

DISCURSIVE AND SOCIOIDEOLOGICAL ASPECTS IN THE POEM “PROMETHEUS”, BY GOETHE: A COUNTERWORD TO THE GREEK TRAGEDY

Wilder Kleber Fernandes de SANTANA*
Pedro Farias FRANCELINO**
Danielyson Yure de Queiroz VALENTIM***

- **ABSTRACT:** This study aims to discuss discursive and socio-ideological aspects in Goethe’s poem *Prometheus*, from the dialogical perspective of language, observing how it is configured as a counterword to the Greek tragedy *Prometheus*. For in such a way, we find theoretical and methodological endorsement in the thought of Bakhtin (2006a, 2006b [1979]; 2010 [1930-34]), Medviédev (2016a, 2016b [1928]), Volóchinov (2017 [1929]) and Benjamin (2018), which subsidize the research. Using a dialogical approach, we delimited as *locus* of the study the poem entitled *Prometheus*, authored by Goethe. From the moment when we understand the poem by Goethe as a counterword, it is possible to glimpse a change of conception in the construction of the character, resulting of discursive interactions between Prometheus and Zeus. In addition, there is a process of discontinuance of the mythical narrative, since Goethe’s perspective reveals dialogues with the German sociopolitical system between the 18th and 19th centuries. It is, therefore, considered a research of qualitative and interpretative matrix. The results had pointed to the fact that the points of view of Goethe, in his work-statement (BAKHTIN, 2006d [1979]), differentiate of the tragic perspective visualized in the *Myth of Prometheus*, where the character has become a slave and had perpetual punishment.
- **KEYWORDS:** Discursive and Socio-Ideological Aspects; Prometheus; Goethe.

Introduction

Enrolling in the dialogical perspective of language studies implies the accountability of the word that is enunciated/launched in the light of knowledge (SANTANA; SILVA-JÚNIOR; FRANCELINO, 2020). We are increasingly careful to spread the word in ethical,

* Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB). João Pessoa – PB – Brasil. ORCID: 0000-0001-7569-499X. wildersantana92@gmail.com.

** Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB). João Pessoa – PB – Brasil. ORCID: 0000-0001-6945-1940. pedrofrancelino@yahoo.com.br.

*** Universidade do Estado do Rio Grande do Norte (UERN). Pau dos Ferros – RN – Brasil. ORCID: 0000-0002-8891-1217. dvalentim123@hotmail.com.

aesthetic and scientific spheres in view of its specificity, since, as researchers, what we mobilize – the objects of investigation – influences various consciousness, whether didactic or academically (BRAIT; PISTORI, 2012). Thus, in a context of dialogical studies, we insert ourselves into an arsenal of existing productions about language and discourse (FRANCELINO, 2007; GRILLO, 2017; ROHLING; VIEIRA, 2021).

When we restate studies that portray the Greek tragedy, we are echoing voices, among which, those of scholars of religion and mythology, as pointed out by Schleiermacher (1958), Rosa (1979), Otto (2007) and Eliade (2010, 2013). In this direction, we dialogue with contemporary discursive studies guided by the dialogical theory in order to assume concrete positions in front of the social audience that constitutes us (MEDVIÉDEV, 2016b [1928]). It is worth, in this direction, to recollect what is postulated by Santana and Silveira (2019) on the fact that it is necessary to create effect of active responsibility for what we sign and/or we enunciate to not only reflect on the object of study and the enunciated words, but on plural opinions (BAKHTIN, 2006b [1979]).

In this sense, we delimit as object of study the discursive and socio-ideological aspects in the poem *Prometheus*, by Goethe, which consists of a re-enunciation of the Greek tragedy that stars Prometheus.¹ To formulate the theoretical assumptions, we refer to Bakhtin (2006a, 2006b, 2006c [1979]), Volóchinov (2017 [1929]) and Medviédev (2016a, 2016b [1928]), since the reference to socio-ideological aspects in the enunciate-discursive universe is recurrent in the production of Russian scholars. In addition, under the historical agenda, we turn to Benjamin, whose production brings together essays on Goethe articulating political system and literary production, after all, the critic records that, shortly after 1772 “[i]t first unfolds the procedure that will characterize Goethe’s literary work: he always gives in to the temptation of revolutionary themes, to later dodge them or abandon them in the form of a fragment” (BENJAMIN, 2018, p. 129).

In view of such a configuration, the *corpus* consists of the Poem “Prometheus”, by Goethe, and the objective of the work is to analyze the discursive and socio-ideological aspects of this utterance (poem), in the dialogical perspective of language, observing how it is constructed as a counterword to the Greek tragedy. From the moment we understand the Goethean poem as a counterword, it is possible to glimpse different forms of presence of the other, that is, the presence of different social voices resulting from discursive interactions. Moreover, it has discontinuous lines, once the perspective of Goethe discloses dialogues with the German sociopolitical system between the 18th and 19th centuries.

Referring to the methodological procedure, one is about a documentary and bibliographical research that assumes a qualitative-interpretative approach in data analysis. Or even, considering the theoretical perspective adopted, it is a dialogic reading of the statements that make up the research data.

In structural terms, for the fulfillment of our objectives, we subdivide the manuscript in three sections, besides the Introduction and the Final Considerations. The first section,

¹ The Greek tragedy *Prometheus* is attributed to Aeschylus. The myth of Prometheus appears in other Greek workmanships such as in poems of Hesiod (*Theogony, Works and days*).

entitled *Discursive and socio-ideological aspects under the prism of Bakhtin and the Circle*, promotes a theoretical discussion on basic concepts of thought by Bakhtin, Volóchinov and Medviédev, such as speech, statement and ideology. *The second section, Prometheus, the Greek myth, and some of its re-emphasis* traces a historical-conceptual course around the Greek tragedy Prometheus, as well as its interpretative variations over time. In sequence, the third section *Discursive and Socio-ideological Marks of the Greek tragedy in Prometheus, of Goethe* consists of the analysis of the poem Prometheus, in view of the arsenal theoretical and methodological mobilized here.

Discursive and socio-ideological aspects under the prism of Bakhtin and the Circle

We understand, by means of the thought of Bakhtin (2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2006d [1979]), Volóchinov (2017 [1929]) and Medviédev (2016a, 2016b)), that the language is loaded of a multiplicity of senses and ideologically filled. Thus, in the different contexts in which it manifests, points of view arising from situations of discursive interaction are constructed. In the perspective of the scholars in the Circle of Bakhtin, the discourses we produce can generate diverse ways of positioning themselves, evidencing the alive character of the language (VOLÓCHINOV, 2017), as well as the discursive genres that are tied to it.

Committed to discussing social and ideological language, when dealing with the relationship between culture and life, Bakhtin (2010 [1924]) and Medviédev (2016a [1928]) defended the inseparability between these two worlds,² as was common to find in the Natural Sciences, in Bergsonian Philosophy of Life and Formalist aesthetics (SANTANA, 2018). In this aiming, Medvedev, in his writing *The science of the ideologies and its immediate tasks*, affirms that

All the participant individual acts of the ideological creation are only the non-separable moments of this communication and are its dependent components, therefore, they cannot be studied outside of the social process that understands them as a whole. [...] The ideological meaning, abstracted from concrete material, is opposed, by bourgeois science, to the individual conscience of the creator or the interpreter. [...] Each ideological product and all its “ideal meaning” are not in the soul, nor in the internal world and nor in the isolated world of ideas and pure senses, but in the available and objective ideological material, in the word, the sound, the gesture, the combination of the masses, the lines, the colors, the living bodies, and so on (MEDVIÉDEV, 2016a [1928], p. 49-50).

The Russian researcher was alerting for the fact that the consequence of the split between the cultural process (socio-ideological environment) and the object would

² The expression “worlds” must be understood as spheres, as interconstitutive spaces of sayings and events. In Bakhtinian terms, in the way claimed by us, the word “world” consists of a horizon of possibilities of events.

be the immediate deletion of the ideology. A signal cannot be evaluated far from its socio-historical reality, from the voices that constitute it. Bakhtin (2006c [1979]), in *The problem of the text in linguistics, philology and other human sciences*, understands that borders do not act as a dividing mark of interpretations, nor do they align with a segment of studies based on the text as pure form, but they are inscribed as signatures of axiological movements, which summons the senses in the discourses.

Once that the senses promote the understanding of the statement, Bakhtin, in his writing *Methodology of human sciences*, certifies that the understanding materializes from its dismemberment in particular acts. “In the effective, real and concrete understanding, they establish indissolubly in an unique process of understanding, however, each particular act has semantic autonomy (of content) ideal and can be detached from the concrete empirical act” (BAKHTIN, 2006d [1979], p. 398). It is in this enclosure that it reaches the “understanding active-dialogical (discussion-agreement). The insertion in the dialogical context. The evaluative element in understanding and its depth degree and universality” (BAKHTIN, 2006b [1979], p. 398).

Still in accordance with the philosopher, in the manuscript *The science of literature today* (BAKHTIN, 2017 [1970], p. 14), is over all thanks to the historical and ideological aspects in the language that “The workmanships dissolve the borders of its time, live in the centuries, that is, in the great time, and moreover they frequently take a more intense and full life than in its present time”. Immersed in this conception of an inclusive and alive language, any dialogical process of analysis will be able to understand the concreteness of the statements produced in different situations of discursive interaction by socially organized citizens, seen that

Every statement, even when written and finished, answers something and is oriented towards a reply. It is just one link in the unbroken chain of verbal discourses. Every monument continues the work of its predecessors, polemicalizes with them, waits for an active and responsive understanding, anticipating it, etc. [...] The monument, like any monological statement, is oriented to be perceived [...] in the formation of that ideological sphere, from which it is an indissoluble element (VOLOCHINOV, 2017 [1929], p. 184-185).

Under the lenses of the Russian studios, the statement, that emerges from the intersubjectivity (VOLÓCHINOV, 2017), carries ideological content, so that every speaking individual tends to be a respondent to other citizens in the interactional processes of the everyday. In accordance with Bakhtin (2010, p. 53), in his (social) philosophy of the act, “at the moment of the act, the world reorganizes in one instant, its true architecture it reestablishes, in which everything that is theoretically conceivable is nothing more than an aspect”. By means of a criticism to the way traditional philosophy was being constructed, by disregarding the individual from the real participation in life, affirms Bakhtin that there is a rebuilding of social constructions in each act produced

by the citizen, and this is not only by means of its moral ethical responsibility, but in the alive contact between two or more consciences. Thus, it is necessary to raise voices that reinsert socio-political factors into the discussion, not unitary ones, but voices that echo a multiplicity of historical-ideological factors, which add to social responsibility.

Thus, for Volóchinov (2017 [1929]), insofar as the word is the ideological phenomenon par excellence, it is also populated by ideological signs. In turn, the speeches are alive and dynamic in discursive interactions, which are, for Volóchinov (2017 [1929]), the fundamental reality of language. It is in this sense that we deal with ideological spheres (MEDVIÉDEV, 2016a), which collide with each other in order to constitute discursive arenas, however, they contain different ideological perspectives, being interdependent on each other. Thereby, it becomes visible that, in the poem *Prometheus*, written by Goethe, the voices intercross; and through a set of ideological contents it is revealed in discursive practices.

Prometheus, the Greek myth, and some of its re-emphasis

In the different versions of the myth of Prometheus, such as the narrations that date back to 470 BC, in Hesiod and Homer, to the years 700 BC, in Aeschylus and Plato (with his work *Protagoras*), to the most recent adaptations of the myth, in order to try to convey the tragic event with the titan, we have access to the story of Prometheus, who deceived the father of the gods, Zeus in favor of the human race.

From the beginning, we pay attention to the myth told by Protagoras, of Plato. The character tells us that, at a time when no mortal creatures yet existed, only the gods, when it pleased fate that these creatures were formed, they granted Prometheus and his brother, Epimetheus, the task of offering whatever was necessary for creatures so they could survive and would not disappear. So Epimetheus asked Prometheus to allow him to carry out the task, on condition that he passed his approval. Thus, he did what was agreed:

To some he attributed strength without speed, endowing the weakest with speed; to others he gave weapons; for those he had left with an unarmed nature, he devised different means of preservation: those he clothed with a small body, endowed with wings, to escape, or provided them with some underground refuge; the corpulent found salvation in the dimensions themselves. Thus he acted with all, applying always the criterion of compensation (PLATÃO, 2002, p. 19, our translation).

Through carelessness and lack of understanding, Epimetheus forgot to provide for the generation of men. When the titan Prometheus arrived to make the final review, he realized that he had given everything to the animals and man was destitute. When the day came for them to be brought to the light, Prometheus, not knowing what to

do to secure salvation for man, stole from Athena and Hephaestus the wisdom of the arts and fire and gave them to man “for without fire, beyond of useless arts, it would be impossible to learn them” (PLATÃO, 2002, p. 65, our translation). This way, man was able to survive in good conditions and Prometheus was imprisoned in the fetters of Hephaestus on a mountain in the Caucasus, because of Epimetheus.

In another version (BRANDÃO, 2015), Prometheus would have deceived Zeus, the father of gods, with the objective of benefiting the mortals. As a result, Zeus had punished men by denying them the right to fire. The titan, against the will of the father of the gods, steals fire from Olympus and gives it to men. For this purpose, two punishments are declared by Zeus:

- a) Pandora’s box is sent to men, which contains all the evils of the world;
- b) Prometheus is chained to a pillar, where, daily, a bird devours his liver.³

In terms of historical register, when knitting review notes on the Goethean literary production, Benjamin (2018) affirms that

Already in his first drama Goethe was withdrawing from the influence of the revolutionary energy of Storm and impetus, which becomes more evident in comparison with the dramas of his contemporaries. **The German bourgeoisie was by no means strong enough to maintain, by its own means, a broad literary activity.** In consequence of this situation, literature continued to depend on feudalism, still in the cases where the affection of the literate was beside the class of the bourgeoisie (BENJAMIN, 2018, p. 130, author’s emphasis).

Regarding the historical context in which Goethe wrote his poem, the 18th century was marked by the Enlightenment (or the Renaissance), a period that, according to Kant (2002), marks the departure of man from his minority, “the inability to serve himself with the understanding without the guidance of another.” (KANT, 2002, p. 11).

At this time, knowledge starts to move away from religious rules and man begins the attempts to test, to try and to take science for base, what gives space for the reason ideal (KESTLER, 2006) and, thus, the man passes to question, to walk more freely without the shackles of religion. On the other hand, in this exact period, took place the literary movement preceding the called German Romanticism *Sturm und Drang*. The movement was composed of sentimental productions (COLEN; DRUMMOND, 2010) by several young poets, among them Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who wrote the poem

³ As a punishment for Prometheus and Epimetheus for stealing fire from Olympus, Jupiter (the Roman equivalent of Zeus) would have sent the first woman called Pandora, “made in heaven, and each of the gods contributed something to perfect her.” (BULFINCH, 2017, p. 20). Epimetheus gladly accepted the gift from Jupiter, despite being warned by his brother to be careful with gifts from the father of the gods. Pandora found a box belonging to Epimetheus that held evil articles and, taken with much curiosity, opened it letting out plagues that hit the man.

to be analyzed in this article and which was seen as a symbol of radical resistance to the Enlightenment (HOBSBAWN, 2011). *Sturm und Drang* looked to oppose rationality with sentimental productions and poetry (COLEN; DRUMMOND, 2010).

Faced with such considerations, we proposed to analyze the discursive and socio-ideological aspects in the poem *Prometheus*, by Goethe, which consists of a renunciation of the Greek tragedy that stars Prometheus. This poem, which dialogues with the myth of Prometheus, was written by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, considered one of the biggest poets in German language (KESTLER, 2006) who lived between centuries 18 and 19. In its structure, Goethe's *Prometheus* is composed of 7 stanzas and 57 lines. We can find traces in the poem that mark the ancestry of the rebel who opposes the injustice and the tyrannical rule of the gods (GAMA, 1996).

Discursive and socio-ideological marks of the Greek tragedy in *Prometheus*, by Goethe

In this section, we focus on the analysis of the poem *Prometheus*, present in *On storms: the German poetry of Sturm und Drang* (2010), edited by Érico Colen and Luana Drummond. We seek to show and the approximations of the Greek tragedy proposed by the writer of the poem to his political reality, the detachment experienced in the period in which he wrote it. Here is the poem, translated into English.

Prometheus

*Hide your sky, O Zeus,
With cloud vapors...
But my Land
You must leave me,
And my hut, which you did not build,
And my home, Whose brazier
You envy.*

*Nothing poorer I know
Under the sun than what you, O Gods!
Meekly nourish
Of sacrifice tributes
And breaths of prayers Your majesty;
And you would die of hunger, if they were not
Children and beggars
Wild full of hope.
[...]*

*Who helped me
Against the insolence of the Titans?
Who exempted me of the death,
From slavery?
[...]*

*You thought perhaps
That I ought to hate the life
And flee to the deserts,
There because nor all
The dreams in flower had borne fruit?
Therefore I am here! I form Men
To my image,
A lineage that is similar to me:
To suffer; to cry,
To enjoy and rejoice,
And not to respect you,
As I!*

(GOETHE, 2010, p.08).

The political and social context in which the German poet Goethe is inscribed is marked by debates that put in opposition what is considered the ideal of reason (influence of the Enlightenment) and the sentimentalist productions produced by the followers of the pre-romantic movement *Sturm und Drang*. Having this in sight, Goethe makes use of the Greek tragedy to disclose his opinion concerning the German society of the period in question, as well as “the revolt he feels with regard to the power of the great” (SOUTO, 2010, p. 205), that feeling is well-known in some verses of the poem.

Initially, we appeal to Bakhtin, for whom, “To the similarity of Prometheus by Goethe, Dostoiévski does not create dumb slaves (as Zeus), but free people, capable to place themselves side by side with their creator, to disagree with him and even rebelling themselves against him.” (BAKHTIN, 2008 [1963], p. 4). Thereby, we start from the principle that Goethe, as author-creator, circumscribes a world of possibilities for dialogue in his poem, whose characters have life, own will, voice, that is, the capacity of the counterword.

We verify, in the first stanza of the poem, that Prometheus rebels against the father of the gods by making the following pronouncement “*Cover your sky, O Zeus, with vapors of clouds... But my Land/You shall leave me*”, in which the use of the verb “to cover”, in this passage, brings a sense of separation between what would be the domain of Zeus (the sky, the clouds) and the domain of the Titan, the land. This separation manifests the axiological position of Prometheus when he emphasizes that Zeus no longer has absolute dominion over the life of terrestrials.

After endorsing his indignation against the authoritarianism and pettiness of the gods, in the verses “*Nothing poorer I know/ Under the sun than what you, O Gods/ Meekly nourish/ Of tributes of sacrifices*”, the character refers to the unfortunate ones, those that did not have as much importance from the social point of view, convoking them as responsible for the divine sovereignty: “*And you would die of hunger, if they were not/ Children and beggars/ Wild full of hope*”. With such words, with divine beings as poetic recipients, Goethe establishes severe criticism and takes a stand against the prevailing political system of his time, a kind of counter-word to the German government. As for the figure of the addressee, one of the contributions, in the discursive scope, is the ability to speak of the other – the phenomenon of alterity. After all, “The hero’s consciousness is given as the other, the consciousness of the other, but at the same time it is not objectified, it is not closed off, it does not become a mere object of the author’s consciousness” (BAKHTIN, 2008 [1963], p.4).

Following the poem, Prometheus makes a series of interpellations:

*Who helped me
Against the insolence of the Titans?
Who saved me from death,
From slavery?
[...]*

*You thought maybe
That I ought to hate life
And flee to the deserts,
There because nor all
The dreams in flower had borne fruit?*

Through such interrogations, Prometheus refers to Zeus, reminding him that, on his part and the deities who live in his shadows, there was no protection, no compassion, nor the recognition that slavery consists in the erasure of the other, the silencing of the voice of others, sentencing him to an inferior place. It is interesting to observe the multiplicity of meanings in the character’s utterances, as they also refer to the political and socio-ideological conditions of 19th century’s Germany, since, according to Volóchinov (2017, p. 195-196), “The meaning of the word is entirely determined by its context. In fact, there are as many meanings for a word as there are contexts for its use”. This makes us reflect on the creational aspect of Goethe, who, by assuming the position of artisan of the word – an author-creator – gave voice to his characters, impelled them to social dialogue, considering that these “do not lie side by side, as if they did not perceive each other, but are in a state of interaction and tense and uninterrupted clash” (VOLOCHINOV, 2017, p. 197).

When mentioning Goethe, Benjamin notifies (2018, p. 130) that “[the] great author, from the beginning, converts his inner world into a matter of public interest,

fully transforming the problems of his empirical and intellectual world”. So, when understanding that the German poet found, in the poem, words to express his dissatisfaction with the current government, he exemplifies the continuity of his criticisms in works such as *Werther's Sorrows*, in which “the bourgeoisie of the time found its pathology described at the same time in an incisive and flattering manner, likewise current bourgeoisie finds in Freudian theory” (BENJAMIN, 2018, p. 130).

Goethe, then, does not immerse himself in the ritual of repeatability of tragedy, as a mimetic process, but enters the vivacity of language (MEDVIÉDEV, 2016b [1928]) through discontinuous aspects. In this prism of understanding, Bakhtin records that “An artist like Goethe seeks to perceive all existing contradictions as different stages of a single development, he tends to see in each phenomenon of the present a vestige of the past, the apex of the present or a trend of the future” (BAKHTIN, 2008 [1963], p. 31). Then, in the last stanza of the poem, Prometheus says:

*Therefore I am here! I form Men
In my image,
A lineage that resembles me:
To suffer, to cry,
To enjoy and rejoice,
And not to respect you,
Like me!*

A remission of Prometheus to the act of the creation enunciated by God in the book of Genesis of the Jewish-Christian holy scriptures, as the narrative of Moses. In Genesis, Moses records: “Then God said: “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. May he have dominion over the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky...”. (BÍBLIA, Gênese, 1, 28-29). At that moment, the narrative of the creation⁴ is pointing to the fact that God has bred the human being similar to him, in exclusive characteristics, such as rationality, the capacity to think, to create, etc. However, it is clear the great difference between God, the creator, and the man, the creature. In other words, a functional distance between the creator and the creatures becomes well-known - the creator is the one who has the power to make to seem or to differentiate, and this happens for the constituent and exclusive characteristics of God, such as the omnipotence, the omnipresence and the prescience (MACDONALD, 2010).

When we refer to the Goethean poem, specifically to the lines “*For here I am! I form Men/ in my image, /A lineage that resembles me...*”, it is verified, through a *counterword* to the perpetuation of ordinances to the figure of the creator, an axiological position of creative reformulation: not only is the almighty Zeus who has the gift of creating, but creatures also form, create, become creators and participants in dialogue together.

⁴ Dake is careful to specify that when man and animals were brought into existence, “their bodies were formed, but their lives were created. The creation of the man was not carried through only by a divine order, but by divine advice (26-28). Therefore, God created the man to its proper image” (DAKE, 2012, p. 62).

Through the lines of the poem *Prometheus*, in a historical-ideological horizon, Goethe was able to explore not only the political system of his nation, but above all reaffirm urgencies in the psychosocial chronotype. The voice circumscribed by Goethe, which is materialized in the character Prometheus, in addition to emancipating libertarian tendencies, proposed the exaltation and freedom of popular expression. Once his revolutionary voice could not be effective in the ethical political field, it was in literary edges that his voice found echoes and resonances.

Final Considerations

The dialogic reading of the statement in analysis - *Prometheus*, by Goethe - evidenced the dialogic character of the speech as it disclosed the presence of other discourses, proceeding, also, from other spheres of language, as the religious one, either keeping the directions of the “original”, first (as it occurs in a paraphrase), either reformulating them, producing other meanings (as it occurs in parodies, ironies etc.). The constitutive alterity, in this sense, was present in a re-reading, in a re-statement, produced by the axiological positioning of the author (Goethe), who proposes displacements of meanings from the enunciate framework that allows him to (re)read the classic (the myth), renouncing it with other emotive-volitional hues and tones.

This is the way speeches work in a society, in which, whether in a big or small time, they (re)encounter each other and establish the most varied meaning relations. In the case of the poem in analysis, the enunciative project of the author occurs by means of a counterword, a process of rework of meanings already existing, as it is the case of the outcome of the character Prometheus in the classic text. This restatement elapses from the axiological positioning of the author and his relation with the socio-historical context which engenders the construction of this statement.

As we undertook an analysis in a dialogical perspective, it was possible to detect that Goethe’s points of view, in his work-statement (BAKHTIN, 2006d [1979]), differentiates from the tragic perspective visualized in the *Myth of Prometheus*, where the character became a slave and had perpetual punishment. It is defended, therefore, that the practices of language analysis under the horizon of dialogical studies potentiate the analyst’s gaze and invite him to adopt a reflective posture before of the text, evaluating its linguistic and socio-historical-ideological aspects and observing the discursive movement of the author in the creative path, in his enunciative project.

SANTANA, W.; FRANCELINO, P.; VALENTIM, D. Aspectos discursivos e socioideológicos no poema “Prometeu”, de Goethe: uma contrapalavra à tragédia grega. *Alfa*, São Paulo, v.66, 2022.

- *RESUMO: Este estudo objetiva discutir aspectos discursivos e socioideológicos no poema Prometeu, de Goethe, na perspectiva dialógica da linguagem, observando como este se configura como uma contrapalavra à tragédia grega Prometeu. Para tanto, encontramos*

respaldo teórico-metodológico no pensamento de Bakhtin (2006a, 2006b [1979]; 2010 [1930-34]), Medviédev (2016a, 2016b [1928]), Volóchinov (2017 [1929]) e Benjamin (2018), os quais subsidiam a pesquisa. Por meio da abordagem dialógica delimitamos como locus do estudo o poema intitulado Prometeu, de autoria de Goethe. A partir do instante em que compreendemos o poema goetheano como uma contrapalavra, é possível vislumbrar uma mudança de concepção na construção da personagem, resultante de interações discursivas entre Prometeu e Zeus. Além disso, há um processo de descontinuidade da narrativa mítica, uma vez que a perspectiva de Goethe revela diálogos com o sistema sociopolítico alemão entre os séculos XVIII e XIX. Trata-se, portanto, de uma pesquisa de cunho qualitativo-interpretativo. Os resultados apontaram para o fato de que os pontos de vista de Goethe, em sua obra-enunciado (BAKHTIN, 2006d [1979]), diferenciam-se da perspectiva trágica visibilizada no Mito de Prometeu, em que o personagem se tornou escravo e teve castigo eterno.

- **PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Aspectos Discursivos e Socioideológicos; Prometeu; Goethe.

REFERENCES

BAKHTIN, M. A ciência da literatura hoje. In: BAKHTIN, M. **Notas sobre literatura, cultura e ciências humanas**. Organização, tradução, posfácio e notas de Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2017 [1970]. p.9-20.

BAKHTIN, M. **Para uma filosofia do ato responsável**. Trad. Valdemir Miotello e Carlos Alberto Faraco. São Carlos: Pedro & João Editores, 2010 [1924].

BAKHTIN, M. O discurso em Dostoiévski. In: BAKHTIN, M. **Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski**. Rio de Janeiro: Forense, 2008 [1963]. p.207-310.

BAKHTIN, M. O autor e a personagem. In: BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 4. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006a [1979]. p.3-20.

BAKHTIN, M. Os gêneros do discurso. In: BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 4. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006b [1979]. p. 261-306.

BAKHTIN, M. O problema do texto na linguística, na filologia e em outras ciências humanas. In: BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 4. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006c [1979]. p. 307-336.

BAKHTIN, M. Metodologia das ciências humanas. In: BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 4. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006d [1979]. p. 393-410.

BENJAMIN, W. Goethe. In: BENJAMIN, W. **Ensaio reunidos**: escritos sobre Goethe. Trad. Mônica Bornecusch Irene Aron e Sidney Camargo. São Paulo: Duas Cidades: Editora 34, 2018. p. 123-178.

BÍBLIA: Bíblia de promessas. Trad. João Ferreira de Almeida. Co-edição (JUERP). Revisão do Estudo das promessas Luiz Saião. 15. ed. rev. corr. São Paulo: Imprensa Bíblica Brasileira King's Cross publicações, 2010.

BRAIT, B.; PISTORI, M. H. C. A produtividade do conceito de gênero em Bakhtin e o círculo. **ALFA: Revista de Linguística**, São Paulo, v. 56, n. 2, 2012. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/5531>. Acesso em: 20 out. 2022.

BRANDÃO, J. S. **Mitologia grega**. 26. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2015. v.1.

BULFINCH, T. **O livro de ouro da mitologia**: Histórias de deuses e heróis. Tradução de David Jardim. Rio de Janeiro: Ediouro, 2017.

COLEN, É.; DRUMMOND, L. (org.). **Das tempestades**: a poesia alemã do *Sturm und Drang*. Edição bilíngue. Belo Horizonte: FALE/UFGM, 2010.

DAKE, F. J. Prefácio e comentários à Bíblia de Estudo DAKE. In: BÍBLIA DE ESTUDOS DAKE. Trad. Freitas *et al.* 2.ed. Belo Horizonte: Atos, 2012. p.13-1899.

ELIADE, M. **O Sagrado e o Profano**: a essência das religiões. Trad. Rogério Fernandes. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes, 2013.

ELIADE, M. **História das crenças e das ideias religiosas**: da idade da Pedra aos mistérios de Elêusis. Trad. Roberto Cortes de Lacerda. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2010. v.1.

FRANCELINO, P. F. **A autoria no gênero discursivo aula**: uma abordagem enunciativa. 2007. 230f. Thesis (Doctor in Linguistics) – Post-Graduation Programme in Letters, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, 2007.

GAMA, R. Uma declaração de intenções: o mito de Prometeu. **Revista Do Instituto De Estudos Brasileiros**, São Paulo, v. 10, n. 41, p. 135-140, 1996.

GRILLO, S. Marxismo e Filosofia da linguagem: uma resposta à ciência da linguagem do século XIX e início do XX. Ensaio introdutório. In: VOLOCHÍNOV, V. N. **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem**: Problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. Tradução de Sheila Grillo e Ekaterina Vólkova Américo. Ensaio introdutório de Sheila Grillo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017. p. 7-79.

GOETHE, J. W. V. Prometheus. In: COLEN, É.; DRUMMOND, L. (org.). **Das tempestades**: a poesia alemã do *Sturm und Drang*. Edição bilíngue. Belo Horizonte: FALE/UFGM, 2010. p.6-33.

HOBSBAWN, E. J. **A era das Revoluções, 1789-1848**. Trad. Maria Tereza Teixeira e Marcos Penchel. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2011.

KANT, I. Resposta à pergunta: que é o iluminismo? In: KANT, I. **A paz perpétua e outros opúsculos**. Trad. Artur Morão. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2002. p.11-19.

KESTLER, I. M. F. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: arte e natureza, poesia e ciência. **História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 13, p. 39-54, 2006.

MACDONALD, W. **Comentário bíblico popular do Antigo Testamento**: versículo por versículo. Trad. Alfred Poland *et al.* São Paulo: Mundo Cristão, 2010.

MEDVIÉDEV, P. A ciência das ideologias e suas tarefas imediatas. *In*: MEDVIÉDEV, P. **O método formal nos estudos literários**: introdução a uma poética sociológica. Tradutoras: Sheila Camargo Grillo e Ekaterina Vólkova Américo. São Paulo: Contexto, 2016a [1928]. p.41-56.

MEDVIÉDEV, P. A corrente formal nos estudos da arte da Europa Ocidental. *In*: MEDVIÉDEV, P. **O método formal nos estudos literários**: introdução a uma poética sociológica. Tradutoras: Sheila Camargo Grillo e Ekaterina Vólkova Américo. São Paulo: Contexto, 2016b [1928]. p.87-102.

OTTO, R. **O sagrado**: aspectos irracionais na noção do divino e sua relação com o racional. Tradução de Walter O. Schlupp. São Leopoldo: Sinodal; Petrópolis: Vozes, 2007.

PLATÃO. **Protágoras**. Tradução de Carlos Alberto Nunes. Belém: Ed. da Universidade Federal do Pará, 2002.

ROHLING, N.; VIEIRA, I. J. S. O horizonte temático-valorativo em Fóruns on-line, na formação de professores de Língua Portuguesa: uma análise dialógica. **Working Papers Em Linguística**, Florianópolis, v. 22, p. 141-157, 2021.

ROSA, M. **Psicologia da religião**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Junta de Educação Religiosa e Publicações, 1979.

SANTANA, W. K. F. **Relações axio(dia)lógicas na arquitetônica do discurso de Jesus sobre o pão da vida**. 2018. 124f. Dissertation (Masters in Linguistics) – Post-Graduation Programme in Linguistics, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, João Pessoa, 2018.

SANTANA, W. K. F.; SILVA-JÚNIOR, S. N.; FRANCELINO, P. F. Perspectiva dialógica no livro didático de língua portuguesa: um estudo discursivo. **Revista Prolíngua**, João Pessoa, v. 15, n. 1, p. 119-133, 2020.

SANTANA, W. K. F.; SILVEIRA, É. L. Reflexos e refrações educacionais: do dizer ao fazer (Apresentação). *In*: SANTANA, W. K. F. de.; SILVEIRA, É. L. (org.). **Educação**: ressonâncias teóricas e práticas. São Carlos: Pedro & João Editores, 2019. v.1. p. 7-8.

SCHLEIERMACHER, F. **On Religion**: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers. Translated by John Oman. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1958.

SOUTO, I. P. Prometeu: Fragmento Dramático, de Goethe. **Cadernos de Literatura em Tradução**, São Paulo, n. 11, p. 203-241, 2010. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2359-5388.i11p203-241>. Access on: 14 out. 2022.

VOLOCHÍNOV, V. **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem**: Problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. Tradução de Sheila Grillo e Ekaterina Vólkova Américo. Ensaio introdutório de Sheila Grillo. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2017 [1929].

Received October 2, 2021.

Approved on January 14, 2022.