## A RE-INTERPRETATION OF PROMETHEUS BOUND 514

## STEPHEN G. DAITZ

The City College and The Graduate School, CUNY

	βραχεῖ δὲ μύθῳ πάντα συλλήβδην μάθε· πᾶσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως.		505
Xo.	μή νυν βροτούς μεν ωφέλει καιροῦ πέρα,		
AU.	σαυτοῦ δ' ἀκήδει δυστυχοῦντος ὡς ἐγὼ		
	εὔελπίς εἰμι τῶνδέ σ' ἐκ δεσμῶν ἔτι		
	λυθέντα μηδέν μειον ισχύσειν Διός.		510
Πρ.	οὐ ταῦτα ταύτη Μοῖρά πω τελεσφόρος		
•	κράναι πέπρωται, μυρίαις δὲ πημοναῖς		
	δύαις τε κναφθεὶς ὧδε δεσμὰ φυγγάνω.		
	τέχνη δ' ἀνάγκης ἀσθενεστέρα μακρῷ.	←	
Xo.	τίς οὖν ἀνάγκης ἐστὶν οἰακοστρόφος;		515
$\Pi \rho$ .	Μοιραι τρίμορφοι μνήμονές τ' Ἐρινύες.		
Xo.	τούτων ἄρα Ζεύς ἐστιν ἀσθενέστερος;		
$\Pi \rho$ .	οὔκουν ᾶν ἐκφύγοι γε τὴν πεπρωμένην.		
Xo.	τί γὰρ πέπρωται Ζηνὶ πλὴν ἀεὶ κρατεῖν;		
Πρ.	τοῦτ' οὐκέτ' ἄν πύθοιο, μηδὲ λιπάρει.		520

The traditional interpretation of Pr. 514 (printed above in its context from the OCT) is that given by E. Fraenkel (Agamemnon 3.729) in his paraphrase: "all my ingenuity and inventiveness are powerless in face of the compulsion to which I am subject...." In this interpretation  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  (ingenuity, inventiveness) refers to Prometheus,  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  (compulsion) refers to Zeus. In view of the specific context of the word  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  in this line, and given the normal Greek usage of the word  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  from Homer to Euripides, I find this traditional interpretation most doubtful. I hope through the following discussion to offer a likelier interpretation, namely that in this line,  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  refers to the craftsmanship of Hephaistos, while  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  refers to a universal Necessity that is beyond the power of Zeus.\(^1

¹ Although the *communis opinio* concerning 514 is that of Fraenkel, several editors of the play, without giving detailed explanations, have identified  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  with Hephaistos and  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  with Necessity. These include A. Prickard (Oxford 1880), E. Sykes and St. Wynne Willson (London 1898), and G. Thomson (Cambridge 1932). I owe these references to the kindness of an anonymous *TAPA* reader. G. O. Hutchinson in *CR* 34 (1984) 2 also shares this view concerning  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  514.

In the thought sequence of our passage, however,  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$  514 must have the larger sense of "universal Necessity." In 513, Prometheus declares that after much suffering he will be freed of his bonds ( $\phi\nu\gamma\gamma\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$  is an "oracular" present). The sense of the next line, 514, should be that Prometheus considers this freeing to be inevitable, for it will happen through  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$ . The chorus then can quite plausibly ask, who is in control of  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$ ? When Prometheus answers that it is the Moirai and the Erinyes, the chorus asks whether Zeus himself is weaker than these powers ( $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma$ s, the same adjective used in 514 to describe  $\tau\dot{\epsilon}\chi\nu\eta$ ). The answer, although expressed negatively, is in the affirmative.

The listener to this dialogue must assume that the sense of  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$  515 as used by the chorus is the same as that of  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$  514 as used by Prometheus. A basic change of meaning within the space of two lines would be intolerable. Besides, the question in 515 concerning  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$  arises directly from its use in 514, so we must assume that the chorus understood Prometheus' meaning of  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$  and framed its question in accordance with that meaning. (Surely we cannot assume that the cho-

² Furthermore, the general sense of ἀνάγκης 105 seems quite close to that of ἀνάγκης 514, the difference being that the thought in 105 is expressed absolutely, while in 514 it is expressed comparatively. The absence of the definite article with ἀνάγκης in 514 and 515, in contrast to its presence in 105, is not significant. ἀνάγκη is "personified" without the article in 514 and 515 just as are Μοῦρα 511 and Μοῦραι ... Ἐρινύες 516. A further similarity of thought and language of the two passages may be observed: 103-4 τὴν πεπρωμένην δὲ χρὴ / αἶσαν φέρειν and 511-12 μοῦρα ... / κρᾶναι πέπρωται. Both passages convey the sense of ονerriding inevitability. With the sense of ἀνάγκη in 105 and 514, cf. Soph. fr. 234P πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην οὐδ' Ἄρης ἀνθίσταται, and Simon. 5.21 ἀνάγκα δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται. Particularly appropriate to this passage is Eur. Alk. 980 καὶ τὸν ἐν Χαλύβοις δαμάζεις σὺ (ἀνάγκα) βία σίδαρον. (I owe this reference to the kindness of Professor R. Meridor.) For the distinction between ἀνάγκη singular and plural, and for the various usages of ἀνάγκη singular, see LSJ s.v.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$   $\delta$ ' 514 probably has the connective sense of  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ . According to J. D. Denniston *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954²) 169, such usage of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is quite frequent.

rus misunderstood Prometheus' meaning.) Working backwards then, it is clear that the chorus in 515 is referring to  $\partial \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  in the sense of a universal force, Necessity. (Hence the answer of Prometheus in 516 to their question.)  $\partial \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  in 514 must therefore have the same universal sense of Necessity as in 515. This  $\partial \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  in 514 cannot therefore emanate from Zeus, since we learn in 518 that Zeus also is weaker than the prime movers of Necessity. Looking further back, we can see that  $\partial \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  514 is an extension of  $\partial \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha$  511. Our conclusion then is that  $\partial \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  514 does not refer to the compulsion of Zeus, as is traditionally held, but signifies the universal force of Necessity, a force outside of and more powerful than Zeus.

The traditional interpretation of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  514, as we have seen, would have Prometheus here refer to his own inventiveness or ingenuity, and declare that his own  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  was far weaker than  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ . A great obstacle to this interpretation is that it goes counter common Greek usage of the word  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ . According to LSJ,  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  is generally used, both in the singular and plural, in the concrete sense of a specific craft, skill, or trade (like the French *métier*) such as metal-working, prophecy, or agriculture. When  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  is used abstractly, both in the singular and plural, it usually has the pejorative sense of "trickery, deception," e.g.  $\delta o \lambda i \eta \tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ . This sense of dishonest trickery is of course applicable to the Hesiodic Prometheus, but it is hardly a sense that the Aiskhylean Prometheus would apply to himself—he is a disobeyer, not a deceiver. A more neutral abstract sense of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  is also found, but only with a modifier, e.g.  $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ (by every means). And so the favorable or at least neutral abstract sense of "ingenuity, inventiveness" required by the traditional interpretation of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  is apparently not a commonly attested usage of classical Greek.

- <sup>4</sup> For a similar exchange between a dramatic character and the chorus, where the chorus picks up the exact meaning and word uttered by the previous speaker, cf. *Eum.* 621–22 Apollo:  $Z\eta\nu\dot{o}_{S}$ ... / Chorus:  $Z\epsilon\dot{v}_{S}$ .
- <sup>5</sup> Under this interpretation of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ , the sense of  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$  could conceivably be either that of "the compulsion of Zeus" or that of "universal Necessity." As we have seen above, the context of the entire passage clearly favors the latter sense of  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ .
- $^6$  It is of course a completely different matter when in this play Kratos calls Prometheus a thief (8, 83) or when Kratos (62) and Hermes (944) call him a "wise guy" (σοφιστής). Their viewpoint would hardly be one that Prometheus would endorse for himself. It is likewise a different matter when Kratos says of Prometheus (59):  $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \varsigma \ \gamma \alpha \rho \ \epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu \kappa \dot{\alpha} \xi \ \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \chi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \nu \ \pi \dot{\sigma} \rho \sigma \nu$  (for he's clever at finding a way out even of the inextricable). Although Prometheus may well be  $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\sigma} \varsigma$  in the sense Kratos suggests, the only way such  $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \varsigma$  could be equated with  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  in its usual sense is if Prometheus had, in Houdini-like fashion, adopted as a career the métier of extricating himself from the inextricable. Also different in context is the unabashed self-proclamation of Odysseus in Od. 9.19–20  $\epsilon \ddot{\iota} \mu'$  'Όδυσεψς  $\Lambda \alpha \epsilon \rho \tau \iota \dot{\alpha} \dot{\delta} \eta \varsigma \dot{\delta} \varsigma \ \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota \ \delta \dot{\delta} \lambda \iota \iota \sigma \iota \nu / \ \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\theta} \rho \dot{\omega} m \iota \sigma \iota \nu$  (I am Odysseus, son of Laertes, formidable in the minds of all men through my tricks). The chief characteristics of the Homeric Odysseus are his wiles and tricks ( $\pi o \lambda \iota \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \varsigma$ ,  $\pi o \lambda \dot{\iota} \tau \rho \sigma m \sigma \varsigma$ ). As stated above, these are not the characteristics of the Aiskhylean Prometheus.

A complete survey of all occurrences of the various forms of  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  in Homer, Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, Herodotos, Thucydides, Aiskhylos, Sophokles, Euripides, and Aristophanes (154 occurrences altogether) fails to reveal a single instance where the noun  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ , in the singular and without a direct modifier (as is the case with  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ , 514), carries the abstract sense of "ingenuity, inventiveness." This sense may occasionally occur in the plural, but it is rare, for even in the plural the sense is usually that of "tricks, deception." When a more neutral sense is found, both in the singular and plural, it usually is in a stock phrase accompanied by an adjective, e.g.  $\pi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \eta$   $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ ,  $\pi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota s$   $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \alpha \iota s$ ,  $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \acute{\epsilon} \mu \gamma e$ 

The survey also shows that the only use of  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  in reference to gods in this period is found in the concrete sense of a craft or skill: Hephaistos (metal-working), 10 Apollo (prophecy), Hermes (music and firecraft). In the extant plays of Aiskhylos, with the exception of *Prometheus Bound*, all occurrences of  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  refer to the skill or art of prophecy. In *Prometheus Bound* there are eight occurrences of  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ . Apart from 514, the instance in question, all seven other occurrences of  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  (47, 87, 110, 254, 477, 497, 506) have the sense of a specific craft or skill (including that of prophecy). Now the last five of the above occurrences refer to the specific crafts and skills that Prometheus taught to humans. Most illuminating, however, is the discovery that the first two of these occurrences (47, 87) refer unequivocally to the  $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  of Hephaistos.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The adjective  $\alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha$  514 is of course in the predicate.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> The survey was made possible through the kind cooperation of Project Wordsearch and its computer resources at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> E. Fraenkel (Agamemnon 3.729, note 2) cites "Mousaios" B4 DK (date uncertain) ώς ἀεὶ τέχνη μέγ' ἀμείνων ἰσχύος ἐστί (τέχνη is always far superior to strength) in the belief that  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  here also has the abstract meaning of "ingenuity, inventiveness" that he attributes to  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  514, and that our line 514 is a polemic against this thought of "Mousaios." Aside from the uncertain date of the line of "Mousaios," making the question of polemic equally uncertain, we have no context by which to judge whether the sense of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  here is that of abstract "ingenuity, inventiveness," as Fraenkel assumes, or that of a specific skill. The well-known passage of Soph. OT 380-81 τέχνη τέχνης / ὑπερφέρουσα could well provide a similar uncertainty of interpretation if the context did not inform us that  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  here has the sense of the "art of ruling" (see Jebb ad loc.). The sense of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  in the "Mousaios" line might well be similar to that of μήτι in Il. 23.325 μήτι τοι δρυτόμος μεγ' ἀμείνων ἢὲ βίηφι (a tree cutter is much better off with skill [in cutting] than with mere strength). M. Griffith, in his recent edition of *Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge 1983), shares Fraenkel's traditional interpretation of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  in 514, citing ad loc. the abovementioned passages of "Musaios" and of the Iliad. Although I disagree with Griffith's interpretation of the sense of 514, his view that 514 is a gnome is plausible, and is a view that Professor A. E. Raubitschek independently expressed in a conversation with the author.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> In the case of Hephaistos, the concrete sense is made doubly clear by  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  47 functioning as a synonym for  $\chi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega \nu \alpha \xi i \alpha$  45 (handicraft).

It is of course true that shortly before 514 is spoken, the audience has listened to a long speech of Prometheus (476–506) in which the Titan enumerates the various  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \alpha \iota$  he has revealed to humans. This passage culminates in the proud claim in 506:  $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \alpha \iota$   $\beta \rho o \tau o \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \Pi \rho o \mu \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \omega s$  (all human skills come from Prometheus). Yet it seems to me that this consideration is offset by the dialogue in the following eight lines, which shifts the focus of thought away from events of the past to events of the future. The sequence of thought from 509 to 513 is revealing.

The chorus declares its hope that one day Prometheus will be released from his bonds and will be no less powerful than Zeus. Prometheus replies that this is not the way Moira has decreed the future, but that only after much suffering will he escape his bonds. When the chorus says in 509–10  $\sigma'$  ...  $\lambda \nu \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha$ , in using the passive voice, they presumably do not mean that Prometheus will contrive his own release, but that he will be released by someone else.  $(\lambda \nu \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha)$  here parallels the passive  $\lambda \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$  in the title of the following play where Prometheus was presumably released by Herakles.) Since the chorus therefore does not suggest to Prometheus that he contrive his own release, there would be no reason for Prometheus, in rejecting the hope of the chorus, to say that his own  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  cannot accomplish this release. Prometheus objects to the chorus's view of the future because he knows that he is destined to undergo long and painful suffering, and that only then will he be released, and by someone other than himself. But he also knows that when that time does arrive, when the Moirai set into motion the power of Necessity, not even the supreme craftsmanship  $(\tau \dot{\epsilon}_{\chi\nu\eta})$  of Hephaistos will be able to withstand its overriding force.<sup>12</sup>

If the above argument has lexical and dramatic validity, in Pr. 514  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  must refer to the craftsmanship of Hephaistos,  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta s$  to the force of universal Necessity.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Professor C. J. Herington pointed this out in correspondence as a difficulty in my interpretation of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  514.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> It is presumably not by accident that τέχνη 514 is the word that immediately follows the oracular φυγγάνω 513 (I will escape). The emphasis at the end of 513 is clearly on Prometheus' escaping his bonds. It would therefore be completely counter the current of the thought progression for Prometheus, immediately after proclaiming his eventual escape, then to state that he has not the means to escape.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> I should like to think that at the original performance of *Prometheus Bound* the actor playing Prometheus (Aiskhylos?), as he spoke the word  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ , raised his chained hands somewhat, so that the audience actually *saw* the meaning of  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ . Alas, no video cassette of the performance exists. Otherwise this article need never have been written.