meaning.

We invoke the *Odyssey* not only for its plot but for its image of the universality of mourning and the shifting perspectives that a



narrative of suffering and loss can bring – to the victors as well as the vanquished.

So the famous singer sang his tale, but Odysseus melted, and from under his eyes the tears ran down, drenching his cheeks. As a woman weeps, lying over the body of her dear husband, who fell fighting for her city and people as he tried to beat off the pitiless day from city and children; she sees him dying and gasping for breath, and winding her body about him she cries high and shrill, while the men behind her, hitting her with their spear butts on the back and the shoulders, force her up and lead her away into slavery, to have hard work and sorrow, and her cheeks are wracked with pitiful weeping. Such were the pitiful tears Odysseus shed from under his brows. 8.521-32

Here we see the *Odyssey's* sympathetic transfer, notably conducted through an extended simile: Odysseus, here the audience of his own story, not only weeps but does so like a woman grieving her dead warrior husband: like, for example, an Andromache. That Odysseus himself was among the victors at Troy (and was a warrior-slayer and bereaver of women) does not prevent – indeed, may propel – his capacity for sympathetic response to this story. We would draw attention to the analogously powerful, complex operations of perspectivalism in the *Persae* and their potentially analogous effects on the play's audiences.

### Rethinking the *Persae* in Syracuse

Let us return to the question of what we might say about the *Persae's* possible reception in Syracuse: how would an ancient audience in Hieron's theater experience the play's transports – its re-orienting and re-situating of its audience's perspectives?

A number of scholarly discussions have helpfully problematized the familiar assumptions of a triumphalist interpretation of the *Persae*. Studies by Mark Griffith, Kathryn Morgan and Kathryn Boshier<sup>50</sup> invite a more complex reading of Hieron as a ruler and of socio-political attitudes on the part of an audience at Syracuse. These reframings, together with insights provided by Peter Wilson and Oliver Taplin into the impressive level of theatrical sophistication that a Syracusan audience would have brought to the viewing of Aeschylus's play, suggest that they too, as much as Athenians, would have been alive to this drama as about the human situation – the

predicament Pindar himself glosses in his *gnomai* on human life.

Now, such a reading runs the risk of depoliticizing this play and de-historicizing its specific reception;<sup>51</sup> yet it restores to us, we hope, the likelihood that the Sicilian audience, no less than the Athenian one, would have been prepared to do what the play asks: to see the predicaments of the *Persians* from the multiple angles it so deftly presents.

Here again, deixis helps us to consider the possible horizons of Syracusan reception. We have seen how, from the first word of the play, the twelve members of the chorus, as they enter, refer to themselves as "these ones present" at the Persian court and how this situates the origo or deictic center in Susa. The remaining lines of the *parodos* sustain this situatedness, primarily through the use of directional verbs, with action beginning in Persia and moving toward the land of Greece. The assemblage of Persian leaders and allies in lines 21-58<sup>52</sup> and the arrival of Queen Atossa and later of the messenger reinforce the deictic center in Susa. Secondary audiences, too, would be dislodged from their literal, historical locations to the Persian court. Initially, in the case of the Syracusans, they might experience their new insider location in Persia as sympathizers with the Greek defensive cause, but sympathizers, perhaps, who deserved no credit for Xerxes's defeat, as they didn't fight at Salamis or in other critical battles.

We are intrigued by an additional poetic effect that might have occurred to Syracusans of Hieron's time once they heard the messenger describe the sea battle. Aeschylus's emphasis on the discrepancy in numbers between the two sides, Persian and Greek, might well trigger an association captured so emphatically by Pindar, when he composed *Pythian* 1 in honor of Hieron, to be performed in Syracuse in 470. In lines 72-80 the poet unhistorically and extravagantly creates an entire system of battles, as Kathryn Morgan points out: he arranges mainland and Sicilian battles in such a way as to justify his claim that Hieron's battle against the Etruscans at Cumae "helped Greece escape from heavy slavery" and that, by casting their foe from their swift-moving ships, Hieron saved Greece from the Persians. "Pindar's poem prays for peace after Kumai," Morgan writes, "and then mentions in quick successions the Battles

of Salamis, Plataia and Himera. The didactic synchronism between Himera and Salamis... had not yet been constructed, but its elements were beginning to be assembled."<sup>53</sup>

I beseech you, son of Cronus, grant that the war cry  
of the Phoenicians and Etruscans may remain quietly  
at home, now that they have seen their aggression  
bring woe to their fleet before Cyme,  
such things did they suffer when overcome by the leader  
of the Syracusans, who cast their youth  
from their swiftly sailing ships into the sea  
and delivered Hellas from grievous slavery. I shall earn  
from Salamis the Athenians's gratitude  
as my reward, and at Sparta I shall tell of the battle  
before Cithaeron,  
in which conflicts the curve-bowed Medes suffered defeat;  
but by the well-watered bank of the Himeras I shall pay  
to Deinomenes's sons the tribute of my hymn,  
which they won through valor, when their enemies were defeated.<sup>54</sup>  
*Pythian 1.72-80*

Moreover, if their sea battle off the coast of Himera resembles the Athenians' defeat of the Persians at Salamis, then they are like the Athenians, and their foe, the Carthaginians, are like the Persians, or so it might seem to them. Once savvy Syracusans in the audience, already transported from their literal and historical here-and-now at Syracuse to the interior of the Persians court, make the connection that Pindar made in his ode for Hieron (performed on Syracusan soil in 470), some of the inferences that the Athenians would have likely made about self and other, we and they, friend and enemy could be extrapolated from the play for their political situation and their humanistic understanding of victory and loss. With the particulars of Greeks versus Persians abstracted to a more general level, smaller versus larger naval fleet, these members of the Syracusan audience would also experience a heightened awareness of the human condition shared by winners and losers in a conflict.

## Conclusion

These implications of a performance in Syracuse bring home what the *Persae* encodes, paradoxically independent of performance

locale: that the view from "here" and "there" might be radically different yet mutually imaginable; that *pathos* and lament are situated and specific, yet transferable; that events are experienced by suffering mortals. Drama in Aeschylus's hands becomes here an astonishing engine for a vertiginous perspectivalism but also for a potential imaginative sympathy: *deixis* offers the core linguistic-semantic tool for both effects. It is perhaps no surprise then that critics have over the decades developed strikingly divergent and mobile interpretations of this brilliantly shifting and shiftable play.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Nancy Felson is Professor Emerita of Classics at the University of Georgia. She is the author of *Regarding Penelope* (1994) and has edited and contributed essays to two volumes of *Arethusa: Semiotics and Classical Studies* (1983) and *Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric* (2004). Her research interests range from Homer, Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and Pindar to semiotics, narratology, and family dynamics in myth: female agency, paradigms of masculinity, conflictual and cooperative fathers and sons. She served as Whitehead Professor at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (2010) and Margo Tytus Fellow at the University of Cincinnati (2011). Laura M. Slatkin teaches classical literature at New York University and the University of Chicago. She is the author of *The Wrath of Thetis and selected essays* (2011) and articles on archaic Greek poetry. She is a Senior Fellow at the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington D.C.; Nancy and Laura have co-authored several essays, including "Gender and Homeric Epic" (2004) and "*Nostos, Tisis, and Two Forms of Dialogism in Homer's Odyssey*" (2014).

<sup>2</sup> The necromancy takes place at Darius's grave in Susa (624-842), the lamentation led by Xerxes in a procession toward the palace (931-1075).

<sup>3</sup> Erich S. Gruen, *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011).

<sup>4</sup> The evidence for performance in Syracuse is collected most recently in *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*, ed. Kathryn Bosher (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) 1-16 and 97-111. See Bosher's "Introduction" (1-16) and Chapter 5, "Hieron's Aeschylus," (97-111); also Chapter 2, Kathryn Morgan, "A Prolegomenon to performance in the West" (35-55) and Chapter 11, Oliver Taplin, "How was Athenian Tragedy played in the Greek West?" 226-50. Taplin writes (228): "The commission of *Aetnaeae* was

closely followed by a showing of *Persae* at Syracuse, the earliest attested re-performance of any Greek tragedy." In "Hieron's Aeschylus," following an earlier suggestion by Kiehl (endorsed by Wilamowitz), Boshier argues that Aeschylus designed the play for its first performance in the theater of Syracuse. See also Ismene Lada-Richards, "By Means of Performance: Western Greek Mythological Vase-Paintings, Tragic 'Enrichment', and the Early Reception of Fifth-century Athenian Tragedy" *Arion* 17. 2 (2009) 99 – 166, and Barbara Kowalzig, "Nothing to Do With Demeter? Something to do with Sicily! Theatre and Society in the Greek West", in O. Revermann and P. Wilson, edd., *Performance, Iconography, Reception. Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* Oxford (2008) 128-57.

<sup>5</sup> For an overview of this terminology, see Anna Bonifazi, "Deixis," and Nancy Felson and Jared S. Klein, "Deixis in Linguistics and Poetics," both in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics (EAGLL)*, edd. George Giannakis et al. (Leiden and Boston: Brill Academic Publisher) 2013), vol. 1: 422-29 and 429-33, respectively, with further references.

<sup>6</sup> For an earlier treatment of *Deixis am Phantasma* in Aeschylus's *Persae*, see Maria Vamvouri Ruffy, "Visualization and "Deixis am Phantasma" in Aeschylus's *Persae*, *QUCC N.S.* 78,3 (2004): 11-28.

<sup>7</sup> The best case for the play as a vehicle for the "orientalizing" of the Persians is in Edith Hall (comm.), *Aeschylus Persians* (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1996), 1-19, which emphasizes the political climate in Athens in 472 BCE.

<sup>8</sup> See Jesper Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. J. Lloyd (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993) 36-37.

<sup>9</sup> Phrynichus set his play, *Phoenissae*, in the Persian court; its prologue, however, was spoken by a eunuch. The testimonia in Nauck, (722) suggests that Aeschylus was invoking Phrynichus in his use of *τάδε*, "these ones here before you," by first person speakers.

<sup>10</sup> Subtle allusions that point to the cultural or physical site of performance are to be noted as well. See Marianne G. Hopman, "Chorus, conflict, and closure in Aeschylus's *Persians*," in *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy*, edd. Renaud Gagné and M. G. Hopman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), especially 66-72.

<sup>11</sup> Quotations are from Alan Sommerstein. ed. and trans., *Aeschylus* (Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 2008), 1-137.

1-21:

ΧΟΡΟΣ: Τάδε μὲν Περσῶν τῶν οἰχομένων  
 Ἑλλάδ' ἐς αἶαν πιστὰ καλεῖται,  
 καὶ τῶν ἀφνεῶν καὶ πολυχρύσων  
 ἐδράνων φύλακες,  
 κατὰ πρεσβείαν οὖς αὐτὸς ἀναξ  
 Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς Δαρειογενῆς  
 εἴλετο χώρας ἐφορεύειν·  
 ἀμφὶ δὲ νόστῳ τῷ βασιλείῳ  
 καὶ πολυάνδρου στρατιάς ἤδη  
 κακόμαντις ἄγαν ὀρσολοπεῖται  
 θυμὸς ἔσωθεν·  
 πᾶσα γὰρ ἰσχὺς Ἀσιατογενῆς  
 οἴχῳ κε, νέον δ' ἄνδρα βαῦζει  
 κοῦτε τις ἄγγελος οὔτε τις ἵππευς  
 ἄστῳ τὸ Περσῶν ἀφικνεῖται·  
 οἷτε τὸ Σούσων ἠδ' Ἀγβατάνων  
 καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν Κίσσιον ἕρκος  
 προλιπόντες ἔβαν, οἱ μὲν ἐφ' ἵππων,  
 οἱ δ' ἐπὶ ναῶν, πεζοὶ τε βάδην  
 πολέμου στίφος παρέχοντες·

<sup>12</sup> Marianne Hopman, "Layered Stories in Aeschylus' *Persians*" in *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 360.

<sup>13</sup> Vamvouri Ruffy, "Visualization and "Deixis am Phantasma in Aeschylus' *Persae*," 4, gives examples of *Deixis am Phantasma* that "imaginatively locate the Chorus as a witness of the Persian army's actual departure," a past event that is not shown on stage.

<sup>14</sup> 59-64:

ΧΟΡΟΣ: τοιόνδ' ἄνθος Περσίδος αἶας  
 οἴχεται ἀνδρῶν,  
 οὖς πέρι πᾶσα χθῶν Ἀσιῆτις  
 θρέψασα πόθῳ στένεται μαλερῶ,  
 τοκέες τ' ἄλοχοί θ' ἡμερολεγδὸν  
 τείνοντα χρόνον τρομέονται.

<sup>15</sup> M. Hopman, "Chorus, conflict, and closure," 58-77.

<sup>16</sup> 402-5:

"ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων, ἴτε,  
 ἐλευθεροῦτε πατρίδ', ἐλευθεροῦτε δὲ  
 παῖδας, γυναῖκας, θεῶν τε πατρῶων ἔδη,

θήκας τε προγόνων· νῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀγών”

<sup>17</sup> Egbert J. Bakker, “Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Context*, Egbert J. Bakker, ed. (Leiden 1997), 7-54. He notes that the use of the narrative imperfect is not so much a reference to an event as “the displacement of its observation into the past.”

<sup>18</sup> For an early effort to define what is needed to create a sustained vicarious transport, as opposed to an orientation to a new location, see Nancy Felson, “The Poetic Effects of Deixis in Pindar’s *Ninth Pythian Ode*,” *Arethusa* 37 (2004): 365-89. For a different view of the degree of relocation of the internal audience, see Vamvouri Ruffly, “Visualization and “*Deixis am Phantasma*,” 14-15.

<sup>19</sup> 93-100:

δολόμητιν δ’ ἀπάταν θεοῦ  
τίς ἀνήρ θνατὸς ἀλύξει;  
τίς ὁ κραιπνῶ ποδι πηδῆ-  
ματος εὐπετέος ἀνάσσω;  
φιλόφρων γὰρ ποτισαίνουσα τὸ πρῶτον παράγει  
βροτὸν εἰς ἀρκύστατ’ Ἄτα,  
τόθεν οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπέκ θνατὸν ἀλύξαντα φυγεῖν.

<sup>20</sup> 59-64:

ΧΟΡΟΣ: τοιόνδ’ ἄνθος Περσίδος αἴας  
οἶχεται ἀνδρῶν,  
οὐς πέρι πᾶσα χθῶν Ἀσιῆτις  
θρέψασα πόθῳ στένεται μαλερῶ,  
τοκέες τ’ ἄλοχοί θ’ ἡμερολεγδὸν  
τείνοντα χρόνον τρομέονται.

<sup>21</sup> We may think, for example, of Callinus 1.18-19: λαῶ γὰρ σύμπαντι πόθος κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς/θνήσκοντος, ζῶων δ’ ἄξιος ἡμιθέων; also Tyrtaeus 12.27-28: τὸν δ’ ὀλοφύρονται μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι ἤδὲ γέροντες, ἀργαλέῳ δὲ πόθῳ πᾶσα κέκμηδε πόλις (*Greek Elegiac Poetry*, ed. Douglas E. Gerber [Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1999]).

<sup>22</sup> 132-37:

λέκτρα δ’ ἀνδρῶν πόθῳ  
πίμπλαται δακρύμασιν·  
Περσίδες δ’ ἀβροπενθεῖς ἑκάστα πόθῳ φιλόνορι  
τὸν αἰχμάνεντα θοῦρον εὐνατῆρ’ ἀποπεμφαμένα  
λείπεται μονόζυξ.

<sup>23</sup> 181-89:

ἔδοξάτην μοι δύο γυναῖκ’ εὐεῖμονε,

ἡ μὲν πέπλοισι Περσικοῖς ἠσκημένη,  
 ἡ δ' αὖτε Δωρικοῖσιν, εἰς ὄψιν μολεῖν,  
 μεγέθει τε τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα πολὺ  
 κάλλει τ' ἀμώμω, καὶ κασιγνήτα γένους  
 ταύτου· πάτρην δ' ἔναιον ἢ μὲν Ἑλλάδα  
 κλήρω λαχοῦσα γαῖαν, τῆ δὲ βάρβαρον.  
 τούτῳ στάσιν τιν', ὡς ἐγὼ ἴδोकουν ὄρᾶν,  
 τεύχειν ἐν ἀλλήλαισι·

<sup>24</sup> Helen H. Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), 44; see Chapter 2, "Aeschylus," for full argumentation.

<sup>25</sup> Erich S. Gruen, *Rethinking the Other*, 16.

<sup>26</sup> 233: ἀλλὰ μὴν ἴμεω' ἐμός παῖς τήνδε Θηραῖσαι πόλιν; Atossa's use of τήνδε indicates her mental orientation toward Athens-in-the-distance (a case of imaginary deixis); at the same time, for Athenians in the first performance audience it points to and foregrounds their surroundings (a case of ocular deixis).

<sup>27</sup> 231-45:

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: ὦ φίλοι· ποῦ τὰς Αθήνας φασὶν ἰδρῶσθαι χθονός;

ΧΟΡΟΣ: τῆλε πρὸς δυσμαῖς ἀνακτος Ἥλιου φθινασμάτων.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: ἀλλὰ μὴν ἴμεω' ἐμός παῖς τήνδε θηραῖσαι πόλιν;

ΧΟΡΟΣ: πᾶσα γὰρ γένοιτ' ἂν Ἑλλάς βασιλέως ὑπήκοος.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: ὧδέ τις πάρεστιν αὐτοῖς ἀνδροπλήθεια στρατοῦ;

ΧΟΡΟΣ: καὶ στρατός τοιοῦτος, ἔρξας πολλὰ δὴ Μήδους/κακά.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: πότερα γὰρ τοξουλκός αἰχμὴ διὰ χειρῶν αὐτοῖς/πρέπει;

ΧΟΡΟΣ: μηδαμῶς· ἔγχη σταδαῖα καὶ φεράσπιδες σαγαί.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: καὶ τί πρὸς τούτοισιν ἄλλο; πλοῦτος ἐξαρκῆς/δόμοις;

ΧΟΡΟΣ: ἀργύρου πηγὴ τις αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ, θησαυρός χθονός.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: τίς δὲ ποιμάνωρ ἔπεστι κάπιδεσπόζει στρατῶ;

ΧΟΡΟΣ: οὔτινος δούλοι κέκληνται φωτός οὐδ' ὑπήκοοι.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: πῶς ἂν οὖν μένοιεν ἀνδρας πολεμίους ἐπὶ λυδας;

ΧΟΡΟΣ: ὥστε Δαρείου πολὺν τε καὶ καλὸν φθειραὶ στρατόν.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: δεινὰ τοι λέγεις κίοντιν τοῖς τεκοῦσι φροντίσαι.

<sup>28</sup> James Barrett, "Aeschylus' Persians: The Messenger and Epic Narrative," in *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 23-55, points out the contradiction between the Persian messenger's claim to be an eye-witness of the Battle of Salamis and his surprisingly extensive level of knowledge, a level that is typical of the ideal messenger of Greek tragedy.

<sup>29</sup> 266-67:

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ: καὶ μὴν παρῶν γε κοῦ λόγους ἄλλων κλυῶν,



Πέρσαι, φράσσαμι' ἄν οἱ ἔπορσύνθη κακά.

<sup>30</sup> 253-55:

ὦμοι, κακὸν μὲν πρῶτον ἀγγέλλειν κακά·  
ὄμως δ' ἀνάγκη πᾶν ἀναπτύξαι πάθος,  
Πέρσαι· στρατὸς γὰρ πᾶς ὄλωλε βαρβάρων.

<sup>31</sup> 260-61:

ΑἴΤΕΛΟΣ: ὡς πάντα γ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνα διαπεπραγμένα·  
καυτὸς δ' ἀέλπτως νόστιμον βλέπω φάος.

<sup>32</sup> 268-71:

ΧΟΡΟΣ: ὄτοτοτοῖ, μάταν  
τὰ πολλὰ βέλεα παμμιγῆ  
γᾶς ἀπ' Ἀσίδος ἦλθ' ἐπ' αἶαν  
Δίαν, Ἑλλάδα χώραν.

<sup>33</sup> 272-73:

ΑἴΤΕΛΟΣ: πλήθουσι νεκρῶν δυσπότημως ἐφθαρμές.  
Σαλαμῖνος ἄκται πᾶς τε πρόσχωρος τόπος.

<sup>34</sup> 280-83:

ἰυζ' ἀπότμοις βοᾶν  
δυσαιανῆ ἠΠέρσαις δαΐοιστ,  
ὡς πάντα παγκάκως θέσαν  
<δαίμονες>· αἰαῖ στρατοῦ φθαρέντος.

<sup>35</sup> 261:

ΑἴΤΕΛΟΣ: καυτὸς δ' ἀέλπτως νόστιμον βλέπω φάος.

<sup>36</sup> 262-64:

ΧΟΡΟΣ: ἡ μακροβίος οὐδε γέ τις αἰ-  
ὼν ἐφάνθη γεραιοῖς, ἀκού-  
ειν τόδε πῆμ' ἄελλτον.

<sup>37</sup> 280-81:

ΧΟΡΟΣ: ἰυζ' ἀπότμοις βοᾶν  
δυσαιανῆ ἠΠέρσαις δαΐοιστ

<sup>38</sup> 284:

ΑἴΤΕΛΟΣ: ὦ πλεῖστον ἔχθος ὄνομα Σαλαμῖνος κλύειν·

<sup>39</sup> 290-99

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: σιγῶ πάλαι δύστηνος ἐκπεπληγμένη  
κακοῖς ὑπερβάλλει γὰρ ἦδε συμφορὰ,  
τὸ μῆτε λέξαι μῆτ' ἐρωτῆσαι πάθη.

<sup>40</sup> 331-32:

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: αἰαῖ, κακῶν ὑψιστα δὴ κλύω τάδε,

<sup>41</sup> 429-32:

ΑἴΤΕΛΟΣ: κακῶν δὲ πλήθος, οὐδ' ἄν εἰ δέκ' ἤματα

στοιχηγορόην, οὐκ ἂν ἐκπλήσαιμί σοι

εὖ γὰρ τόδ' ἴσθι, μηδ' ἄμ' ἡμέρα μῆ

πλήθος τοσοῦτάριθμον ἀνθρώπων θανεῖν.

<sup>42</sup> 438: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: καὶ τίς γένοιτ' ἂν τῆσδ' ἔτ' ἐχθίων τύχη;

<sup>43</sup> See Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), Chapter 8, especially 172-73.

<sup>44</sup> 293-94:

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ: ὁμως δ' ἀνάγκη πημονὰς βροτοῖς φέρειν  
θεῶν διδόντων·

<sup>45</sup> J. Peter Euben, "The Battle of Salamis and the Origins of Political Theory," *Political Theory* 14 (1986): 359-90.

<sup>46</sup> Euben, "The Battle of Salamis," 367.

<sup>47</sup> Euben, "The Battle of Salamis," 365.

<sup>48</sup> Nicole Loraux, *The Mourning Voice: An Essay on Greek Tragedy*, trans. E. T. Rawlings (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 48.

<sup>49</sup> Hopman, "Layered Stories," 364 n.13, citing Oliver Taplin, *Stagecraft in Aeschylus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 124-26.

<sup>50</sup> Mark Griffith, "The King and Eye: the Rule of the Father in Greek Tragedy," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 44 (1998): 22-86; Kathryn Morgan, *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), especially Chapters 1-3; Peter Wilson, "Sicilian Choruses" in *The Greek Theatre and Festivals*, ed. Peter Wilson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 351-377; and see again Kathryn Bosher, "Introduction" and "Hieron's Aeschylus," as well as Oliver Taplin, "How was Athenian Tragedy played in the Greek West?," all in *Theater Outside Athens*, 1-16, 97-111, and 226-50, respectively.

<sup>51</sup> See again the forceful argument of Edith Hall, *Aeschylus Persians*, 1-25.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. also 302-28 and 957-99.

<sup>53</sup> Morgan, *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy*, 17. She argues for the rhetorical ploy on Pindar's part of panhellenizing his *laudandus*, Hieron, as if he were or had been a champion of the Greeks against the Persians and as if he were responsible, with his brother Gelon, for the victory at Himera against the Carthaginians, a victory that Herodotus (7.166), relying on Sicilian sources, places in the very same year as the Battle of Salamis.

<sup>54</sup> *Pythian* 1. 72-80:

λίσσομαι νεῦσον, Κρονίων, ἡμερον  
ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοῖνιξ ὁ Τυρσα-

νάων τ' ἀλαλατὸς ἔχη, ναυσίστονον  
ὑβριν ἰδὼν τὰν πρὸ Κύμας,  
οἷα Συρακοσίων ἀρχῶ δαμασθέντες πάθον,  
ᾠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὁ σφιν ἐν πόν-  
τῳ βάλεθ' ἀλικίαν,  
Ἑλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας. ἀρέομαι  
παρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθαναίων χάριν  
μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δ' ἐρέω πρὸ Κιθαιρώωνος μάχαν,  
ταῖσι Μήδριοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι,  
παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὐυδρον ἀκτὰν  
Ἥμερα παιδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσαις,  
τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἀρετᾶ, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.

<sup>5</sup>The authors would like to thank Heather Reid and the other organizers of the Fonte Aretusa conference, especially Davide Tanasi, as well as members of the audience at that event, above all Virginia Lewis, Kathryn Morgan, and Peter Wilson, for their comments. For expert editorial help, special thanks to Maureen McLane. We are grateful as well to the Classics Departments at Yale University, University of British Columbia, and University of Washington in Seattle for giving us the opportunity to present this paper as a work in progress and to their faculty and graduate students for offering invaluable feedback.