

THE UNBINDING OF PROMETHEUS

The presence in the Aischylean catalogue of a *Prometheus Lyomenos*, plus the numerous ancient citations from it¹, demonstrate sufficiently that as Prometheus was bound in Greek mythology, so was he unbound. The extant fragments of the play together with later mythological accounts² establish beyond doubt that with or without the consent of Zeus, Herakles shattered the chains and freed Prometheus from his imprisonment. But there is also ample evidence to show that Greek mythology was not always so charitably disposed toward the benefactor of mankind³. Indeed, in earlier versions of the story he was not even a benefactor, but rather a figure of trickery and mischief, a folk-tale character much like the Norse Loki or the Irish Bricriu. Like Loki, in fact, Prometheus is eventually chained down so as to cause no more harm, and if we follow our early sources he appears destined to stay that way, to play out time together with his brother Atlas and a host of sinners in Tartaros as necessary hostages to the maintenance of world order. Yet somehow in the development of Greek culture the notion arose that Prometheus, unlike his fellow sufferers, was released. Precisely how this change took place in time for its appearance in Aischylos' trilogy on the subject is a more difficult question, but I think the available evidence can be made to suggest strongly that the culprit behind Prometheus' release was actually Aischylos himself.

Our earliest accounts of Prometheus occur in Hesiod, both in the *Works and Days* and in the *Theogony*. The description of Prometheus' sins and consequent punishment in the latter work has engendered considerable confusion owing to a questionable interpretation of certain lines. The whole passage runs as follows:

δῆσε δ' ἀλυκτοπέδησι Προμήθεα ποικιλόβουλον
δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοισιν μέσον διὰ ζιόν' ἐλάσασας
καί οἱ ἐπ' αἰετὸν ὄρσε τανύπτερον· αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἦπαρ
ῥηθιεν ἀθάνατον, τὸ δ' ἀέξετο ἴσον ἀπάντη

¹ For the fragments cf. H. J. Mette, *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin 1959), pp. 115—31.

² Cf. Apollodoros *Bibl.* 2. 5. 11. 10; Pausanias 5. 11. 6; Diod. Sic. 4. 15. 2; Hyginus *Fab.* 54, 144.

³ Cf. in particular L. Séchan, *Le mythe de Prométhée* (Paris 1951), pp. 13—4, and G. Grossman, *Promethie und Orestie* (Heidelberg 1970), pp. 12—4.

νυκτός, ὅσον πρόπαν ἤμαρ ἔδοι τανυσίπτερος ὄρνις.
 τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱὸς
 Ἡρακλῆς ἐκτεινε, κακὴν δ' ἀπὸ νοῦσον ἀλαλκεν
 Ἰαπετιονίδη, καὶ ἐλύσατο δυσφροσυνάων
 οὐκ ἀέκητι Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ὑψιμέδοντος,
 ὄφρ' Ἡρακλῆος Θηβαγενέος κλέος εἶη
 πλεῖον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβοτείραν
 ταῦτ' ἄρα ἄζόμενος τίμα ἀριδείκτεον υἱόν·
 καὶ περ χωόμενος παύθη χόλου δν πρὶν ἔχεσκειν,
 οὔνεκ' ἐρίζετο βουλάς ὑπερμενεί Κρονίωνι.

(ll.521-34)

„But Zeus bound shifty-counselling Prometheus in harsh, unbreakable bonds, driving them through the middle (?) of a column. And he sent a long-winged eagle to him, an eagle who devoured his immortal liver. And the liver grew back whole again during the night, however much the long-winged bird might eat in the course of the day. The valiant son of slim-ankled Alkmene, Herakles, slew the bird and warded off evil pain from Prometheus, freeing him from cares not without the consent of high-ruling Olympian Zeus, that the fame of Theban-born Herakles might be greater than before on the many-flocked earth. Approving therefore these things Zeus honored his renowned son, and though he was angry he ceased from the anger he had before, when Prometheus strove in counsels with him, the all-powerful son of Kronos.“ Hesiod then goes on to describe the cause of Zeus' anger, the banquet at Mekone where Prometheus tricked the ruler of the gods into choosing bones and fat for his portion (ll. 535—60). As retribution Zeus withholds fire from men, but Prometheus steals it for them (ll. 561—9). Finally Zeus counters with Pandora and the race of women, and to that there is no effective answer (ll. 570—612). The story closes with the moral that no one can escape the mind of Zeus, not even Prometheus, who for all his cunning is still bound fast (καὶ πολυδριν ἔοντα μέγας κατὰ δεσμὸς ἐρύκει, l. 616).

As it stands the text of this part of the *Theogony* is usually presumed to involve a contradiction: since line 616 quoted above clearly employs the present tense (ἐρύκει) to describe the condition of Prometheus' bondage, scholars have assumed that lines 523—34 with their account of the release must be a later interpolation, most likely by Athenians anxious to propagate Athenian tradition.⁴ But in point of fact, as M. L. West has now pointed out⁵, the supposed contradiction does not exist because there is no such reference to any release of Prometheus in Hesiod. What Hesiod says in lines 527—8 is that Herakles killed the bird (τὸν . . . Ἡρακλῆς ἐκτεινε), warded off bitter anguish (κακὴν δ' ἀπὸ νοῦσον ἀλαλκεν), and freed Prometheus from anxiety (καὶ ἐλύσατο δυσφροσυνάων). The first part of this

⁴ Cf. W. Kraus in *RE* (vol. 23: 1, col. 658) for an interpretation of the whole Herakles passage and even the eagle as an interpolation. So also F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca 1949), pp. 47, 124—5.

⁵ West, *Hesiod's Theogony* (Oxford 1966), pp. 313—5. West supposes the release to be a natural development of the cult at Athens but does not consider at what point that release might have occurred.

description refers to the slaying of the eagle in concrete terms, while the second phrase underscores the physical pain (νοῦσον) from which Prometheus has been rescued. The third part of Herakles' deed is couched in more general language, but ἐλύσατο δυσπροσυνάων can hardly mean „freed from bondage“: δυσπροσυνάων denotes rather some mental torment⁶, most likely the anticipation of the eagle's return every morning. Thus Hesiod uses three phrases to denote the specific deed and its wider consequences. But nowhere does he say, or even suggest, that Herakles did more than end the torture imposed by the eagle. Further confirmation of this reading comes from line 533, where we are told that Zeus in permitting the death of the eagle „ceased from the wrath he had before, although he was angry“ (καί περ χῳόμενος παύθη χόλου, δν πρὶν ἔχεσκεν). At first this line may also appear contradictory, but I think it actually refers to two different degrees of anger: the extreme wrath (χόλου) which caused Zeus to send the eagle when he first bound Prometheus, and the more subdued irritation (χῳόμενος) which still demands Prometheus' imprisonment but allows the eagle to be slain in mitigation of the torment and for the greater glory of Herakles.

It seems, therefore, that the *Theogony* does not describe the release of Prometheus after all; hence there is no contradiction and thus no compelling reason to suppose interpolation at any point in the account. According to Hesiod Prometheus was bound to a column for his deception at Mekone and for his theft of fire. At the same time⁷ an eagle was sent to torture him by devouring his liver. Subsequently Zeus alleviated that part of the punishment by permitting Herakles to kill the eagle, but there was no question of freeing the offender. In Hesiod's mind Prometheus was bound to his column for all time as an object lesson to others who might cross Zeus, and thus served a function analogous to that of Atlas and other sinners in Greek mythology, as noted above. Such an account relieves us of the need to explain Hesiod's inconsistency, but unfortunately it offers no evidence as to when the concept of a release did take shape. Clearly, however, there was a time when the release was not part of the story, and that in itself is suggestive.

The next category of evidence is a series of artistic representations ranging in date from the mid-seventh to the mid-sixth century. The material includes a Spartan ivory, a bronze shield relief from Olympia, a Cretan gem, and a variety of painted vases; the inventory is as follows:

1. Gem from Crete: location unknown, impression in British Museum Bibl.: RA 36 (1878), pl. 20 fig. 1; J.

⁶ Note the similar usage of δυσπροσυνέων at *Theog.* 102.

⁷ Several scholars have argued, perhaps rightly, that the eagle is a subsequent part of the tradition (as Aischylos himself may suggest), but the point is not important here.

Boardman *Island Gems* (London 1963), pp. 52—3 n. 186.⁸

Prometheus sits facing right, his hands bound behind him; the eagle moves in from the right.

2. Ivory relief from Sparta: Athens. Bibl.: K. Schefold *Myth in Early Greek Art* (New York 1966), pl. 11.

Prometheus kneels, leaning back at a sharp angle and facing right, with his head turned full front; his hands are bound behind him. The eagle appears to alight on his breast. Details badly worn. C. 650 B.C.

3. Bronze shield relief from Olympia: Bibl.: K. Schefold, op. cit., pl. 41.

Prometheus sits, leaning back and facing left, with his hands seemingly bound behind him. The eagle moves in from the left. C. 590 B.C.

4. Gem from Etruria: British Museum. Bibl.: G.M.A. Richter, *Engraved Gems of the Greeks and Etruscans* (London 1966), p. 211 no. 865.

Prometheus sits on a rock facing right, his bound hands held overhead. The eagle moves in from the right and attacks his liver. C. 490 B.C.

5. Attic Black-Figure dinos: Athens 16384. Bibl.: *ABV* p. 6; K. Schefold, op. cit., pl. 57a.

Prometheus sits (?) facing left, hands bound behind him; his body obscures a tree-trunk placed in such a way that he seems to be impaled on it. To the left Herakles crouches in the act of shooting arrows at the eagle; to the right the eagle itself falls wounded. Nessos Painter. C. 610 B. C.

6. Attic Black-Figure krater fragment from Phaleron: Erbach-Lucerne Bibl.: K. Kübler, *Altattische Malerei* (Tübingen 1950), pl. 78 oben; *ABV* p. 7.

Prometheus, seemingly impaled on tree trunk as above, faces left. Further to the left the wing of the eagle, wounded by two arrows. No other details visible.

⁸ Boardman also mentions a second gem (no. 187, with bibliography) which has been interpreted as a standing Prometheus attacked by an eagle. The design, however, seems more likely to represent a prostrate Tityos, or perhaps, as Boardman thinks, an unidentified corpse. Cf. also Roscher, col. 3087, fig. 3.

7. Attic Black-Figure krater from Chiusi: Berlin 1722. Bibl.: G. von Lücken, *Greek Vase Paintings* (The Hague 1921), pl. 31, 2; *ABV* p. 104. Roscher col. 3090 fig. 4a.
Prometheus half-sitting, seemingly impaled as above but with bound hands held out in front of him, faces right. To the left a running Herakles shoots arrows at the eagle; to the right the eagle itself approaches.
8. Attic Black-Figure amphora from La Tolfa: Karlsruhe B2591. Bibl.: *ABV* p. 97; *CVA* pl. 5.4; 6. 1—2; *Jdl* 1889, pp. 218—9; Roscher col. 3091 fig. 4c.
Prometheus in sitting position, hands out to either side, tree trunk behind him, facing left. Herakles moves in from left with bow, eagle falls wounded to right.
9. Attic Black-Figure amphora from Tarquinia: Florence 76359. Bibl.: *ABV* p. 97.
Prometheus half-sitting, hands out to either side, tree trunk behind him, faces right. Herakles approaches with bow from left, eagle moves in from right. Flanking deities (Athena, Hermes, Demeter).
10. Attic Black-Figure amphora: Milan, formerly Sammlung Vidoni. Bibl.: *Jdl* 1889, p. 221; Roscher col. 3091 fig. 4b.
Prometheus half-kneeling, hands out to either side, tree trunk behind, faces right but looks left. Herakles runs in with bow from left, eagle moves in from right. Four deities to left, meaningless inscriptions.
11. Lakonian bowl from Caere: Vatican 1298. Bibl.: *BSA* 34 (1933—4) p. 165.
Atlas (?) to the left supporting a large stone on his shoulders; to the right Prometheus, his hands bound behind him and lashed to a column, leans back while an eagle perches on his stomach. Arkesilas Painter. C. 550 B. C.⁹
12. Lakonian bowl: Louvre E668. Bibl.: *BSA* 34 (1933—4), p. 166, pl. 37b.
Prometheus (?) wrapped in garment, arms not shown, seated on frame bleacher; eagle closes in from right.

⁹ This scene has sometimes been interpreted as Tantalos and Tityos. But Tantalos is nowhere described as carrying a stone (Pindar *Ol.* 1. 57—8 says only that a rock hangs over his head) and Tityos is by all accounts tied down to the ground (*Od.* xi. 576 ff.). Atlas is by no means a sure attribution for the left-hand figure here, but Prometheus on the right-hand side seems certain enough. Perhaps the artist's intention was to link Atlas and Prometheus as fellow sufferers, much as Aischylos himself does in the *Prometheus Bound*.

Scanty as the above material may seem, it does offer a reasonably large sample of evidence which in no case shows Herakles actually freeing Prometheus from anything more than the torments of the eagle. Such a situation is not of course proof that the artists involved did not know of Prometheus' release, but again it is suggestive. We may also note some interesting details on the specific nature of Prometheus' bondage. The earliest representation, the Cretan gem, shows our miscreant with his hands bound behind him: on the Spartan ivory and the shield relief from Olympia the same holds true. But on the Vatican tondo (n. 11) his hands are clearly bound to a column behind him, thus illustrating that variations in detail are not necessarily geographic.¹⁰ This column may well be what Hesiod imagined if the words μέσον διὰ κίων' ἐλάσσας in the *Theogony* are to be taken to mean that Prometheus' bonds were driven through the middle of such a column; alternatively we might suppose that the column was set up in the middle space between Prometheus and his hands, i.e. that Prometheus was placed with his back against the column and his hands bound around it.¹¹ The Attic vase-painters, however, beginning with the Nessos Painter, have chosen to interpret Hesiod as though the column was driven through the middle of Prometheus himself, for without exception they show him impaled upon it. In the Nessos Painter's version his hands are still bound behind him, but on the Berlin amphora from Chiusi he holds them out bound in front of him, and on the other three vases (excluding the Phaleron fragment, where nothing can be determined) he is not bound at all, only fixed down by the column or tree trunk with his hands left free. Such agreement in rendering need not necessarily stem from a misinterpretation of Hesiod, but I think it likely. In any case the Attic painters do not make Herakles' task any the easier with their insistence on Prometheus' impalement; here again we may suspect that they were prepared to leave the transgressor where they found him, on his stake. Aischylos' version rather simplifies such matters.

Attic Red-Figure vase painting does not seem to have taken to the bound Prometheus as did Black-Figure, but fifth-century Athens still offers us some very important evidence on the question of his

¹⁰ E. Kunze, *Archaische Schildbänder* (Berlin 1950), pp. 91—2, has divided the material into two groups, one from the Peloponnese and Krete (here nos. 1, 2, 3, 11), the other from Athens (nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). Since Herakles appears in all of the Athenian representations and none of the non-Athenian ones, Kunze argues that Dorian tradition did not know of Herakles' intervention, which was actually a seventh-century Attic addition to the original story. But Kunze's theory depends on his insistence that neither chance nor limited space are factors, whereas in fact four examples are probably too few for such conclusions, and in three of them space really is a consideration. Only in the case of no. 11, the Lakonian tondo, is there sufficient room for Herakles, but here the artist apparently wished to illustrate a different story; certainly his representation of Atlas should not be taken for ignorance of Herakles' role.

¹¹ Cf. West, *op. cit.*, p. 312 for discussion of this passage. He decides in favor of bonds fastened to the column, much as did the artist of the Lakonian cup (no 11). Cf. also *Hésiode et son influence* (Fondation Hardt: Geneva 1960), pp. 105—6.

release. The scholiast to Apollonios' *Argonautika* IV 1395 tells us that the golden apples mentioned therein were procured by Herakles, who on his way to get them¹²

ἐξελθὼν δὲ παρὰ Προμηθεῖα καὶ ὄφθεις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ οἰκτεῖρει ἱκετεύοντα καὶ κτείνει τὸν ἀετὸν, ὃς αὐτοῦ τὸ ἥπαρ ἤσθιε, τοξεύσας προσπετόμενον. ἀντὶ δὲ τούτου Προμηθεὺς μὴ ἀπιέναι ἐπὶ τὰ μῆλα ὑποτίθεται, ἐλθόντα δὲ πρὸς Ἄτλαντα κελεύειν ἐνέγκαι αὐτῶ, καὶ ἀντὶ Ἄτλαντος αὐτὸν ἔχειν τὸν οὐρανόν, ἕως ἂν ἐνέγκῃ τὰ μῆλα παρὰ τῶν Ἑσπερίδων.

„Passing in the vicinity of Prometheus, and being seen by the latter, Herakles took pity upon him as he supplicated and slew the eagle which was devouring Prometheus' liver, having shot him as he approached. In return for this deed Prometheus advised Herakles not to get the apples himself, but rather to go to Atlas and ask him to procure them, and to hold up the sky for him until he should bring the apples back from the Hesperides.“ The passage goes on to describe how Herakles took the advice offered and then closes with the words οὕτως ὁ αὐτὸς Φερεκύδης ἐν β ἱστορεῖ „thus Pherekydes relates.“ Since Pherekydes the Athenian mythographer is indicated here, and since Eusebius gives him a floruit of 456 B.C., his account is of considerable relevance for the question of how Athenians viewed Prometheus' bondage in Aischylos' own time. We might of course argue *ex silentio* that since Pherekydes does not mention the release he did not know of it, but we have much better evidence for the same point in the phrase ἀντὶ δὲ τούτου used to shift from the rescue to Prometheus' advice. Herakles shot the eagle, and *in return for this* Prometheus gave him some useful information. Obviously there would be no point to such wording if Herakles went on to release Prometheus; both eagle-slaying and release would then logically precede Prometheus' gesture of thanks. But they do not; as matters stand in this description Herakles receives advice from the still-bound miscreant in gratitude for the mitigation of part of the torment (cf. *Theogony* 533). Then, having done all he dared to do and received in turn the help he needed, Herakles proceeds on his way, surely leaving Prometheus to his bondage. Pherekydes' Greek allows, I think, no alternative.

It seems therefore that there is no recoverable tradition of a released Prometheus before the time of Aischylos; on the contrary an Athenian of that very period tells us that to his knowledge Prometheus is still in bonds, still chained down, as it was in the days of Hesiod. Yet for Aischylos matters were different. Of course his trilogy does contain changes of many sorts. We might note, for example, that the well-meaning trickster of Hesiod who brings ruin to mortals by his deceit at Mekone and his theft of fire has become instead a culture hero, a benefactor of mankind. To Hesiod Prometheus is like Pandora an explanation of the evils men suffer; he tricked Zeus and caused disaster for the mortals he was trying to help.¹³ But Aischylos' Prome-

¹² For the whole text cf. Jacoby, Pherekydes *FrGH* 3F17.

¹³ *Works and Days* 42 ff.

theus clearly succeeds in his aims: he brings not only fire but many other benefits to men, and Zeus does not take them back. That he does not do so suggests a more beneficent Zeus than the one Hesiod envisions, a Zeus who permits, though he may not at first actively champion, the progress of man. So perhaps we should not after all be surprised by the possibility that Aischylos conceived an even more radical departure from tradition in the second play of his trilogy, a departure whereby Herakles not only slew the eagle but also shattered Prometheus' bonds in token of an increased divine benevolence. Many of the details of the trilogy are lost to us, but the very title *Prometheus Lyomenos* makes it clear that Prometheus was released, and that Zeus eventually approved this arrangement. Such a situation again separates Aischylos' Zeus from his Hesiodic counterpart, and we may suspect that the desire to portray divinity in this fashion was what prompted Aischylos to innovate in the denouement of his second play. Certainly the result would have startled an Athenian audience expecting to see Prometheus bound throughout the performance, but then Athenians were probably used to Aischylos' startling effects; even within our own limited repertoire of seven plays the *Eumenides* should attest the poet's willingness to reshape traditional material to his own poetic purposes. If Aischylos' conception of Zeus required a released Prometheus, he surely would not have hesitated to create one.¹⁴

There remain several important objections to this hypothesis which must be considered. It may, for example, be pointed out that Aischylos had already treated Prometheus in the satyr-play *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* presented with his entry of 472 B.C. (*Persai*, *Phineus*, *Glaukos Potnieus*). But this play, as the fragments make clear,¹⁵ dealt with Prometheus' gift of fire to men, here burlesqued as satyrs, and thus had nothing to do with his eventual fate. Nor does perpetual punishment preclude one from appearing on stage, as Aischylos' *Ixion*, *Sisyphos Drapetes*, and *Sisyphos Petrokylistes* demonstrate; sinners, in fact, seem much in demand. More serious in terms of objections is the fragment of the *Sphinx* (satyr-play to the Theban trilogy of 467 B.C.) which refers to a garland thus:¹⁶

τῷ δὲ ξένῳ γε στέφανον, ἀρχαῖον στέφανος,
δεσμῶν ἄριστος ἐκ Προμηθεώς λόγῳ

¹⁴ On innovation in the resolutions of Aischylean trilogies cf. C. J. Herington in *Arion* IV (1965), pp. 391 ff. We should keep in mind too that Aischylos' version of the Prometheus story already contains numerous features probably attributable to him. In addition to the interview with Io, which serves a solely dramatic function, there is the secret of Thetis, known to us from Pindar's earlier *Isthmian* 8 but there having nothing to do with Prometheus. If, as seems likely, the shift from Themis to Prometheus as keeper of the secret is an Aischylean touch, we might logically assume that Aischylos needed this shift in order to motivate another new element in the story, i.e. the release.

¹⁵ Cf. Mette, *Fragmente*, pp. 165—6.

¹⁶ Cf. Mette, *Fragmente*, p. 61, frag. 181 (235N).

„But to the stranger a garland, a most ancient crown, best of bonds according to the word of Prometheus.“ Later mythographers¹⁷ do mention a garland as well as a ring that Prometheus supposedly wore in symbolic token of bondage to Zeus; if that garland is referred to here, it would imply that the release was known prior to 467 B.C. But it is difficult to see whom Aischylos could be citing with the words ἐκ Προμηθέως λόγου;¹⁸ nothing of this sort appears in the *Theogony* or the *Works and Days*, and the context of the *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*, as noted above, has nothing to do with any release. One quite possible solution would be to draw the quote from the *Prometheia* itself,¹⁹ even though the consequent pre-467 dating of the trilogy contradicts most recent thinking.²⁰ Or perhaps we might suppose that Athenaios mis-cited his source: his quotation does follow directly upon a reference to the *Lyomenos*,²¹ thus multiplying the chances for a confusion of some sort.

Finally there is the question of the cult of Prometheus. That such a cult existed is verified by the scholia to Sophokles' *Oidipous at Kolonos*,²² where Apollodoros writes that Prometheus was honored together with Hephaistos at the Akademeia, and even had an ancient statue. Numerous other writers confirm that there was a festival for Prometheus, and with it a torch race dating back to at least 320 B.C.²³

¹⁷ Cf. Athenaios *Deip.* xv. 672 ff.; Hyginus *Astr.* ii. 15; Serv. *Ecl.* 6. 42; Pliny *NH* 33. 4, 37.1.

¹⁸ This phrase could also mean „according to the tale of Prometheus“, but a traditional legend is not nearly so likely to contain a set quote as is a literary work. Thus H. W. Smyth in his Loeb edition of the fragments (London 1926, pp. 460—1) translates „as Prometheus said“, while Mette (*Der Verlorene Aischylos*, Berlin 1963, p. 37) renders „nach Prometheus' Wort“.

¹⁹ So Mette, *Fragmente*, pp. 256—7, following Wilamowitz, *Aischylos Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914), p. 242 n. 2. Mette supposes the reference to derive from the *Prometheus Lyomenos*, and hence assumes for the Prometheus trilogy a date earlier than that of the Theban trilogy, specifically 469 B. C. (on the basis of a dubious link between *Prometheus Desnotes* 789 and Sophokles' 468 B. C. production of the *Triptolemos* [frag. 597]).

²⁰ C. J. Herington, *The Author of the Prometheus Bound* (Austin 1970), *passim*, argues most eloquently for a post-Oresteian date on the basis of stylistic evidence. In an appendix (pp. 127—9) he also confronts Mette's arguments (*supra* n. 18) for a pre-467 dating. But though I think he disposes of the *Triptolemos* connection convincingly enough, I cannot see why Aischylos should not be free to quote himself in a satyr-play. A more serious objection, through not a decisive one, is the awkward likelihood of a dummy to play Prometheus in any pre-467 staging of the trilogy.

²¹ Cf. n. 16. Athenaios' transition from the *Lyomenos* to the satyr-play of a completely different trilogy seems to me rather abrupt. Just possibly he meant to refer to the satyr-play of the Prometheus trilogy, where the lines would not be inappropriate.

²² Cf. V. De Marco, *Scholia in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum* (Rome 1952), p. 9, 1. 56.

²³ L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford (1896—1909), vol. 5, pp. 387 ff.

All this poses certain problems: the Athenians are not likely to have held a festival for a still-bound god. Yet there is no evidence that the cult was an old one, nor very important, and it might well have grown up in the course of the fifth century as a result of Aischylos' theological revisionism, attaching itself for obvious reasons to the worship of Hephaistos. Or we might adopt Wilamowitz' suggestion that the inscriptional form Promethia for Prometheia reflects an ancient Attic potters' deity Promethos to whom worship of Prometheus was subsequently fused.²⁴ Certainly problems remain, but I do not think they should be allowed to obscure the indications that Prometheus' transformation from mischief-maker to cult hero was a relatively late process, one brought about in the fifth century B.C., to judge from Pherkydes, and quite likely engineered by Aischylos.

University of Georgia.

T. N. Gantz.

²⁴ Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 138, 144—7.