

**XVI. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Unbound*, Fr. 193**  
 (*Titanum suboles* . . .)

C. JOHN HERINGTON

SMITH COLLEGE

The twenty-eight Latin lines now to be discussed are preserved by Cicero, in the course of an argument on pain (*Tusc.* 2.10.23–25). In their own right they must surely rank among the noblest surviving passages of Latin iambic verse. But their importance becomes greater still if, as is often supposed, they were translated by Cicero himself from the Greek of the *Prometheus Unbound*; for in that case they constitute by far the longest fragment of Aeschylus' lost play, as well as an impressive testimony to the art of Cicero. Were they, however, translated by Cicero? Many of our editions of Aeschylus express uncertainty as to whether this is so, or whether Cicero is merely quoting from a play by Accius on the same subject.<sup>1</sup> The issues involved are such that it seems worth while to review in detail the external and internal evidence for the authorship of the fragment.

The text follows.<sup>2</sup> To it are added the ancient citations other than Cicero's, and a list of Greek parallels and likely equivalents in wording.

Titanum suboles, socia nostri sanguinis,  
 generata Caelo, aspice religatum asperis  
 vinctumque saxis, navem ut horrisono freto  
 noctem paventes timidi adnectunt navitae.

<sup>1</sup> The latter doctrine goes back at least as far as Bothe's edition (*Aeschyli Dramata quae supersunt* [1805] 584), and probably could be traced earlier still. The doubt still lingers in G. Murray's second edition in the Oxford Text series (1955). There have, of course, been some eminent dissenters also, notably Hermann (1859) and Wecklein (1893). The editors of Accius are also divided on the question. The most recent, A. Klotz (*Scaeniorum Romanorum fragmenta* 1 [1953] 253–55), includes the passage as a whole among the fragments of Accius. His great predecessor, O. Ribbeck, admitted only the line and a half that are quoted by Nonius (see *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta*<sup>2</sup> [1871] pages lvii and 187).

<sup>2</sup> The fragment presents no textual problems relevant to the present discussion. For the full apparatus criticus see M. Pohlenz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 44 (1918) 291–93.

- 5 Saturnius me sic infixit Iuppiter,  
 Iovisque numen Mulciberi adscivit manus;  
 hos ille cuneos fabrica crudeli inserens  
 perrupit artus, qua miser sollertia  
 transverberatus castrum hoc Furiarum incolo.
- 10 iam tertio me quoque funesto die  
 tristi advolatu aduncis lacerans unguibus  
 Iovis satelles pastu dilaniat fero;  
 tum iecore opimo farta et satiata adfatim  
 clangorem fundit vastum, et sublime avolans
- 15 pinnata cauda nostrum adulat sanguinem.  
 cum vero adesum inflatu renovatum est iecur,  
 tum rursum taetros avida se ad pastus refert.  
 sic hanc custodem maesti cruciatus alo,  
 quae me perenni vivum foedat miseria.
- 20 namque, ut videtis, vinclis constrictus Iovis  
 arcere nequeo diram volucrem a pectore.  
 sic me ipse viduus pestis excipio anxias,  
 amore mortis terminum anquirens mali;  
 sed longe a leto numine aspellor Iovis.
- 25 atque haec vetusta, saeculis glomerata horridis,  
 luctifica clades nostro infixata est corpori,  
 e quo liquatae solis ardore excidunt  
 guttae, quae saxa adsidue instillant Caucasi.

#### ANCIENT CITATIONS

13. Priscian, in Keil's *Grammatici Latini* 2.542, line 24: "Cicero in II Tuscularum: tum . . . satiata."

14–15. Nonius, page 17, lines 2 ff.: "ADULATIO . . . Accius Prometheo: tui mei volans (*sic codd.*) pinnata cauda nostrum adulat sanguinem."

15. Arusianus Messius (ca. 400 A.D.), in Keil's *Grammatici Latini* 7.457, line 6: "idem (Cicero) Tusc. II: nostrum adulat sanguinem."

#### GREEK PARALLELS AND LIKELY EQUIVALENTS<sup>3</sup>

2. *generata Caelo*: cf. *PV* 164–65 *ouranian gennan*. *aspicite*: cf. *ut videtis* below, line 20, and the recurring references to the *watching* of Prometheus' suffering in *PV* 92, 93, 118, 119, 140, 299, 304, 1093, and in *Prometheus Unbound* fr. 191. In most of the instances it is Prometheus himself who appeals to someone to look on him; and so here.

2–3. *religatum . . . saxis*: cf. *PV* 4–6.

<sup>3</sup> This list owes much, though not all, to earlier commentaries on the fragment, especially: N. Wecklein, *Äschylos, Prometheus*<sup>3</sup> (1893) 125; M. Pohlenz, *Ciceronis Tuscularum disputationum libri v* (1912) 1.149–50; G. Thompson, *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound* (1932) 179.

3-4. *navem . . . navitae*: for the image Wecklein compares *PV* 965 *kathōrmisas*. The thought is also paralleled in Aesch. *Supp.* 764-72, on which more is said below.

6. cf. *PV* 619 βούλευμα μὲν τὸ Δῖον, 'Ηφαίστου δὲ χεῖρ.

7. *cuneos*: i.e. *sphēnas* or *sphēna* (*PV* 64)?

9. *castrum*: i.e. *phourion* (*phourion theōn*, *Eum.* 918; cf. *PV* 31, 144, and perhaps 801)?

10. *tertio . . . quoque funesto die*: Nauck compares the gloss in Photius and others: τρίτῳ φάει· τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. This does not contradict *PV* 1024 (the eagle) ἄκκλητος ἔρπων δαυταλεὺς πανήμερος, as Klotz, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) and Pohlenz object. *Panēmeros* means "all day," not "every day." Compare the meaning of *pannychios* and *panetes*, and Hesiod's account of the eagle's feasting *propan ēmar* in *Theogony* 525.

11. *aduncis lacerans unguibus*: Schütz and others connect this phrase with *Prometheus Unbound* fr. 204, *eisaphasmata*, preserved by Hesychius. But the case is dubious. The meaning and derivation of that unique word were already uncertain in Hesychius' day; and even if it does mean *sparagmata*, "pieces torn off," which is one of his suggestions, there is nothing close to this in the Latin.

15. *adulat*: i.e. *sainei*? See below.

19. *foedat miseria*: the phrase, combining the infliction of shame with that of distress, recalls a concept which is exceptionally frequent in the *PV*, *aikēia*. That word is used by Aeschylus three times in the *PV*, possibly once elsewhere (fr. 596 Mette); compare his use of *aikēis*, four times in the *PV*, at most three times elsewhere; and of *aikisma*, once in the *PV*, not elsewhere. Tentatively, therefore, it may be suggested that the Greek here included the verb *aikizō* (-*omai*) (four times in *PV*, once elsewhere).

20. *ut videtis*: cf. on *aspicite*, line 2.

22. *me ipse viduus*: no exact parallel for this most striking phrase seems to survive in either language, but Wecklein's suggested αὐτὸς δ' ἐμμαντοῦ χῆρος would be convincing, as well as metrical, Greek.

23-24. For Prometheus' "cruel immortality", Wecklein and others compare *PV* 753-54, 933, 1053. Add the almost exact parallels to *terminum mali*: *PV* 99-100 μόχθων . . . τέρματα τῶνδ' (repeated in almost the same words, 755-56 and 1026), 183-84 τῶνδε πόνων . . . τέρμα, 257 *athlou terma*. The word *terma*, it may be noted, is used by Aeschylus more often in the *PV* than in any other play—no doubt deliberately. It occurs there ten times (six times in the *Oresteia*, once in *Supp.*, once in fr. 362).

Significantly, no editor of the *Tusculans* for more than a century<sup>4</sup> has doubted that these twenty-eight lines are translated by Cicero from Aeschylus; it is the editors of Aeschylus who have spread the rumor that they are taken from Accius' *Prometheus*. The fact is that the argument within whose framework the lines occur, if it is read as a whole, is decisive. The trouble begins only when the fragment is isolated from its setting.

<sup>4</sup> The only exception at any date known to me is Neidius, who is quoted on this point—to be disagreed with—by R. Kühner in his edition of the *Tusculans* (1846). I have not seen Neidius' edition.

First, then, let us restore it to that setting. The argument proper of the second Tusculan disputation begins at § 14, where the thesis is proposed that pain is the greatest of evils. After briefly opposing this with the suggestion that dishonor is a greater evil still, Cicero passes on to examine the views of the various philosophers on the thesis (§§ 15–18). It appears that the great majority have denied it, and that Epicurus, of all people, actually affirms that a sage trained in his discipline would even fry in the Bull of Phalaris with exclamations of pleasure. But this really goes too far, protests Cicero: pain, whatever its moral status, is undoubtedly something hard to bear.

This passage, as we shall see, has already to be taken into account in studying the present problem. But immediately relevant is the passage that follows (§§ 19–25), in which Cicero illustrates his last point by telling us how the *poets* have represented pain. He first mentions Philoctetes and quotes two short pieces of verse, both obviously spoken by that hero in some play, though Cicero does not name its author. Only by Nonius are we told that the first is from Accius, in his *Philocteta Lemnius*; and it is reasonable to suppose that the second is also (Accius, 553 and 562 Ribbeck). Then Cicero passes to the example of Hercules. What horrid cries *he* utters in Sophocles (*apud Sophoclem*), in the *Trachiniae*! There follows a direct translation from the Sophoclean play, lines 1046–1102 (omitting 1081–86, which are lyric in the Greek).

And now, Cicero says, let Aeschylus stand forward—Aeschylus who is “*not just a poet, but a Pythagorean too.*” How does Prometheus in him (*apud eum*) endure the pain laid on him for that theft from Lemnos—“whence” (and here Cicero launches into a four-line anapaestic verse quotation) “as fame has it, fire was secretly dealt out to mankind, stolen through guile by clever Prometheus, who by fate (?) paid the penalty to highest Jupiter”? These four lines are not from Aeschylus; they are, as we are told by Cicero’s contemporary Varro (quoting part of them in a different context), from Accius’ *Philocteta Lemnius* (533 Ribbeck). And in fact they say nothing of the manner in which Prometheus endured his pain. After this short digression, Cicero continues: “Well, then, this penalty he is paying when, clamped to the Caucasus, he says: *Titanum suboles. . .*”

Here the poetic examples end. The pattern of quotation

deserves careful notice. Cicero's invariable practice elsewhere in the *Tusculans* is, when he cites a translation from a Greek poet, to name that poet beforehand; but his quotations from the Roman poets (which tend to be shorter than the translations) are far more often than not incorporated in his text without any acknowledgement at all.<sup>5</sup> The passage which we are considering begins, according to this rule, with two brief quotations from Accius, unacknowledged. Then comes a very long verse-passage demonstrably translated from Sophocles, who is named. Next Aeschylus is named; and named, it should be emphasized, not only in his capacity as poet but also in his capacity as philosopher, so that he is being produced as a doubly expert witness against the silly case of Epicurus. In him (*apud eum*—the same preposition as was used in introducing the quotation from Sophocles) we learn how Prometheus endures pain. But at this point Cicero, diverted for a moment by his own passing mention of Lemnos, throws in a short quotation from Accius' *Philocteta* which neatly combines both Lemnos and Prometheus. As usual, he does not give the Roman poet's name, but we know it from an independent source. Cicero then recollects himself (*igitur*, resumptive), and proceeds to a long verse-passage in which the promise given at the moment when Aeschylus' name was introduced is fulfilled; for here Prometheus clearly describes his sensations. If Cicero was not translating Aeschylus direct in those lines, then why had he named him at all? In particular, why had he named him with such emphasis on his philosophical knowledge, implying that he was specially important

<sup>5</sup> Apart from the passage under discussion (2.7.19–10.25), Cicero cites translations from Greek poetry sixteen times in the *Tusculans*, and names his source each time. But of his forty-five (approximately) quotations from the Latin poets, only some fourteen are attributed by name to their authors. Evidently he assumes that contemporaries will be able to identify the national poetry for themselves. A typical passage is 3.13.28–14.29, where a three-line unattributed quotation from a Latin tragedy is followed by the remark: “itaque apud Euripiden a Theseo dicta laudantur; licet enim, ut saepe facimus, in Latinum illa convertere”; and then by six lines of translation.

The length of our passage alone could be reckoned as indicating that it is a translation. The only close parallels from this point of view in all Cicero's works are Cicero's translation from Homer (29 lines, in *Div.* 2.30.63), and that from Sophocles (45, in *Tusc.* 2.8.20). His longest uninterrupted quotation from a Latin poet consists of 20 lines, and in fact uninterrupted quotations of more than 10 lines are very rare; the instances are: 20 lines from Ennius, *Annals* (*Div.* 1.48.107); 17 lines from the same poem (*Div.* 1.20.40); 12 from Accius, *Brutus* (*Div.* 1.22.44), followed after a brief interruption by 10 more from the same play; 12 from an unidentified tragedy (*Div.* 1.21, 42); 12 from Accius, *Argonautae* (*Nat. d.* 2.35.89). Even of these instances none is from the *Tusculans*.

for the refutation of the case which the whole collection of poetic quotations here was designed to refute? There does not seem to be any answer.

But Cicero himself has more to say in his following paragraph (§§ 25 *fin.*–26). At the close of the speech by Prometheus, he briefly remarks that it seems good proof that pain produces wretchedness, and is therefore an evil. His partner in the dialogue, who is still rather faintly defending that thesis, here breaks in: “Well, you’re still pleading my case for me. But I’ll see to that in a moment; meanwhile, where do those lines come from? I don’t recognize them.” *Unde isti versus?* This question, surely (especially in view of the *isti*), can only refer to some verses that have recently been quoted. As it happens, the passages given in §§ 19–25, which have just been discussed, are the only poetic quotations so far on the second day of the *Tusculans*, apart from a couplet by Accius quoted in § 13. Cicero answers his friend’s question in a roundabout way, reminding him first of the lecture-rooms which they had both attended in Athens, and then of how the Greek philosophers there had enriched their lectures with quotations from the poets. “And so,” he concludes, “since I’ve taken to these declamations of my old age, as I may call them, I too take care to bring in *our* poets. But wherever they fail me—well, *I have translated much from the Greeks*, that in this kind of debate also our Latin tongue should lack no ornament.” On this, Cicero passes to a fresh subject. Unless, therefore, the whole paragraph is to lose its point, his last sentence must constitute the answer to the question at its beginning, *unde isti versus?* “They are my translation,” he says. The question, then, obviously did not refer to the quotations from Accius. It is most unlikely that it referred to the Sophocles passage, which is prefaced unambiguously by *apud Sophoclem in Trachiniis*. The only satisfactory reason that can be seen for this whole elaborate explanation is that Cicero is claiming credit for translating the last verses he quoted, the authorship of which might certainly have been obscured by the insertion of that four-line quotation from Accius.<sup>6</sup>

Such is the evidence to be obtained from the context of the fragment in the *Tusculans*. It suggests so strongly that the lines are a direct translation from Aeschylus that it is hard to believe

<sup>6</sup> The evidence afforded by § 26 has often been remarked on (e.g. by Pohlenz, [above, note 3] 150).

any doubts would ever have been raised, if this had been our only ancient citation. Brief extracts, however, are quoted also by three grammarians of the late Empire (for their words, see above, 240). Two, Arusianus Messius and Priscian, refer their extracts simply to "Cicero in the Second *Tusculan*." (That Priscian should do so is interesting, because he, or his authority, shows evidence elsewhere<sup>7</sup> that he knows the rarely-cited *Prometheus* of Accius). It is the third, Nonius, who quotes our lines 14–15, *sublime . . . sanguinem*, with the comment *Accius Prometheo*. This fact should be made clear, but it should be made clear at the same time that Nonius' words are the solitary evidence on which the attribution of the entire twenty-eight lines to Accius rests. How much weight can be allowed to them in comparison with the evidence drawn from the context in the *Tusculans* and, it may be added, with the internal evidence shortly to be discussed? The balance inclines towards a mistake on the part of Nonius, a mistake which could easily be accounted for. For example, a commentator's note "Haec sumpta ex Accio," or the like, against the short quotation about the Lemnian theft, could well have misled the grammarian (or one of his predecessors) as to the source of the lines which immediately follow it in Cicero's text.<sup>8</sup>

We may now consider the verses themselves. They suggest, no less strongly than their setting, that they are directly translated by Cicero from Aeschylus. The list of parallels given above shows how often the phraseology and even, it seems, the characteristic wording of the *Prometheus Bound* recur, latinized, in our fragment; see especially the notes on lines 2, 6, 19, 23. A less obvious, but perhaps for that reason even more significant, connection will be found in the word *adulat* of line 15. The eagle has glutted herself on liver, she pours out a vast<sup>9</sup> scream, she wheels away towards the heights; and at this moment, "with her feathery tail she

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Accius 390 Ribbeck.

<sup>8</sup> There is a third possible solution, which saves the faces of both Cicero and Nonius: that Cicero may have found the words *sublime . . . sanguinem* already in Accius, and incorporated them into his own translation (so Ribbeck, *loc. cit.* [above, note 1] and also in his *Die römische Tragödie* [1875] 543). This seems a somewhat artificial explanation; but if it is correct, Cicero can only have done so because Accius' words gave a fair idea of the original Greek at this point. That something Aeschylean does lie behind the words is suggested in the next paragraph of the text.

<sup>9</sup> The implications of the Latin *vastus* (including both "ravaging, terrible" and "immense") can hardly be rendered in a single English word. Did Aeschylus here use the similarly ambiguous *aiānēs*, a favorite of his?

sweeps my blood.” *Adulat*: *adulatio*, says Nonius, is properly used of the fawning of dogs. And he quotes, along with this very passage, words of Cicero in the *De natura deorum*, “canum . . . tam fida custodia tamque amans dominorum adulatio.” So the Latin image here makes the dog’s caressing welcome dissolve horribly into the last sickening insult of the eagle. Now Greek also possesses a word with which precisely this effect could be obtained, *sainei*, and there can be little doubt that Aeschylus used it here.<sup>10</sup> This then would continue the idea contained in *PV* 1022. There the eagle is the “winged hound” of Zeus;<sup>11</sup> here also, with its “feathery tail,” it is like—and yet not like—an earthbound dog.

Another image in the fragment, where Prometheus compares himself to a ship (lines 2–4), faintly echoes an image in the *Prometheus Bound* (965). But its commentators do not seem to have noticed<sup>12</sup> that it is also connected with another Aeschylean passage outside the *Prometheia*. In the *Supplices* (764–72) Danaus tells his daughters why they need not be afraid that the sons of Aegyptus will disembark from their ship before he can return with help from town. It takes time, he says, to anchor and moor a ship; and even when that is done “the shepherds of the Fleet are not immediately confident (οὐ θαρσοῦσι παραντίκα)—above all, when they have come to a harborless land while the sun is pacing towards night. Night, to any pilot that knows his art, brings on the very pangs of birth.” Here is a picture of sailors who are naturally cautious anyhow, but now have added reasons for fear (or more than fear—ὠδῖνα τίκτειν, says Aeschylus, in a phrase which has actually been criticized for exaggeration). Night is closing in, and there are no harbors on this coast. The picture is so vivid that one is strongly tempted to connect it with Aeschylus’ personal experience of naval service. In our fragment the timid sailors recur, and so does their fear of the night; the difference is that these sailors are caught in a stormy strait (might one here recall the night-storm around Euboea in the Artemisium campaign

<sup>10</sup> So Pohlenz (cf. *Ag.* 725, etc.). Wecklein suggests *prossainō* (*PV* 835, cf. *Ag.* 1665).

<sup>11</sup> The same phrase is used of the eagles in *Ag.* 136.

<sup>12</sup> Paley, however, did refer back to our fragment in his commentary on *Supp.* 769–70 (his 749–50). The appearance of this same striking idea in both *Supp.* and *Prometheia*—until recently supposed to be the earliest and latest, respectively, of the poet’s surviving works—might be worth considering in the light of the *Supplices*-trilogy didascalia (*POxy.* vol. 20 [1952], No. 2256, Fr. 3; etc.).



of 480?). And if the *experience* underlying lines 3–4 of the fragment thus seems to be peculiarly Aeschylean, there can be no doubt that its application in this context is worthy of the poet. There is brought out not merely the grandeur of the Titan, but the uncertainty or even panic in which the new prince of the gods has caused that hulk to be fixed to the rock.

In lines 25–26 lies a third image, again one of great power, but not so easily explained. The Latin, as it stands, says: “This ancient, grievous *clades*, *glomerata* in the frightful ages, is fastened in my body.” It is undoubtedly wrong to exact one definite and literal meaning from a poetic statement, and one which combines two Latin words so far-ranging as *clades* and *glomerare*. But we may fairly point out that neither word is being used in a common way,<sup>13</sup> and that the total effect is unparalleled. Can it be reproduced in English? Perhaps

Century has swarmed on shuddering century  
around this antique, lamentable pain,  
this rivet through my body . . .

will give some of the echoes. But already too sharp a color has been given to *glomerare*, and two words, “pain” and “rivet,” have been necessary for *clades*. What Greek words inspired such Latin, it is not easy to say;<sup>14</sup> it may be felt that Cicero has something before him that is straining even his resources, and that he is paraphrasing at this point rather than translating. In fact, some support may be found for this feeling in the fact that the only other passage in Latin at all like this occurs in one of his *original* poems, the poem on his own consulship (quoted in *Div.* 1.12.19). There, the muse Urania catalogues the portents which foretold Cicero’s

<sup>13</sup> See the *ThLL*, s. vv., and, for a more recent discussion of *glomerare*, W. H. Semple in *CR* 60 (1946) 61–63. *Clades* must have a material meaning (i.e. the shackles?—see next note) with *infixa*, but hardly so with *glomerata*. The connection of *glomerare* with a time-word seems to be confined, in classical Latin, to our passage and to Cicero’s poem on his consulship, quoted below in the text; from later Latin two instances at most are cited (Ausonius, *Griphus Ternarii Numeri* 13, and perhaps Claudian, *Cons. Stil.* 2.447, to which Mr. Seth Benardete kindly drew my attention). Further, the expressive *horridus* does not seem to be used elsewhere to qualify a time-word.

<sup>14</sup> But note that *pedē* in Greek is capable of the same double sense as *clades* has in our version; that both Aeschylus (*PV* 6, cf. 169) and Hesiod (*alyktopedai*, *Theogony* 521) use the word in connection with Prometheus; and that Cicero, in the translation from the *Trachiniae* which precedes our fragment in his text, seems to render the ambivalent *pedēi* there (*Trach.* 1057, of the lethal robe) by *clade* and *peste*.

year of office, ending: "All these things are fixed, and defined, and massed together by your year."

Omnia fixa tuus glomerans determinat annus.

Although the sense, of course, is not closely related, the vocabulary is. This is the only other passage in Cicero where *glomerare* is found; it is the only other passage in classical Latin where it is found in connection with a noun meaning a segment of time (*annus*, cf. *saeculis*); and up against it we observe *fixa*, recalling *infixa* in our fragment. These are considerable coincidences. It may be that Cicero, in paraphrasing, has left his signature here.

So far as possible, the evidence has now been put together for supposing that these verses are Cicero's own translation from the *Prometheus Unbound*, and no mere adaptation by Accius. How faithful a translation they are can be estimated by anyone who cares to compare Cicero's rendering from the *Trachiniae*, which comes immediately before in the *Tusculans*, with the Greek original. Although Aeschylus' powerful verse may, on the whole, have been easier for Cicero to put directly into Latin than the bafflingly subtle texture of Sophocles, we must clearly allow for some redundancy, some condensation, and possibly the omission of a line or more here and there. But equally we can be sure that we have the essential tenor and, as has been suggested above, some reflection of the more extended imagery.

Granted that this is so, it remains to ask what the passage tells us about Aeschylus' *Prometheia*. If it adds little line, little to the facts of the action except for details of Prometheus' second penalty, it does replace a patch of color on the great fragmentary canvas.

At the opening of the *Prometheus Unbound* the choir of Titans has marched in, chanting in anapaests of the remote places which they have crossed to reach this scene, after their scattered, ancient prisons have opened up.<sup>15</sup> By all analogy, an anapaestic entry should have been followed at once by a full choral ode,<sup>16</sup> so that the contrasting figure of the still-chained Prometheus at the back

<sup>15</sup> Fr. 190-92. These verses are chanted right at the beginning of the tragedy, according to Procopius (quoting Fr. 190). The omission of an iambic *prologos* here is yet another point, this time a technical one, common to the *Prometheia* and the *Supplices*.

<sup>16</sup> H. J. Mette (*Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* [1959] 117-18, Fr. 323a) prints, between the fragments of the anapaestic entry-song and our fragment, the papyrus Heidelberg 185. These fragmentary lines certainly appear to come from an Aeschylean play about Prometheus (lines 9-10 offer the most striking, but not the only,

of the scene would have maintained for many lines one of those famous Aeschylean silences. So he did in the *Prometheus Bound*. And here, again as in the *Prometheus Bound*, he breaks his silence in a long speech, calling on those who are by<sup>17</sup> to look on his disgrace.

In this speech (and some may feel that this is the conclusive evidence that our fragment comes direct from the *Prometheia*) the same personality appears as appeared in the play which survives. Here is that same torturing self-consciousness (*look! . . . look!*), that same anxious analysis of the suffering by the sufferer. Prometheus the thinker will do Zeus' cruel work for him over again. At the beginning of this second play, in fact, Aeschylus seems deliberately to recapitulate Prometheus' character for his audience. It is true that one feature is missing. The Prometheus of the *Bound* constantly tempered the complaints of his suffering with confident statements that, at however distant a time, he was destined to be released through his knowledge of the fatal marriage.<sup>18</sup> Prometheus here, in an extensive passage, does not even hint at any such confidence. Although only fresh evidence about the trilogy could determine whether this silence is due to a change in Prometheus, a breakdown under the added torments, or simply to the chances of preservation, the fact should be registered.

Besides his restatement (with this omission) of Prometheus' character, Aeschylus seems also to recall and assemble other

indications of this), and if Mette's reading of line 14 is accepted they give the end of a choral ode and the beginning of an iambic speech by Prometheus:

I4 . . . δ]ύποτμοι ξυναί[μονες  
I5 ]ἐκτὸς[

It would be tempting to suppose that we had here both the postulated ode following the anapaests, and the opening words of the original of Cicero's translation (*xyneimones: socia nostri sanguinis*). But this possibility is made unlikely by the *ektos* of line 15, and even more unlikely by the grave objections to the attribution of the lines to the *Unbound* at all, stated by K. Reinhardt in *Hermes* 85 (1957) 12–13. It may be added that even the assumption, made by both Mette and Reinhardt, that Prometheus is the speaker in 15 f., cannot be taken for granted. It seems equally possible that one member of the chorus is here addressing the rest; for such an iambic address at the close of an ode, compare *Sept.* 369 ff., especially 370, *O philai*. In short, the papyrus is too problematic to be used in evidence here.

<sup>17</sup> In the *PV*, of course, these were only silent watchers, the elements (lines 88–92).

<sup>18</sup> There is a hint of this as early as the middle of his first speech (100–2)—a speech which, if we exclude the song at the approach of the chorus (114 ff.), is two lines shorter than our fragment. The statements become explicit in 168–77, 186–92, 511–25, 755–74, 871–76, 907–40, 957–59, 989–96.

leading motives of the preceding tragedy, almost verbatim.<sup>19</sup> Such repetition need not surprise, for the *Prometheus Bound* itself is already well known for it. To take one relevant instance, the name of Zeus occurs there fifty-eight times, far more often than in any other play.<sup>20</sup> Only in our fragment is that frequency, proportionately, surpassed. The hated name reverberates five times in this space. And there is the evidence of another fragment, independent of this, to show that the repetitive *Prometheus Bound* was in turn echoed in the *Unbound*.<sup>21</sup>

The passage, then, has not only the merit of being a great translation from great poetry. It is also a further witness to a feature of Aeschylus' technique in these first two plays of the *Prometheia*: repetition. We had perhaps better not ascribe this to old age, nor to imaginative impoverishment, but rather to design. Aeschylus was gripped by the throbbing recurrence, through the countless years, of the grievance and the pains of Prometheus. It was in this way that he expressed it.

<sup>19</sup> See the list of parallels, notes on lines 6, 19, 23.

<sup>20</sup> Compare *Supp.* (some 44 times), *Ag.* (some 24). Other well known examples of ideas repeated in the *PV* are: *tyrannos* (*tyrannis*), 13 times; *authadēs* and related words, 8 times; *aikeia* and related words, 12 times.

<sup>21</sup> Compare Fr. 194, preserved by Plutarch, with *PV* 462–66.