Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Hesiod's Theogony

Samantha Jane Newington

How to cite:

Newington, Samantha Jane (2006) Hesiod's Theogony. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/2698/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

Hesiod's *Theogony*

Miss Samantha Jane Newington, B.A. (Hons. University of Surrey) M.A. (University of London)

Department of Theology

University of Durham

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2006

Supervisors: Professor L.T. Stuckenbruck

Professor D.J. Davies

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author or the university to which it was submitted. No quotation from it, or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or university, and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.

1 1 OCT 2006

Acknowledgements

For my Father, Mother and Brother.

I acknowledge and thank all those concerned with this Thesis, especially Professor L.T. Stuckenbruck and Professor D.J. Davies and the Examiners Dr. B. Pearson and Dr. S.D.E. Weeks.

Declaration

I declare that the material contained within this Thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other University, and that it does not exceed the wordcount limit.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without their prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Abstract

This thesis offers a textual interpretation of the *Theogony*, which is a text often ascribed by classical scholars to the author Hesiod. The thesis then turns its attention to discuss the narrative findings in relation to historical determined interpretations of early Greek literary texts. The thesis will examine how a culture determined interpretation of ancient literary sources can either negate or support a narrative approach.

Chapter One of this thesis focuses on determining a methodological approach for text analysis, and does so by providing a critique of the traditional methods of historical text criticism used by classical and literary scholars for ancient documents.

Chapter Two offers a textual analysis of the *Theogony*, examining its fabula, focalizations and characterizations as presented by the text.

Then Chapter Three explores how useful a textual analysis can be in historical discussion. This chapter will also investigate how our findings of Chapter Two have possibly re-shaped our appreciation of former historical research for ancient Greek literature. In particular, this chapter will offer a brief discussion on ancient religion and early Greek philosophy.

The Conclusion will be brief and simply outline possible next steps in research drawn from the discussions of the previous chapters.

Selected Abbreviations

AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
Apld.	Apollodorus
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BICS	*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*
BO	*Bibliotheca Orientalis*
CA	*Classical Antiquity*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
CR	*Classical Review*
DK	Diels, H., and Kranz, W., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker griechisch und deutsch* 6th ed. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1951-1952)
FO	Folio Orientalia
Gaisford	Gaisford, T., *Poetae Minories Graeci* 4 vols. (Oxford Clarendon Press 1814-1820)
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
h.Dem	*Homeric Hymn to Demeter*
Hdt.	Herodotus
HSCP	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
ICS	*Institute of Classical Studies*
Il.	Homer: *Iliad*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*

JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
LSJ	Liddell, H.G., & Scott, R., *A Greek – English Lexicon* revised by H.S. Jones 9th edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
Mazon	Mazon, P., *Hesiode* Bude series (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1928)
NT	New Testament
Od.	Homer: *Odyssey*
OT	Old Testament
Procl.	Proclus
RAI	*Royal Anthropological Institute*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RHR	*Revue de L'histoire des Religions*
SBL	*Society of Biblical Literature*
Solmsen	Solmsen, F., *Hesiodi Theogonie, Opera et dies, Scutum* edited by R. Merkelbach and M.L. West (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philology Association*
Th.	Hesiod: *Theogony*
WD	Hesiod: *Works and Days*
West	West, M.L., *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

Table of Contents

Chapter

One

Chapter One

Introduction and Methodological Considerations

This thesis re-evaluates the narrative significance of Hesiod's *Theogony*, and discusses how a text-source analysis of the *Theogony* re-shapes the invaluable appraisals of historical-text analysis provided by classical scholars. Our outline discussion will appreciate the historical source criticism often applied to 'old' literary forms, and suggest a more dialectic approach. Of course, any methodology applied to literary forms, whether historically based analysis or narrative criticism, will bear with it inherent difficulties in interpretation. The discussion below will highlight some of the benefits and counter benefits of any approach to understanding an ancient text. Although the basic advantages of historical analysis will be reviewed, the first part of our thesis here will propose an approach which demands closer attention to the narrative of the *Theogony*.

Hesiod's *Theogony* has often been conventionally interpreted by classical scholars as a mythological story about the gods on the basis of traditions known from other sources.[1] Text- and source-critical appraisal has led scholars to make categorical pronouncements about the literary genre of the *Theogony*, the historical author Hesiod, and the cultural setting in which the work was composed. Accordingly, there has been a modern tendency to interpret the *Theogony* as simply a work by Hesiod of

[1] Cf. R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), especially p. 36 where Parker has clearly connected stories about the gods of Homer and Hesiod to discuss cult hero worship. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996) follows a similar method to Parker in his identification of deities (pp. 119-189).
Good textual sources for the *Theogony* are provided by the following scholars: E. Gerhard, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin: Reimer, 1856); C. Goettling, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Leipzig: Gothae Henning, 1843);

the 8th century BCE by taking an external, reconstructed and predetermined historical framework as a point of departure. This thesis, however, intends to step outside the convention of 'historical' interpretations and the structures that this type of research carries, and instead shall initially offer a narrative analysis of the text itself.

The title of the text alone conjures a theological cognitive framework for interpreting the work; it has often guaranteed the *Theogony* a historical-text-critique alongside other ancient texts deemed to be of a similar nature. It is commonly accepted by the classical scholars that early Greek poetry (and, by extension, traditional theogonies) was comprised of one or more of a number of generic mythological forms.[2] G.S. Kirk categorises the types of mythology used in traditional theogonies as follows:[3] (i) cosmology, (ii) development of the Olympian deities, (iii) history of humankind, (iv) legendary heroes, (v) imitative heroes, and (vi) accounts about the beginning of the historical period.[4] Accordingly, It is within the framework of such types that scholars have found a basis for interpreting ancient theogonies. Here the guiding assumption has been that a fixed literary genre must have existed, accompanied by theological norms inherent within that genre.[5]

F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1930); A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1902); M. L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

[2] By this I include Orphic theogonies. Cf. M. L. West, *Orphic Poems* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), esp. pp. 39-67, 68-115, 116-139. Also, A. Laks & G.L. Most (eds.), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), esp. pp. 39-64.

[3] G. S. Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths* (London: Harmondsworth, 1990). Cf. also Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Function in Ancient and Other Cultures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 8-31.

[4] Cf. similarly, W. Burkert, "The Logic of Cosmology", in R. Buxton ed., *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 87-106, who assumes that Greek 'myth' as found in the *Theogony* is to be understood against the background of 'traditional tales' that draw on common topics such as 'myths about genealogies, migrations, foundation of cities, the establishment of culture, and the origins or rituals, especially initiation and sacrifice' (p. 87). This approach is less appropriate for *Theogony* than for, e.g., an interpretation of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, in which ritual procedures relate more directly to the Eleusinian mysteries; cf. the text and discussion in H. P. Foley, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary and Interpretive Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), esp. pp. 142ff.

[5] There are inherent difficulties with Kirk's paradigm which will be briefly cited here. Although the *Theogony* (of Hesiod) does draw on the forms identified by Kirk, it does not necessarily follow that

Yet, despite the assumptions made by historically based analysis, we must not negate the importance of such an approach and its contribution towards understanding, or even piecing together, the jigsaw puzzle of the ancient world. After all, historicism has often shaped the voids in our knowledge about the past, and on occasion, has allowed continuity in the progression of academic research; we must ensure, however, that a level of integrity continues to remain the basis of any academic appraisal. In a sense my thesis includes the intentions of the historical approach; it does so by bringing together the methodological threads with text analysis as the primary point of departure.

Certainly, the dynamic themes developed by the *Theogony* are, to some extent, not overtly distinct from other literary forms. Indeed, Hesiod and his works have been located by historical critics firmly in the *theogonic tradition* of classical antiquity.[6] In addition, and more generally, Hesiod's work is thought to occupy a place in the epic genre that was inspired by Homer. According to M. L.West, who stresses that the *Theogony* 'is by no means unique', there was during the archaic period a 'theogonic genre [that] was...actively cultivated as heroic narrative' (or 'Epic Cycle').[7] West is able, of course, to note a number of examples for such a narrative.[8] This means that in

---

such a preconceived paradigm should determine its interpretation. Each theological document will use selected language on the basis of a thematic relevance that may not necessarily have corresponded to generic aesthetic values. For all existing similarities with other works of the same genre, each composition has its own internal procedure, one that reflected particular values expressed through the author's communicative strategy. If some degree of singularity is innate to each document, then one may argue that each text should be interpreted initially on its own, and that the interpreter may explore the question of what message the author is trying to convey to the audience of the past.

[6] In relation to our text, it could be conceded that the themes of the *Theogony* overlap those in other literary forms, a point which will be discussed in chapter three. Cf. Proclus *In Tim.* 1.427.20 and Pisander *In Phd.* 172.3-4, where *theologoi* is used for Orpheus and early Greek hexameter poets. Hermias includes Orpheus, Homer and Hesiod (*In Phdr.* 11.10-11).

[7] West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 12.

[8] Ibid.

To show how widespread the genre is, West mentions the poetic theogonies ascribed to Orpheus, Musaeus, Aristeas, and Epimenides; the prose theogonies attributed to Abaris, Pherecydes, 'Dromocrites'; those to Linus and Thamyris; a *Cosmopoiia* by a Palaephatus; the beginning of Acusilaus' *Genealogiai*; and Eumelus' or Arctinus' *Titanomachy* or *Gigantomachy*.

this genre, the main figures of the narrative are regarded as exemplary or paradigmatic, much as happens in Homer's *Iliad* which inspired them. However, there is little, if any, evidence in the *Theogony* itself for West's 'heroic narrative'.

Although West has identified a number of theogonic compositions, it does not necessarily follow that these reflect a 'unanimous system of belief'.[9] To begin with, it is difficult to identify what is meant by 'tradition' and to determine the extent to which the author of the *Theogony* was aware of, or even influenced, by pre-existing 'traditional' or formally recognised modes of discourse. It is, likewise, possible that some correlations – as, for example, common motifs, named characters, mythological events – amongst the theogonic documents may not have been so much intentional as they were incidental. Even if the *Theogony* may be said to have participated in a traditional theogonic literary landscape, it is questionable to what extent the themes within the *Theogony* arose entirely out of traditional ideas.[10] Instead, a case is to be made that more attention should be given to how a given author develops his own theogonic perspective.

West and Kirk have assumed that the most appropriate way to interpret 'conventions' in the *Theogony* is, in the first instance, to situate the text within a historical framework. This procedure makes the interpretation depend on the

[9] West, *Theogony*, p. 12.

[10] By this, I mean that the creation myth of the *Theogony* remains distinct, despite its thematic overlaps, from the *Derveni Papyrus* which it has so often been compared. Furthermore, the devouring Titan role of Kronos in the *Theogony*, for example, bears little if any resemblance to the Kronos of the *Derveni Papyrus* or the blessed Kronos of Pindar's *Olympian 2* (cf. line 70). Despite the fact that Pindar's poetry is composed later than our *Theogony*, and the *Derveni Papyrus* later still; these latter citations have been said to form part of an understanding towards mystery, and in particular Orphic religion, which is an interpretation which forms no part of the *Theogony's* narrative. Furthermore, *Olympian 2* has often formed part of academic discussions in connection with Empedocles and philosophical theories about existence. This line of enquiry will be explored more fully in our chapter three. Cf. G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar: edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982), M. M. Willcock *Pindar Victory Odes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 49-55 and 133-166, K. von Fritz, "Hestris ekaterothi in Pindar's second Olympian and Pythagoras' Theory of Metampsychosis" *Phronesis* 2 (1957) pp. 85-88.

correctness of the historical framework as it has been reconstructed. It seems that as an initial part of the investigation for the *Theogony*, the simple adoption of such an approach risks undermining the possibility of recognising the creative discourse of the text itself. Moreover, historical study frequently assumes that a given document is addressed to an ideal audience who would have recognised the derivative nature of such traditions when they occur. The *Theogony* is now read by a modern 'unideal' audience whose main source of information about the *Theogony* comes from the text itself.[11] Therefore, the modern audience needs to develop a methological approach that would complement a text reading of the *Theogony*, not based on historical considerations.

We must try to rid ourselves of the tendency to assume that an interpretation of the text is fixed; by contrast we should attempt to allow ourselves to hear the text speak to us in its own voice. In interpreting the *Theogony* we should allow for a more open interplay between author and audience that does not overtly rely on singular historical identifications of author and audience. It is the relationship between author and audience that makes the *Theogony*, as is the case with any document from antiquity, a masterpiece that ultimately exceeds, but also compliments, traditional boundaries. This, in turn, becomes possible when, at least initially, 'historical interpretation' is given secondary consideration.

Reading a text within a predetermined historical paradigm assumes an author's intention to convey something stereo-typical. But the *Theogony* is not a 'typical' theogony, and needs to be set aside from such an appraisal. On this point, Quinton

[11] Here the term 'unideal' does not imply that a modern reader would be incapable to understand the *Theogony* text; but, moreover, the term recognises the difficulties the contemporary audience has in interpreting a text of many centuries ago. It would be impossible to interpret the text entirely, if at all, through the lens of the ancient audience.

Skinner outlines in some detail the danger of set cultural and historical form of literary interpretation.[12] In particular, he states the following:

> '[F]or to suggest instead that knowledge of the social context is a necessary condition for an understanding of classic texts is equivalent to denying that they do contain elements of timeless and perennial interest, and is thus equivalent to removing the whole point of studying what they said'.[13]

Clearly, Skinner is attempting to deviate from the restrictions of historical method, by redefining the importance of culturally based ideas as a means to provide an ultimate interpretative paradigm.[14] This point is expressed further by his subsequent claim that 'the autonomy of the text itself [is] the sole key to its own understanding.'[15]

One could respond to Skinner's claim by arguing that to 'examine the autonomy of a text itself' as 'the sole key to its own understanding' is in itself misleading. To some extent there is a mutual basis of 'cultural' understanding between author and audience, especially if one interprets the text 'historically' as an act of communication within a particular time, place and social context. This criticism, however, still does not do justice to the particularities of the text. To ignore the 'autonomy of a text' runs the danger of formulating or even creating 'mythological historical and cultural paradigms', with the result that reality is contrived from criteria 'external' to the text.[16]

---

[12] Q. Skinner 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory* 8 (1969) 3-53. Although Skinner does not explicitly refer to the *Theogony*, the principle of his argument may be appropriately applied to any given literary text.

[13] Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding', p. 5.

[14] Nevertheless, a text can lend itself to a form of religious expression. But this expression could be, in fact, separate from any real religious practice and belief.

[15] Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding', p. 3.

[16] Here, what is meant by 'autonomy' is the text's own ability to speak for itself. The internal dialogue of the text is its cohesion and does not need to rely on external sources to be understood.

Nevertheless, to some extent there is a level of expectation when the author of the *Theogony* claims to sing about the succession of Zeus, as the audience's imagination may conjure up and conflate external mythologies. Therefore, if the text is valued in terms of 'expectations', the voice of the author is then muffled, and the articulations made in the *Theogony* (for example) are invariably reduced to a systematic interpretive framework. There, then, emerges a decisive difference between the intention of the text and the interpretive expectations of historical research.[17]

In partial recognition of this interpretive difficulty, Skinner suggests that 'there is always the danger, that is, that the historian may conceptualize an argument in such a way that its alien elements are dissolved into an apparent but misleading familiarity.'[18] Once again Skinner recognises an inherent difficulty in historical research, though ultimately returns to the default of historical method by stating that 'more interesting and intractable objection however to attempt to make a text in itself a self-sufficient object of understanding'.[19]

---

[17] Another point could be that if the myths of the *Theogony*, are taken in correlation with other texts we, as the audience, may in fact distort some of the internal devices of the narrative. The thesis of Auerbach in his article "Odysseus' Scar" makes a valid point that sometimes the characters of the narrative are oblivious to the action and deeds performed by another character. If applied to the *Theogony* then the deception of Hera and Gaia against Kronos would be a good example. Kronos is unaware of the scheming to conceal Zeus. From a textual point of view this is a poignant moment in the text's main focalisation, as the audience know something Kronos does not (though fears). This is the turning point of the succession myth and the catalyst of the Titanomachia and, eventually, the Typhomachy. The audience should not be distracted at this point about another myth which refers to the genesis of Zeus, but instead concentrate on the interaction between the *Theogony's* main characters and the unfolding drama of the narrative. Auerbach, *Mimesis* (Princeton: Princeton University press, 1974), esp. Chapter One: 'Odysseus' Scar' (pp. 3-25).

[18] Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding', p. 27.

[19] Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding', p. 32. I cite here the context of Skinner's statement 'more interesting and intractable objection however to attempt to make a text in itself a self-sufficient object of understanding as suggested by the oblique strategies which a writer may always decide to adopt in order to set out and at the same time to disguise what he means by what he says about the same given doctrine'. My initial objection is that the *Theogony*, as with other forms of writing, is not an object but a profound literary text. Furthermore, what we propose here is that the narrative of the text should be deemed autonomous but that does not exclude the text from being compared to any other literary form at a later stage. Even at that later stage the text retains its own importance which should not be compromised by any comparative research.

Despite the default setting of Skinner's historical argument, it is debatable whether this may be without reserve applied to the *Theogony*. If this argument of Skinner is supported, then external strategies are required to interpret the internal strategies of the text. Nonetheless, the approach of this thesis shall not dispose but rather incorporate such means. Although the principle emphasis is on understanding the narrative of the text as it is presented initially, it remains important to establish the 'intention' of the text by looking at the communicative and semantic language of the text itself. Only then is it possible to explore the linguistic implications of the language within a historical context.[20]

In recognition of Skinner's disquiet, in order to establish an understanding of the *Theogony*, it is crucial to establish as much as possible the intended representation of the text itself. For, in Skinner's terms, if there exists 'intended representation', then there also exists a premise that the intentions of the text are intended to be understood'.[21] In principled agreement with Skinner, it is essential to establish the relationship between the intended meaning of the *Theogony* and the perceptions and intended understanding of the audience. For example, it is significant that the characters or *dramatis personae* in the text, whether Zeus or Kronos, should not be first interpreted in terms of their cultural vestiges, but as intermediary communicators between text and audience. Characters are utilized by the author to invite the reader to identify with or object to certain elements of the narrative. In this way the *dramatis personae* become the communication link between the author and audience by relaying a reciprocal tension of meaning and intended understanding.

[20] Skinner argues that 'if we wish to understand a given idea even within a given culture and at a given time, we cannot simply concentrate, on studying the forms of the words involved. For the words denoting the idea may be used, with varying and quite different incompatible intentions'. Skinner, 'Meaning and Undertanding', p.32.
[21] Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding', p. 48.

For guidance on literary interpretation, we can turn to the works of the structural linguist, R. Barthes. Barthes has argued that literature is to be understood in relation to a cultural context. In a lecture delivered in 1977, Barthes suggested that 'structure is not solely the construction of a single poetic work but also the work's relationship to all that surrounds it and with which it comes into contact.'[22]

Although Barthes comments first on the 'construction of a single poetic work', he does so to qualify what for him is the more important task de-establishing a cultural framework for a text. Barthes does not elaborate on how to the 'structure of a single poetic work' might be interpreted in terms of unidentified author and audience, but refers rather to 'culture' as the primary definition of literary models, that is, to the approach taken in the present thesis.

However, before we delve into the pool of literary comparisons, other considerations need to be made that relate to the question of language. Historical interpretation of literary texts involves the classification of language. If culture, according to historical structuralism, is to be regarded as an evolution of tradition, then the medium of communication used by a given culture, likewise, evolves. In order to appreciate the development of language, the modern linguist, has to appreciate that there exists many levels of discourse. For instance, we could identify colloquial language, standard or formal language, and artistic language. These types of discourse are not necessarily separate from each other; a poet could incorporate the rhetorical language of formal speech as well as colloquial speech into his or her

[22] R. Barthes, *Lecture in Inauguration of the Chair of Literary Semiology* College de France January 7 1977, cited by F. W. Galan, *Historical Structures: The Prague School Project 1928-1946* (Austin: University of Texas, c.1985); Cf. also R. Barthes, *Mythologies* (Paris: Seuil, 1970), and his 'Responses', in *Tel Quel*, 47 (1971) 89-107.
F. W. Galan, *Historic Structures: The Prague School Project 1928-1946* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985). Cf. Galan, *Historical Structures*, p. 48.

artistic discourse. Indeed, there is evidence that these linguistic forms have been welded together in the *Theogony*.[23]

It is difficult to assess how and to what extent the divergent linguistic styles in the *Theogony* correspond to conventional language forms.[24] In essence L. Jakubinskij, as discussed by F. W. Galan, puts forth a convincing argument that although a single piece of work cannot stand independent of 'complex norms and conventions', its language can be 'distinguished from it'.[25] It is then reasonable to assume that the author, if he or she wishes to communicate at all, has to use language based within the world of ideas and forms known to the recipient. Nevertheless, the author aesthetically invests the work with particular forms that will engage the cognitive understanding of an audience. Therefore, an approach to language by structuralist and functional methods, which involves both 'diachronic' and 'synchronic' interpretations, is now subject to reconsideration. In partial acceptance of historical evaluation, one may – by regarding language as the essence of cultural unity – appeal to the 'norms' of a given time, but at the same time allow for some poetic devolution. If so, then language is subject to historical formulations; as suggested by B. Tomasevsky that literary forms

[23] For example, the colloquial address of Kottos to Zeus (655ff) and the formal address of Zeus' appeal for assistance against the Titans (644ff, cf. also 392).

[24] For the purpose of this current study this will include the dismissal of the transmission argument – whether the original *Theogony* formed part of an oral or literary culture. Here we acknowledge the thesis of R. Thomas, who questions the importance of determining whether Hesiod was part of a literary or oral culture, and investigates the 'tools of analysis' for such debate – especially as Hesiod tends to be compared with the Homeric tradition. (R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), esp. pp. 101ff. Cf. also, M. Griffin, 'Personality in Hesiod', *Classical. Antiquity* 2 (1983) 37-65, and L. Alexander, 'The Living Voice: Skepticism towards the Written Word in Early Christian and Graeco-Roman Texts', in P. J. A. Clines, S. E. Fowl and S. E. Porter (eds.), *The Bible in Three Dimensions* (*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* Suppl. 87: Sheffield, 1990), pp. 221-247.

[25] Here I cite the quotations more fully so that we can appreciate the context of the citations above, 'as in linguistics, in the study of poetry we must first investigate the normative backdrop or implicit "context" both of standard language, since an individual literary work cannot be ultimately exist – nor can it be adequately understood – independently of this complex of norms and conventions. Thus poetic language is intimately bound up with the standard language, but always distinguished from it' Galan, *Historical Structures,* p. 19.

tend to be 'a continual variation' of another poetic device, never replacing itself but merely changing its function.[26]

There is nothing controversial in stating that language speaks many (and different) meanings at any given time or place, and that this is only perceived if the language of a text is interpreted within a historical framework. Therefore, to some extent, it is important to be conscious of the cultural complexities that may surround and influence the dynamics of literary style and form. It is even more important to interpret the language of a text *as it presents itself*: otherwise, a piece of literature could lose its narrative significance for study if it is confined to a specific temporal and spacial framework of interpretation.

For a composition to achieve such literary recognition, assuming that this is the text's aim, it should not be examined, as Galan suggests, principally in terms of the expected norms of society.[27] Instead interpretation should be through the qualities presented within the text itself, a suggestion surprisingly offered by a formalist V. B. Shklovskii.[28]

The latter point has been similarly made by the structuralist J. Mukarovsky, who suggests that literary works should be interpreted for their own aesthetic

---

[26] B. Tomasevsky, 'La Nouvelle école d'historie litteraire én Russie', *Revue des études slaves* 8 (1928) 226-40. Here Tomasevsky provides an interesting argument about the evolution of language and its implication on literary forms. Here is a translated citation: '[poetic devices] did not present itself as a series of forms substituting for one another, but as a continual variation of the aesthetic function of literary devices. Every work found itself orientated in relation to the literary milieu and every element in relation to the entire work. That element whose value is determined by one era completely changes its function in another... The true life of a literary work's element manifests itself in the continual change of function.'

[27] In making this statement I have a particular reference in mind taken from Galan, *Historical Structures*, p. 25 as follows: 'it is not by delving into the poet's private or social life that the critic can uncover the reasons why and the way in which the particular poem came about. Rather, it is necessary that the critic come to grips with the state of 'expected' norms of the time, to which the poet must have reacted. But such norms are historically relative, since the complex of norms valid for one generation is modified, and in some instances neglected by the next.'

[28] V. B. Shklovskii, *O Teorii Prozy* (Moscow: Sov. Pisatel, 1983) and 'K ceskemu prekladu Sklovskeho' *Teorie prozy*', *Cin* 6 (1934) pp. 123-30, cited by Galan in *Historical Structures*, p. 36.

quality.[29] Mukarovsky's claim is based on the claim that society tends to impose a paradigm on the text that is alien to the intentions of the author. However, Shklovskii's argument is itself not so different from the substance of Mukarovsky's objections. Shklovskii puts forward the view that the 'weave' of a text should be the source of interpretation and not the origin of the 'thread'.[30] Although these arguments at no point suggest their application to ancient documents, such methodological devices could be applied to a textual analysis of the *Theogony*.

Furthermore, if the approach of Shklovskii – like the narratological approach of Mieke Bal – is applied to the *Theogony*, then the function of the text's main themes and characterisations rests on both autonomous literary interpretation and its literary context, and not simply or principally on cultural aesthetics.

But despite his historical approach, Mukarovsky's argument for the 'continuous evolution of poetic structure' should be taken into account as a point of caution.[31] His attempt to find a balance between 'outside intervention' and 'inner dynamism' of the text is, in principle correct, though should not be unduly weighed in favour of the former.[32] Yet critical literary research goes on to interpret the significance of a text either diachronically or synchronically, and it is debatable to what extent this either-or approach really provides a tenable understanding of a text.[33] Negotiation between 'outside intervention' and 'inner dynamism' presents further complications for text interpretation, as it reflects with it an existing dichotomy

[29] J. Mukarovsky, *Structure, Sign, and Function: Selected Essays* translated [from Czech] and edited by J. Burbank and P. Steiner (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977). Mukarovsky usually argues against formalist Shklovskii.

[30] Galan, *Historical Structures*, p. 27.

[31] J. Mukarovsky, *Kapitoly z Ceske Poetiky*, p. 348.

[32] Chapter Two focuses on the principles of Mukarovsky's 'inner dynamism' and supposes methodologically, that on the basis of such analysis 'outside intervention' may be appropriately evaluated.

[33] Synchronically – isolate the use of specific language. Diachronically – evolution of language.

between *parole* and *langue* that corresponds to an opposition between synchrony and diachrony, and finally, to the functional point of view.[34] To these tensions in interpretation Ferdinand de Saussure offers some relief in his statement that, the true aim of linguistic research is not 'individual utterance, but language as a distinct system of signs.'[35]

It is not contentious to assert, as Saussure does, that language is a 'sign' for communication, as words can conjure up many images. The difficulty is, rather, how to interpret words according to their intended meaning. Using the terms of the structuralists, one may note that *parole* represents the individualized language of the poet, whereas *langue* refers to the collective understanding of words as a means of social communication. Due to the notion of significance of language underlying *parole*, Saussure promotes the synchronic approach for literature as 'the invention of history can only falsify his [i.e. the researcher's] judgment.'[36]

It is questionable whether there is a clear opposition between *langue* and *parole*. We have to ask whether language forms part of a social structure, and if so, whether such a structure for both language and culture can be fully identified. More specific to our enquiry, we ought to ask whether the language of the *Theogony* can or should be considered in a way that makes it conform to the structures offered by the *langue* and *parole* approach.

---

[34] F. W. Galan, *Historical Structures: The Prague School Project 1928-1946* (Austin: University of Texas Press, c.1985).

[35] Galen, *Historical Structures,* p. 10.

[36] F. de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* translated by W. Baskin (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 81. Indeed, Jakobson, according to Galan, extends Saussure's argument that

> 'the immanent characterization of the evolution of poetic language is frequently replaced in literary history by a cultural-historical, sociological or psychological deviation, that is, by reference to heterogeneous phenomena. Instead of mystifying causal relationships among the heterogenous systems; we have to investigate the poetic language itself.'

There are evident methodological problems with the *parole* and *langue* approach of Saussure which will be discussed above.

To our methodological dilemma guidance may be sought from the structuralist theory of Galan's 'system within system'.[37] Galan highlights the fact that the dichotomy between *parole* and *langue* can in fact be circular, as it is difficult to interpret diverse linguistic techniques as apart from or as part of a system. This being the case, the relationship between *parole* and *langue,* between synchrony and diachrony, becomes distorted: a text may or may not use the language expected by a 'culture' specific audience, nor does it have to reflect an evolution in linguistic techniques. Therefore, the 'either'-'or' are both equally 'historical' in a conventional sense and cannot determine the primary approach to the *Theogony* (of Hesiod), as the narrative there reflects the use of diverse and complex linguistic styles. In addition, the problem with synchronic interpretation of a text is that the themes and language are examined in terms of their contribution to the evolution of literary forms, not for their significance within the 'autonomy' of a text.[38] Although great play has been made by classicists, including West, of the linguistic similarities between ancient texts, we must not overlook the that our 'author', whether part of a literary tradition or

[37] Galan's theory appears as follows:

> 'In order to understand fully the principle of literary change, literary series must be integrated with other historical series. Only by means of a 'system of systems', which would correlate the two series co-existing in manifold relations of tension, indirection, opposition or complementary can we gain an all-encompassing perspective on literary evolution.'

Galan, *Historical Structures,* pp. 8-9.

[38] Mondi favours the diachronic approach on the grounds that 'the distinction between the synchronic and diachronic analysis of a work of literature is nowhere more relevant than in the explication of Hesiod's *Theogony.* To regard the poem that Hesiod created purely as synchronic composition – giving no consideration to the separate traditional origins of its various parts and therefore expecting unity and consistency among them – is to invite a difficult choice between unpalatable alternatives when dealing with the text that comes down to us: the commentator must either explain away, often at the expense of great effort and ingenuity, the glaring discrepancies and obscurities in that text in his attempt to preserve its integrity, or delete enough of it so that what remains is synchronically consistent, the work of the 'original' Hesiod.' Mondi goes on to suggest that the *Theogony* is a compilation of a number of songs into one text, which leads him to conclude that 'in sum, the Titanomachy and the Hymn to Zeus, as they appear in the Theogony, present diachronically independent mythical narratives, and as late as Hesiod's time there was not yet any established tradition for combining them [and that]... Consequently, it is pointless to try to understand or reconcile them synchronically. Hesiod does not mention Kronos in the Titanomachy because traditionally Kronos did not play an outstanding role there, just as the Titans did not figure in the alternative tradition, based on the Hellenized Hittite myth of

not, could have deliberately intended to deviate from his 'supposed' literary genre and expected language forms.[39]

Although E. G. Turner does acknowledge the importance of respecting the words of the original poet, he offers no methodological framework to achieve this objective. Instead Turner refers to tradition as a grid within which interpretation should take place. But inter-textuality is a methodological phrase familiar to interpretative means of classicists, as it serves to construct paradigms of the ancient Greek world.[40] J. D. Culler suggests that inter-textuality 'becomes less a name for a work's relation to prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of a culture.'[41] As a test case, I shall briefly discuss a point made earlier about the inter-textual comparative approach applied to Homer and Hesiod.

Homer has been regarded as the traditional paradigm against which all other ancient poets are compared. Often the *Theogony* (of Hesiod) has been interpreted as

---

Zeus' birth and single-handed expulsion of his father.' R. Mondi, 'The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*', *GRBS* 25 (1984) 325-344, esp. p. 329.

[39] Although Hesiod was part of a culture of oral composition, in order to 'sound' unique, poet's used to develop their own style of poetry and oral effects about stories of a legendary past to be recognized as a muse (cf. R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

E. G. Turner, in his approach to ancient papyri, has recently discussed explanations given by scholarly critics who identify apparent deviations from traditional forms. Turner argues that

> 'Literary and historical scholarship are impossible unless the reader respects the words of the author he is reading, and reproduces them in all the accuracy of which he is capable. This is a presupposition of scholarship we take for granted, but it was not part of the tradition of Classical Greece. Used to the cut and thrust of oral dialectic, the Greeks tended to be careless of exact quotation or copying of precise chronology, undisturbed by anachronisms.'

E.G. Turner (ed.), *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 106-107.

[40] The inter-textual approach involves scholars, both Ancient and Modern, collating textual documents, and comparing such evidence to formalise a thesis, or simply to fill-in the gaps where another source lacks. Inter-textuality can allow the scholar to look at the broader canvas of a given subject matter. For example, documents detailing myths about the Titans have been pooled by scholars (such as Guthrie) from material known as the Orphic corpus, and then authors such as Hesiod have been used as a textual comparison. Although the collating, comparing and formulating of different documents can be useful in terms of synthesising historical data, or for piecing together a document with gaps in the narrative; it can also lead to the conflation of ancient sources and, generalised statements being made about ancient documents which do not reflect the intention of the original document, but rather the historians intention.

[41] Although Culler refers to the inter-textual relationship between the Gospel, Midrash and the works of Paul, such skepticism may be applied to the inter-textual approach applied to ancient Greek literature. J.

part of the Homeric Cycle. If the *Theogony* is seen in some places to deviate in style and form from those of Homer, then Hesiod stands accused of having corrupted traditional norms. However, such appraisals of Hesiod seem to have dismissed the fact that the actual *muthos* of Homer is quite different from that of Hesiod. Although both poets may refer to the supremacy of Zeus, the divergent themes of their respective poems demand different interpretive sensitivities. Therefore, it is not so much that a poet deviates from traditional norms, but that the concept of traditional norms is itself a *muthos*. It could be argued that ancient poets create an artistic form to suit their *muthos*, and nothing more.

Turner cites another difficulty of inter-textual analysis in his discussion on the Alexandrian scholars. Turner claims that 'the principle evidence [for Homer and Hesiod] is still derived from Homeric scholia, supplemented by occasional detail from papyri.'[42] Although the evidence from the papyri is often cited from texts that have been copied by the ancient scholia, it does offer some insight into how ancient scholars interpreted ancient literature.[43] The cross-referencing of the ancient Homeric scholia with other textual sources has formed the basis of modern textual scholarship, and as a consequence, the language of the *Theogony* has been compared to the archetypal texts of Homer.[44] The deviations from the Homeric model found in the

---

D. Culler, *Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), p. 109.

[42] Turner, *Greek Papyri,* p. 110.

[43] Sometimes scholars misread and miscopy the texts, or put in their own interpretation of the ancient document in the margin. Cf. *P.Oxy.* 1086. Also, K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri* vol. I-III (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1931-1941).

[44] Edwards is an example of this tendency, as he discusses Hesiod in terms of Homeric narrative, and concludes that Homer forms the basis for interpreting 'traditional' and 'conventional' literary and non-literary forms. Edwards provides examples of grammatical parallels between Homer and Hesiod such as the use of -αῶν genitive ending as found at *Theogony* 24, of which there are eight parallel instances in Homer's *Iliad.* Edwards also cites metrically parallel phrases, for example the use of the phrase ἐκ κεφαλεῶν positioned at the second and third foot of the verse. For example at *Odyssey* 20.394 Homer uses the phrase πρότεροι γὰρ ἀεικέα μηξάνοῶντο, and this phrase parallels almost verbatim line 166 of the *Theogony* πρότερος γὰρ ἀεικέα μήσατο ἔργα. Despite these similarities, it should not be concluded

Theogony are then reduced to being the consequence of a careless poet, copyist, scribe or interpolations, instead of regarded as ingenious innovations of the poet Hesiod.[45]

Thus H. Bloom's argument may be misleading when he contends that 'every poem is a *misrepresentation* of the parent poem'.[46] Although there may be some justification to suppose metalepsis, where one text should (or may) be interpreted alongside another as to explore an interplay of allusions, the interplay of allusions may be illusionary in that it reflects very different concerns.[47] There are indeed some linguistic parallels between Homer and Hesiod, but these are undermined if they are taken out of their respective literary contexts. The *muthos* of Homer's *Iliad*, for example, refers to a historical legendary past, when the Greek and non-Greek super-heroes engaged in conflict. The *Theogony* of Hesiod, on the other hand, refers to a remote past in order to account for the genealogy of the gods, and not in the Iliadic sense of heroes. Therefore, it is questionable to what extent inter-textual comparison is appropriate and, in this instance, the *Theogony* is not to be regarded as a deviation.

What P. A. Brunt suggests about the Hellenistic historians could be applied also to other literary authors: ancient writers used themes already narrated by others, but their aim in doing so was to outshine their predecessors with dramatic splendour.[48] What Brunt seems to recognise is that a text can possess its own semantic energy. We

---

that Homer and Hesiod are of the same, or indeed that one existed, literary tradition. See G. P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), pp. 55-185, esp. pp. 127-128.

[45] Aristophanes is just one example from antiquity that emphasizes the divine nobility of Homer, following the view that Homer is the 'founder' of the epic 'tradition'. Cf. *Frogs* 1030.

[46] The italics are my own here. H. Bloom, *Anxiety of Influence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 44.

[47] This may certainly be the case for Aristophanes *Frogs* and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.

[48] P. A. Brunt, *Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 181.

may then extend this argument further by claiming that a text does not require a role model to possess literary vibrancy.[49]

Yet scholars have remained firm in their appraisal of Homer, which results in the sideline relegation of Hesiod. For one thing, Kirk has disregarded the rhapsodic ingenuity of the author of the *Theogony.* In his article on 'Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*', Kirk interprets the artistry of the *Theogony* as influenced by Homeric rhapsody by comparing the Typhoneus episode in Hesiod with the Doloneia in the *Iliad* and the Nekyia of the *Odyssey.*[50] Even if the *Nekyia* and the end of the *Odyssey* are authentic, Kirk's argument is still dubious, as the Typhoneus episode in the *Theogony* alludes, but does not repeat the Titanomachy.[51] Thematically these episodes are similar in that they refer to the succession of Zeus. But the interplay of words and phrases between Homer and Hesiod is not so much a matter of language repetition as it is an evolutional idea within the text. For example, the language which surrounds the Titan characters appears at key moments in the text's narrative, and in each instance it provides the reader with a development of ideas. Such use of language is nowhere to be found in Homer.[52] The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are saturated with stock

[49] For example, the use of τιταίνοντας (209) is an extended use of the conventional verb τιταινῶ that expands on the implications of τιτῆνας in line 207. Similarly the use of doublets with inter-changeable words and phrases may not only be a poetic device to avoid repetition, but also a means to reiterate and develop a concept, and for the purpose of this discussion, the concept Titan, and this may be the technical device used in the doublet lines of 138/155 and 324/563.

[50] G. S. Kirk, 'The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*', in K. von Fritz (ed.) *Hesiode ét son influence: Éntretiens sur L'antiquité classique* (Geneva: Hardt, 1962), pp. 61-109, esp. p. 65.

[51] Cf. C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading Greek Death* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), for the Nekyia cf. esp. p. 75, where Inwood states that 'it seems plausible that at least one pre-Homeric epic had a Nekyia at its end, functioning as a closure; and that Homer reshaped this Nekyia while transferring it to the middle of the fairyland'. Inwood discusses the Homeric neykia by means of historical method. Concerning the end of the *Odyssey*, cf. pp. 94ff.

[52] Further reference to the language that surrounds Titan in Hesiod will be discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis. Linguistic parallels between Homer and Hesiod have been argued by G.P.Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

epithets and formulas, which offer a single interpretation which, in this respect, has little scope for a development through additional understanding.[53]

More specific to our text is that, if parts of the *Theogony* falls short of a Homeric based interpretation, then large chunks of the text's narrative will be, and have been, omitted. Furthermore, if what remains rests awkwardly in the narrative flow of the text, then more chunks are omitted under the premise of interpolation.[54] But if the passages rejected by the commentaries of Jacobson, Mazon and Wilamowitz were omitted, then we would be left with a fragmentary text with no – or rather very little – substance. Indeed, the difficulties raised by rejections evoke the need for methodological re-evaluation to include also the authoritative comments made by scholars such as Kirk.[55]

The term 'interpolation' is deeply problematic, especially as in recent times scholars have used such a term as a *methodological* definition for texts too problematic to interpret. To cite an example of this tendency is, in addition to the scholars mentioned above, J. P. Barron.[56] In his article on Hesiod, Barron uses 'interpolation' to explain the seeming discontinuity of the *Theogony*, but he then

---

[53] With this in mind, the *context* of a phrase (or passage) should determine its interpretation. For example, it would be confusing if line 160 of the *Theogony* is compared with the use of τέχνη at *Odyssey* 4.529. At line 160 the term τέχνη, and its context at 160, implies the crafty mind of Gaia and later the skill of Kronos. If this interpretation of the *Theogony* is taken into consideration, then a comparative with the *Odyssey* would be inappropriate.
Cf. A. Parry (ed.), *The Making of Homeric Verse: Collected Essays of M. Parry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

[54] Interpolation could be regarded as a term used when the *langue* and *parole* approach has extended its boundaries.

[55] This would certainly be the case if Kirk's thesis is taken to the extreme in that 'not even the most conservative of critics now take the *Theogony* as we have it ... to be a unified work. It has obviously suffered major expansions and omissions as well as many minor interpolations.'; so G. S. Kirk, 'The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*', in K. von Fritz (ed) *Hesiodé et son influence: Entretiens sur L'antiquité classique* (Geneva: Hardt, 1962) 61-109, esp. p. 63.

[56] J. P. Barron and P. E. Easterling (eds.), 'Hesiod', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 95-105.

contradicts himself. Barron paradoxically recognizes the difficulty in applying 'interpolation' to the *Theogony* as Hesiod 'show[s] a certain diffuseness'.[57]

Crucially, although Barron identifies Hesiod as author, he deviates from structuralist methods for identifying interpolation. In other words, what Barron posits is that *apparent* thematic divergence should not be assumed as interpolation, and vice versa. This is not to suggest that the 'interpolations' which have been identified by classical scholars should be ignored, but instead that they should be critically analysed. In a sense, we should follow the example set by P. Walcot.[58] Although Walcot notes that the Prometheus episode rests awkwardly in the *Theogony's* narrative, he overcomes this difficulty by arguing that 'it is significant that it stands at the climax of the poem with other stories grouped in pairs symmetrically either side of it.'[59] Walcot goes on to state that the Prometheus episode provides the *Theogony* with 'unity of structure'.[60]

Walcot's analysis suggests many interesting points. He first accepts the Prometheus episode as part of the narrative of the *Theogony* when so many other scholars have rejected this episode.[61] Moreover, Walcot sees the episode as crucial to supporting other episodes within the text which, likewise, have been rejected. Thus following the example of Walcot, we may reflect on basic considerations: We ought to explore whether it is appropriate to identify episodes and characters within the narrative which seem awkwardly placed as interpolation, and we ought to explore

---

[57] In making this statement I have in mind the following citation from Barron (ibid.):

> 'It is hard to find a safe criterion for judging interpolation in an author like Hesiod. Both his extant poems show a certain diffuseness, a tendency to be side-tracked from the matters in hand, which lead one to doubt whether they ever possessed any logical or rigorous arrangement'

[58] P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff: Wales University Press, 1966).

[59] Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East,* p.2. Cf. also pp. 55-79 where he discusses the Prometheus myth in relation to Near Eastern sources and the *Works and Days*.

[60] Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East*, p. 2.

whether it is now acceptable to determine what is thought to be interpolation on the basis that episodes and characters in one text are justified by cross referencing to parallels in (an)other textual source(s).

It is at this juncture that we turn our attention to the intentions of this thesis and to the methodological framework which will shape Chapter Two. When presented with the text, we ought at first put aside historical criticism of the *Theogony*, and only return once we have attempted to read the narrative of the text independently. Certainly difficulties in this narrative approach are illustrated in cases where scholars have rejected significant passages of the text, namely those referring to the Titans as spurious or non-Hesiodic simply because these passages do not fit predetermined criteria identified from outside the *Theogony*.[62] However, such a direct approach to the text can only strenghthen any secondary historical formulations.

The study below will thus explore the *Theogony*, firstly not by means of the source- and tradition-historical methods commonly applied, but by direct reference to the text itself. Nevertheless, this text-centred approach will not ignore the more traditional historical methods; but on the contrary, it builds on such academic appraisals of the *Theogony*.[63] Although the analysis of Chapter Two, the author Hesiod is not the principle concern as much as the contents of the narrative itself, historical methodology becomes more important to the discussion of Chapter Three.

---

[61] Cf. F. Solmsen, 'The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text', *HSCP* 86 (1982) 1-31.

[62] To cite an example, P. Mazon maintained that the authenticity of either so-called Titanomachia (617-731) or Typhoneus (820-868) should be regarded as an interpolation on the grounds that more than one conflict leading to the ascendancy of Zeus – after all, the purpose of the work – would have been unnecessary. See further A. Meyer, *De compositione Theogoniae Hesiodeae* (Berlin: Reimer, 1887); M. L. West, 'Hesiodea', *Classical Quarterly* 59 (1961) pp. 130-45 and 'More Notes on the Text of Hesiod', *Classical Quarterly* 60 (1962) pp. 177-81.

[63] We must remind ourselves of the valuable insights of the historical scholars already mentioned above, namely Q. Skinner, who have recognized the problems and difficulties inherent in historical methods and have often discussed alternative methods. Here though we will actively respond, through analysis, to the murmured disquiet of the historical forum.

This approach contrasts greatly, not only with tradition historical methods, but also with attempts to assess the *Theogony* through structuralist means. Our focus will be on the text's interaction with a modern audience, leaving us the perceiver to identify with the characters, activity, and symbols of the text without the initial requirement to relate to an author and a delineation of his 8th century BCE context. The emphasis of this appraisal is not on 'who' said 'what' and 'when' – as these are factors external to the text –but on *what* is being communicated in the work as a whole.

In a sense, today's interpreter of an ancient theogony has to try, positioned as a reader, to establish a relationship with the author that involves a level of shared cognitive understanding and communication. Applied to the *Theogony*, the themes, motifs and characterizations made in the text are ascertainable once the audience, for today as much as in antiquity, recognises the communicative procedures of the author. However, it is difficult to infer the nature of the relationship between author and audience.[64] The most satisfactory way to attempt such a task is to read the text in terms of its own 'autonomy'. Once this has been achieved, then it becomes more fruitful to explore first the text in relation to 'external' traditions and sources.

For guidance on narrative analysis I turn to the methods of M. Bal, especially as from our reading of the narrative of the *Theogony* we will discover that the text offers insight into key themes often provided first by historical research.[65] Bal's

---

[64] This holds despite the attempts made by classicists who have appealed to factors external to the text in determining the relation between author and audience. Cf., for example, G. W. Most, "The Poetics of Early Greek Philosophy", in A. A. Long (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) pp. 332-62, especially pp. 334-35: "Homer and Hesiod are not only important early evidence of the constraints that governed serious public discourse in archaic Greece, but they also massively influenced those constraints for many centuries in later Greek (and even non-Greek) culture.... This [a generic repertoire] is what audiences wanted to hear."

[65] M. Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).

discussion on fabula, focalisation and characterizations offer insight for narrative approach. She states that 'a fabula may be considered as a specific grouping of a series of events', and argues therefore that 'the fabula as a whole constitutes a process'.[66] Bal then continues to identify three distinguishing features of a fabula: (i) the possibility, (ii) the event – ie. realization, and (iii) result – conclusion.[67] Here I redefine Bal's criteria and propose that the 'fabula' of the *Theogony* represents the central theme of the text, or rather, its 'deep structure' which, in turn, determines events and characterizations made within the narrative.

For the purpose to illustrate the narratological thesis of Bal, I suggest that the main fabula of the *Theogony* is its cosmology, and that all events, characterizations and focalisations are shaped by this fabula. Cosmology, as the text's main fabula, should be determined solely by evidence from the text, and not on any homological theory offered (see below) by structuralist critics. For the latter, Barthes supposes a universal model for narrative texts determined by language and homology.[68] What is meant by homology is that there exists a 'structural correspondence' between 'narrative fabulas' and 'real' fabulas; this, moreover, reflects a correspondence between people's real experience and the experience of the character. Contrary to this thesis is the view of C. Bremond, who argues that there is no 'mutual experience but structural similarities'.[69] Citing a flaw in Bremond's thesis, Bal maintains instead 'that readers, intentional or not, search for a logical line in such a text', and that, if necessary, they introduce their own such line:

---

[66] Bal, *Narratology*, p. 189. Therefore, to further this claim, Bal argues that each event forms part of that process.

[67] This criterion could certainly be applied to our text, as the 'possibility' is Zeus' ascension, the 'events' are the conflicts, and the realization is Zeus' ascension. Nevertheless, although the realization in our text is positive, this may not be so in all instances.

[68] R. Barthes, 'Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative', *Image – Music – Text* (London: Fontana, 1977), pp. 167. Cf. Bal, *Narratology*, p. 175.

> 'Consequently, most fabulas can be said to be constructed to the demands of human 'logic of events' provided that this concept is not too narrowly understood.' [70]

Bal's comments point in the direction of social anthropology, or at least suggest the significance of a study of the philosophy of humankind, in that the reader is assumed to possess a recognisable 'logic of events' – presumably one that reflects a personal (and more generally human) understanding of the world. But, as Bal rightly warns against allowing a narrative fabula to overwhelm the anthropological suppositions of readers; accordingly, it is this latter tendency which the present study initially intends to avoid. In making an initial assessment of the text, the reader requires no external reality to understand the internal reality of the text. The *Theogony* should expose the reader to all relevant details of (for example) the 'cosmological' fabula by the very fabric of the text itself, and to this there are no gaps in the *Theogony's* narrative that would demand external considerations. Certainly ellipsis forms no part of our consideration of the *Theogony*.[71] Gaps in the narrative would only appear if the omissions of (ie) Goettling and Rzach were to be taken seriously.

In agreement with the general principles of the narrative theory, this study argues, as the basis for interpreting the *Theogony*, that the 'narrative is structurally self-sufficient'.[72] But at the same time, we ought to be aware that the narrative, once considered, could lead to other considerations external to the text.[73] For example, the

---

[69] C. Bremond, *Logiqué du Recit* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1973). Cf. Bal, *Narratology*, p. 176.
[70] Bal, *Narratology*, p. 177.
[71] Ellipsis is when information is omitted, but the sequence of events assumes it. Cf. Bal, *Narratology*, p. 91.
[72] Bal, *Narratology*, p. 179.
[73] Even Goettling et al, to some extent, support the 'anthropological thesis, as they too omit sections of the *Theogony* on the grounds that lines do not reflect a 'literary norm'. Their understanding of 'literary

narrative of the Prometheus episode could be used in studies of religion, sociology and other aspects of the social sciences.[74]

Concessions to the anthropological considerations can only be adopted if one intends to explore the *Theogony's* account for humankind's existence. In this instance, then, the *Theogony* lends itself to transhistorical criteria.[75] The theory of existence does form part of the *Theogony's* cosmology, and the process of existence is accounted for by a series of cosmological confrontations differentiated by genealogical digressions; but these digressions also provide essential information for the main events within the narrative.[76] Thus, the characters and characterizations made by the genealogical digressions form the basis for interpreting the text's fabula and the relevance of humankind to that fabula.

Therefore, the *Theogony* of our Chapter Two does not concentrate on 'external retroversions', as it is not yet obvious that such exist. Bal provides a crucial line of narrative approach – in that 'the action which takes place in the narrative' – does not embellish socio-cultural norms'.[77] Instead we should first concentrate on 'internal diversions within the *Theogony's* narrative.[78]

---

norm' is based on text comparison and cultural precepts, and not founded alongside a text's independent status.

[74] Cf. R. Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* translated by P. Gregory (London: Athlone, 1995) who discusses the psychology of sacrificial ritual; C. Kerenyi, *Prometheus: Archetypal Image of Human Existence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), esp. pp. 33-49; R. A. Segal, *The Myth and Ritual Theory* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), esp. pp. 118-135, 156-171 and 172-179.

[75] The narratological approach suggests that – in principle – most fabulas 'endorse the notion that patriarchy is a ... transhistorical form' (Bal, *Narratology*, p. 179).

[76] For example, the genealogical digression of Styx accounts for the importance of cosmological justice. The Styx episode is an aside that provides crucial information about Titan, which foreshadows their eventual fate.

[77] 'External retroversions' include historical political and social undertakings. Cf. Bal, *Narratology*, p. 155.

[78] What we will detail as 'internal diversions', other narratologists including Bal would define as 'internal retroversions'. Our definition defines instances in the text where the main fabula is taken over by another form of action. This secondary action complements the primary fabula by providing additional narrative structure and detail. Cf. Bal, *Narratology*, p. 91 where internal retroversion sometimes overlaps the primary fabula to bridge chronological gaps in the narrative.

An example of an 'internal diversion' would be passage references to Styx and Hekate. Both these characters appear early in the text, and override the main fabula. The importance of these episodes then comes secondary to the main fabula that begins to take shape at lines 617-731 in the Titanomachy episode, that relates then directly and more profoundly to the events of the Typhoneus episode. To some extent the Styx and Hekate episodes bridge a conceptual gap, that being an idea of cosmological necessity and that some kind of notion about justice has to be established before cosmological punishment is endorsed.[79] Thus, these 'diversions' are crucial to the understanding of the fabula; as they do not 'override' it, but complement the primary fabula.

Furthermore, Bal's description of 'internal retroversions' and / or our 'internal diversions' extends deeper, as it contributes to our understanding of the *Theogony's* characters and characterizations. Thus, the characterizations made within the text which provides the communication between text and audience. It is at this point of realisation that social anthropology becomes a crucial part of the discussion. The unfolding of events in the *Theogony* rests on a series of 'focalisations', and are associated with this 'subjective retroversions'.[80]

Although cosmology remains the main fabula of the *Theogony*, focalisations form categories of the fabula. The most apparent focalisation is human nature; and the characterizations made within the narrative, namely that of the Titans, support the text's anthropological assertions. The 'anthropological' characterizations described in

[79] Another example would be the *Theogony's* description of the Kyklopes. For example, the Kyklopes first appear at lines 139ff, only to receive no further mention, apart from at lines 286, until lines 707ff as attributes of Zeus. Lines 139ff are a genealogical sidetrack, that if omitted would question their importance in the two main conflict events (ie. the Titanomachy (707ff) and the Typhoneus episode at (845ff and 854ff.). The reason for the genealogical detail of the Kyklopes becomes apparent when the narrative focuses on the main events of the fabula itself, namely in the Typhoneus episode.

[80] Subjective retroversions refer to a character's personal feelings.

the text's narrative associate with events, emotions and understandings felt by humankind. For example, the subjective retroversion of Gaia at lines 164-166 functions in two ways: (1) it provides the basis for developments within cosmological formation, which accounts for the necessity of progressive genealogies, and (2) lends itself to anthropological considerations. Thus, the subject retroversion felt by Gaia in lines 164-166 led to the subjective retroversion of Ouranos at lines 207-210, and both instances determine the characterisation of their Titan offspring and other perennial genealogies.

The disquiet of Gaia enabled genealogical development, and each genealogical narrative after lines 207-210 reflects some form of focalisation that forms a layer of the text's fabula.[81] Each focalisation is character-bound, and this 'character' emphasis shifts from one character to another at given points in the over all narrative. Furthermore, each shift in 'character-bound' focalisation contributes to the sub-text of the primary fabulum.

It is possible that the *Theogony* describes the cosmological importance of each genealogy by first introducing its main characters as part of a group characterisation; this is then followed through by individual narrative descriptions. Thus each key character is given, at some stage of the text's narrative, a key role and point of narrative focus. To illustrate this latter point, the Hundred Handers are first mentioned at lines 147ff, their physique receives further narration at lines 670-673 as something that profoundly contributes to the cosmological Titanomachy. Once the narrative has exhausted its necessary description of the Hundred Handers, it then focuses on characterising other characters of the first generation – namely the Kyklopes. The

descriptive characterisation provided for the Hundred Handers and the Kylopes is then merged in the narrative characterisation of Typhoneus at lines 823-838. Hence the characterisation of Typhoneus at line 823-838 comes as no real physical surprise, as it has been constantly alluded to throughout the text's narrative series of genealogical events and conflict sagas.[82]

The discussion so far has provided much guidance on how to approach a narrative text. The reader has to observe every detail of the text, identify each characterization and determine the main and sub–text fabula(s) of each episode. The reader ought to try this in order to bring forward the text's relationship and relevance to historical thought and appraisal of ancient Greek literature. The surprise of Chapter Three will be the observations made in Chapter Two, which could be that the *Theogony* is more than a textual aside to Homer et al., but in fact the text should be read up-there in relation with other 'global' Near Eastern cosmologies and even alongside early Greek philosophy.

[81] Bal defines 'focalisation' as the 'relationship between the 'vision', the agent that sees, and that which is seen' (Bal, *Narratology*, p. 146). In the example here Gaia sees and feels discomfort, whereas Ouranos fails to see this discomfort and is oblivious to his causal involvement in the initial violence.
[82] Cf. Echidna episode at lines 304-355.

Chapter

Two

Chapter Two

In order to provide an interpretation of the *Theogony* that incorporates the discussion of method in Chapter One, it is appropriate to take into account some of the scholarly interpretations that have been provided for our text. As noted in Chapter One, recent scholarly research of the *Theogony* has often taken Homer as a point of departure, so that Hesiod's poems have been regarded as part of the 'epic cycle' which is, invariably, concerned with myths about the Olympian gods.[83] This chapter thus aims to explain why in principle that it is necessary to study the internal dynamics of the *Theogony* before undertaking comparisons that set it alongside other ancient documents and literary forms.

While Kirk's generic appraisal of Hesiod's divine characters has the advantage of providing a model for interpreting ancient Greek mythology, it has its limitations. For example, Kirk's criterion for myth does not necessarily do justice to the narrative of the *Theogony*, but instead seeks to interpret Hesiod in connection with other ancient poets concerned with divine genealogies. The *Theogony*, however, is not merely a piece of literature that presents a systematic view of the gods; it is, rather, something far more fundamental. The *Theogony*, in fact, when considered apart from

[83] Cf. M.L. West's translation, *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), were he states that '[Hesiod] was nevertheless one of the most famous poets of antiquity, often mentioned in the same breath as Homer..', p. vii. Furthermore, because Homer and Hesiod are thought to stand at the beginning of Greek literature, the formulaic style used by these poets has led to the assumption that these poets held similar world views in their works. This latter assertion is certainly an impression offered by Edwards and West; cf. G.P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971) and West, *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days*, p. viii. However, this construal of the the relationship between the two authors can only be evaluated through an independent study, for example, of Hesiod's *Theogony*.

generic 'classical' interpretations, reveals itself to be an in depth discourse about cosmology in which divine agents function as the leading exemplars.

One of the main difficulties with looking at Hesiod's *Theogony* as an independent text (ie. separate from Homeric appraisal) is that such an attempt seems to contravene significant previous research on the document. Nevertheless, it is not so much the aim of this thesis to dismiss the work of previous scholars, as it is to push research on Hesiod into new a direction. Thus it would be absurd to disregard the similarities between the formulaic diction found in Homer and Hesiod, as discussed by scholars such as West and Edwards. Indeed, our intention here is to incorporate such developments into our current study. However, we will need to question the place of 'recognised' Homeric epithets in our interpretation of Hesiod. To illustrate this latter point, the epithet 'broad earth' (for example) is found both in Hesiod and Homer. Homer's use of the expression 'broad earth' merely functions as a general description of earth; but the context of this epithet in Hesiod suggests that it refers to times of upheaval and thus points beyond a general description to something more fundamental about cosmology.[84]

If we are to investigate an apparent cosmological nature of the *Theogony*, then we shall have to re-address West's argument that in the *Theogony* 'genealogy thus takes the place of cosmology'.[85] For West, 'Hesiod's only answer to the question how the heaven and earth were created' is to say that 'first came the Chasm, and then Earth, and Earth gave birth to heaven, and the mountains, and sea.'[86] While this is correct as far as it goes, West crucially omits any mention of the separation of the

[84] West, *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days*, p. ix.

[85] Ibid. p. x. The term 'seeming' is an acknowledgement that we are to leave an open mind at this stage to the narrative interpretation of the *Theogony*. What we are doing here is discussing some of the assertions made by other scholars, and by doing so, seeing a way forward by recognising areas which require further research.

'broad earth' and 'far-stretching sky' by Kronos which brought into formation the terrestrial creation, on the one hand, and the celestial entities, on the other.

Although Kirk offers a similar thesis to that of West, he does recognise Hesiod's contribution to our understanding of the world and its formation. However, Kirk nonetheless approaches Hesiod, as we have now come to anticipate, through the lens of Homeric studies. In particular, he argues that 'the myths, by the time of Homer and Hesiod, had been given an organized form in which the supernatural had been assigned a definite place'.[87] However, Kirk's emphasis on the 'organized ... supernatural' is mustered in support of his overall thesis that myth provides humankind with an aetiology for ritual behaviour.[88] Thus Kirk ultimately interprets the *Theogony* in terms of its genealogy, and then goes on to explore the relationship of this to cultural behaviour external to the narrative of the text.[89]

Whether deliberate or not, it seems that Kirk has formulated his thesis in a way that compares to Clay's understanding of Greek religion and myth. For Clay, the importance of the Homeric cycle, including the *Theogony*, consisted in the fact that it was a 'presentation of a panhellenic religion with the divine world ordered by and under the dominion of Olympian Zeus'.[90] However, although the *Theogony* does refer to the ascension of Zeus, we ought to question to what extent Hesiod describes a 'panhellenic religion' at all and whether the *Theogony's* portrayal of Zeus' genealogy was something widely recognised in the ancient world. Is it possible that a modern

---

[86] West, *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days*, p. x.
[87] G.S. Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths* (London: Penguin Group, 1990), p. 53.
[88] G.S. Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths*, p. 138.
[89] Cf. E.R. Leach, *Political Systems of Highland Burma*, p. 13. Although Leach does not refer directly to ancient mythology, his statement 'myth implies ritual, ritual implies myth, they are one and the same', bears relation to Kirk's thesis above.
[90] J.S. Clay, *The Politics of Olympos: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), esp. pp. 8-15.

scholar would be mistaken in assuming that the *Theogony* is but a microcosm of what may be said to have broadly characterised aetiological religiosity in antiquity?

A further caution is in order. We ought to be wary of any interpretation of the *Theogony* which seems to be principally focused on the Olympian deities, especially since the text provides an abundance of references to deities outside of the Olympian domain. We need to account for why peripheral deities gain significance in the narrative of the *Theogony*, and not dismiss them from our discussion.

A possible reason why scholars such as Clay have concentrated on Zeus is because an all inclusive or comprehensive discussion could lead to the conclusion that the *Theogony* (i) is not merely a myth about Zeus, (ii) is not a myth principally about the genealogy of the gods, and (iii) provides something more than a template to translate Homeric literature. Instead, although it embraces all of the above, the *Theogony* is also a myth about the supernatural world which humankind inhabits.[91]

It is from this preliminary stance that we ought to examine the *Theogony*, that is, its structure and narrative content. For the purpose of academic ease, the analysis below will divide the text into episodes and attempt to discern how the narrative of each episode relates to a former and later episode. Here, we are not suggesting that the *Theogony* is made up of different myths which have been merged together by a later author. Rather, we are trying to establish a method which will allow us to see the *Theogony* as a whole, continuous and interwoven text. Such an approach of dissecting the text is, of course, nothing new and is adopted to some extent by West, Goettling, Rzach and Gaisford.[92] However, in our case, the consideration of a particular episode does not at the same time discard another or reflect a focus in myopic isolation. Much

[91] For (i) refer to Clay's thesis, for (ii) consider West's and for, (iii) bear in mind Edwards and West.
[92] Cf. West, *Theogony*, pp.17-18.

more, the interpretation taken here offers an approach to particular episodes as they relate to the *Theogony* in its entirety. In offering such a literary-narrative approach, our examination of the *Theogony* will draw on the editions of the text provided by modern scholars and their citation of ancient scholia.[93] Thus, while being synthetic in nature, the analysis will attempt to neutralize inevitable arbitariness of such an investigation by observing and discussing interpretive issues raised by both modern and ancient commentators of Hesiod's *Theogony.*

It remains now to outline a template which we will follow as much as possible in order to interpret the *Theogony.* The *Theogony* has three main episodes, or succession conflicts, which are thematically linked by three intermediary or intervening episodes. The main episodes appear at lines 207-210 (the Curse of Ouranos), 617-731 (the Titanomachy) and 820-868 (the Typhomachy). The intermediary passages occur at lines 389-403 (incorporating 414-453, Nux and Hekate), 512-616 (the Prometheus myth) and 732-819 (description of Tartarus).[94] These interim passages are situated between each succession conflict; in their respective positions, they not only heighten the significance of themes, motifs and characterizations formerly made, but also allow the narrative of the *Theogony* to be read as a coherent and integrated text. The pivotal episode of the *Theogony* originates from the forced separation of Ouranos and Gaia by Kronos (174-182) with the Curse

[93] References to the scholia will include mention to the medieval and renaissance manuscripts, as also referred to by modern scholars. Any mention to such manuscripts and scholia will be detailed accordingly in the discussion.

[94] The singling out of these passages may seem to suggest that this thesis ignores other lines in the text as either irrelevant or unimportant to our discussion - this is certainly not the case. On the contrary, the other lines and passages form part of our investigation for the main and intermediary episodes and not in isolation. After all, lines 211-388 (for example) provide a genealogical account of Nux, Pontos, Nereus, Theumas, Phorkys and Keto, Tethys and Okeanos, Theia and Hyperion, Kreios and Eurybia, and it is these genealogical accounts which supplement our understanding of (for example) lines 138ff which leads us to the Curse of Ouranos at lines 207-210.

of Ouranos at lines 207-210.[95] Kronos' violent activity was a response to Gaia's request at lines 170-172 in response to the violent generative suppression of Ouranos (156-159). Following this, lines 207-210 see the birth of the text's main characters, the Titans.[96] The repeated appearance of Titan from here on throughout the narrative influences the development of other characterisations made within the weave of the text.

In fact, it could be argued that the description of Gaia's and Ouranos' other offspring in the narrative – offspring that came about through the union and separation of Earth and Sky – find their origin through the introduction of a few cursed Titan children at line 207.[97] It is these Titan characters which to some extent provide the basis for distinguishing between each of the generational progeny, namely, the three Hundred Handers, the Kyklopes, and Typhoneus who is eventually created. Furthermore, it is possibly the reference to the Titan children at 207 that gives way for the expansion of the text's genealogical narrative as expressed in the *Theogony's* main fabula: genealogical cosmology. A possible inference from this would be that the significance of the passage in lines 207-210 should not be underestimated with respect to the way it shapes many focalisations of the narrative which, in turn, contribute to our understanding of the main fabula.

---

[95] This crucial passage reads as follows:

207 τοὺς δὲ πατὴρ Τιτῆνας ἐπίκλησιν καλέεσκε
208 παῖδας νεικείων μέγας Οὐρανος οὕς τέκεν αὐτός
209 φάσκε δὲ τιταίνοντας ἀτασθαλίῃ μέγα ῥέξαι
210 ἔργον τοῖο δ' ἔπειτα τίσιν μετόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι.

[96] In principle the *Theogony* provides an account of the origin of the gods. The genealogical structure of the deities has a profound impact on the formation of our world. In the *Theogony*, the genealogy of the gods and the necessity for genealogical evolution reflects both the causes and consequences of existence (207). Thus, Titan operates as an idiom for a certain levels of 'existence'. Conversely, these Titan characters help to identify aspects of the newly formed tripartite cosmology. This tripartite cosmology is made up of sea, sky and earth. Cf. lines 126, 127 and 132.

[97] This point is noted by the texts consistent use of verbs of becoming. Cf. lines 208 and possibly 210.

This chapter begins by looking at lines 207-210, followed by a consideration of how these few lines have shaped the narrative of the succession conflicts and intermediary episodes. As outlined in Chapter One, this investigation will involve an analytical approach that identifies and examines the language, motifs and allusions that recur throughout the text and in particular to one of the text's main set of characters – the Titans. Therefore, our interpretation of passage 207-210 will form the structural basis of this chapter.

1) Passage 207-210: Introduction to Succession Conflicts

There are considerable methodological issues overshadowing an interpretation of lines 207-210. T. Gaisford and F. A. Wolf relegated lines 207-210 as a later interpolation on the grounds that only Kronos committed violence against Ouranos.[98] This claim, however, can only be maintained if lines 155-156 are omitted.[99] F .A. Paley, though not as extreme as Gaisford and Wolf, regards lines 207-210 as a self-contained episode referring to the moment when Ouranos calls his children Titans, and goes on to claim that Titan is a term of response against the violence of these children (208).[100] Paley's view agrees with that of Apollonius; for Paley the curse by Ouranos is interpreted as vengeance against all the children (i.505). Goettling rejects the following lines 211-232 as an interpolation by a later rhapsodist.[101] Despite these scholarly claims, there is a basic error of approach; that being, each scholar depends on the thesis of another scholar. Thus each argument, to receive credibility, depends

[98] T. Gaisford, *Poetae Minores Graeci* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1814) and F. A. Wolf, *Theogonia Hesiodae* (Halle 1783).
[99] These lines refer to a comparative number of children and not to the isolation of merely just one offspring.
[100] Paley, *Hesiodi*, p. 153.

on a former argument which may be seen as less credible than their own. What instead should be each scholar's line of departure is the text of the *Theogony* itself.[102]

West does not question the genuineness of lines 207-210. However, he does identify the Titan children as those children referred to in lines 132-138. In his commentary to lines 132ff, West suggests a non-integral genealogy which clearly separates the Hundred Handers and the Kyklopes from the Titans.[103] Following on from this, he concedes in finding difficultly in reconciling narrative which

---

[101] Gaisford rejects equally lines 212-213 and 224.

[102] Modern scholars have often based their dismissal of some lines in the *Theogony* on assertions of ancient scholars. Some of the difficulties in interpretation of line 209 have been associated with the use of φάσκε. The *b* scholia cite ειφασκε. The *b* manuscript comprises of mL(R). There are four main manuscripts for m: Paris gr. 2763 SXV; Paris gr. 2833 S.XV; Vratislav Rehd. 35.S.SV and Mosq. 469 S.XV. All of these sources probably derived from the same text. The other sources for *b* are (L) Laurentianus conventi soppressi 158 S.XIV and (R) Casanat. 356 (vv. 1-5, XIII ex.- XIV in). The reliability of the m scholia is overshadowed by the discovery of the K manuscript. In effect the *b* manuscripts deem corrupt if K is then compared with a. The **a** texts consist of n, v, W and X manuscripts that date from the 14th and 15th centuries. The n texts originate from Marcianus IX.6 of the 14th century and Salmanticensis 243 of the 15th century. Source v is Laurentianus conventi soppressi 15 of the 14th century, W is 15th century Panormitanus 2Qq-A-75; and X 15th century Parisinus supplement grec 652. Without doubt, all these texts relied on unaccounted former sources. The reliability of S is made possible only by comparing it with other later texts, but this is not a license to suggest that S is genuine to historical Hesiod. It does - however, enable modern scholars to draw on various sources to assess certain credence for the text of the *Theogony*. The rendition of ειφασκε seems unlikely not only for metrical reasons but also on grammatical grounds – as the augment ει- appears nowhere else in the text.
However, greater problems are presented by Π^4 for line 210 (cf. P. Lit. Lond. 33 [inv. 159, Milne *Catal. Lit* S.III-IV. *Pap. In Brit. Mus*]: *Th.* 210-38, 259-71, 296-97), and K (Ravennas 120 S.XIV) who both suggest με[θ]οπισθεγε for μετόπισθεν, and K who offers κατόπισθεν. It is the -γε that has forced reinterpretations of this line, and West, to name just one scholar, who has stated the difficulties in its interpretation, 'Π^4 after μετόπισθεν gives γε[, which some scholars have for some reason assumed must represent γενέσθαι. It was more probably γ' ἔσεσθαι, though there are other possibilities such as γε δώσειν (cf. A.R. 2 796 ἔμπης δ' ἐξ ὑμέων ἔδοσαν τίσιν) or γε τείσειν. For the version of the codd. Cf. *Od.* 22.40 νέμεσιν κατόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι. K actually gives κατόπισθεν here, the same variant occurs in a papyrus at *Op.* 284-285'. In response to West, one should not discard the possibility of γένεσθαι, especially if the occurrence of the verb γίγνομαι throughout the *Theogony* is taken into consideration. If the use of γένεσθαι in 210 is credible, then this will have profound impact on both the reading line 210. Γίγνομαι first appears in lines 126ff which describe the presence of the primordial order (i.e. the physical genesis of earth, sea and sky) that forms the basic principle of the metaphysical world (cf. lines 129-130).

[103] M. L. West (ed.), *Hesiod: Theogony*, p. 200. West's actual statement reads, 'the list of children that follows as far as 138, six male and six female (cf. p. 36), forms the group to which Uranos gives the name Titan in line 207, the Cyclopes and the Hundred Handers (139-53) cannot be included, since they help Zeus against the Titans in the Titanomachy (cf. esp. 663).'

differentiates Kyklopes and the Hundred Handers from those children mentioned at lines 139-153 which are then again distinguished at lines 663 and 668-669.[104]

Here I propose to alleviate the difficulty West presents. Although we may accept West's claim that the Titans are totally distinguishable from the other offspring of Gaia and Ouranos, it would be misleading to suggest that the characterization of the Titans is entirely dissimilar from the characterizations made for the other progeny. Perhaps if any decisive distinction could be made it would be a response to the question 'who and / or what is Titan?'.[105] Is Titan simply a collective name given twelve primordial offspring, and if so, are other progenies so different from that of the Titans? Furthermore, questions should be raised on how each character emerges and interacts with other characters to facilitate the text's fabula.

The term 'Titan' is obscure.[106] The general consensus is that the Titan children are born from Gaia (822).[107] Each instance of procreation contributes to the

---

[104] West, *Theogony*, p. 206, gives the statement that, '.. to the Titan children are now appended two further groups of children of Earth and Heaven, the Cyclopes and the Hundred Handers. Their appearance here is hard to reconcile with the narrative that follows. All children are 'concealed' by Uranos (157). Gaia cites them to retaliate, and because of their act they receive the name Titans (207) – still, as it seems, all of Uranos' children. But we have seen (on 133) that the Titans cannot include the Cyclopes and the Hundred Handers, and indeed are distinguished from the latter (663, 668-9).'

[105] Hsch. fr. 272 N = 258 Muller. As already stated, the general consensus among scholars is that Titan denotes a group of personifications. Cf. Stobaeos vii fr. 40 and Pohlenz *N.Jb.* 1916 p. 577. Titan was thought to be an epithet used in conjunction with Θέος (*Theogony* 729). Cf. *Iliad* 14.278; *h.Ap.* 335; A. *P.V.* 427; S. *O.C.* 56. More recently, Wilamowitz has observed that *Titanes* was a Thracian word meaning 'god', and thus infers that Titan in the *Theogony* must mean 'god' as well. Nevertheless, Wilamowitz does not, however, simply regard Titan as a synonym for Θέος or Θεοί. In support of Wilamowitz some ancient sources cite Thrace (herself) was a Titan nymph married to Kronos. Cf. Choeroboscus *Gramm. Gr.* iv.i.328.12, Cramer *An. Par.* iii.295.34. The *Theogony* does refer to the Titans as 'former gods', later replaced presumably by the Olympians (424). West, when referring to the characteristics of the Titans, comments that, '... they represent an older system of gods (424, 486) and they are no longer active in the world but dwell in Tartaros (729ff, 814; *Iliad* 14.279; also O.F. *H.*37.2-3).'

[106] Assuming that the Titan children of line 207 are the twelve mentioned at 132 -138 then, if we search outside of our text, there is a lot of historical data we can draw upon to characterise these offspring. For example, to cite a few: in archaic epic, although Okeanos married to Tethys (*Th.* 136-137, 337 and *Iliad* 14.201, 302, 18.607, also Lyc. 1069) represents the source of all water (*Iliad* 21.295) and a binding boundary around the earth (*Theogony* 790-791 and *Iliad* 18.607 and *Sc.* 314-317). A difference lies where Homer refers to Okeanos as the 'originator of all things' (*Iliad* 14.201, 246), whereas in the *Theogony* Gaia is the principle element of creation. Koios (*Th.* 134 and *O.F.* 114.7-8), commonly known as father of Leto, probably of non-Greek origin (*H.Ap.*62; also Pindar fr.33d3), is also

characterisation of Titan that helps to shape a system of divine attributes (183-187). These Titan creations are interactive aspects of cosmological conflict, which affect all other genealogies described in the text. [108]

The curse of Ouranos at lines 207-210 is placed at lines 164-165 where Gaia asked all her children (164-165) to respond violently against the suppression of Ouranos (157). Although lines 168-169 suggest that only Kronos responds to Gaia's appeal, the plural παίδας at lines 164 and 208 suggests that the response is ultimately a collective Titan aggression, and effectively only those detailed at lines 132-138. However, it should not be overlooked that Gaia also conceives children with compatible characteristics to those of 132-138 described at 178-182.

As already cited, West has argued that the Kyklopes and the Hundred Handers are not to be included as the part of the cursed children of lines 207-210 because of the distinctions made at lines 663 and 668-669. But we are then faced with A. Meyer's

---

associated with geography (cf. Herondas 2.98) and sacrificial ritual (cf. Hdt. 2.41, 6.56). Interestingly, West infers that Iapetos was 'the most Titanic figure after Kronos'. In partial acceptance of West it should be recognised that, Iapetos does appear in the text more than the other children mentioned at lines 132-138, with exception to Kronos. Iapetos is connected with the Prometheus episode at *Theogony* 506ff and 556. Other evidence external to the *Theogony* suggests an etymological link between Iapetos and the biblical name Japeth (*Gen.* ix.21ff).
More crucial though are the myths regarding Kronos, which cannot possibly be accounted for fully in this footnote. However, Kronos is the exemplar, a *muthos* of scholars, who have merged divergent, ambiguous, and conflicting accounts to produce a systematic profile of Kronos. Scholars have first set side-by-side the *Theogony* and the *Works and Day*, but such correlations may only be made if (for example) lines like 173b (WD) are taken as genuine (M. L.West (ed.), *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), esp. pp. 48, 51, 195-96). From this stance, the texts of Hesiod are compared with those of the Near East. In addition, the *Works and Days* has been compared with Zoraster myths (Cf. F. M. Muller, *Sacred Books of the East* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886-1892), esp. pp. v and xxxvii. Also M. L. West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971). It should be noted that there are decisive differences between the Kronos of the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days (WD)*, the Kronos of the *WD* (109-111) refers to a benevolent king of a golden age set in some real chronological time (cf. F. J. Teggart 'The Argument of Hesiod's Works and Days' *Journal of Ideas* 8 (1947) 45-47: also M. Skafte Jensen, 'Tradition and Individuality in Hesiod's Works and Days', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966) 1-27). Contrary to this, the Kronos of the *Theogony* represents a violent contributor of cosmological and genealogical violence (459-462).

[107] Other references made to Titan include Prometheus and Atlas. Cf. Sophocles in the *Oedipus at Colonus* (56) and Aristotle, *Pr.* 427; also cf. *O.F.*, 512; *I.G.* 12[5] 893.1; Hesph. *Astr.* 1.24.

[108] Cf. line 185: κρατέρας μεγάλους τε Γίγαντας, 821 Τυφωέα, 822 ἔν φιλότητι, 821 ὅπλοτατον.

dismissal of lines 139-153 as interpolation.[109] Indeed, West rejects Meyer's view by citing the thesis of H. Buse who claims that the Kyklopes and the Hundred Handers are later inserted in the text to allow continuity in the narrative.[110] The argument of Buse overtly ignores the ingenuity invested behind the text's composition. The *Theogony* is not an *ad hoc* composition, but a masterpiece with a definite structure containing comprehensively interwoven themes and motifs. It is almost irrelevant whether lines 139-153 were 'originally' omitted and then inserted as an afterthought: the point is that these lines now appear within the main body of the text.

Continuity in the text may be sought by the portrayal of Gaia's progeny. There is certain symmetry between the existence of the Hundred Handers with other children of Ouranos and Gaia.[111] Even the use of epithets can be seen to link each genealogy. Furthermore, it could be argued that certain terminologies within the text support the cohesion of the narrative – whether it is through language motif or detail of physical appearance.[112] What is clear, though, is that each progeny receives its negative characteristics from its maternal source Gaia.[113]

---

[109] A. Meyer, *De Compositione Theogonie Hesiodeae* (Diss. Berlin, 1887), p. 60.

[110] West, *Theogony*, p. 206. H. Buse, *Quaestiones Hesiodeae et Orphica* (Diss. Halle 1937). Buse states 'that Hesiod originally wrote the castration narrative immediately after the list of Titans and with reference to them alone. When he came to the Titanomachy, and found that the Cyclopes and Hundred Handers had not been prepared for he inserted 139-153, not realizing the difficulty that this caused in the following narrative' (pp. 27-28).

[111] For example, line 820 describes in detail the Titan descent into Tartaros, a descent is similar to the Hundred Handers' final fate described at lines 729-731 and 734-735. Of course, such a correlation may have been questioned by Π^{28}, who omitted lines 734-735 since they contradict 815-820. However, a valid counter-claim consists in the correspondence of details between passages 734-735 and 815-819.

[112] For example, Okeanos is an intermediary between cosmological extremes of (chthonic) Gaia and (celestial) Ouranos. We then learn that the chthonic deity Styx is related to Okeanos. The epithet δεινὴ for Styx (776) associates her with other offspring of Ouranos and Gaia (132ff). In terms of function, Styx is the place where oaths are sworn and where the Hundred Handers are conjured. The Hundred Handers, who inhabit the edge of Okeanos, are primarily associated with the peripheral boundaries of the world; this accounts for Briareos' union with Kympoleae. The possible association of Kymopoleae with the Nereids may be deduces from lines 252 Kymodoke, 253 Kymatolege and 255 Kymo.

[113] *Theogony* 159-162 describes the devious creation of the *adamantos* implicitly used by Kronos against Ouranos. Then the *adamantos* is subsequently associated with the Hundred Handers (as the description by Zeus in line 644). Fundamentally, Κακὴν ... τεχνὴν (160) and ἄγλαα τέκνα (644) represent the physical nature of Gaia's intelligence (ἔπεφρασσατο). In the instance of lines 159-162,

However, the reference to the Kyklopes in the *Theogony* has often been given separate recognition by scholars from the other progeny (namely those of 132-138).[114] It is true to state that the Kyklopes are unique characters, in that they are given specific personal names which refer to specific functions in the succession conflicts attributed often to Zeus. However, it is the Kyklopes' personal names and the epithets used for Zeus' weapons in the succession conflicts which allow for comparison to be made between Gaia's other offspring.[115] The personal names of the Kyklopes, unlike those of the Hundred Handers, have profound significance in the *Theogony*, especially as they are fundamental to the cosmological weave of the text.[116] Crucially, however,

---

this violent force (by Kronos) projects against Ouranos, whereas in line 644 detail the violence of Zeus against the former gods. Hence, there lies profound physical compatibility between Titan(s) of 159-162 and those referred to at line 644. The term *adamantos* is constantly alluded to throughout the text. The characterisation of Eurybia reminds the reader of the *adamantos* motif, and each reference sees a development in its characterization. Eurybia is characterised at line 339 as been made of *adamantos* and *thumos*. Here the '*adamantos*' is a poignant motif. Originally forged by Gaia at line 161 αἶψα δὲποιήσασα γένος πολιοῦ ἄδαμαντος (188), then through mental precision physically used by the crafty minded Kronos Κρόνος ἀγκυλομητις (168) against Ouranos (179-180). From this initial detail about Kronos, with Eurybia the significance of the *adamantos* has evolved. The *adamantos* has developed from a physical object to a psychological attribute governed by φρέσι θυμόν. The φρεσὶ of Eurybia may be associated with the προφρονέως (677) of Zeus' combatants, and therefore engage both undertakings. Ironically Gaia's attributes see the ascension of Zeus.

[114] West cites the Catalogue fr. 52[a] which details the Kyklopes destruction, claiming that the Kyklopes in this fragment, also attributed to Hesiod, are not the same Kyklopes mentioned in the *Theogony*.

[115] Cf. West, *Theogony*, where he states that 'the Cyclopes make Thunder, so Hesiod gives them names suggested by thunder. Zeus' weapon is regularly described in three words: Βροντή, στεροπή and κεραυνός (504-505, 690-1, 707, 845-6, etc.). These really represent three different aspects of the same phenomenon: Βροντή is what you hear, στεροπή is what you see, and κεραυνός is what hits you.' Cf. West's commentary for line 140. Also, Cf. C. Blickenberg, *The Thunderweapon in Religion and Folklore* (Cambridge: CUP, 1911).

[116] Kottos is a Thracian name. Gyges is known in various fables (cf. Suda iv.594.23A); and Briareos who is the most famously known of the brothers, associated with βριμώ (cf. Eust. 650.46, *Et. Magna* 346.38). At *Iliad* 1.403 Briareos is the name given by the gods and Aigaion by man. In the *Titanomachia* fr. 2 Ge is the mother of Briareos and Pontos that may account for his union with Kymopoleia.

The relationship between the Kyklopes and Zeus is unique; this uniqueness may explain the Kyklopes' exceptional characterization in the narrative, and not lend such narrative accounts to be excluded from the text as interpolation or an insert of a later myth.

In gratitude for their release the Kyklopes offer their 'craftful skills' to Zeus. Zeus thus becomes an embodiment of the Kyklopes (139-141). The significance of this is that the Kyklopes represent those fundamental military epithets of Zeus which are used at vital moments of succession conflicts. It is at such instances that the Kyklopes' fate resembles those of other offspring of Ouranos and Gaia. At lines 853-867 the Kyklopes are metaphorically sent, like their predecessors, away from οὐρανος into the scorched earth (867, cf also the characteristic traits of Zeus at line 823). In lines 140 the Kyklopes, as is the case with other children of Ouranos and Gaia (719), are sent deep into the earth for having θύμος

it the children of lines 132-138 that have been singled out as the most terrible of all Gaia's offspring, and the reason for this is probably that they inevitably stand against the succession of Zeus.[117]

On reflection and further examination of the text, it is evident that the position in the narrative of each genealogical account is meticulous and deliberate. The first mention of the Kyklopes is not accidental and foreshadows the importance of their presence later in the text. In addition, each genealogy has an interpretive impact on the other genealogies; this makes for a natural flow in the texts focalisation(s). The sequence of genealogies in the *Theogony* corresponds to the description of the next, as well as former, genealogies. Genealogy narratives in the *Theogony* bear a close relationship with each other. Each genealogical account either supports or provides a contrast with another account, thus providing narrative cohesion. Furthermore, each genealogy reflects the development of the text's main fabula, picking up on events and providing key focalisations.

In certain, and in deed most, instances it is the non-Olympian personalities which provide the *Theogony* with its internal cohesion. For example, the genealogy of Nux (211ff) is a consequence of Titan violence. The narrative of Nux and her offspring symbolize the consequences Titan of violence and the origins of retribution

---

within their nature. Here *thumos* of the Kyklopes contrasts with the φρένες of Zeus at line 688. The φρένες of Zeus that defeats the violent irrationality of θύμος, and this victory is exemplified by the swallowing of Metis by Zeus (886-890).

[117] It would be difficult to expand here in this thesis on the implications of the phrase 'most terrible children', namely because such a discussion about notions of 'evil' would demand, and should demand, as separate investigation. Here though I will state that the phrase δεινότατος παίδων (138), interpreted by West as 'most fearful of children', brands the children of lines 132-138 as the terrible off spring of Ouranos and Gaia, with Kronos being chief among them. In connection to this thesis, the Titans of lines 132-138 are assumed to have been the originators of evil within the world. However, it is debatable to what extent 'Titans' represent the genesis of evil. Certainly, the primordial necessity of 'evil' is detailed at lines 159-160. After all it was Gaia's intellectualisation (160 ἔπεφράσσατο) of such a concept of evil (i.e. the evil suppression of Ouranos) that resulted in the creation of Kronos. Furthermore, the blood spilt by Kronos introduces expressions of fear, retribution, and strife within the

which secures the final fate of the Titan children. The genealogy of Nux is then followed by the creation of Eurybia (239). Eurybia reflects embodiment of physical and mental violence as created by Kronos at his separation of Gaia and Ouranos. The genealogies above are then complemented by that of Nereus' (240ff).

The examples cited above may be referred to as sub-focalisations in that, although they are important to the main fabula, such focalizations provide narrative support to the text's primary focalisations. It could be argued that the main focalisations of the Theogony are those that directly relate to the main events leading to the succession of Zeus. For example, the castration of Ouranos (154-210) is deemed as the established cause of cosmological Titan violence, and accounts for the consequences of successive conflict. It was the deceit of Kronos (459-596), which culminates in the (so-called) Titanomachy (617-731), followed by a graphic description of Tartaros (732ff). Followed then by the violent creation of Typhoneus, here Typhoneus alludes to the creation of Echnida which symbolizes the embodiment of matriarchal violence (860ff). It is not until the outcome of the Typhoneus focalization that the genealogy of Zeus (881ff) sees the end generational conflict that signifies a harmonious world governed by an absolute patriarch.

Typhoneus is an exemplary offspring of Gaia, and is the result of her union with Tartaros.[118] Once more, Gaia herself is a passive aggressor, in that she does not personally perform violence, but merely produces it. Gaia internally crafts and bears forth another form of succession violence within the world. On this premise, Typhoneus, as with other offspring, is a manifestation of Gaia's maternal nature.

---

terrestrial void. These abstract aspects of existence are physically actualised by the personified creation of the Erinyes (185), Giants (185) and the Meliai Nymphs (187).

[118] Typhoneus is created directly after the Titans have been firmly entombed in the belly of Gaia (821).

The term *philotetes* at line 822 is not without significance. Here *philotetes* clearly alludes directly to Ouranos, which caused Gaia's disquiet resulting, as we know, in the curse of her children in 207-210. Gaia at line 822, with the assistance of Aphrodite, uses φίλοτητι to create a further violent force.[119] Although, the creation of Typhoneus (821-822) does not reflect any moral undertone, the physical evolution of Typhoneus is later presented as inherently fearful (820ff).[120] The defeat of Typhoneus by Zeus marks the final act of patriarchal retribution and matriarchal suppression. What this in fact means is that the cosmological map has now been drawn, and the positions of Gaia (Earth), Ouranos (Sky) and Sea (Pontos) have been finalised.[121]

In summary, Gaia animates the physical characteristics of Tartaros by her creation of violent Typhoneus.[122] Yet, the eventual defeat of Gaia is expressed at line 867. Although the succession conflicts are expressed through a series of violent acts, these events should not be interpreted so much in moral as in pragmatic terms. Each episode provides insight into the main fabula of the text.[123] Each focalisation concludes in a description of patriarchal authority. Certainly line 867 refers to the

---

The latter (Tartaros) was personified briefly before assuming again an inanimate identity as a locale within Gaia. In this instance, Tartaros is seen as a violent locale as it represents the inner-self of Gaia, also it has within itself the violent Titans.

[119] The description of Typhoneus' head alone makes him violently fearful. Cf. line 828.
West's commentary on lines 828, 829-830 cites the arguments of Ruhken and Fick. West appends Ruhken's condemnation of line 828 that, ' there is perhaps much as to be said for condemning 826-827. It may be that neither version is original ...'. West substantiates this claim further by his comments on line 829-830, 'Fick suggested that 830 originally followed 825 (κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος ... ὄπ' ιεῖσαι as, for example, Nonn. *D.* 2.368 (Typhoneus) κεφαλαὶ δὲ βοῶν, μυκηθμόν ἰεῖσαι); an interpolator of 826-827 would have to make up some such line 829 to restore sense to 830.' However, as a passage lines 828-841 qualify the importance of line 828-830.

[120] Here the physical natural of Typhoneus is cited by characteristics formerly used to differentiate Gaia's other children.

[121] Perhaps as a slight tangent, the latter statement allows us to state here that the finalisation of the succession conflicts sees at first the suppression of Gaia's inner-powers to produce violence, but at the same time sees how Gaia's nature has lead to this final cosmological position.The cosmological interpretations of the *Theogony* will be further expanded later in this current chapter.

[122] Line 822 transforms Tartaros from a locale with personified metaphysical inhabitants (732ff) into an animated personified entity.

[123] The main fabula being the text's cosmology and the succession conflicts merely focalize on the final ascension of Zeus as the ruler of Heaven. Cf. lines 886-887 as foreshadowed at lines 883-885.

victory of Zeus over Gaia, expressed dramatically by the juxtaposition of πύρος between σέλαι and αίθομενοιο. Despite this apparent defeat (853), the essence of Gaia's nature will merely be suppressed, and is never fully destroyed.[124] The entombed seeds of conflict will re-generate periodically to pose a potential threat against generational stability.

Embedded in the narrative fabric of the text's main fabula is the impact lines 207-210 have on the existence of humankind. Although the genesis of humankind is not referred to explicitly in the *Theogony*, the explicit genealogy of the gods expresses aspects of human existence.[125] It could be argued that there exists in the text a level of

---

[124] The references below highlights the process of the gradual suppression of cosmological matriarchy:

> 154-210: The castration of Ouranos instigated by Gaia and fulfilled by some Titans. This cosmologically symbolizes the separation of Heaven and Earth that accounts for the creation of animate entities within the newly formed intermediary void.
> 459-506: The birth of Zeus and the deceit of Gaia and Hera of Kronos, which redresses the cosmological balance by introducing an intermediary between cosmological violence and vengeance.
> 617-731: The so-called Titanomachy and the birth of Typhoneus (820), symbolizing attempts made to suppress cosmological violence through re-generative violence.
> 820-868: The so-called Typhomachy: the defeat of the progeny of Gaia and Tartarus by heavenly Zeus, which sees the rise of a new world order.

[125] The Meliai Nymphs of line 187 have often been taken for as an account for the genesis of humankind. An inter-textual comparison with the *Works and Days* may offer insight into the identity of the Meliai Nymphs of the *Theogony*. It is not without significance that the Meliai nymphs represent off-cuts performed by the *adamantos*. In the *Works and Days* line 147ff (ἀλλ' ἀδαμάντος ἔχον κράτεροφπονα θύμον), the bronze race is formed intrinsically by an act of violence, and *adamantos* is within their cognitive and physical composition (θύμον). Similarly, in the *Theogony* the reference to the creation of the Meliai Nymphs is placed between two references to the *adamantos*; the first refers to the act of violence and the second is a reminder of that violence (188).
Additionally, it is the act of evil violence that Ouranos condemns the Titans at 207-210; and that some time in the future the Titans are fated (Erinyes) to be punished by a similar form of violence (the three Hundred Handers). These activities foreshadow the creation of the Meliai Nymphs and govern their mode of existence (211 κῆρα μέλαινα). The term Meliai means 'ashen' that may provide a further connection between the *Theogony* and the most woeful bronze age of the *Works and Days* (143ff) whose inhabitants were created from ashen trees. This bronze age was foreshadowed by a silver age who, like the Titans referred to by Ouranos at 207-210, fought against each other (*Works and Days* 134 ὕβριν γάρ ἀτασυάλον οὔκ ἔδυνάντο 135 ἀλλήλων ἀπεχειν...), and were defeated and sent eventually to the underworld by Zeus (138 Ζεὺς κρόνιδῆς ἔκρυψε χόλουμενους ... 140 αὖταρ ἔπει καὶ τοῦτο γένος κάτα καλέψεν, 141 τοι μέν ὕποξθόνιοι μακάρες θνήτοι κάλεονται; cf; *Th.* 730ff). In the *Works and Days* the Bronze Age is a by-product of the hubris of the silver age that seems to parallel with the formation of the ashen nymphs in the *Theogony*.

empathy which the reader possesses for the conflicting gods.[126] The upheavals of the characters communicate directly to the text's audience (whether ancient or modern). Therefore, the suffering by Gaia against the cruelty of Ouranos speaks not only to the text's internal characters, but also to the text's external characters who too are burdened by the suppressive powers of supernatural forces.[127] On a more apparent level, Nux and her associations perpetually subject humankind to a fated existence (211) mixed with abstractions, alternatively, of pleasure (218-219) and especially pain (233).[128] This interaction of opposites plays a crucial part on the quality of human existence.

Furthermore, the genealogy of Nux provides abstract personifications of deception,[129] warfare[130] and slaughter[131] - all of which are relevant to humankind.[132] The expressions of human suffering are expressed further through the Prometheus myth, which for all intents – as suggested by scholars such as West – stands alone within the narrative of the *Theogony*. Here, as well as later in this chapter, it will become evident that the Prometheus episode is a crucial intermediary digression which provides insight into our understanding of the main succession episodes. The Prometheus myth allows contrasts to be made between the genealogy of Nux and the genealogy of Nereus, especially as Nereus' offspring represent some form of harmony

[126] For example the fate of humankind, in the *Theogony*, is modeled on experiences of the conflicting divine genealogies (compare the fate of the Titans to the suffering of humankind in the Prometheus episode). Although the (so-called) Titanomachia occurs later in the text (617-731), the allusion to humankind in lines 226-232 anticipates future time. This dramatic reference to humankind distinguishes the Titan passage of 207-210 from the Titanomachia. Hence humankind is positioned between fate and its hard reality.

[127] Cf. The Prometheus episode, esp. lines 585ff. Once again the external characters refer to the modern audience as much as it may the ancient. Off course, the latter claim is conjectural.

[128] Cf. line 219.

[129] Cf. 229 Ψευδέα related to line 137 ἀγκυλομήτης.

[130] Cf. 228 Μάχας and at line 711 Μαχή.

[131] Cf. 288 Φόνους τέ 'Ανδροκτασιας associated with lines 711-712.

[132] The importance for Humankind is its allegiance to appointed divine authority as reflected in lines 661-662, and this allegiance deters any potential hardship with potential reward (231 πλεῖστον).

(250 εὐδείδης Γαλάτεια). The offspring of Nereus supersede the fearful creations of Nux and Typhoneus' progeny by offering humankind a sense of hope.

The importance of Nux, Styx and Hekate in the narrative of the *Theogony*, especially in the intermediary passages, is their embodiment of the justice and revenge invoked by Zeus (412) in reaction to Ouranos' curse at lines 207-210. Without the intermediary focalisation of the interim episodes, such as lines 389-403 and 414-453 with the functional animation of Nux, Styx and Hekate, there would have been no consistency in the narrative between the lines 207-210 and the Titanomachy episode (617-731). Indeed a great deal of the text's narrative pivots around the causes and consequences of lines 207-210 and, thus, these lines are crucial to appreciating the *Theogony's* main and sub-focalisations.

To illustrate this latter point: lines 207-210 encapsulate the root of cosmological upheaval which leads to cursed retribution and the final establishment of cosmic harmony. Although lines 207-210 see Ouranos as the accuser and his children as the recipients of his curse, this is in fact a role reversal. On the one hand, lines 180-181 refer to one of the deeds of retribution performed by Kronos against his father and lines 472-473 and 501-502 describe the retribution set by Ouranos, while lines 617-618 refer to how this retribution is achieved. On the other hand, Kronos is in fact responding to the call for help from his suppressed mother for her children to act against their cruel father (164-169).[133] Therefore, a question emerges: to what extent do the Titan children actually deserve their fate? Here an initial step to answer this question could be to reflect on the narratological thesis. If we are right that the

[133] Forms of retribution hurled against the Titan children by their father Ouranos appear at lines 472 which mentions the Erinyes, 501 describes the release of the Kyklopes and 617 refers to the release of the Hundred Handers. The Kyklopes and the Hundred Handers are later instrumental in the Titanomachy, which sees the fulfilment of the retribution pronounced by Ouranos in lines 207-210 against his children.

Theogony's main fabula is cosmology, then the internal plot of the text will orientate its characterizations and sub-plots around that premise. Therefore, the characterized cruelty of Ouranos is also expressed in his progeny, which for the intentions of the text's scheme must be destroyed in order for the ascension of Zeus as father of the gods and humankind.[134]

Thus, returning our attention to the relevance of the intermediary passages of Nux, Styx and Hekate, it is safe to state that there would be a void in the text's narrative should these lines be omitted. The account of Hekate contributes to our understanding of key themes in the text, such as the developmental process of the primordial genealogy which, subsequent to lines 207-210, becomes an exponent of justice, reward and punishment unique to the *Theogony*. At line 410 the use of the perfect (κεκλήσθαι, cf. fr. 305.4), and not just a simple aorist, suggests that there is a firmly established genealogy almost as old as the primordial entities (421-425). Hekate is a personification of genealogical justice, and her role is to allot appropriate rewards and punishments in accordance with the curse of lines 207-210 against those who act against their kin (431-432). This status of Hekate is enforced by the fact she is revered the most by Zeus (411-412).

At line 450 Hekate, as protector of the young, responds against the injustice performed by the '*former Titan gods*'.[135] Although, in terms of chronology, Hekate is awarded this role after the defeat of the Titans, thematically her role supports Zeus'

[134] Passage 617-618 describes Ouranos' imprisonment of the Hundred Handers as foolish, and there is a certain amount of irony to the use of *thumos*. Here *thumos* suggests that Ouranos is unaware of the consequences of his actions against Gaia, as the suppression of the Hundred Handers by Ouranos was the result of his love for Gaia (177). But in lines 617-618 the Hundred Handers prove to be crucial for Ouranos' retribution against the Titans. However, here it is important to note a distinction that lies behind the actions of Ouranos and that of Kronos. The foolish nature of Ouranos in lines 617-618 contrasts with the crafty mind of Kronos in line 165, and if Ouranos' actions are not considered deliberate, then the Titan children deserve to be cursed; but if Ouranos' actions are 'premeditated', then the Titans have been treated unjustly by their father.

claim to attack the '*former gods*' in response to Ouranos' retribution against his children. Hekate thus sets a precedent for punishing the violence of Kronos against his father and children (459-462) and for other crimes committed against his kin (178, 459-462) that will ultimately involve the loss of Kronos' status as 'father and ruler' (πατήρ/βασιληίδα 462).[136]

---

[135] Lines 450-451 describe Hekate as protector of the young. Lines 458-461 refer to the hubris Kronos commits against his children. Kronos swallows his children so that he may retain his celestial power.

[136] It should not be forgotten that the main characters of the *Theogony* are gods, but the text offers a tiered system of the gods determined by their role in the fabula. The equal union between Gaia and Ouranos does not reflect the equality of all things created but introduces a stratified universe that undergoes constant renewal. Although πατὴρ and τιτῆνας of line 207 describe two different kinds of *theos,* in the *Theogony* there are in fact three main levels of being to which *theos* can be applied, each with its own subcategories. The stratification is as follows:

1 Primordial
2 Intermediary
3 Olympian

(1) Primordial deities are mostly personifications of the physical world such as earth, sea, and sky along with the mountains, stars and rivers. It is these geographical landscapes that are affected most by the actions of the intermediary deities.

(2) Intermediary deities are all those produced from Gaia and Ouranos. These deities, which have metaphysical significance, are thought to inhabit some locale within the physical world. Although these deities are immortal, their attributes have significant impact on world change. For example: during the night that Kronos deviously separates Gaia and Ouranos, this separation produces an intermediary landscape.

The Titans of line 207 creates and inhabits the transient and intermediary world. Although the Titans escaped from the suppression of Ouranos, the manner of their escape brings about further upheavals within the world. Despite the apparent suppression of the Titans in Tartaros, their violence against Ouranos continues to have an impact on world order. Therefore, once hubris has been committed by the Titans, the revenge of Ouranos is a permanent future fixture.

Although, Kronos has often been interpreted as the figurehead for Titan and thus those produced by him are thought to be lesser intermediary entities (ie. 630), the *Theogony* differentiates Kronos from his offspring. 'Olympian' Zeus (633-634) is distinct from his Titan father.

(3) Olympian deities are those derived from Zeus. A partial exception to this is Hekate, who is greatly honoured by Zeus. Although Hekate administers the justice of Zeus, she remains located within the chthonic realm, as noted in line 424.

From the first reference to Titan at line 207 distinctions between various strata of *theos* are set. For example, the dichotomy between Titan and heaven is represented in line 820, though this is already implied at line 392 (for example: in line 820 some of the Titan gods have sent away from heaven into Tartaros). In the latter instance, Zeus invokes some of the gods to fight against the Titans. The text does not specify which gods, but later states that those gods who assist Zeus will be awarded appropriate honour. Line 881 describes the 'blessed gods' who assisted Zeus, 882 refers to the deeds taken against the Titans and the 'privileges' that are to be given to the other gods, 884 draws a distinction between the realms of Earth and Heaven, with 883 already claiming that Zeus should be ruler among the immortals. These lines then conclude with the allocation of appropriate honour to the gods (885). Honour for each *theos* depends on the shown allegiance to Zeus (881). Even a chthonic deity may assist Zeus, but the received honour is subject to change. Paradoxically, the superiority of Olympian Zeus depends on the allegiance of lesser deities. For example, were it not for the allegiance of the Hundred Handers and the Kyklopes in each succession conflict, Zeus' authority would not have been established. Titan represents a unique system that includes entities from the primordial / chthonic and Olympian / celestial realm. But it is the Titans referred to in line 207 who have a transient existence which involves traversing the cosmological landscape, for example the Titans originate from Gaia (132-

However, the violence of Kronos is crucial to the narrative progression of the main fabula. Kronos caused the separation between Gaia and Ouranos which allowed generational violence and genealogical evolution.[137] If this evolution is a crucial aspect of the fabula, then it reflects a necessary (and positive) condition of cosmological development.[138]

Furthermore, the violent upheavals caused by the Titans generate a generational conflict between father and son; male and female is not only to be seen as a metaphor for cosmological development, but also as something that applies to the circumstances of humankind.[139] If these latter points are to be taken as correct, then

---

138), inhabit the terrestrial void, descend from Mount Othryus (632), to descend then into Tartaros (820), whereas the other deities tend to remain mostly constant.

[137] The violence of the children (208) reflects the inter-locking relationship between cosmological polarities that enables world formation as we know it.

[138] What is meant by cosmological development is that the separation of Gaia and Ouranos by Kronos sees an emergence of a tripartite division of the world, sea, sky and earth. Also the void created between sky and earth is a vacuum for terrestrial life to include the existence of humankind. Therefore, the Titan children help to consolidate world formation. Atlas maintains primordial separation (746-748) which allows the passing of Day and Night.

[139] The main succession focalisations of the *Theogony* explore generational tensions. It is the intention of the main male characters (Ouranos, Kronos, Typhoneus and Zeus) to succeed and maintain the hierarchal position and to be 'Lord of all the gods and humankind'.

According to M. Hofinger πατήρ in the *Theogony* is 'designé aussi Zeus, en tant que chef des familles divine et humaine; sert d'epithete a Zeus (Ζεὺς πατὴρ, Διί πατρι etc.), frequentment employe dans les expressions (δ) ανδρῶν τε θεῶν τε'. (M. Hofinger, *Lexicon Hesiodeum cum Indice Inverso*, vols. 1-4 (Leiden: Brill, 1975). The term 'father' is applied to various characters; and of the twenty-four occurrences of πατήρ in the *Theogony*, seven refer to Ouranos, one to Nereus, one to Typhoneus, one to Kronos, one to Okeanos, and thirteen to Zeus.

The references to Ouranos as πατήρ occur, either in connection with the violence of his children, or instances when retribution by Ouranos is taken against his offspring. Passages 164-168 and 171-172 provide the reason why the children committed violence against their father Ouranos. At lines 164-166 Gaia calls upon her children to act against the cruelty of their father. The cruelty referred to by Gaia is Ouranos' suppression of her and their children. Interestingly, the language used in lines 164-166 corresponds closely with line 207-210. Ouranos, like the Titans (209 ἀτασθαλίῃ) is referred to as ἀτασθάλος subject to 'the spreading out' (τεισαίμεθα 165). The verb used at line 165 (Τεισαίμεθα) is etymologically linked to the verb used in line 209 (τιταίνοντας), and this action of *spreading out* by Ouranos causes Gaia to seek revenge.

Πατήρ for Ouranos appears in contexts of violence, but as an epithet for Zeus it represents total fatherhood. This is suggested at line 580 (χαριζόμενος Διὶ πατρί) and by the phrase θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν (47, cf. 457 and 458).

Each reference to πατήρ delineates characteristics of fatherhood. For example, Ouranos is an impulsive father who responds totally to erotic desire. In effect, he negates his own fatherhood by preventing the birth of his children. In contrast to Ouranos, Kronos establishes a new form of πατήρ, as he deliberately contrived to suppress his children by swallowing them. However, Zeus as 'father' represents reason (37) and as such allows the birth of new generations, which contrasts with Typhoneus who would like

the *Theogony* clearly has embedded within its narrative a subtext which relates directly to anthropological issues which the author intends to communicate to readers of the text.[140] The author, then, is using the cosmological fabula to communicate an embedded secondary sub-fabula.

Moreover, part of the main focalisation is the tension between matriarchy and patriarchy. The suppression of the female self (ie. Gaia) in the text's narrative leads to the creation of monstrous hybrids that facilitate the succession conflicts between the main male protagonists. For example, the Hundred Handers, conceived directly after Kronos (147-148), are instrumental in the Titanomachy. The Hundred Handers' physical strength is also detailed as more formidable than that of the Titans, Gaia's earlier progeny. Thus, the characterisation of the female self is considered the cause of generational violence.[141] This said, there is a partial exception to the rule, although

---

to be 'father of gods and men' in order to subject the 'gods and humankind' to the dark powers of his maternal chthonic origin.

[140] Issues on anthropology in the *Theogony* will be discussed in Chapter Three of this current thesis, especially in its considerations of the Prometheus myth which will compare the myth of the *Theogony* with external historical analysis.

[141] Cf. References to Gaia found in lines 160-162. Ruth Padel offers detailed discussions on the literary portrayal of the tragic female self. In *In and Out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self'* Padel discusses the characterization of Nux found in the *Theogony*. Although I have chosen to use Gaia as an example above, what Padel has to say about Nux which leads to notes on Gaia may also be applied to our discussion here. Padel states that 'Hesiod's Night is an archetypal lonely fertile blackness.... who bore Fate, Death, Sleep .... That disastrous self-damaging of mind'. Padel goes on to claim that 'Earth is mother to .... Erinyes, Cyclopes and Giants. She makes within herself "the element of grey flint," which forms a sickle "with jagged teeth. This tool will castrate Heaven ..... The archetypal dangerous mother' (R. Padel, *In and Out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 100-101. Also cf. R. Padel, *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek Tragic Madness* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), esp. pp. 184-187). What stands out from Padel's discussion is the citations of the creations of the female self as something inherently evil and threatening to her male counterpart. For example in the *Theogony*, the offspring of Echidna and Typhoneus (306) represent characterizations of chthonic darkness. Furthermore, it could be extended that γίγνομαι tends to genderise dark aspects within the cosmological fabric unknown to humankind. Although Padel cites the female creations almost as metaphors of the female self, Hesiod also characterises these inner aspects as real characters who have their own physical function in the succession conflicts. What is also interesting is that, if we are to agree (and I think we do) that the main fabula of the *Theogony* is cosmology, then Hesiod intends to correspond his portrayal of the female inner self to a general appreciation of Greek notions on the structure of the external world – ie. the Greek *kosmos* (cf. C. J. Classen 'Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechishen Philosophie', *Studium Generale* 18 (1965) pp. 97-116. A fuller discussion on the cosmological implications of the female will be discussed in our chapter three. Here I intended only to note characterizations of the dichotomy

Styx and Hekate are characterised as dark chthonic of the female self, they also contribute to the developing characterisation of Zeus; this sets them slightly apart from other female characterizations presented in the text's narrative.

The main references to Hekate and Styx at lines 389-403 and 414-453 form the first of a series of intermediary episodes. Hekate and Styx in these instances also appear in connection with further references to the Titan characters at lines 392 and 424, forming a crucial part of fulfilling the curse of 207-210.[142] In terms of the text's plot, the appeal of line 392 accounts for the cosmological centrality of all aforementioned genealogies. Line 392 puts into place a Titan hierarchy in two ways: firstly, this line delineates the importance of Zeus among other divine entities, and secondly, it lends itself as an intermediary digression that sees genealogical transformations of phenomena accounted for prior to line 207.

The interim passages of 383-403, 414-453 and 512-616 allow the narrative to explore and develop certain characterisations crucial to the text's main fabula. The function of Styx and her offspring in lines 383-403 directly refers to the process of

---

between the female and male self as it appears in the narrative and show how such metaphoric language affects our appreciation of the text's main fabula.

[142] Line 392 refers to Zeus' appeal to the other gods to fight against the Titans. The line translates, 'he [Zeus] said that whoever of the gods would fight with him against the Titans'. Line 392 is one of the few instances in the *Theogony* where direct speech is quoted indirectly. This indirect reference to a direct speech of Zeus compares with the initial explicit reference to Titan at lines 207-210. The report of Zeus' direct speech responds to the curse of 207-210. Ouranos' speech of 207-210 is narrated indirectly in a verbatim manner. West's commentary for line 302 confirms that 'oratio oblique is rare in epic narrative', but queries the interpretation of μετὰ εἶο and μάχοιτο (Cf. West, *Theogony*, where he refers to *Op.* 60-68; *h.Dem.* 331-3; Kuhner-Gerth, ii.542-3; L.R. Palmer, in Wace-Stubbings, *Comparison to Homer*, p.157). Accordingly West argues, 'μετὰ εἶο: here and perhaps 401 we find μετά constructed with the genitive singular for the first time. In Homer it is only constructed with plural nouns (except where it means 'after' and takes the accusative), or collective singulars (as *Iliad* 22.49 μετὰ στρατῷ, etc), and means 'among' rather than 'with'.'(Cf. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen uber Syntax*, ii.242-3).

Indeed, the use of μετά εἶο should not cause too much confusion, as the context of this appeal speaks for itself. (Although, μάχοιτο is altered by Hermann to μάχηται, this does not change the thematic implications of line 392). Zeus' appeal results in the principle Titanomachy event of the *Theogony*.

actualising the curse of Ouranos against the Titan children of 207-210.[143] After the narrative to Styx comes the functional description of other peripheral genealogies: Nux (211-232),[144] Pontos (233-239),[145] Nereus (240-264),[146] Thaumas (265-269),[147] Phorkys and Keto (270-336),[148] Okeanos and Tethys (337-370),[149] Thea and Hyperion

---

[143] Ie. the other progeny of Ouranos and Gaia including the Titans are the Hundred Handers and the Kyklopes. The Hundred Handers are alluded to at lines 320-324 (323-324 are condemned by Wolf: and scholia *a* omits line 324. Cf. *Iliad* 6.181-182). This allusion becomes especially evident when passage 320-324 is compared with the descriptive language of lines 148-152.The fearful greatness of the Khimaera compares with the Hundred Handers (compare lines 320-322 with 149-152). The violent potentiality of those monstrous hybrids threatens the very core of cosmological stability (cf. 681-683 where the violent impact of the Hundred Handers is felt).
The Kyklopes implicitly appear at line 286, though explicitly named at line 140. Since their naming at line 140, the Kyklopes frequently occur at decisive moments in the texts narrative, namely in the thick of genealogical upheavals (707, 845 and 854). For example, Pegasus gave Zeus the gifts of thunder and lightning, attributes which are decisively used against cosmological enemies.

[144] Μόρον and Κῆρα were produced (ἔτεκεν) directly after the grim (Cf. 176 ἠλθε δὲ νύκτ'; 211 μέλαιναν in conjunction with 123 ... τε μέλαινα τε Νύξ ἔγένοντο.) actualisation of Kronos' violence (Moira and Keres are characterisations made after line 210: τίσιν μετόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι). Here ἔτεκεν denotes the changeable character of 'fate', which itself is a static phenomenon. The eternal flux of Fate and / or Victory is enforced by ἐγεινατο at line 217 and the phrase γείνατο τέκνα at line 385, which relate to Victory (384), Power (385) and Strength (385) from Resentment (223), Deceit (224) and Strife (225). The oscillations of existence, such as hardship (vv. 226ff) and happiness (vv. 384ff), receive further dimension with στυγέρη at line 226 and the genealogy of Στύξ at lines 383-403.

[145] The genealogy of Nux is contrasted by Pontos (233-239), followed then by Nereus (240-264). Although Nereus appears as an exemplar of cultural justice (235), Nereus has the ability within his nature to produce irrational (θυμόν 239) violence. Instead, Eurybia's negative potential (ie. her adamantos) has been over-shadowed by the cosmological respect held by Pontos (cf. 236 δίκαια and οὐδὲ θεμίστων .. λήθεται). Here genealogical δίκαια (236) governs Eurybia's *thumos* (239), and this allegiance to cosmological justice (δίκη) is rewarded with appropriate cultural honour (cf. 396).

[146] Epithets deem Nereus' genealogy as cosmologically benevolent; for example, ῥοδόπηχυς (246) and χαρίεσσα (247), which later contrast the violent maleficent nature of Typhoneus' genealogy at lines 869-871. Comparisons between lines 252-254 and 869-871 make possible an appreciation of the dynamic interplay between benevolent and maleficent characters.

[147] The genealogy of Thaumas is a brief interlude between the benevolent genealogy of Nereus and the malevolent genealogy of Phorkys and Keto. Thematically the genealogy of Thaumas and Electra links to that of Nereus at lines 240-264. Furthermore, τέκεν contrasts the function of "Ιρις (266) with "Εριν τέκε καρτερόθυμον. (255). Therefore, however short this reference to the genealogy of Thaumus, elements in the narrative are crucial to interpreting other genealogies and the inherent conflicts between each *genos*.

[148] The genealogy of Phorkys and Keto is distinct in that is gives further, and exceptional, dimensions to former genealogy narratives (Cf. genealogy of Nux 211-232; also 275). In addition, Phorkys and Keto provide a precursor to the genealogy of Styx at lines 383-403, which marks another explicit reference to the cursed Titan. The genealogy of Phorkys and Keto is described as transgressors of genealogical upheaval. For example, the narrative of Medusa provides a characterisation of genealogical transgressors (ie. something beyond the norm). Medusa lives beyond the boundaries of Okeanos (274-275) and, like the Titans, is separated decisively (274) from other divine progeny. The independent violent forces at lines 274-275 are redressed at lines 276-335, where Medusa's identity is violated by the violence of Perseus. (Cf. J.-P. Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals*: Collected Essays ed.ited by F.I. Zeitlin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992). Importantly, Perseus' violence against Medusa (280) foreshadows the violence against other Titans at lines 620ff. To illustrate the latter point; the Titans are borne from Gaia, only then to return to her inner chamber. A good discussion on the inner-

(371-374)[150] and Eurybia and Kreios (375-388).[151] Styx marks a digression from the ring-composition of the genealogies described between lines 211-382.

The genealogical digressions, in particular lines 304 and 334, prepare the reader for the descriptive narrative of the Typhomachy and characterisation of Typhoneus at lines 820-868.[152] The monstrosity of both Echidna (304) and the serpent (334) is elaborated at lines 306-307 and 333-335, and then later developed in a brief, though poignant, passage of 820-822.[153] It can be argued, furthermore, that the

---

self of the female-self is R. Padel, *In and Out of Mind: Images of the Tragic Self* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), esp. pp.99-113. Cf. also *Theogony* 668-669 and 690.

[149] The cosmological function of Okeanos and Tethys' genealogy is not explicitly stated, but only alluded to in a series of personlised epithets and nouns. The genealogy of Okeanos and Tethys (337-370) appears to contrast with that of Phorkys and Keto. The apparent abundance of Okeanos and Tethys' descendants at lines 363-364, points to the productivity of cosmological harmony (cf. 369-370 in conjunction 346-348. The descendants' epithets and personal names complement their cosmological benevolence. The personal names of some of the offspring refer to something 'cosmologically' good: such as Galaxaura (353), Polydora (354), Plouto (355), Europe (357) and Eurynome (358). Even the epithets used for other offspring supports their cosmological benevolence (cf. 342, 345, 350 and 353). It could be argued that this idea of embedded malevolence is a tenuous one which demands a stretch of the imagination. This would only be the case if no other such examples could be found within the text. Indeed, the complex dual nature of existence is developed further by the reference to Τύχη (360). Τύχη could be interpreted as an act of god (Cf. Pindar *Ol.* 8.67) or chance (Cf. Pl. *Def.* 411b.), but in the *Theogony* Τύχη translates as fate (339, 343 and 367), and should be seen in connection with the former description of the Erinyes (185 and 348), Moira, the Keres (211) and the Erinyes.

[150] The brief mention of the genealogy of Theia and Hyperion describes the immortality (cf. 374), which contrast with the spatial mortality of humankind (371-373). Once again, the *Theogony* contrasts cosmological polarities, in order to achieve a cosmological equilibrium. Further reference to temporal time is found at line Νύξ τε καὶ "Ημέρη (748). Notably the children of lines 371-374 refer to the immortality of cosmological time, whereas Νύξ τε καὶ "Ημέρη refer to the mortality of terrestrial existence.

[151] Kreios does not marry a female sibling, but the daughter of Pontos (239). Nevertheless, Kreios and Eurybia have much in common with other genealogies. Kreios and Eurybia, like Theia and Hyperion, generate offspring by mixing 'in love' (ἐν φιλότητι, 374-375). The successive use of the expression 'ἐν φιλότητι' is conceptually differentiated by its associated verb. Line 374 begins with γείναθ', recalling the static characteristics present in the genealogy of Theia and Hyperion. In contrast, the form of τέκεν is used for the genealogy of Eurybia and Kreios, thus describing their descendants' changeable attributes. Clear distinctions are made between the creation of Mist and Morning Star (381-382) with Moon and Dawn (371-374). At line 378 καρτεροθύμος could be compared with the inner attribute applied to Zeus at liner 476. The context of 476 foreshadows the defeat of Kronos in response to the curse of 207-210 (cf. 472ff).

[152] It has often been thought by classicists that the Titanomachy is the main succession conflict of the Theogony and that -according to Goettling - the Typhomachy is an unnecessary episode and more likely an interpolation. I consider, however, the Typhomachy to be a dramatic twist in the narrative. The reader is likely to assume that once the curse of 207-210 has been fulfilled the story ends and Zeus is the divine ruler over all the gods and men; but the Typhomachy emerges at the end as the text's main focalisation. The Typhomachy addresses one of the text's main themes, matriarchy versus patriarchy.

[153] In recognition of historical method, the significance of the serpent and Typhoneus in the *Theogony* may be compared thematically, though loosely, with the serpent of Hesiod Fragment 96. Although a caution must be applied to historical comparison, especially as Fragment 96 has been identified as part

physical traits of Typhoneus at 823-835 compare with those of all of Gaia and Ouranos' progeny, thus making Typhoneus the most awesome of Gaia's creations.

The Styx episode prepares the reader for the dramatic action of the Typhomachy, which is pre-empted by the Titanomachy. The relationship between Zeus and Styx reflects how apparent cosmological polarities may benefit each other by interacting harmoniously. Line 392 sees the necessity for conflict, and does so by contrasting divine punishment against Zeus' enemies (400) matched with reward for

---

of Hesiod's *Catalogues* preserved on fragmentary papyrus dating from the third century CE (now in the Berlin collection number 10560), nevertheless it may offer textual insight into the thematic relevance of the Typhoneus and Phorkys and Keto episode of the *Theogony*.
The principle lines of interest in Fragment 98 are 96-114. The serpent is an enemy of Zeus, and is condemned and punished for committing hubris:

98 δεινὸς ὄφις κατὰ νῶτα δα φοινος
99 ἀλλά μιν ὑβριστήν τε καὶ ἄγριον οὐδὲ δίκαιον
100 κῆλα Διὸ. δαμνᾷ φὴ λυ σιμελης γλυκὺς ὕπνος.
101 ψυχὴ τοῦ γ' οἴη καταλείπε ταις
102 ἥ δ' ἀμφ' αὐτόξυτον θάλαμον

The compatible significance of these passages is the concept of Justice. In both the *Theogony* and Fragment 96 *dike* is in accordance with Zeus. The 'evil' serpent (*Th.* 334, Fr. 96.98) is punished, like other enemies of Zeus (307), for *hubris* (*Th.* 307, fr. 96.99).
In Fragment 96 the *psyche* (101) of the serpent remains even though being hurled into the underworld (103-105), the notion of regeneration may be cited by the possible construction of line 108 (αὖθις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν. Similarly, in the *Theogony* even though Typhoneus is sent finally with other Titan elements into Tartarus an essence of him remains within the realm of humankind. Although, Typhoneus is defeated technically by Zeus, he is not destroyed entirely (869ff):

103 ἠβαιὴν ελ. ηρα κατὰ χθ ονὸ ευρυοδείη
104 εἶσιν ἀμαυρωθεῖ ἀ πό θ' εἱματα ποικίλα δῦσα,
105 κεῖται δὲ χ θονίη.

In addition to the compatible notions of Justice and fate between the *Theogony* and Fragment 96, the texts are linked thematically by cosmological concepts. Both texts refer to the cyclical process of existence that oscillates between generation, destruction and regeneration together with intrinsic aspects of this process of the happiness and hardship of cultural Humankind. The cosmological process of harmony and upheaval is expounded by nature imagery and natural phenomena. In the *Theogony* the winds of Typhoneus express the hardship of existence and the gusts associate with the destructive wintry elements. Similarly, Fragment 96 refers to seasonal change that accounts for the passing of cultural time and the flux of circumstance experienced by humankind (138-140 reconstructed by West for *Erga* 90-92):

138 ζωε πρὶν μεν γὰρ ζώεσκον ἐπι χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων
139 νοσφ ι νόσφιν ἄτερ τε κακῶν καὶ ἄτερ χαλεποῖο πόνοιο
140 κηρ νούσων τ' ἀργαλέων αἵ τ' ἀνδράσι κῆρα ἔδωκαν

Certainly the mixture of 'good' and 'evil' blessings upon humankind seems to be an inherent aspect of the genealogies of Typhoneus, as well as, Styx and Hekate (as mentioned above). Although this brief comparison between the *Theogony* and Fragment 96 suggests thematic compatibilities, this is not to suggest that the *Theogony* was in anyway influenced (or vice versa) by the (so-called) *Catalogues*, though is does suggest that cosmological theories were being expressed in various mediums.

his allies of measured honour.[154] The notion of divine struggle is a consistent motif throughout the *Theogony*.

Although passage 383-403 repeatedly uses either θεός or ἀθανάτος, each interpretation of *theos* or *athanatos* depends on its context. For example, ἀθανάτους ... θέους at line 391 refers to those affiliated with Zeus as πατήρ (390) as enforced by the phrases given to describe Olympos ('Ολύμπιος ἀστεροπητης and μακρὸν 'Ολυμπον (391). Whereas the ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι at line 394 refers to the fate of those who do not conform to the oath suggested at line 400 (ie: those cursed at 207-210).[155]

The children of Styx illustrate a complex divine framework, especially those of lines 384-385 who are detailed by genealogical conflict (μάχοιτο 392).[156] Although these children are potentially negative attributes, as Victory and Force cause defeat and destruction, here their affiliation to Zeus (388ff) suggests their positive contribution to Zeus' ascension. The continuing presence (401 εἶναι) of these children (401) beside the cosmological ruler (398) guarantees that their productive skill (385 τέκνα) will perpetuate forever (385 γείνατο) within the (evolving) world.

The focalisation of the Styx episode strengthens the expression of the *Theogony's* main fabula, that being cosmology expressed through succession conflict. The characterisations of the Titans and Typhoneus make it possible to have a consistent flow in the narrative and support the importance of the 'internal diversions'.[157] For example, it is the genesis of Hekate which complements the

---

[154] Cf. *Theogony* 393, 395, 396, 399.

[155] Cf. Punishment for those who swear false oaths *Th.* 220, 472; also *Il.* 15.204, 21.412 and Heraclitus B94

[156] Lines 384-385 appear below, notice especially the military implications of the offsprings' names and attached epithets:
Ζῆλον καὶ Νίκην καλλίσφυρον ἐν μεγάροισι
καὶ Κράτος ἠδὲ βίην ἀριδείκετα γείνατο τέκνα

[157] Goettling argues in his commentary that lines 411-452 are an interpolation by a poet from a separate tradition. The principle reasoning of Goettling' objection is that the historical evidence for a cult of

genealogical function of Styx.[158] The accounts about Styx and Hekate relate to the struggles among the gods, all of which have a profound impact in the void created by the original separation of Gaia and Ouranos.[159]

The genesis of Hekate marks the functional re-definition of primordial genealogies: both those consequential to the initial upheaval (176) and those that respond to the curse of passage 207-210. The unique status of Hekate justifies (426,

---

Hekate prior to the fifth century is found mostly in Asia Minor, and that Hekate filtered later into Greek mainland from Caria (E. Sittig, *De Graecorum nominibus theophoris* (Halle, 1911), pp. 61ff.).
Goettling's argument leads to a historical based interpretation of the Hekate episode, and the reference to Titan at line 424 has encouraged a comparative study with supposed Orphic citations of Nonnos and Pindar. Comparisons are shown below:

424 ὅσσ' ἔλαχεν Τιτῆσι μετὰ προτέροισι θεοῖσιν

Pherenicus *ap.* Sch. Pi. *O.* 3.28
προτέρων ... Τιτήνων

cf. Antim. *Fr.* 45
προτερηγενέας Τιτῆνας

West questions correctly the Orphic *historical* interpretation of the Hekate episode. West argues that the 'Hekate described is one very different from the Hekate familiar from later centuries'; and that the Hekate of the *Theogony* bears no magical associations 'indeed, of the four realms that constitute the universe in 736-7, Tartaros is the sole one in which she has no share (cf. 413-14, 427)'. Cf. also West, *Theogony*, p. 277. West then goes on to argue that Hekate 'does not disrupt the Hesiodic scheme of the distribution of τιμάι among the gods. Hers is a special kind of τιμή, superimposed upon the formal scheme, but harmonizing with it.'
The magical elements West refers to evidence probably taken from the 4th-5th Century *PGM* texts (cf. K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri* vol. I-III (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1931-1941), which describes the chthonic and ritual significance of Hekate. These late sources suggest Hekate to be a mistress of the underworld – she is almost synonymous with Persephone- roaming at night with phantoms and barking dogs (*P. Mag.* 4.1434, 2530, 2550). Interpreted in light of the magical formula of *PGM* LXX, Hekate could easily be confused with Erishkegal, who is invoked to fulfill a maleficent curse. Although Hekate is invoked at *Theogony* 416-418 in the context of a ritual sacrifice performed by humankind, there is no suggestion of maleficent chthonic magic, but rather of traditional Greek 'civic' religious practice.
Additionally, contrary to *PGM* LXX, *Theogony* 416-418 tends to portray explicit positive attributes of Hekate as a benefactor for humankind. Although malevolence is implied within the nature of Hekate, the closing remarks of the Hekate episode define her role as appointed by Zeus. Hekate's role as protector of future generations is determined by cosmological necessity (450-452), that then extends even further than this into the remits of the justice which governs humankind.
[158] According to A. *Rh.* 3.467 Hekate is the daughter of Nux.
[159] Cf. lines 416ff, esp. 429.

448) her authority and function as an intermediary between celestial and chthonic gods.[160]

Nonetheless, it should not be overlooked that the functional redefinition of Hekate rests totally on the established authority by Zeus. Thus, as early as line 424 one can assume the victory of Zeus against the Titan enemies; already, the cosmological hierarchy is, more or less, in place. The appeal of Zeus in line 392 and the context of line 424 fundamentally provokes the celestial gods to fight in order to retain their genealogical status against the Titan transgressors. Therefore, Hekate and Styx balance the tensions between the opposing elemental forces that clash against each other in the terrestrial void.

Although 'anthropology' will be discussed in our Chapter Three, here the narrative of the Hekate episode shows the reliance of humankind on her benevolence. Humankind may offer sacrifice in the hope for a better existence (418-419); but lines 418-420 and 431-438 suggest that Hekate is liable to undetermined reciprocity.[161] The ritual sacrificial performances recognise both that Hekate is an intermediary for humankind between the celestial and chthonic realms, and that human beings accept their genealogical position.

In the Hekate episode, ῥεῖα (419, 438) reflects the flux of human existence and the changeable state of cultural well-being. The notion of well-being is measured in terms of τιμή (418) and repeated κῦδος (433, 438). Τιμή and κῦδος are governed by Victory, Power and Strength (νικήσας δὲ βίῃ καὶ κάρτει) that are personified accompanying attributes ascribed to Zeus (384-386). The reward of νική (433, 437)

[160] This is emphasized by the fact that Hekate has a portion of honour within the earth and sea from the sky (429, 449). Hekate is a crucial aspect of the tripartite division of the world that influences every part of human existence (cf. 427-429 and 448-449).
[161] Cf. lines 418-419.

depends on the rationale behind the pursuit for τιμή and κῦδος. Significantly, humankind irrationally tends to supplicate Hekate (419 πρόφρων) for a blessed existence, as well as to engage in irrational activities of strife (433 πρόφρονέως).

The focalisation of the Hekate episode offers coherence to the text's characterisation of terrestrial and celestial genealogies. The dynamic interplay between celestial and terrestrial realities is exemplified by the phrase 'whom Zeus honoured' (Ζεὺς κρονίδης τιμῆσε) at line 412. The context of this phrase alludes to the terrestrial deeds of Kronos (210) which Zeus intends to replicate with the assistance of allies (392). This phrase also describes the complex composite nature of humankind, as similar aggression is shown toward humankind as that described at lines 207-210.

It is at this juncture of the text's narrative that the purpose of the Prometheus episode becomes a crucial focalisation.[162] Although passage 512-616 does not fit into the text's chronological structure, the Prometheus narrative complements the themes explored in the narrative which surrounds the Titanomachy and Typhomachy. The notions of deception, honour, punishment and power propel the energetic description of the genealogical struggle between the gods. For the reader, Prometheus – like the Titan characters – could in fact be interpreted as a metaphor for human existence itself.[163] Therefore, the struggle of Prometheus assists the reader to connect with the

[162] For scholars such as Gerhard the Prometheus episode is an interpolation on the grounds of that 523-533 are contradicted at line 616. In the former passage Prometheus is bound, whereas at 616 he is released. I do not consider this to be a contraction, but a narrative parallel with the fate of the Hundred Handers. Furthermore, we ought to try to compare this account of Prometheus and the role of Herakles with myths external to the *Theogony*, namely later accounts offered by Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* (872, 1020-1093), Apollonius (2.5.11.10) and Pausanius (5.11.6). Cf. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound and Other Plays* translated by P. Vellacott (London: Penguin, 1961) and Pausanius, *Description of Greece: Books III-V* edited by W. H. S. Jones & H. A. Ormerod (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993). The Prometheus episode and its anthropological implications will be discussed more fully in chapter three.

[163] The Titans sought means for survival; and similarly Zeus (like Prometheus) partly deceived the genealogical hierarchy as a means to assert his own position.

Theogony's main and secondary focalisations which direct our understanding of the text's main fabula.

The Prometheus episode is not an interpolation. The sub-focalisation of lines 512-616 prepares the reader for the narrative complexities of the subsequent Titanomachy. Therefore, in terms of the text's plot, the Titanomachy comes as no narrative surprise. Each of the genealogical accounts after line 210 have been preparing the reader for the conflict foreshadowed at 207-210; and the Prometheus episode provides neat transition from the creation of genealogies to next stage in genealogical conflict. The succession of Zeus has been determined from the outset of the *Theogony*, and at 617 the reader has reached the point in the narrative which sees development in the text's main fabula. Thus, the section below will explore the text's second major succession conflict.

2) **Titan Conflict**

Scholars and commentators on the *Theogony* have conveniently categorised lines 617-719 as the Titanomachia. This categorisation has often led to the isolation of the Titanomachy episode from the rest of the text. Such a view has made these lines especially vulnerable to historical interpretation, so that the passage is compared with other assumed Titan conflict mythologies, as well as with other conflict myths found among ancient Near Eastern traditions.[164]

[164] Cf. F. Dornseiff, *Antike und alter Orient* (Leipzig:Gothae Henning, 1959), esp. p. 65; also W. Burkert, *The Orientalising Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992).

West recognises that later literary traditions have confused the Titanomachy with myths about the Giants.[165] In fact West should distinguish Titan stories and interpret these divergent accounts as independent from each other, as not to confuse one myth from another. Nonetheless, for the purpose of this thesis such *a priori* assumptions are misleading; the Giants are not Titans any more than the Titans are Giants. Titans are Titans, and the Titans mentioned in the *Theogony* and the Titanomachy are unique to this very text. A consequence of 'confused myths' is the blatant categorisation of Titan and Giant, which West to some extent warns us against; this is especially so, as Titans and Giants of the later literature feature as interchangeable characters in stories about 'warring gods'. This thesis, by contrast, ignores the confusion made between the Titans and Giants, and concentrates only on the succession myth of the *Theogony* for interpretation.

Although lines 617-719 describe a conflict between particular divine figures, these characters do not form part of a coherent and consistent mythological system of assumed Titan mythology. Instead, lines 617-719 form a crucial and central aspect of the *Theogony* as a whole, and the concentrated use of Titan provides explicit understanding of the text's main characters and its fabula. The Titanomachy, with its Titan characters, is a key focalisation; and the intermittent, though crucial, mention of the Hundred Handers, the Kyklopes and the chthonic deities provide secondary characterizations in the Titanomachy narrative. Although a characterisation for Titan appears at line 617, our discussion here will begin at line 630-814.

The deeds performed by the Titans between lines 630-729 are the consequences perpetuated from the ε□ργον referred to at line 210. Moreover, the retribution of the deeds of 210 becomes a significant focalisation at 729. The narrative

[165] West, *Theogony*, pp. 337-38.

of the *Theogony* is shaped by the consistent referencing and characterisations of the Titans. The explicit references to Titan appear at crucial moments in the action of the Titanomachy 630, 632, 648, 650, 663, 668, 674, 676, 697, 717, and 804.[166] 'Εργον is the main connective [theme] between lines 631-683 and 207-210. For example, lines 207-210 refer to the deeds and implications of violence on genealogical harmony where the chthonic Titans displace their father Ouranos. Similarly, lines 631-683 explore the implications of rebounding violence performed previously against Ouranos. In the case of lines 631-683, the conflict is between the Titan(s) and all those generated from Kronos. The conflict described at lines 631-683 fulfils the retribution foreshadowed at line 210.

The curse of 207-210 determines the action of the Titanomachy, and therefore parts of the narrative about the Titanomachy respond to the genealogical conflict created by the separation of Gaia and Ouranos. Certainly at lines 697-699 there is a clear reference to the retribution of Ouranos (210), as the blasts from the sky bring about the destructive forces of the fighting referred to at lines 631-636. The fulfillment of the retribution of Ouranos is further supported at lines 713-721, which results in the cosmological redefinition at lines 729-733. These latter lines describe the permanent placement of the aggressive Titans in the formed cosmos. Indeed, lines

[166] The composition of the Titanomachy is unique, in that it has its own self contained narrative style which neatly fits into the text of the *Theogony*. The references to Titan support each other. For example, cf. Titan passages 630-636 and 646-653. Lines 630-636 provide a narrated account of the conflict between the Titans and all those born from Kronos. Then lines 646-653 offers a repeated reference to the fighting between the Titan(s) and all those born from Kronos, with the additional invocation by Zeus for allegiance from the three Hundred Handers.
Lines 661-663 describe the conflict among the 'warring gods' (cf. 631-636 and 646-653), expounding the cognitive and physical processes of warfare. Lines 664-670 refer to the practical actualisation (631-636, 646-653) of the desire for conflict (661-663).
Lines 674-675 provide a brief iteration of the actualised conflict (664-670) between Titans (631-636) and the three Hundred Handers (646-653). Lines 676-683 intellectualise (661-663) on the practical consequences of warfare (664-670) on cosmological harmony.

729 –733 delineate cosmological order affected by the deed (ἐργον) of line 210 that later sees a characterisation of Tartaros.[167]

Passage 630-739 is a conceptual expansion of lines 207-210, and both passages provide a logical development in the text's fabula. The curse of Ouranos at lines 207-210, is eventually fulfilled by the defeat of the supposed perpetrators at lines 716-717. In turn, this defeat sees a progression towards the final establishment of Zeus' genealogy (884-886). Therefore the following paragraphs will cite the explicit Titan references at lines 630 and 632, investigating the contextual relevance of these lines in the text's fabula.

There is significant academic debate regarding the textual authenticity of lines 630 and 632 and concerning the construction of its immediate context. Scholarly scepticisms regarding the authenticity of lines 630 and 632 are based on their almost verbatim repetition at lines 630 and 648, in addition to their seemingly dubious context lines 629-636.[168] West bases passage 629-636 on his citation of Π^5 and acknowledges Π^{13} omission of line 630.[169] Despite the general consensus that lines 630 and 632 appear within the text, objections made by Jacoby on the basis of lines 630, 632-636 should be carefully considered.

Although West partially agrees with Jacoby that line 630 is 'dispensable' especially if lines 648 and 668 are authentic, West qualifies the position of line 630 by suggesting that

> 'it would not be characteristic of epic style to leave the subject of the sentence (which is different from that of the preceding sentence) to be expressed in the following disjunction. The

[167] This detailing of Tartaros at lines 729-733 develops the previous references made to Titan in the genealogies of Styx and Hekate.
[168] Rzach cites *R* that is the same line ordering as West, and Goettling follows suit but without citing either Π^5 or Π^{13}.
[169] Cf. Solmsen, *Theogony* in his comments for line 630.

position of the line at the end of the sentence, as in Π^5, is supported by 648.'[170]

West's argument could be extended further if line 630 were taken as valid for understanding 'Titan'. The validity of line 630 is its citation of the participants of the conflict, and line 632 provides insight into the nature (ἀγαυοί) and location (ὄθρυος) of the Titan enemies which neatly contrast with the kindly (δωτῆρες) allies of Zeus at Olympos (633).

In concession to the critics, the composition of lines 630-633 makes it difficult to determine which group of gods is being characterised, especially if the particles τε ... καὶ at line 630 are taken into consideration.[171] In fact, the gods of line 632 and 633 could be synonymous: after all, ἀγαυοί and δωτῆρες are characteristics of the same genealogy. If this is so, then what is taking place conceptually is an inner-conflict within a single phenomenon. Therefore, the entire passage refers to the strategy of the Titans. If this argument is feasible, then the reference to Titan in successive lines has a deliberate logic, as thematically lines 630 and 632 provide insight into the characterisation of the Titans at two separate points in the narrative.

Justification for an argument for deliberate language repetition, rather than for interpolation, of lines 630 and 632 depends on the authenticity of lines 629-636. Although Wolf rejects line 634, our study relies on its presence in the narrative. The divergent use of the verbs for 'becoming' from ἐξεγένοντο (630) to τέκεν (634) expands the idea of continuous world development, by which its inner structure is in a state of flux (634). Line 634 is conceptually relevant for interpreting line 630 in so far as it provides a basis for comparison. Moreover, line 630 stresses the significance of

[170] West, *Theogony*, pp. 339-40.
[171] For example, critics such as Jacoby, F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1930). Equivalent variants of this line may be found at 729 and 625.

Kronos' deeds at establishing genealogical development.[172] Although what *exists* will always *exist*, evolution is dependant on the union of kindred opposites, as suggested at line 634 with the union between Kronos and Rhea.

In extension, Friederichs condemns lines 635-636, and to an extent his rejection of line 635 seems logical as it repeats almost verbatim line 631.[173] Yet the reasons to condemn line 636 would be qualified only by the omission of 635.[174] But both lines are crucial to the narrative as line 636 refers to the grim battle, and line 635 details how long the combatants have been fighting each other (635 ἀλλήλοισι).[175]

If we take into consideration the scholarly objections cited above, then we are confronted with the difficulty in interpreting lines 629-636 in terms of their genealogical content. Confusion is determined by the different verbs for becoming (ἐξεγένοντο 630 and τέκεν 634), and the position of the particles τε ... καί at line 630. In both lines, Kronos is the agent of the genealogical framework, and once again Kronos becomes a main focus of characterisation. The use of two verbs meaning 'to become / create' suggests the formation of separate genealogies, and the use of ἀλλήλοισι at line 635 certainly supports this assumption. And yet, the fact that Kronos appears in connection with both verbs which reminds the reader of Kronos' influence on creating the divine genealogies by separating Gaia and Ouranos.

---

[172] Cf. vv. 168ff and 179ff.

[173] Cf. K. Friederichs, *Die Bedeutung der Titanomachie fur die Theogonie* (Pogr. Rostock, 1907), p. 9.

[174] Cf. G. F. Schoemann, *Opsula Academie*, ii (Berlin, 1857). Line 635 is cited by ancient scholia. Scholia *x* retains χόλον at line 635, whereas WY suggest μα<χην (cf. Π^5) and Schoemann proposes πόνον presumably in parallel with line 629.

[175] In terms of a historical comparative, χόλον θυμαλγέ' is a recurrent phrase found also in fragment 318 and *Iliad* 4.513 and 9.260. In agreement with the $_{MSS}$ and Π^5 μα]χην would be equally appropriate as χόλον, especially if lines 629-636 represents some form of thematic ring composition. Lines 629 and 631 are supported by line 635, and line 636 expands on the temporal endlessness of the grim genealogical and cosmological conflict (635).

Initially line 630 suggests that the narrative focalises on two distinguishable warring parties, perhaps even three.[176] But the use of the verbs of 'becoming' steer the reader to identifying the different characterisations of the 'warring gods'.[177] The use of the verb ἐξεγένοντο points to a singular notion that, what exists will always 'be'. The verb ἐξεγένοντο of line 630 is then complimented by τέκεν at line 634. The verb τίκτω signifies not only the notion of 'transient' existence, but more fundamentally refers to the female aspect of creation, here personified as Rhea; whereas ἐξεγένοντο refers to static creation.

The status of 'female' generative power is transformed throughout the *Theogony*. Gradually, matriarchal autonomy is being replaced by usurping patriarchy. At the beginning of the *Theogony* Gaia produced male counterparts (126ff), but gradually these powers will be assumed by the generative powers of Zeus. But the consequence of creation is inner genealogical conflict, as each evolving *genos* tries to usurp its fellow kin.[178]

More specifically, then, lines 629-636 reflect the text's main fabula – cosmology. The genealogy of lines 629-636 has a profound impact on cosmological development. The process of cosmological change is delineated by genealogical conflict, expressed explicitly at lines 629 and 631 and then encapsulated at line 636.

Titan existence is cyclical and traverses the cosmological spectrum. It is cyclical in that existence is a continual process of progression and retraction. For example, prior to birth, the Titans were embedded deep within earth (136ff), and after

[176] The Titans and those born from Kronos and the use of θεοί repeated at line 633 (οὐλύμποιο θεοί) cites an additional genealogical aspect.
[177] Cf. 631 (ἀλλήλοισι) and 636 (συνεχέως).
[178] The eternal inner genealogical conflict is emphasised by the participle ἔχοντες at the end of line 629 (cf. 635), followed by the conflict language of line 631 (ἀντίον ἀλλήλοισι διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας) The latter refers to the subject(s) of ἐξεγένοντο at line 630. The language of line 629 is then almost repeated

usurping Ouranos and the curse of 207-210 the ring composition of existence starts to retract. Line 633 accounts for the gradual recession of the Titans existence, most notably by the Titans retreat from heaven to Othryos. This descent then leads toward the eventual regression, ending up in a newly formed locale within Gaia, known as Tartaros.

The narrative of 629-636 acts as an invocation by Zeus to the Hundred Handers at 646-653. Passage 629-636 is a narrative description of the upheavals between the generations of the celestial and terrestrial realm, referring to the causes and consequences of the actions referred to in passage 207-210. Lines 629-636 form an essential response to the retribution referred to at line 210.

According to the line construction of West, lines 630 and 632 form the central aspect of the passage. Lines 629 and 631 detail the hardship of the conflict which is repeated at line 636. Line 630 refers to the genealogical framework of cosmological entities that is expanded at line 635 with reference to Rhea. The generated phenomenon of 630 includes not only the siblings of Kronos, but also all sequential genealogies. Therefore, for the purpose of this thesis the central lines are 630-633 as these provide insight into the generations associated directly and consequential to Kronos.

The next two explicit characterisations and explicit mention of the Titans appears at lines 648 and 650.[179] These lines may be discussed within the contextual

---

at 635 (οἵ ῥα τότ' ἀλλήλοισι μάχην θυμαλγέ' ἔχοντες), and the thematic implications of lines 631 and 630 are defined at line 636 by the interplay use of συνεχέως and ἐμάχοντο.

[179] The authenticity of lines 648 and 650 have been subject to scholarly debate, and the consequences of this debate could have a profound impact on how we interpret the Titanomachy. But the authenticity of these lines becomes evident by their thematic relevance to Titan. Lines 646 and 647 linguistically and thematically correspond to lines 629 and 631 (Cf. *Iliad* 16.497 πέρι μαρνάμεθ' : also Π^6). Lines 646-647 provide reasons for conflict on the grounds for power and strength, whereas 629 and 631 refer to the context of the fighting and hardships of powerful conflict. In both instances these lines are followed by almost identical line at line 630 and 648. The couplet composition of lines 630 and 632 develop

framework of passage 646-653. The initial context of this passage is Zeus' appeal to the three Hundred Handers. Although Zeus calls upon the Hundred Handers for assistance on the basis of reciprocity, there is no reference to their reward. It is not until the defeat of the Titans that the reader is made aware of the fate of the Hundred Handers.

Lines 648 and 650 describe the genealogical reality of the three Hundred Handers.[180] Thematically, these lines reflect the dynamics of inner genealogical conflict. Derivatives of the verb γιγνόμαι signify the eternal existence of created forms within the cosmological framework. The particles τε .. καί (648) do not distinguish separate genealogies, but instead emphasizes the eternal status of created phenomena (τιτῆνές) within the cosmos.[181]

The implications of 648 and 650 are important for our understanding of the text's genealogical cosmology. The detailed account of the Hundred Handers' birth, alongside reference to the Titans, sees a development from their previous mention, as the Hundred Handers are now described as actual forces of cosmological violence. The physical description of the Hundred Handers at line 649 relates back to the initial violence of Kronos at line 178-180. It is the correlation between lines 649 and 178-180 that links the actions of the Hundred Handers with that of the Titans. The difference in this instance is that the Hundred Handers are understood to be allies of the cosmological hierarchy; whereas before the Titans were acting against patriarchal

---

further at 648 and 650. However, the use of language at lines 648-650 becomes crucial for interpreting the text's genealogical structure. Scholia *a* writes ἐξεγένοντο for line 648 in agreement with line 630. Rzach cites *N* τ›ειτηνε~ for line 648 and τειτη‹νεσσιν for line 650. Solmsen in his commentary refers to $aS^{ac}L^{1gr}$ ἐξεγένοντο; though Goettling, like West, cite v1.2 vat. R.S. Taur. ἐξεγένοντο in Par. Corr.. Cf. C. Goettling, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Leipzig: Gothae Henning, 1843); F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1930); A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1902).

[180] Genealogy in the *Theogony* signifies a unitary system of created forms that have inner sub-divisions and the Hundred Handers represent another aspect of the genealogical framework.

control. However, Kronos' devised deed against Ouranos has evolved at line 649 into an inherent characteristic within the Hundred Handers.[182] This shows that violence has become a generative feature of cosmological violence.[183]

It is not without reason that the conceived Hundred Handers (147-149) are realised later on in the narrative of the *Theogony*. If they had been born at lines 147-149, then the Hundred Handers would have been redundant until lines 644. Therefore, it is logical for the text to have introduced the idea of the Hundred Handers at lines 147-149 with other genealogical kin to foreshadow their explicit purpose at lines 644ff.[184] Furthermore, the invocation of lines 646-653 compares with that of Gaia's at line 164-166; which can only offer validation for their textual authenticity. For example, Gaia at lines 159-160 groans against the immobilisation of her reproductive nature caused by the suppression of Ouranos (156-159). Similarly, lines 646-653 respond to the suffering of the suppressed Hundred Handers (651) within the internal darkness of Gaia (653). Here the Hundred Handers are offered the blessing of terrestrial existence within the light (652), provided they fulfill the invocation of Zeus to engage in deeds of violence.[185]

---

[181] Significantly, the genitive κρόνου does not singly identify *Titan*, but instead alludes to the animation of world phenomena consequential to the violence to lines 178ff.

[182] Such characteristics evolve further by the physical actualisation of Typhoneus described explicitly at lines 820ff.

[183] Compare 649 with 178-180.

[184] At lines 178-180 and 182 Kronos controls the movement of inanimate weapons with his hands, and the awesome nature of these weapons is described explicitly at lines 179-180, especially noted by αρπην and the proceeding phrase μακρὴν καρχαρόδοντα. The awesome violence yielded from Kronos' hands is later translated to the power (μεγάλην 649, μακρὴν 180) and strength (βίην 649) of the Hundred Handers and their invincible hands (649 χεῖρας ἀάπτους)[cf. 179-180 and 182]. The language of violence has developed from an understated implication (μακρὴν) into a magnitude (μεγάλην). Additionally, line 182 foreshadows the eventual fate of the Titan children (210ff). The hurling of Ouranos' genitals conceptually reflects the hurling of the Hundred Handers (734ff), Kyklōpēs (853ff), Typhoneus (867ff) and other Titan (potential) enemies of the cosmological order into the abyss of Tartaros.

[185] Cf. 650-653. Furthermore, passage 650-653 thematically parallels the actual genesis of the παῖς to line 164, and also reflects the violence of Ouranos of lines 165-166. Cf. Line 653 may correspond with ῥονίδεω διὰ βουλὰς (572), especially in this instance, as it is within the context of violent suppression. Cf. also180, also 651.

The account of the Hundred Handers (645ff) genealogy reflects the evolution of the cosmological order. The narrative starts with reference to the primordial creators Gaia and Ouranos (644), and closes with the establishment of a new genealogical order of Zeus. The conflict narrative of lines 646-653 explores the cosmological necessity for violent genealogical upheavals. The invoked violence of the Hundred Handers, like the invocation of lines 164-166, is to be regarded as a kind of violence that has positive consequences for the text's main fabula.

Lines 646-653 describe how cosmological elements struggle against their negative inner violent nature. The aggression of the enemies of the Hundred Handers (646) represents the inner destruction of cosmological harmony.[186] The inherent aggression of the Hundred Handers is a positive aspect which plays a crucial role in the defeat of cosmological suppressors. Despite the constructive use of the violent Hundred Handers, the dual potentiality of their violent nature sees their eventual return within Gaia. The Hundred Handers, are likewise unable to escape a fate similar to that of the Titans.

The text at lines 648 and 650 remind the reader of the Styx episode at 383-385. The characterisation of νίκη and καρτέυς at line 647 accounts for the progeny of Styx at lines 383-385. The genealogy of Styx is followed by the invocation by Zeus for the gods to fight against some of the Titans. For her allegiance, Styx is awarded the function of maintaining genealogical harmony by enforcing the cosmological oath of

---

A further parallel in the text between lines 651 and 177 is found in the use of φιλότητος. At line 651 φιλότητος relays the provision of good will, though this good will is in fact deeds of violence. Similarly, Ouranos suppresses Gaia with φιλότητος (177), which Gaia regards as evil (cf. 160), that Kronos and later the Hundred Handers respond against with further acts of violence. Therefore, φιλότητος represents a paradox between the nature of each of the genealogies. This φιλότητος, as a concept, evolves from Ouranos (177) within all Τιτῆνες παίδας. These characteristic traits, in fact, have a fundamental impact on our interpretation of the text's cosmology.

allegiance. The resulting outcome of passage 646-653 is the sworn allegiance of the Hundred Handers to Zeus (655). The success of the Hundred Handers has been already foreshadowed at lines 383-385, with Styx in the background enforcing the power, strength, zeal and victory for the fulfillment of the oath.

If this is so, then the invocation of line 392 and the genealogy of Styx are conceptually parallel to those given in lines 646-653. The context of line 392 refers to the justice of the cosmological hierarchy, and the context of line 646-653 expands this concept in physical terms by the sworn violence of the Hundred Handers.

In extension, further characterisations of Titan appear at lines 663 and 668, where they form part of the context of lines 661-670. Passage 661-670 will be discussed in relation to the two adjoining passages of 661-663 and 664-670. The narrative almost prior to 661 is also crucial for conceptually interpreting line 663 as it forms the basis for understanding line 668.

Lines 661-663 see the close of the Hundred Handers' response to Zeus 646-653 spoken in direct speech by Kottos. Then lines 664-670 are a narrated response of Zeus to Kottos' speech of lines 654-663. Therefore the passage of 661-670 divides into two inter-related narratives: 661-663 and 664-670.

There are still difficulties though in overcoming the narrative flow of the Titanomachy, especially as many scholars have questioned the authenticity of lines 646-670. If these lines of the Titanomachy are omitted, then this would question the cosmological significance of the Theogony, and our interpretation of each focalisation within the text. Furthermore, should aspects of the Titanomachy narrative be ignored as interpolation, it would leave us with little option other than to interpret the text as a

[186] Paradoxically the violence of lines 178ff is deemed cosmologically positive, as it enables cosmological development, whereas at lines 646ff the same aggressors are regarded as negative

compilation of disparate poems. Therefore, here we need to discuss the validity of scholarly objections for the Titanomachy.

Contrary to West's edition for lines 661-663, some scholars have provided alternatives for line 661. Rzach, Solmsen and Goettling suggest βουλῇ instead of θυμῷ, making line 661 to read τῷ καὶ νῦν ἀτενεῖ τε νόῳ καὶ πρόφρονι βουλῇ instead of τῷ καὶ ἀτενεῖ τε νόῳ καὶ πρόφρονι θυμῷ.[187] The ancient scholia source for line 661 Π^{13} is cited only by Solmsen, though with little explanation other than]φρονι θυμω [Π^{13}.[188] The explicit Titan reference at line 663 presents additional problems in interpretation. According to scholion T μαρνάμεθα should read as the participle μαρνάμενοι. Further to this, scholion Π^{13} suggests ἀνὰ κρα[τε]ρην ὑσμεινην, and scholion *a* cites ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ instead of ἀνὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας.[189]

In order to dispel such ambiguities, we need to discuss their contextual importance. For example, line 661 θυμῷ is more conceptually appropriate than Rzach, Solmsen and Goettling's suggestion of βουλῇ. The term βουλῇ is used throughout the *Theogony* in connection with Zeus, whereas derivatives of θύμος have been used to describe the Hundred Handers.[190] With respect to thematic symmetry, the consequence of θυμός at line 661 reflects the final suppression of the Titans in Tartaros described at lines 717-729. This eventual fate is foreshadowed also by the use of χθονίους at line 697 and the repeated use of δεσμῷ (618) and εὐρυοδείης (620) at line 717.[191] A correlation between lines 661-663 and 617-621 is authenticated by

---

suppressors of cosmological development and harmony specific to the structure of the text.

[187] Cf. the notes in their commentary for these lines C. Goettling, *Hesiod*; A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina*.

[188] Rzach and Goettling use βουλῇ without any scholia source or indeed any explanation.

[189] Cf. *Iliad* 7.18 ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ. In contrast, at lines 617-618 *thumos* refers to that of the *pater* set against the Hundred Handers. Here the identity of the πατὴρ sees contention among scholars.

[190] For example, θύμος at line 665 describes the Hander Handers' desire for battle 'more than before'. But even before line 644 the Hundred Handers have appeared in the context of θυμός.

[191] Cf. 620 and 621.

the language and thematic parallels with line 717-720. Line 719 supports the argument for θυμός at line 661 and not βουλῇ.[192]

In relation to the criticisms of modern scholars, it is possibly irrelevant whether line 663 reads ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνας, ἀνὰ κρατερὰς or ἀνὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας, as each possibility carries similar contextual implications. Although the plural κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας describes the multiple grimness of a long conflict, the use of κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ at line 618, taken in conjunction with θυμῶ. at line 617, provides some form of stylistic symmetry and continuity with lines 661 and 663.

In discussing the above findings, we must address the difficulties present in interpreting line 663. According to scholion T, line 663 should read μαρνάμεθα instead of μαρνάμενοι. Although the first person plural indicative μαρνάμεθα could be referring to the Hundred Handers, with the subjects of μαρνάντο to be found in line 630, the present plural participle μαρνάμενοι is more appropriate on conceptual grounds. The use of μαρνάμεθα is perhaps too precise as the identity of 'we' could only refer to the Hundred Handers, and the reference to Titan at line 663 recounts line 648 and projects to line 668.[193] Furthermore, the characterisations for the Titans at 663 refer to the many participants of the conflict.[194]

---

[192] Further justification for θυμῷ at line 661 is the use of μῦθον at line 665. The term βουλῇ implies something rational, whereby it would have been more appropriate to respond to Kottos' speech with λογὸν. In conceptual terms, the use of θεοὶat line 665 juxtapositions with the cosmological status of the Hundred Handers. It is θεοὶ, namely Zeus, who rationally devise a plan of action, whereas it is the lesser agents, such as the Hundred Handers, who exact the irrational or rather non-cognitive response to the plan. Θυμὸς, as previously stated, refers to inner irrational emotions that may, and do, germinate into physical actions (cf. 665-666). Although this point suggests the application of the philosophical premise of a distinction between *muthos* and *logos*. Cf. Richard Buxton (ed.), *From Myth to Reason* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), where such interpretations may be applied, to some extent, to the context of the *Theogony*. Cf. also line 239: ὑρυβίην τ' ἀδάμαντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἔχουσαν: also at *Iliad* 1.388 μῦθος means a threatening command; or indeed a charge or mission as at *Iliad* 9.625.

[193] Cf. 662 ῥυσόμεθα.

[194] If, for example, the invocation of Zeus at line 392 is taken into account, then line 663 explicitly refers to the Hundred Handers, and others. The ambiguous subjects of μαρνάμενοι are foreshadowed by the uncertain objects of ῥυσόμεθα (662). Schween's commentary interprets ῥυσόμεθα as referring to the Titans, though West notes that ῥυσόμεθα 'does not necessarily imply that the Titans are the

Lines 706-710 certainly qualify the involvement of divine combatants. The inclusion of this passage (706-710) in this debate, together with the other Titan references, provides insight into how the multifarious characterisations of the Titans may be interpreted within the *Theogony*. The present participle μαρνάμενοι gives a sense of continuous action, which also suggests that upheavals of warfare, once initiated (178), will always be present within the world. Lines 661-663 express the continual evolution of genealogical or cosmological conflict, with its explicit inclusion of the newly 'actualised' Hundred Handers.[195]

Passage 661-663 reiterates the significant causes and consequences of cosmological upheavals. Lines 661-663 define cosmological upheavals as a power struggle (662) between transient cosmological elements. The text refers to the transient status of those generated from Kronos (630); some of the proud Titans have moved from Othryos (632), while other gods follow similar relocation by moving away from Olympos (633). Additionally, lines 661-663 describe the relocation of the Hundred Handers from the underworld prison into the light (617). The position of the Hundred Handers, like the other τιτῆνες τε θεοί, is transient and their genealogical position within the world is dependent totally on patriarchal will.

A static genealogical order depends almost entirely on the successful outcome of that which is described at lines 661-663. We ought to remember that at this point of the narrative that Zeus has not assumed absolute patriarchy. At lines 661-663 Zeus is a secondary character; and the term *daimon* at line 655 points to the fact that Zeus is not

---

aggressors'. If West is correct, then, in light of line 392 the use of the participle μαρνάμενοι at line 663 includes all the 'aggressive' participants in the 'grim conflict'. Cf. F. Schwenn, *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1934).

[195] Cf. lines 706-710.

yet ruler 'of gods and men', but an aspiring deity.[196] The successful fulfillment of the desire expressed in 661 does not avert further upheavals. Although a static position for the Hundred Handers is not confirmed until the ascending ruler Zeus has sent some of the Titans to Tartaros, the consequences of establishing this new locale is

---

[196] It is important to note that δαίμων has been subject to historical interpretation that could be misleading if applied to the *Theogony*. G. S. Oegema in discussing the Greco-Roman background suggests that *daimon* is a mediator between gods and man. If this presumed interpretation is applied to the *Theogony*, in the way Oegema has done for ancient Greek religion, then this reduces the status of Zeus as both θεός and ascending cosmological ruler (Cf. 'Casting Out of Demons in the gospel of Mark against its Greco-Roman Background', in A Lange, H. Lichtenberger and K.F. Diethard Romheld (eds.), *Die Dämonen: Demons* (Tübingen: Mohr 2003), pp. 505-518).
In the same volume, A. K. Petersen ('The Notion of Demon: Open Questions to a Diffuse Concept", pp. 23-41) suggests that *daimon* is the will of Zeus and guardians of humankind who judge cruel deeds (cf. *Works and Days* 122-126; 250 and 254). In a sense this interpretation could be partially applied to the *Theogony*, as *daimon* at line 655 does reflect the will of Zeus judging cruel deeds.
But the term *daimon* has appeared in diverse spatial and temporal contexts - from Coptic magical papyri, biblical texts, epic, philosophy and so forth. The comparative historical method has led some to reduce *daimon* to a general meaning of 'intermediary deity or spirit. But this general interpretation does not do justice to *Theogony* 655. Cf. West's commentary for *Op.*122 where the term means 'tutelary deities'.
According to Liddell and Scott Lexicon (LSJ) one of the possible interpretations for δαίμων is 'god or goddess ... of individual gods and goddesses' (cf. *Iliad* 1.222, 3.420).
LSJ. goes on to suggest that '..more frequently of the divine power (while θεὸς denotes a god in person) i.e. *Od.* 3.27 πρὸσδαίμονα [meaning against divine power]'. To some extent, this interpretation could be applied to lines 661-663 of the *Theogony*, as line 661 is especially a direct response to the divine will of (impersonal) Zeus. Also, such an interpretation may account for the use of δαίμων instead of θεός or a personal pronoun. Here, Kottos responds to abstract divine power, as at this point in the LSJ. goes on to suggest that δαίμων could mean 'the power controlling the destiny of an individual' (cf. Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonos* 76 γενναίος πλὴν τοῦ δαίμονος).
Again this interpretation could certainly be applied to the contextual relevance of lines 661-663, as it is the will of Zeus that determines the fate of the Hundred Handers. Zeus has the power to release and imprison, and Zeus certainly reminds the Hundred Handers of their precarious existence. Zeus at lines 644-653 contrasts the fate of imprisonment and its explicit hardships (651-653), with the benevolence of release into the light away from suffering. Although there is a hint of the notions of 'good' and 'evil', and the dichotomy between 'evil' and 'good' *daemons* is applied more often by historical research to citations of mystery religion (cf. Faraone C. & D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,1997). According to *P.G.M.* (cf. K. Preisendanz (ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae*: *Die Griechishen Zauberpapyri* vol. I and II (Stuttgart 1970 and 1974), I.329 the 'divine spirit' is helpful in transmitting dreams and visions (cf. Irenaios *C.Haer.* 16.3), of which Pseudo-Clement suggests that such a ὀνειροπομπια is essentially a source of divine inspiration. (cf. G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge: CUP 1986). Another source - The spell of Pnouthis (*P.G.M.* I.42-195) associates the 'assistant *daemon*' with mystery religion or (perhaps) the mysteries within religion. The spell is a ritual of mystery and, therefore, secret (I.130), and the notion of such secret rituals are found explicitly in the Greek Eleusinian Mysteries, the Mysteries of Dionysus, but also in the Liturgy of Mithras (*PGM* IV. 479-829). This historical spectrum of mystery cult terminology includes also the influence of Jewish religion (*P.G.M.* V. 96-172; XXXVI. 295-311) and the Eighth Book of Moses (XIII. 128ff).
The conceptual implications of δαίμων and the role of Zeus in the *Derveni Papyrus* perhaps offers the closest parallel to the single reference to δαιμόνι' in the *Theogony*. If this method is applied, then, interpretation of δαιμόνι' at line 654 should not be in moral terms, but as a metaphor of cosmological genealogy. In parallel with the *Derveni Papyrus*, Zeus in the *Theogony* is the ascending cosmological

another, even greater, cosmological upheaval: the birth of Typhoneus through the union of Gaia and Tartaros (820-822).[197]

It is at this point in the narrative (especially at 661-663), that the *Theogony* focalises on three inter-related characterizations of the gods. The genealogical account of the gods is, to some extent, a metaphor for world order and explains the relationship between global elements. Each genealogy replaces or re-affirms a former generation (ie. Zeus displaces his father Kronos), enforced most notably by some form of genealogical upheaval.[198] However, line 661 suggests a genealogical requirement of reciprocity which contracts the occurrence of genealogical conflict.

Although the reader may identify, to some extent, conflicting personalities and personifications in the narrative, these characters tend to refer to each other in relation to the other's *genos* which could confuse our understanding. A possible solution may be to argue that this form of address does not necessarily reflect conflict so much as it denotes respect the divine hierarchy. For example, the Hundred Handers respond to their conditional release by Zeus by agreeing to fight on his behalf in grim conflict (662).[199] Although Zeus appeals to the Hundred Handers and receives an appropriate response in direct speech, neither of the direct speeches uses second person pronouns as a form of address. The speaker and recipient of the direct speech are instead made explicit by the surrounding narrative. Zeus addresses the Hundred Handers neither as Hundred Handers nor as Briarious, Kottos or Gyges, but according to their status as

---

force that usurps the generative powers of his predecessors and re-allocates the cosmological function of all generated phenomena.

[197] Cf. lines 734-735; especially 820.

[198] Here sometimes the genealogical accounts as they appear in the text do not necessarily make chronological sense. For example, the birth of the Hundred Handers appears after the birth of Zeus (cf. 497ff). This, however, makes sense in terms of the Hundred Handers function in the sequence of events that form the Titanomachy.

[199] Cf. lines 617ff.

τέκνα of Gaia and Ouranos (644). But the narrative of line 617, confirmed explicitly at line 654, makes it certain that the Hundred Handers are the recipients of the speech.

Similarly, the Hundred Handers respond to the appeal of Zeus with the title *daimon* (655). The absence of subjective self-references or personal formal address contrasts with the explicit objective reference to Titan and the genealogy of Kronos. The crucial moment of Zeus' appeal appears at line 648, and at no point does Zeus refer to himself as produced from Kronos. It is the response of Kottos that reiterates the *genos* of Zeus at line 660 'lord, son of Kronos' (κρόνου νιὲ ἄναξ). Further to this, the reference to Titans in Kottos' speech almost corresponds to the language of lines 647-650. But unlike line 648, Kottos does not refer to the Titans as all those produced from Kronos, but contrasts the Titans (663) and those born from Kronos (660) with separate lines.

To support line 663 and the *Theogony's* genealogical account, a further reference to the Titans is made at line 668.[200] The context of this reference describes

[200] It should be noted here that almost every aspect of line 664 has been questioned as authentic. Solmsen and Rzach cite the scholia for the accuracy of ἐπῆνησαν, while West appeals to Homer for a solution. Π^{13} and SWX offer ἐ]πήνη[σαν; Π^{5} and Q.p.c. suggest ἐπ[ή]ν[έσ]σαν and DHL put forth ἐπήνησαν (Cf. Rzach, *Hesiodos*, in his commentary for line 664). West reconciles these ambiguities by comparing line 664 with Homeric lines, such as *Iliad* 7.344, 9.710, 232.539 ως ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπῆνησαν βασιλῆες (*Odyssey* 4.673). Despite the linguistic compatibility between line 664 and the Homeric texts, West recognises a point of departure: 'in all the Homeric passages a proposal or request has been made, whereas Hesiod's line does not fit this typical pattern' (West, *Theogony*, p. 347).
Further to this, West compares the phrase πολέμου δ' ἐλιλαίετο of line 665 with *Iliad* 3.133 which reads λιλαιόμενοι πολέμοιο, and with 16.89 which reads λιλαίεσθαι πολεμίζειν. West offers for line 666 μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθε and compares this with *Odyssey* 1.322 without further comment. Despite scholia L citation for line 665 ἐγείρων and ἐγειρον by *m*, West bases ἔγειραν on *Iliad* 5.496 and 20.31 (cf. also *Theogony* 713). A similar comparison technique is applied to line 667. The phrase θήλειαί τε καὶ ἄρσενες is compared with seeming linguistic parallels within the (so-called) Homeric epic cycle, and most notably with the *Iliad*, especially *Iliad* 8.7 μήτε τις ... θήλεια θεὸς... μήτε τις ἄρσην. Despite these linguistic similarities, the context of the *Iliad* and *Theogony* are too dissimilar to allow for incitive comparison.
The limitations of historical literary comparisons are not only evident in relation to lines 664-667, but perhaps even more so with respect to lines 668-670. Scholars such as Jacoby and Wilamowitz, have (almost) condemned these lines on the basis of linguistic impracticality (cf. Cf. Jacoby, *Hesiodi*, line 664, and for further discussion see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellen* vol. 1, (Berlin: Weidmann, 1931). Again, West comments tentatively on ἐρέβεσφιν at line 669 that, he adopts

the physical outcome of Zeus' genealogical struggle, with mention of the action that took place at a specific time.[201]

Passages 664-670 and 668-675 become important for understanding the events of this genealogical conflict. The text at 664-670 develops the notion of the necessity for upheaval to allow cosmological development. In addition, lines 669-670 sanction the genealogical necessity of the Hundred Handers, as it describes their utility (699-670), and the implications of their impact in the Titanomachy (670). The narrative here for the Hundred Handers reflects their functional evolution: the Hundred Handers were conceived by Gaia and Ouranos (147-153) and given new life by Zeus (lines 617-620, 639-643, 651-653 and 669) with the result that, in line 670, the Hundred Handers perform vital deeds in the Titanomachy conflict (669-670).

The repetition of language draws the Hundred Handers passages together. The description of the Hundred Handers' physique at lines 150-153 is elaborated in lines 677-678 by the description of their utility, and this is especially noted by the use of the term χείρες in lines 150 and 677.[202]

But repeated language also marks points for comparison. For example, the irrational (ὠδύσσατο θυμῷ 617) imprisonment of the Hundred Handers by Ouranos is

---

the reading 'with some hesitation' (cf. West, *Theogony*, p. 347). Despite hesitation, West applies ἐρέβεσφιν by citing other literary sources, and continues to comment:
'..as ἐρέβεσφιν although an entirely anomalous form, is well attested here and elsewhere (*Il.* 9.572 vulg.; *h.Dem.* 349 M (cod.unicus). ἐρέβεσφιν is attested as a form by Theognotus, *An. Ox.* Ii.160.20.
West rejects the comments of the scholia of line 669, who suggest ἐρέβευσφι (Π^5) in favour of the disparate source of Theognotus. However, qualification for ἐρέβεσφιν is offered by Solmsen's citation of Q, v.l in *ak*.
Despite West's acceptance of line 668, Schwartz rejected this line as an error in Π^5 (cf. also E. Schwartz, *Characterkopfe aus der Antike, 1 Reihe, 1 Hesiod und Pindar* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1956). Jacoby condemns line 669-680, while Wilamowitz rejects line 669-675. Rzach offers no substantive comments for line 664-670 other than the omission of Zeus by Ωb for οὔς κεν at line 669. Although I recognise that lines 668-670 could be rejected on the premise of literary repetition, these lines are crucial for understanding the genealogy of the *Theogony*.

[201] Cf. passages 664-670, also 392-395, [423-425], 629-636, 661-663.

[202] Additionally, it is the force (153) of the Hundred Handers that is used to perform generative evil violence (677).

similarly repeated when they are, rationally, released (640-641). This is then recanted at lines 651-653 and summarised at line 669. Although in each instance the language of release is almost comparable, each phrase relays a different message.[203] To illustrate this point, lines 618-620 refer to the imprisonment of the Hundred Handers under the broad earth, whereas line 652 is a reminder (to the Hundred Handers) that they will undergo an insufferable imprisonment.

The contextual relevance of lines 664-670 is further supported by the conceptual implications of χθονὸς at line 669. The term *chthonos* contrasts the release of the Hundred Handers from their imprisonment, and foreshadows the fate of the enemies of Zeus who will be subject to the violence referred to at line 670. Χθονός of line 669 is further developed in subsequent lines, such as 697 and 715.

What lines 664-670 offer the reader are further genealogical characterisations of the gods. As already stated, passage 664-670 is a response by the θεοί to Kottos' speech.[204] Line 668 informs us of the non-specified identity for the θεοί of line 664. The θεοί at line 668 appear between the θεοί of line 664 and Zeus at line 669, followed then by the implied reference to the Hundred Handers at line 670. The characterisations provided in lines 664-670, which shape the cosmological fabula, describes the various dimensions of cosmological upheaval which only Zeus is identified explicitly. But Zeus at 669 is reported to be a non-physical participant in the cosmological conflict; he is merely said to release those 'from under the earth into the light'. Contrary to this, the θεοί of line 664 offer an explicit response to the

[203] Especially phrases such as δῆσε κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ (618) and δυσηλεγέος ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ (652), ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης (620) with ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος (653) and ὑπὸ χθονὸς (669), ἐς φάος ἄψ' ἀφίκεσθε (653) and ἦκε φοχωσδε (669).
[204] Kottos is the collective voice of the Hundred Handers.

cosmological conflict, and are gladdened by the prospect of the violence by the implied Hundred Handers.

But why the Hundred Handers are not explicitly named is baffling. Two reasons for this may be that (1) the phrase 'those brought into the light' is contextually obvious, and (2) the Hundred Handers are active participants within the collective body of cosmological combatants. Therefore, the use of the personal pronouns is contextually inappropriate, as active violence and active participants of violence are referred to in terms of an ambiguous collective body. If the latter point is valid, then this accounts also for the ambiguous identity and genealogy of θεοί of line 664, as well as for the ambivalent interpretation of line 668.

Further still, θεοί in the text refers to all phenomena generated from Gaia, thus implying that θεοί is to include the Titans (τιτῆνες). If this latter claim is true then it could account for the repeated phrase τιτῆνες τε θεοί. But it appears from the text that each generation of god is delineated within the conflict narrative: whether primordial, first generation and so forth. Previously, at line 392, having already called immortals to Olympos (391-392), Zeus appeals to some of the gods to fight against (some of) the Titan (gods). The term ἀστεροπητή in line 390 is an epithet for the primordial Ouranos. The ἀθανάτοί of line 391 does not necessarily mean 'immortal' as translated by West: but moreover 'without death' relates directly to the θεοὺς. The concept of 'deathless' gods develops further at line 392 with the phrase θεῶν τιτῆσι. If so, lines 390-392 give rise to diverse genealogies of θεοί, all generated from Ouranos. If all θεοί are offspring of Ouranos (208), then these too are cursed by the prospect of

cosmological upheaval (207-210). Despite this possibility, the principle differences between θεοί are suggested by the process of the characterisations made at line 424.[205]

The significance of line 669 is notably its reference to the tripartite division of the world. Here, Zeus represents an absolute embodiment of the celestial realm, and the phrase ἦκε φόωσδε suggests an intermediary sphere situated above the chthonic realm. The narrative of lines 664-670 concentrates on the transient and cyclical process of existence itself; and this is expressed by the mention of the Titans.[206]

Line 670 refers implicitly to the influential powers of the chthonic realm, notably that of Styx.[207] The assurance of Νίκη provides the rationale for κράτος - *strength* and *force* contribute to the eagerness for conflict at lines 665-666. Line 670

---

[205] Another characteristic of the θεοί is their allegiance to the cosmological hierarchy. This is where *Theogony* provides a quasi-moral framework, which includes two types of Titan θεοί (630); at lines 663-664 some of the gods are referred to as kindly, whereas others as proud aggressors. The moral tone of lines 630-633 is not based on conscious ethical values, but based on the gods' allegiance to some kind of cosmological authority (ie. allegiance is determined by the curse of 207-210). The gods who act contrary to the cosmological necessity are deemed aggressors. Therefore, the θεοί of line 664 should not be interpreted as genealogically separate from the Titan gods of line 668, but as an aspect of genealogical conflict.
The term θεοί defines the relationship among all those created from Gaia and Ouranos. Although it is assumed that those produced from Gaia and Ouranos are θεοί; not all of the characters in the narrative are identified in that manner. For example, the Hundred Handers are not designated as θεοί; rather, their genealogy and cosmological status make them an inherent part of the concept of θεοί. The Hundred Handers are conceived by the union between Ouranos and Gaia, and given a 'deathless state' by Zeus. At lines 390-392 the 'without death' gods are summoned to Olympos and are requested by Zeus to fight against (some of) the Titan gods. It is then at line 640 that the ascension of the Hundred Handers to Olympos is reported with them feasting on the food of the 'deathless'.
A later passage at lines 664-670 develops the genealogical implications of lines 390-392 and 640. The term Θεοί occurs in line 664, τιτῆνες in line 668 and an explicit reference to Zeus at line 669. The use of the personal pronoun at line 669 points to the eventual status of Zeus as the πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, and delineates the hierarchy beneath Zeus (cf. Chaos at line 667. Additionally, the unidentifiable status of the collective body of θεοί qualifies the use of μαρνάμενοι at line 663 followed by the poignant term τιτῆνες 663).

[206] In general terms, the Titans are conceived deep within the chthonic realm (cf. 159ff, the Hundred Handers 164ff and Zeus 467ff), then actualised within a terrestrial existence (cf. 170ff, the Hundred Handers 626 and Zeus 477ff), transcend to the celestial realm (632, the Hundred Handers 640ff and Zeus 391ff), but then to descend - with the exception of Zeus - back to the terrestrial sphere (632ff, the Hundred Handers (652), and finally to return within the chthonic abyss (729ff) followed by the Hundred Handers at lines 734-735). Therefore, apart from the cosmological ruler, all generated forms undergo a cyclical process of existence, and during the marginal phases cosmological and genealogical upheavals occur.

[207] Compare line 385 with 670. The power of the chthonic realm has been a consistent theme throughout the *Theogony*, especially with the intermittent references to Gaia (cf. 164ff, 391ff.) and the

prepares the reader for the narrative of 674-684, which sees a further development in the portrayal of the Titans. Initially lines 674-675 describe the physical utility of the strength and physical attributes of the Hundred Handers in the grim conflict (670-673). However, on closer examination the context of lines 674-675 has in view the former reference to the Titans at line 650, and more generally at lines 649-650. It is thus apparent that lines 670-673 offer a descriptive interlude that provides similar language to that found at lines 650 and 674.[208]

Lines 674-675 respond to the invocation of lines 644-653, as Zeus calls again for support against former gods.[209] Lines 649-653 recognise the suitability of the formidable attributes of the Hundred Handers for combat (650).[210] These formidable attributes are further described at lines 670-673, followed immediately with a focalisation which includes a characterisation of the Titans (674).

Significantly, though, passage 674-675 provides no major insight for the genealogy in the *Theogony*. Although line 674 refers to a generational conflict between the *former gods* with other members of the same *genos,* the 'grim conflict'

---

descriptive narrative of the genealogy of Styx and Hekate of which both receive exemplary honour by Zeus (399 and 423).

[208] There are no real problems for interpretation offered by scholars, such as Solmsen, Rzach and Goettling, for line 674. (cf. West, *Theogony*, p. 347, cites parallels of line 674 in Euripides *Helen* ἐς πόλεμον ὑμῖν καὶ μάχην καθίσταται (1168) and Herodotus 3.45.2 κατεπλέουσι δὲ ... πολυκράτης νηυσίν ἀντιάσας ἐς μάχην κατέστη). The comments made by scholars for line 675 present no real impact on lines 674-675. The only difficulty raised is for the appearance of στιβαρῆς in line 675. Goettling and Rzach, like West, cite στιβαρῆς of the Byzantine scholars. Solmsen provides στιβαραῖς (dative plural) qualified by Ωb; whereas the scholion *a*kSS offer στιβαρὰς. West disregards στιβαρὰς as 'an error', and justifies this by quoting Apollonius who 'applies the word to rocks' (2.598 codd., 3.1057, 1372, 4.1638). West, *Theogony*, p. 347. Here West notes that the Hundred Handers fight with natural, and not manufactured, weapons; and compares this observation with accounts of battling Giants (cf. *Od.* 7.59-60, 7.206). However, our interpretation for the *Theogony* does not require such parallels to be made.

[209] Cf. line 424. The reason for this invocation is for Zeus to achieve his status as πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (643).

[210] Notice ἔργα of violent hands tends to be a recurrent motif (cf. 178ff, 649, 671 and 675).

once again re-characterises the genealogical hierarchy.[211] Conflict is the focus of the Titanomachy episode and extensively detailed at 676-684.[212]

---

[211] Cf. 675.

[212] There are some linguistic difficulties for interpreting lines 676-684. But only West offers substantive claims for the explicit Titan reference line of 676 (cf. West, *Theogony*, p.348). West compares lines 676-684 with those drawn from the so-called Homeric tradition. For example, lines 676-677 compare with *Iliad* 12.415-416. (Cf.' Αργεῖοι δ' ἐτερωθεν ἐκαρτύναντο φάλαγγας (11.215). West cites also *Iliad* 1.247 for the use of ἐτέρωθεν). Despite these seeming linguistic parallels, West provides a historical interpretation for φύλαγγας that 'the word must have been used long before the introduction of hoplite fighting, in which it acquired a more specialised sense', West, *Theogony*, p. 348). In response to West, we should consider that line 676 does not offer any insight to military dynamics, but relates to the fact that the Titans strengthened their defense against their enemy.

The use of 'φύλαγγαί' for the τιτῆνες at line 676 contrasts with φύλακες at line 735. At line 676 the Titans try to guard their position with 'προφρόνεως', and at line 735 Kottos, Gyges and Obriaroes become μεγάθυμοί guardians. If there is such interplay between lines 676 and 735, then φύλαγγας should be understood as a desire for self - preservation. Those referred to as τιτῆνες at line 676 have no subjective identity, but form a collective body, whereas at line 735-736 the allies of Zeus retain personal recognition for their positive contribution toward establishing the cosmological order of Zeus. Nevertheless, the collective Titans of line 676 and the individualised Hundred Handers of line 735 receive a similar fate, as both groups are sent again to their place of genesis deep within the earth. The intellect (*phrenes*) of the Titans (676) is physically (μεγάθυμοί) guarded against by the Hundred Handers.

Additional comments have been made for lines 678-684. Rzach cites scholia for lines 678, 680 and 684 (Rzach, *Hesiodi*, lines 678, 680 and 684). For line 678 scholia L suggest περ ἴαχε, contrary to περίαχον of E and περισχεθε of *s* and m^1. At line 680 scholia DΩb offer ἐπνάσσετο, and at line 684 Rzach cites ἄν by scholia DΨ instead of ἄρ', and ἀλληλοισιν by ΩΨ and ἔσαν of G. Solmsen provides additional scholia evidence for lines 682 and 684. At lines 682 scholia Et^2 suggest ποδῶν αἰπεῖά τ' ἰωὴ. For line 684 *o* suggests ἀλλήλοισιν but this is a later corrected by Byzantine scholars *k* as ἀλληλοις. Although tending to qualify the comments of Rzach and Solmsen for line 682 and 684, Goettling cites an Orphic fragment for line 678 and the rendition of περίαχε and that the use of περί as a preposition is Aeolic (cf. V. Herm. *Ad Orph.* p.820).

Line 682 provides difficulties in interpretation. West cites 'the appearance on papyrus of Hermann's ποδῶν τ' αἰπεῖα ἰωή will seem to many as proof of its rightness. But its difficulties seem to me insuperable'. West, *Theogony*, p. 348. West then systematically comments on the difficulties presented at line 682 by suggesting firstly that 'if ποδῶν is made the qualification of ἰωή, 683 is left without construction.'. West then suggests – based on *Iliad* 10.139, that ἰωή is used for human cries'. In this instance the Homeric comparisons offer valuable interpretive insight for lines 684-685, especially those provided by *Iliad* 17.374 and 17.424f.. Cf. also Sophocles, *Philotetes* 216, Nonn. *D.* 15.300), of the sound 'of the lyre' as at *Odyssey* 17.261 and 'of the wind' (cf. *Iliad* 4.276).

West concurs that ἰωή is 'always a bright, clear sound, and surely the shouting of the combatants (685-686)' and not - as suggested by Paley - 'a noise of feet from the incessant pursuit.'. Finally West supports his thesis by the use of αἰπεῖα as a word 'clearly, ποδῶν must qualify ἐνοσις, the shaking caused by the gods' feet as they charged about' (West, *Theogony*, 348-349).

In agreement with West, there is logic, in conceptual terms, to interpret ἰωή as the 'noise of the combatants' as this tends to extenuate the impact of violent and forceful fighting between the Titans (cf. 661, 665-666,676-678). However, I would extend West's qualification by comparing ἐπεστενε at 679, with similar verbs at lines 159 and 160, especially as Gaia's discomfort at 159-160 has initiated the process of the genealogical conflict (cf. also σειόμενος at 680, Cf. lines 159-160, στοναχίζετο - στεινομένη).

At points of conflict, the noise generated by the participants is mental disquiet. It is not Gaia's stomach that is groaning, but the inner being of Gaia groaning in discomfort. Similarly, lines 675-684 does not describe physical fighting (*per se*), but taken in conjunction with 'φάλλαγας' of line 675, it functions as an expression of 'mentality'. Therefore, ἐπέστενε does not mean trembled in the physical sense, but that the broad sky mentally groaned due to cosmological upheaval. If this is so, then it is reasonable to

Passage 676-684 describes the genealogical inter-*genos* relations. More explicitly, this passage denoted the genealogical hierarchy which forms the basic structure of the text's main fabula. Furthermore, 676-684 begins with two explicit dimensions of Titan: (i) cognitive (προφρονέως) and (ii) physical (χειρῶν τε βίης). Directly after the mention of the Titans there is a reference to the primordial realities, πόντος (line 677) and to Ouranos and Gaia at line 678. The physical existence of Pontos, Gaia and Ouranos contrasts with the conceptual paradox of Olympos and Tartaros at lines 680 and 683.[213]

The deed (ἔργον) and the consequences of the deed of lines 677-684 correspond to the cursed deed of line 210 that signifies cosmological upheaval.[214] Although lines 678-684 explicitly reflect the impact of violence on the natural world such as the sea, sky and earth, this is merely a metaphor for the cosmological upheavals between the genealogies.

The conceptual dynamics of cosmological upheaval within the *Theogony* are exemplified by the dynamic interplay of language (677-684) that corresponds conceptually with the language used to describe the cosmological upheaval devised by Gaia (lines 159-160) against the deed of Ouranos (165-166). These events then led to the violence of Kronos at lines 176-181 and defined at 210. As a result, the defined

---

suppose that ἰώ does not refer to the physical noise of feet, but to externalised metaphors expressing the inner mentality of the combatants.

[213] The identification of Olympos as the seat of the immortals and Tartaros as ἠερόεντα remains consistent throughout the text from lines 118, 119 and 680, 682, 683. Pontos is mentioned at line 678 and not Okeanos because of the status of Pontos within the genealogy of the primordial realm. Okeanos is part of a subsequent generation created by the explicit union between Ouranos and Gaia (cf. 133). Therefore, in the conceptual terms of cosmological genealogy, Pontos makes logical sense, especially as the reference of the primordial realm is positioned between references to the physical and mental characteristics of sequential generations of Titan(s).

[214] Cf. 677 and 210.

ἐργον of 210 led to the curse of 207-210, and this motif of revenge is repeated at lines 472-473 and enacted at lines 677-684.

Genealogical upheaval originates from the physical (κακὴν τείσαιμεθα λώβην 165) and mental (ἐντὸς στονάχιζετο ... ἐπεφράσσατο 159-160) processes of primordial cosmological opposites. The mentality of Gaia and the physical actions of Ouranos germinate in the production of a singularised collective phenomenon called Titans (207). Crafty-minded Kronos (ἀγκυλομήτης 168), as influenced by Gaia (170), uses comparable physical force against his father, as Ouranos against Gaia.[215] This cosmological process of generative violence is expressed in lines 674-683 with another upheaval. Although the motifs of cosmological violence described at line 159-160, 165-166 and 176-182 are similar to the narrative of lines 670-674 culminated at lines 675-684, there is a shift in the victims and aggressors.[216] The violent force (174-175) used by Kronos has developed into a multiple force amongst the other generated Titans (674-675).[217]

The impact of violence on the cosmological order is explicitly described at lines 676-684, and the language of these lines compares with lines 159-160, 165-166, 176-182, 472-473 and all which are derived from lines 207-210. The mental discomfort of the primordial entities is exemplified by the use of περίαχε (678), ἐσμαράγησεν, ἐπεστενε (679), τινάσσετο (680) and, ἐρόεντα (682), all of which reflect the original discomfort of lines 159-160 and the subsequent anger of Ouranos at lines 207-210.[218]

---

[215] Notice the interplay of -μήτης and μητὴρ that suggests deviousness is inherited from the mother.

[216] The repeated, though to some extent inverted, performance of cosmological upheaval has been consistently foreshadowed principally by lines 209-210 and again at lines 472-473.

[217] Cf. 677-678 and 684. Cyclical violence reflects the motion of cosmological development, that the static existence of the world is totally dependant on the movement of its inner force.

[218] Interestingly, the verb 'shaken' (τινάσσετο 680) is etymologically linked to the use of τείσαιμεθα in 165 and τινάσσετο in 209, and in each instance refers to the violence performed for cosmological

Once again the *Theogony* expresses a notion of a tripartite division of the world, and this time it appears at 676-684. Although these aspects are referred to as boundless as Pontos is ἀπείρων (678), Gaia is μέγα (679) and Ouranos is εὐρυς (679), they are all contained within the confines of the cosmos. Nevertheless, there is great interaction between earth, sea and sky; the movement of one aspect has profound impact on all other forms within world existence. The response made to cosmological shifts affects the motion of existence confined in the intermediary void between earth and sky. It is confirmed that within the intermediary void that all forms of cosmological violence take place.[219] There is only a limited duration time whereby the cosmological entities can sustain conflict without self-destructing, and at that breaking point does the inner confines of Gaia (Tartaros 682) becomes a vacuum of expelled cosmological aggressors.[220] Thus, the impact of Titan violence within the void becomes a focus for a series of explicit Titan references at lines 687, 717 and 729.

Lines 697, 717 and 729 form a vital part of the *Theogony's* narrative. Line 696 confirms the position of the Titan(s) determined at lines 207-210. Despite the final banishment of Titan within Tartaros at lines 729-733, characteristics identified as Titan continue to form an important factor in detailing the text's fabula. For example, Typhoneus (820) bears similar (but not the same) character traits to the Titans.[221]

---

supremacy. For example, the use of τείνω details Ouranos' position as *pater* (165) above Gaia and the suppression of world formation, whereas τιταίνοντας relates to the actions performed by the παῖδες (207, 473) in order to establish their cosmological position. Τινάσσετο can mean 'shake' but also metaphorically mean shake with fear. Similarly, τείσαιμεθα can mean revenge in a physical sense, but also in the passive could mean 'anxious'. Therefore, despite the imagery of physical violence, the verbal language of these lines tends to be a metaphoric mental reflection of cosmological upheaval.

[219] Cf. 684.

[220] Cf. 694.

[221] Furthermore, Titan at line 697 ties in with former Titan characterisations. At line 424 Titan is mentioned alongside the genealogical genesis of the subterranean offspring Styx, followed then by the actualisation of the terrestrial Hundred Handers. Passage 686-699 follows similar symmetry with the description of the Kyklopes already narrated at lines 136-146.

Passage 696-699 refers to the decisive moment of the Titanomachia, as it is at this point that Zeus himself uses violent force to usurp the former gods. The action of lines 696-699 signifies the transformation of the cosmos and symbolises a new generation of world order. In addition, passage 696-699 details another dimension within the cosmos, noted by the reference to Titan at line 687 followed by the term χθονίος, usually used for Tartaros.[222] Later line 697 contrasts the genealogy of the chthonic realm with the celestial realm (αἰθέρα δῖαν). The multiplicity of the chthonic order defined by the plural of χθονίοις is set against the singularity of the celestial order.[223]

Lines 697-717 illustrate how the text constantly focalises on the genealogical structure of all those created by Gaia and Ouranos. For example, at lines 677-678 all combatants display force that has a profound impact on the genealogical structure of the primordial realm (678-680). Similarly, the force used to describe Zeus in lines 688-689 affects primordial genealogy at lines 693-696. The categorisation of Zeus

---

[222] For our purpose, comments made by scholars for lines 696-699 are minor. For line 696 Goettling cites the suggestion of v_1 for ἄμφεσπε instead of ἀμφεπε; Rzach cites θέρμη of *F* for θερμός. Solmsen at line 697 cites αἰθέρα (δῖον) of Naber and also ἠέρα of oΣ and δῖαν of m$L^{\gamma\varepsilon}$. Finally, for line 698 Rzach suggests ἄσχετος instead of ἄπετος. In all instances, Rzach, Solmsen and Goettling provide no grammatical explanation for the alternatives, nor explain the potential consequences of the variable forms on the contextual relevance of line 696-699 (cf. their commentary for lines 696-699. Goettling, *Hesiodi*, Rzach, *Hesiodi*, and Solmsen, *op. cit.*)

As now expected, West supports the language of lines 696-699 with Homeric comparisons. For line 696 West cites *Iliad* 16.124, 18.348 and *Odyssey* 8.437 to qualify ἄμφετε, and also the Homeric hymn to Hermes 110 for θερμὸς ἀυτμὴ (cf. T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday and E.E. Sikes (eds.), *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936). For line 697, West argues that αἰθέρα is to be accepted as the suggested amendment of ἠέρα by Naber; on the grounds that ἀήρ in 'early epic always means mist, darkness, the stuff of invisibility, etc.; it is a substance with no fixed location, and not part of the world framework.' (Cf. Naber, *Mnemosyne*, (Lugduni Batavorum: Brill, 1855), p. 207 and West, *Theogony*, p. 351). West goes on to suggest that the error of ἠέρα 'may have been due to the Alexandrian dogma that ἀήρ means the lower atmosphere, and that the thunderbolts belong there'. For further reference to the 'atmosphere refer to Sch. A *Iliad* 14.288, Eust. 986.20, Hsch. s.v. and additional mention for the 'thunderbolts refer to Lucan 2.269-71, Serv. *Aen.* 8.454, Nonn. *D.* 14.406.

It is not until West comments on the epithet δῖαν that he confirms αἰθέρα as a formulaic form used in epic, as well as by the Presocratic philosopher Empedocles (109.2). Cf. also Cf. *Odyssey* 19.540, *Iliad* 16.365, *h.Dem.* 70. In support of West, we may agree that it is viable to suggest that the conceptual implications of ἀήρ - αἰθέρα had certainly evolved within philosophical circles by the time of the Alexandrian scholars. Hence, ἠέρα had been asserted on philosophical preconceptions and not based on the intentions of the *Theogony* itself.

compares with the some of the characteristic traits of the Titans.[224] These lines correspond to the genealogical conception of the explicit Kyklopes mentioned at lines 139-140.[225] Compatible genealogical characteristics connect the Kyklopes (139-140) and the Hundred Handers (147-153), and of Zeus at lines 690. The Kyklopes are describes at line 146 as 'strength and force and resource were upon their works' (ἰσχὺς δ' ἠδὲ βίη καὶ μηχαναὶ ἦσαν ἐπ' ἔργοις), and then at line 153 the Hundred Handers are described as 'and strength boundless and powerful was upon their mighty form' (ἰσχὺς δ' ἄπλητος κρατερὴ μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἴδει.).[226]

In connection with the points made above, Zeus at lines 689-693 embodies many of the attributes used to identify the Kyklopes and the Hundred Handers.[227] Although this may be the case, a fine line has to be drawn between similarities and sameness. Here we are not overtly suggesting that *all* those created from Gaia and Ouranos are one of the same characterisation, but more importantly each progeny bears compatible characteristic traits while remaining unique.

---

[223] This paradox is best understood by reflecting on a previous narrative at lines 687-696.

[224] Cf. lines 660-691 and 698-699.

[225] The actualisation of the Kyklopes receives no explicit narration, which is unusual, especially as the genesis of the other off spring of Gaia and Ouranos have received descriptive narrative.
Lines 139-140 identify explicitly the Kyklopes as both related to those referred to at lines 133-138 and the Hundred Handers of lines 147-153. All the offspring of lines 139-153 are then unanimously categorised at lines 154-156, and presumably later collectively conceived at lines 207-208 as *Titan children.*

[226] Also the use of the compound ο βριμόθυμον at line 140 is separated to define the Hundred Handers at line 148 (ὄβριμοι) and 661 (θυμῷ).

[227] There seems to be a total omission of a birth narrative for the Kyklopes in the *Theogony*. A possible reason why the genesis of the Kyklopes receives no account is that they are regarded as inherent attributes of Zeus. Therefore the actualisation of Zeus at lines 468ff presupposes the existence of the Kyklopes, as inferred by lines 706-710. It would be illogical to have provided a separate genealogical account of the actual genesis of the Kyklopes. But further still, the Kyklopes are a category of the celestial realm. Thus, they require no genesis detailing like those of the chthonic realm. The contrast of the genealogical account of the Hundred Handers and the Kyklopes defines them as cosmological polarities. Additionally, the genesis of each genealogy depends on ἔργον. The ἔργον of each generation is seen to surpass that of previous generations. Thereby, ἔργον becomes emblematic of genealogical and cosmological evolution. It was the evil deeds of Ouranos (166) that initiated the genesis of Titan (207) children (208), and the deeds (210) of those referred to at lines 207-208 generated a diverse nexus of chthonic cosmological phenomena (Styx and Hekate), that culminates in the generative ἔργον of Zeus (710, 820ff).

Lines 696-699 deviate though from the now expected genealogy narrative, and instead focus the cosmological fabula. The narrative informs us that cosmological transformations are formed on the assumed premise of a cyclical process of world existence; they are determined by the mutual responses of cosmological opposites.[228] Lines 696-699 see the celestial sphere respond against the generative powers of the chthonic realm.

It is not until line 717 and lines 713-721 that the reader sees a final (re)definition of the genealogical hierarchy of the gods, or at least so it seems. The Titanomachy is not the finale of the text's fabula. The reader will encounter an additional focalisation with the Typhoneus episode. Before the Typhoneus episode, however, lines 713-721 describe the final stages of the cosmological upheaval between all generated phenomena until this point. Lines 713-714 explicitly describe the function of the Hundred Handers who now are at the forefront of the fighting.

The narrative of lines 713-721 follows from the described effects of Zeus' supernatural characteristics. [229] Although Zeus is mentioned at line 708, his role is

---

[228] Cf. 676-683. The text inter-plays meteorological language to describe destructive elements. The narrative for the cosmological upheaval compares with the seasonal upheaval of winter, with its thunder, lightening and winds (706, cf. also 687) that purge Earth of its fertility. The supernatural (696-699) forces of Zeus (708) disable the reproductive forces of the chthonic realm in preparation for the (re)formed genealogy of the celestial realm to flourish. As suggested by the juxtaposition of χθονίους and αἰθέρα at line 697, attached respectively to τιτῆνες at the beginning of line 697 and δῖαν (698) .. ἀσπετος in line 698. In turn, the radiance of the celestial realm during the summer time after spring showers facilitates the (re)generative powers of the Earth. In both cosmological and meteorological terms, the seeds of production and destruction are sky-borne and the lower realm is merely subject to celestial will.
This meteorological aspect links to the cosmological function of the Kyklopes. The Kyklopes are a formation of 'celestial will'. The Kyklopes undergo a similar existence to the Titans, in that they are conceived by Gaia, ascend to celestial heights, and then are sent back to the chthonic realm. But, unlike the Titans, the Kyklopes' identity continues to resemble some of the physical attributes of Zeus.

[229] Although numerous comments by scholars have been made on the language of lines 713-721, for us such comments are of little contextual consequence. The linguistic alternatives still offer the crucial points.
Solmsen and West comment unanimously on line 713 by citing ἄρα ἐν of Π^{19}. If Π^{19} assertions are taken into consideration, the commentary by West and Solmsen for lines 714-715 concentrates on oral appreciation, and not fundamental to the characterisation of the Hundred Handers at line 714. (Rzach, *Hesiodi,* comments on line 714. Cf. στιβαρεων Π^{19}: στιβαρεῶν codd. Cf. also West, *Theogony*, p. 138,

detailed by the narrative provided for Kottos, Gyges and Briareos at line 714, and by the implied reference to the Kyklopes at line 715 and 719. The relevance of this seeming passive stance of Zeus compares with the physical activity of the Hundred Handers and the Titans, which are best understood in terms of genealogy and cosmology.

Indeed, lines 713-721 edify the genealogical framework of Ouranos and Gaia's progeny, noted by the mention of the Hundred Handers and the implicit reference to the Kyklopes. The implications of *why* the Kyklopes are 'implied' are stated by the contextual relevance of lines 713-721.

The reference to Titan at line 717 does not occur within a couplet ring composition, and has no appended line referring to τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ καὶ ὅσοι κρόνου

τ' ὀβριάρεως Hermann, *Hesiodi*, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1825): γύγης ΩΨ, γύης cod. Vatic. 1332). This said, the narrative of lines 714-715 is consistent with former references made at lines 617-618 and especially lines 149, 150 and 152.

However, conceptual implications rest on the variable possibilities for the preposition in line 718. Solmsen cites Π^{19} ἐν and ὑπὸ of S. The preposition ἐν is commonly interpreted as *in* and ὑπὸ as *under*. This questions whether the Titans are *in* or *under* the painful fetters. It is logical to say *in* and, therefore, also avoid the repetition of ὑπο at 717. Following on, there has been much controversial scholarly debate for the linguistic and, indeed, literary authenticity of lines 720-721. Rzach is sceptical of lines 720-721 and Goettling, supported by Mazon, reject totally lines 687-712, on the grounds of interpolation. (Cf. refer to the respective commentary on lines 687-720 in C. Goettling, *Hesiod* , A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina*, and P. Mazon, *Hesiode.* Hermann and L.Dindorf, *Hesiodi*, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1825) extend the interpolation claim to include also lines 720-819).

The exclusion of lines 687-712 and 720-819 would undermine the narrative flow of the *Theogony*, as it would omit the great moment where Zeus directly enters the conflict. Crucially, lines 687-712 explore the impact of *phrenes* (688) and the *force* (689) of Zeus' formation of world order (cf. 695-699). The fate of the Titans alluded to at line 697 (*chthonic Titans*) is realised at lines 717-718 and defined at lines 720-721, all as a result of the actions supported in lines 711-712.

Despite the apparent coherence of lines 687-712 that authenticates lines 720-819, we cannot dismiss West's claim of the 'clumsy' composition of lines 687-712 especially 711-712. To some extent lines 711-712 mark a 'clumsy' transition. But, as West appropriately argues, these are 'necessary in order to reconcile the routing of the Titans by Zeus, which Hesiod's convictions demanded (cf. 820) with the fact that the victory demanded on the assistance of the Hundred Handers.' (West, *Theogony*, p. 355).

However, West (*Theogony*, p.356) validates these questioned lines with Homeric parallels. West compares line 713 ἐνὶ πρώτοισι μάχην is with *Iliad* 9.709 ἐνὶ πρώτοισι μάχεσθαι, and the phrase ἄατος πολέμοιο at line 714 is cited also at *Iliad* 6.203, 13.746. The unique rhythm of νικήσαντες χερσίν is correlated with *Iliad* 1.388 ἠπείλησεν μῦθον, and finally line 720 is corresponded with *Iliad* 8.16 τόσσον ἐνερθ' Ἀίδεω, ὅσον οὐρανός ἔστ' ἀπὸ γαῖης.

Irrespective of the seeming compatibilities made between lines of the *Theogony* and the *Iliad*, it is debatable whether an audience is really expected to form such correlations; that is assuming it was the implied author's intention to unify (for example) the rhythm of line 719 with *Iliad* 1.388. Instead, it is

ἐξεγένοντο, as at lines 630 and 668 (τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ καὶ ὅσοι κρόνου), with only a slight variation at line 648 (ἐκγενόμεσθα) The conceptual implications of lines 630, 668 and 648 should now be assumed. Therefore, there is no need for repetition here.

The language of lines 715-716 refers to the physical violence of the Hundred Handers that parallels the violent force of Zeus at lines 690-692. In both cases, such force condemns aggressors into Tartaros (715-716, 690-692). The violent force of the Hundred Handers at line 719 reflects the characteristic traits of the Kyklopes at lines 139-140.[230]

Therefore, lines 713-721 refer to a diverse, though inter-related, genealogical framework. The genealogy of Zeus and the Kyklopes is implied, whereas that of the Hundred Handers is explicit. The identity of Titan at line 717 is in accordance with the interpretation of the doublet composition of lines 630, 648 and 668, in that it includes all conceived and actualised genealogies.

In addition, the explicit and implicit genealogical references are explained by the inter-relationship of the Titan characters. In order to explain this further, it is now necessary to re-assess the direct response of Kottos at lines 655-663 to Zeus' appeal at lines 643-653.

Direct speech is rare in the *Theogony*, and only applied at poignant moments in the action of the narrative. Here we shall slightly deviate in order to account why the *Theogony* suddenly uses direct speech, and especially consider why at lines 713-721.

---

more likely that the unusual metre of line 719 is to gravitate around the thematic poignancy of νικήσαντες by the physical force of allies of Zeus.

[230] Zeus is explicitly referred to at lines 141-143 and within the passage context of lines 690-692 (cf. 687), thus offering similarities between Zeus and the Kyklopes and the characterisation of the Titans in line 717.

According to A. Sinfield discourse is a 'negotiation of social power', and this type of negotiation can be found in the narrative of the *Theogony*.[231] Direct speech in the *Theogony* is delivered by either the superior hierarchy (ie. Gaia and Ouranos), or usurping powers and addressed notably to other key characters. For example, at *Theogony* 164-166 the cosmological matriarch Gaia directly appeals to '*my children*' to act against her cosmological equal Ouranos. Kronos directly responds to the appeal in lines 170-172. The fate of the *children* (164) is then supported by the indirect speech or curse of Ouranos at lines 207-210. The appeal of Gaia compares with the speech of Zeus at lines 644-653, the response of Kronos, with the direct speech of the Hundred Handers at lines 655-664.

Although the Hundred Handers are allies of Zeus, their independent speech responding to 655-664 conveys a potential threat to the future autonomy of Zeus. The threat of the Hundred Handers is comparable to that of Kronos. The provocation of the Hundred Handers to speak independently, thus breaking the oath of socially defined etiquette, determines their future fate. On this premise, the Hundred Handers are named explicitly at line 714, as those of line 717, will be suppressed within Tartaros by the cosmological hierarch. The explicit reference to the Hundred Handers and the implied reference to Zeus and the Kyklopes develop the diverse aspects of the Titans (717), which are polarised by chthonic and celestial characterisations.

Although the characteristics of Zeus are compatible with those of the Hundred Handers, Zeus represents the celestial order whereas the Hundred Handers belong to the chthonic and terrestrial realm. These polarities form part of the text's intention to account for a patriarchal cosmology. The Hundred Handers are the direct conception

[231] A. Sinfield, *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 35. Cf. R. B. Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A*

of matriarchal generative powers, and that is why they are mentioned explicitly at line 714, then in association with the cosmological definition of Tartaros at lines 720-721. Therefore, this passage does not add to the genealogy of the *Theogony*, but provides cosmological definition for those already created. Hence, there is reason to reject the exclusion of these lines, as proposed by Goettling and Mazon; conceptually, these lines form crucial development for the text's cosmology.

To reiterate, interaction between cosmological polarities, that is, between earth and sky, takes place in the intermediary terrestrial void. Those existing within the terrestrial realm reflect a negative and positive cosmological pull. Existence within the void is determined by the activities of the personified divine cosmological genealogies. In human terms, the terrestrial realm is a cosmological battlefield on which humankind fights for survival against the engaging powers of the celestial and chthonic realms. J. Assmann defines this type of conflict as 'negative cosmology' and 'negative anthropology', and in these terms the conflict between the Titans and non-Titans occur in an accessibly human context.[232]

The polar forces between the Titans and other combatants culminate initially with the momentary active withdrawal of the cosmological ruler (713-721).[233] At lines 713-721 the violent forces meet in the terrestrial void, and it is at that moment that Zeus withdraws from the forefront of the narrative. The implied presence of Zeus at lines 714-721 projects the destructive consequences of disorder, and also stresses the imperfections of existence. It is not until Zeus explicitly re-appears in the narrative that there is a sense of productive order within the terrestrial realm.

Dark Side to Perfection (London: Continuum 2002).

[232] J. Assmann, *Ma'at: Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im Alten Aëgypten* (Munich: Beck, 1990), esp. pp. 201-222.

[233] This is probably a dramatic device designed to extend the narrative tension of the conflict.

In relation to understanding the *Theogony's* fabula, the 'negative cosmology'- to use Assmann's phrase - is reflected by the withdrawal of Zeus, and the absence of explicit cosmological guidance results in a 'negative anthropology'. Conversely, the suggestion of a negative implies a positive. A 'positive cosmology' is the (re)establishment of the order of Zeus, and the 'positive anthropology' is the harmony created by the 'oath of allegiance' by humanity to the cosmological hierarchy. Therefore, humanity may flourish only through self-recognition of its genealogical position within the cosmological framework of existence, and the same oath applies to all the genealogies across the cosmological spectrum. Although all generated forms aspire to exceed their own cosmological status, the reality is that by the nature of chthonic genesis all such generated forms are set to decay. Therefore, Tartaros transforms into a cyclical paradox between generative, degenerative and regenerative aspect within Gaia.[234]

Distinction between celestial and chthonic realms is stressed at lines 720-721, as here Tartaros is given a defined cosmological function and cosmological location. Tartaros at line 720-721 has conceptually evolved from its first and brief mention at line 119, and now develops into a crucial aspect of the framework.[235] Therefore the defeated Titans are identified as the first inhabitants of Tartaros, which gives credibility to Tartaros as a realm actually present within the reality of existence.

The tautology of lines 720-721 describes the dichotomy between celestial and chthonic spheres. Therefore Goettling's dismissal of lines 720-721 should be rejected on textual grounds, as Tartaros provides cosmological distinctions between Earth and Sky with the intermediary void. Tartaros is the locale where 'present' existence is

[234] Tartaros is not a fourth dimension of the cosmological framework, but an inherent part of chthonic existence.

generated that, in turn, regenerates and degenerates into future existence.[236] This latter form of existence is more fully explored by the implications of line 729.

The final characterisation of the Titans in the Titanomachy appears at line 729. The fate foreshadowed at lines 207-210 is explicitly fulfilled by the exile of Titan into a place under the misty abyss at line 729.[237] However, the number of lines thought to be spurious at this point of the text threatens our appreciation of the text's fabula and meaning of the narrative focalisations. If all condemned lines were omitted then this would have profound impact on interpreting the significance of Tartaros (for example) and characterisation of the Titans.

---

[235] Formerly implied in the descriptive narrative of Styx and Hekate.

[236] Typhoneus is a good example of this (820ff).

[237] The issue of literary authenticity of the Tartaros narrative is a recurrent and contentious one among scholars. The questioning of the geometric account of Tartaros at lines 721-723a cited by Solmsen has resulted in dismissal of lines 729-733ff:

721 [τόσσον γάρ τ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα]
722 ἐννέα γὰρ νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα χάλκεος ἄκμων
723 οὐρανόθεν κατιὼν δεκάτῃ δ' ἐς γαῖαν ἵκοιτο.
723α [Ἶσον δ' αὖτ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα]

(Cf. 721-725 omnes et Π^{19}, 721-723 omnes Q, 722-725 omnes K and 723-724 omnes aS^{ac}).

Here we propose that, despite the linguistic ambiguities of passage 729-733, residue from the debate on 721-723a, a contextual focus for investigating lines 729-733 validates the contextual authenticity of lines 721-723a and lines preceding 733. The language of lines 729-733 develops the implications of the language of lines 721-723a, and is further developed within the narrative of Tartaros at lines 733ff. Solmsen cites scholia for each line from 729-733. Perhaps the most crucial citation is scholia *b* excerpt of δέ οί instead of θεοί. The rendition of δέ οί would demand reconsideration of 630, 648 and 668. But the validity of scholia *b*, and Solmsen's citation of it is questionable, especially as neither West nor Goettling or Rzach provides such comments for line 729. Instead, West qualifies θεοὶ τιτῆνες by reference to line 630, and ὑπὸ ζόφῳ ἠερόεντι with line 653, but provides no significant scholiastic concerns (West, *Theogony*, p. 361).

In reply to West, the linguistic comparison between lines 729 and 630 is the cosmological significance of τιτῆνες genealogy. Indeed, the omission of the particle τε at line 729 provides a comparison to interpret the τε at lines 630, 648 and 668. It then seems more likely that θεοίthan δέ οί appears at line 729. Incidentally, other scholia for line 729-733 are minor reflections. For line 730 βουλ]αισι of Π^{19} is cited together with Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἔκητι of Π^{19}K. There are similar minor alternatives for line 731 by Π^{19}ak that suggest π]ελώρη[ς against -οις by *u*.

The alternatives for ε σχατα at line 731 affect our understanding for the cosmological significance of Gaia. $\Pi^{19}\Pi^{30}a$ cite ἔσχατα, K suggests κεύθεσι and U.a.c. provide τεύχεσι. Again, West relies on Homeric comparison to qualify ἔσχατα. West cites for lines 731 χωρῳ ἐν εὐρώεντι at *Iliad* 2.783a noting the 'underworld as a place of physical decay' (p. 359; cf. *Op.* 153, *Od.* 10.513, *Il.* 20.65). West goes on to suggest that ἔσχατα should 'be taken adverbially', though more crucially ἔσχατα is 'supported by papyri' and 'by its conjection with εὐρώεντα in Orph. fr. 168.30 τάρταρα τ' εὐρώεντα καὶ ἔσχατα πείρατα γαίης'. Once again, I question that the validity of this line is offered by the text itself at line 622 with ἐπ' ἐσχατιῇ; and further, by the text's own cosmology. Cf. G. Némethy, *Egyetemes Philologai Közlöny* II (Berlin: Wiedmann, 1887), pp. 243ff.

Tartaros is of crucial cosmological importance in the narrative. Although Tartaros is described in physical terms, the language used for Tartaros expresses metaphysical phenomena within world existence. Even West offers a quasi-conceptual meaning for Tartaros.[238]

Although West considers most of the Tartaros narrative as authentic, the objections by other scholars should not go unnoticed. Goettling's explicit objections begin at his commentary for line 720, 'longe diversa est Hesiodi Tartari descriptio ab Homerica in *Iliad* VIII.16ff'. For Goettling the length of a passage measures its credibility. Goettling substantiates his objections by citing rejections of Par.F (n. 2776) for lines 722-725, and gives reference to Dindorfius' claim that lines 726-819 'octo diversa carmina diversorum actorum sibi agnosse visus et L. Dindorfius (i) 720-735, 830, 821; (ii) 725, 740-745; (iii) 725, 736-739 (807-810)'.[239] In light of these profound objections, one might expect either Rzach or West to here expressed similar concerns. Although West's commentary is more detailed than that of Rzach, the objections made are citations of other scholars and are not necessarily subjective statements.

The concerns of Goettling will here be addressed by assessing the authenticity of the Tartaros episode as it appears in the text, and by reflecting on how it relates to the text's cosmology. The cosmology of lines 729-733 systematically describe Tartaros: its atmosphere as a misty abyss, its nature as a locale of inescapable (732) decay (731), its cosmological position at the extremity of the vast earth (731), and its

---

[238] West, *Theogony*, p. 358, suggests that 'the underworld that emerges from Hesiod's account is not one of which one can draw a map. Maps and models of the world were unknown to the Greeks of his time, and cosmology was not bound by the realities of geometric space'.
In a sense, it is irrelevant whether the Greeks at the time of a historical Hesiod conceived of *cartography*, what is relevant is that the implied author provides a non-geometric cosmology, and that Tartaros is a cognate of world formation.

[239] Goettling, *Hesiodi*, ap.720.

physical attributes, for example, of brazen doors (732) and walls on each side (733). Lines 729 and 730 contrast the two fundamental concepts, that is, the cosmological position and physical fate of the Titans who are now in the chthonic realm (729), on the one hand, and the metaphysical reality of the celestial existence of Zeus, on the other.

The contextual relevance of line 729 and 730 with its comparison of cosmological extremes qualifies its graphic narrative of Tartaros at lines 733-819. The cosmological polarities between the chthonic and the celestial realm are emphasised repeatedly by their geometric distance.[240] The distance between the surface of the earth and Tartaros is known as the chasm, which is the dwelling place of other chthonic realities, namely, namely Styx and Hekate.

Beginning with line 729, the expressions ἔνθα or ἔνθα δὲ delineate aspects of Tartaros. The interchangeable use of ἔνθα and ἔνθα δὲ describes the newly appointed existence of the Titans in the chthonic realm.[241]

In the narrative sub-focalisation of lines 720-819, there is a thematic sub-layer: the twofold reference to the Hundred Handers at lines 713-715 and, in a reiteration, at lines 815ff which refers to cosmological formation. For example, the identification at line 728 to the roots of the Earth, Sea and Sky is conceptually endorsed at lines 807-

[240] Cf. 814, 740 also 727.

[241] The chthonic passages referring to the Titans descent are as follows:

729	720-728	Introduction to Titan confinement
	729-735	Confinement of Titans in Tartaros
736	736-743	Description of the beginning and end of the world
758	746-757	Interlude references to Atlas the other son of Iapetos
	758-766	Reference to Sleep and Death
767	767-773	Reference to Hades and Kerberos
775	775-806	Reference to Styx
807	807-819	
811		Reiteration of the beginning and end of the world

810. Here we have another reference to the tripartite universe (Earth, Sea and Sky), and the compounded importance of Tartaros within the tripartite schema.[242]

The physical confines of Titan – in cosmological terms – refer to humankind. These explain what is repeated in lines 736-739 and 807-810. There are ultimately no good grounds to reject lines 736-739, as occurs in Π^{28}; these lines expound the conceptual implications of line 728, to which they are inextricably linked. West offers further grounds for their credibility:

> 'in a sense the sentence corresponds to and elaborates 728; the roots are now described as πηγαὶ καὶ πείρατα, that is, where the constituent parts of the visible world spring up ...'.[243]

Although West argues in principle that repetition is 'un-Hesiodic', I propose that the repetition of 807-810 should not be regarded as an interpolation. Rather these lines re-affirm the cosmological confinement of Titan/humanity in relation to the conceptual developments already at play in lines 729, 736, 758, 767 and 775. Lines 807-810 reiterate the notion of a three-tiered universe in which the root origin and cosmological significance of Tartaros form an important category of its detail. The world is formed by polar extremes, and the position of such polar extremes is expressed poetically by the juxtaposition of the earth at 807 with sky at 808 bound within Pontos.

The consistent referencing to the physical cosmological framework at lines 720ff, 736-739 and 807-810 is related directly to explicit references to the Titans at lines 729 and 814. Both lines 729 and 814 describe the final cosmological position of

[242] Reference to Tartaros at lines 720-728 reflects the physical cosmological confines (cf. 729), and also the metaphysical confines of Titans by a cosmological hierarchy (730). The metaphysical restraint described at lines 729-730 is an objective reflection on the fate of humanity. Line 730 develops the notion of a metaphysical cosmological reality through the personification of Zeus.
[243] West, *Theogony*, p. 364.

Titan and the completion of their cycle of existence condemned by Ouranos (207-210) and fulfilled by Zeus (730 and 820).

The references to Styx, Eris and Neikos between lines 775-806 alludes back, respectively, to the previous references to Nux's genealogy, in addition to Eris at lines 211-232, and most notably of Styx at lines 389-403. Although there is no chronological logic between lines 775-806 with 211-232 and 389-403, there is a conceptual logic that conveys textual continuity. Nux is a time of devious design that leads to the *eris* and *neikos* (782) resulting in destruction (θανάτος 759, 756).[244] Then the status of Styx referred to in lines 389-403 is re-affirmed at lines 775-806.[245]

The hardship of chthonic endorsements is emphasised by aspects attributed to Sleep and Death in lines 758-766, and to Hades and Kerberos in lines 767-773. Hades and Kerberos are emblematic of decay and devouring aspects of degeneration. The guardianship of Kerberos at the gates of Hades reflects, like the guardianship of the Hundred Handers at Tartaros, the inescapable necessity of degeneration, decay and destruction. Although these aspects interpret as those related to negative *death*, degeneration, decay and destruction in fact enable a process of (re)generation.[246]

Paradoxically, the narrative reality of chthonic authority mentioned at lines 775-806 is a direct response to the curse of Ouranos at lines 207-210. The retribution foreshadowed at line 210 has now been fulfilled, and Hades and Kerberos, like Tartaros, are used metaphorically to contain the negative aspects of genealogical retribution and upheaval.

---

[244] Cf. the use of "Υπνος 756, 759.

[245] The power of Styx and her associates is a source of fear for all humanity, which entails a total and prolonged separation from celestial harmony (790). Chthonic justice reflects the cyclical hardship of existence ordained at lines 207-210.

[246] As exemplified later by the genesis of Typhoneus at line 821.

Initial difficulty rests with the conceptual relevance of lines 746-757, and especially its significance of the phrase 'son of Iapetos' ("Ιαπετοίο παίς) at line 746. But it becomes clear that line 746 is to be understood by an earlier narrative within the text. On reflection, the implications of this phrase conceptually develop the cosmological and genealogical conflict of the children of Iapetos against Zeus at lines 507-511. At the same time, this line (746) offers an alternative reference to the children of Iapetos, denoting the status and characteristics of humankind within the cosmological schema. Humankind resides in the void between Earth and Sky as maintained by Atlas (517-519).

Attempts made by humankind to transcend their allocated genealogical position evoke the wrath of Zeus. The punishment of Menoitios and Prometheus by Zeus is symbolic of the treatment they have threatened to carry out against humankind who attempts to surpass the cosmological hierarchy. Menoitios is sent into the dark abyss (514-515) because of his wickedness (516) and overpowering strength (516), attributes which resemble those cursed by Ouranos at lines 207-210. Therefore, the attributes of Menoitios are compatible with the Titans of line 207.[247]

In a similar manner, Prometheus resonates with Titan characteristics.[248] The intellectual excellence of Prometheus compares with the initial trickery of Kronos against Ouranos (550). But, unlike Ouranos, Zeus recognises the crafty mind of Prometheus (550). A further connection is the 'bound' fate of Prometheus (520-522) to the imprisonment of the Titans mentioned in lines 729-733. The distinct difference between Prometheus and the Titans of lines 729-733 is the former's 'release from the fetters' (528). The reason for such different punishments is that Prometheus and the

[247] Cf. lines 514-516.

Titans of lines 729-733 represent different types of cosmological threat.[249] On the one hand, Prometheus does not intend to usurp Zeus, but hopes to ease the hardships of humankind introduced by Epimetheas (513-514). By contrast, Kronos tries to attain cosmological supremacy.[250]

One of the obvious reasons for the imprisonment of the Titans (729) is that the curse of 207-210 has determined such an outcome. Moreover, were the Titans to have remained active in the narrative as a main focalisation, then their explicit presence in the text would have undermined the significance of the Typhoneus episode. Furthermore, the usurpation of '*former gods*' by a new generation of gods, as noted by the mention of Poseidon at 732, would account for genealogical progression.[251]

The closing cadences of the 'Titanomachy' episode appear at lines 811-814. At line 814 some of the Titans are located in the dark abyss of Tartaros (807). Lines 811-814 appear after passage 807-810, and thus reiterate the previous explicit Titan characterisation of lines 736-739. This repetition of 736-739 in 807-810 may be explained since it is apparent that each passage has different impact on our understanding for 'Titan'. Lines 736-739 introduce the descriptive narrative of Tartaros, whereas lines 807-810 reflect the closing cadences of the determined fate of Titan existence formerly introduced at lines 207-210.

In terms of its description for terrestrial geography, lines 811-814 re-affirms the existence of a chthonic abyss, and does so by contrasting the locale of Tartaros

---

[248] It is this association with Prometheus that the reader is able to identify human experiences with those of the Titans.

[249] Cf. lines 550-552, 526-528 and 529-532.

[250] Cf. lines 550, also 520-522, 527-528 and 513-514.

[251] On another level, line 729 is a subtext referring to humankind. Moreover, Θεοί Τιτῆνες of line 729 functions as an analogy for humankind. The anthropological implications of line 729 become apparent within the subsequent descriptive narrative of Tartaros. The fate of the θεοὶ Τιτῆνες corresponds to the eventual fate of each individual member of humankind.

(807) with the polar extremes of Earth (807) and Sky (808).[252] In addition, lines 811-814 are a reminder of the allocated cosmological position of each generated phenomenon (814). Although line 812 (for example) uses geometric language, the roots (ῥιζῃσι) may not be spatially determined, but instead provide a visual metaphor for the active complexities of metaphysical realities. This conceptual reality of metaphysical phenomena is encapsulated by αὐτοφυής at line 813. These metaphysical confines are developed further within the same line (813), whereby the metaphysical reality of 'gods' shudder at the thought of the cosmological implications of Tartaros (810). The use of στυγέουσι at line 810 is not without implications on interpretation, especially as it is followed by the phrase ἀργαλέ' εὑρώεντα. This line alludes to the enforcement of a metaphysical order (400-401) imposed by Styx (396-399) and endorsed by Zeus (399). Line 810 reaffirms the existence of an ordered cosmological framework by which each actualised phenomenon has an allocated function and position (399ff).[253]

---

[252] But lines 807-810 do present problems in interpretation. The repetition of 807-810 and 736-739 has led scholars to question the authenticity of the 'so-called' Tartaros episode. Goettling comments on lines 807-810 as 'hos versus non ab Hesiodo profectos esse putamus' (Goettling, *Hesiodi,* ap. 807-810). Thereby, Goettling assumes not only an identifiable Hesiod and Hesiodic diction, but also a quasi-historical assumption of a specified interpolator.
Solmsen cites for lines 807-810 the 'seclusit Guyet' - though himself goes as far as line 819, and Rzach refers to the 'seclusit Wolf' of lines 807-810. Further to this, Solmsen in his commentary supports the questionable relevance of lines 807-810 by citing ancient scholia, and for example, at line 811 χάλ]κεος is qualified by $\Pi^5 a$S. It is debatable whether such qualifications are required, especially if the language of line 811 is compared with the language and contextual relevance of line 736. West attempts to qualify the literary relevance of lines 811-814 with Iliadic comparisons. Notably, line 811 seems to correspond to the language of *Iliad* 8.15 ἔνθα σιδήρειαί τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδός. Similarly, line 812 ῥιζῆσι διηνεκέεσσιν ἀρηρώς is correlated with *Iliad* 12.134 ῥιζῃσιν μεγάλῃσι διηνεκέεσσ' ἀραρυῖαι. Cf. West, *Theogony*, p. 378 for line 813 αὐτοφυής notes it as 'natural' and not a 'manufactured attribute', and πέρην χάεος of line 814 as a 'reminder of the remoteness of all these regions'. But beyond these observations lines 813-814 receive limited attention.
But lines 811-814 and its contextual relevance in the internal narrative schema of the text has not been appreciated by the commentaries. The relevance of line 811-814 is profoundly significant for understanding the fabula of the *Theogony*. Indeed, the thematic relevance of lines 811-814 supports the contextual importance of lines 736-739 and 807-810. Therefore, lines 736-739 and 807-810 provide conceptual continuity for the fulfillment of the curse of 207-210 at lines 811-814.
[253] Cf. also 814.

Although *chaos* of line 814 is described in geometric terms, and that the 'gloomy abyss' may be found at the far-side of the chasm (πέρην χάεος ζοφεροῖο), once again it offers an allusion to primordial reality. *Chaos* of line 814 could be alluding to Χάος of line 116, which was referred to in connection with Tartaros (119) in juxtaposition to the polar extremes of Earth (117) and Sky (127). Therefore, the functional primeval elements of lines 116-127 are given relevance in 'world formation' narrative of the Tartaros episode (814).

In addition, lines 811-814 reaffirm the concept of cyclical 'cosmological' time formerly narrated at lines 790-792 and 802-804. These lines emphasise the metaphoric difference between chthonic (cf. 787) and celestial (793-794) reality. Furthermore, these lines expound the notion that the remoteness of chthonic existence (775-776) in isolation from celestial bliss.[254] The divergent use of language to describe Titan confinement (732, 811-814) expounds the fearful characteristics of primeval existence.

3) **Typhomachy**

The Typhoneus episode provides the reader not only with another genealogical conflict (this time between two characters Zeus and Typhoneus), but also the final stages of the characterisation of the Titans at lines 820, 851 and 882.[255] The mention of the Titans at these lines does not directly influence the conflict between the two

[254] The juxtaposition of the fluidity of chthonic existence with the static existence of the celestial realm may be seen at lines 399ff.

[255] Scholars such as Wilamowitz have rejected the Typhonmachy as an interpolation on the grounds of repetition, ie: the Titanomachy episode. West is likewise dubious of the Typhomachia's authenticity as it bears too great a resemblance to the Titanomachy. The argument of these scholars is that it seems peculiar for Hesiod to describe two battle scenes of a comparative nature in a single narrative. Here

main interlocutors Zeus and Typhoneus. Instead the Titan references introduce and close the Typhomachia scene. Here, then, we ought to ask: in what ways do the Titan characters at lines 820, 851 and 882 contribute to the text's fabula within the Typhoneus focalisation? More crucially, the Typhoneus episode and the explicit references to Titan in these lines reflect decisive aspects of the cosmological and genealogical thesis of the *Theogony*.

In considering the 'themes' of the Typhoneus episode and the relevance of the Titan references, we should not ignore the weight of scholarly objections to the authenticity of the Typhoneus episode. In his commentary, Gruppe questions the authenticity of the entirety of lines 820-880, claiming that it is an interpolation of a separate hymn within the Homeric cycle.[256] Similarly, Kirk rejects lines 820-880 as this is only instance in the *Theogony* of a personified Tartaros.[257] A. Meyer, whose earlier argument could be used to support Gruppe and Kirk, compares the Typhoneus episode with the Titanomachy.[258] For him, lines 820-852 correspond to lines 664-677 that describe the combatants, 839-852 and 678-686 describe the conflict, 853-854, at 687-692 Zeus reveals his power, 855-867 and 693-717 note the defeat of the enemy, while 868 and 717-731 refer to the confinement of the enemy in Tartaros.

---

though, we could counter argue that the Tyhomachy and the Titanomachy both offer an important contribution to the text's fabula.

[256] Cf. G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary, volume I books 1-4* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) where he describes the cultural evolution of oral poetry and concludes that 'Writing had spread too far by the early years of the seventh century B.C. for the creative oral genius to flourish much longer. One result was the derivative Cyclic poems and Homeric Hymns, even the earliest and best of which show signs of self-conscious and laboured imitation of the oral style' (p. 16). Therefore, Kirk argues that the transmission of oral poetry from the 8th Century changed, and this became 'the period in which conditions were at their best for the production of monumental oral epic' (p. 16). The composition of poems from this period are know as the Homeric Cycle, these poems did not necessarily describe battles of heroic warriors, but more often were composed in praise of the gods (for example, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, though here this hymn has been associated with the *Eleusinian Mysteries* and the development of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 8th century. In summary the phrase 'Homeric Cycle' is a label applied by scholars for a group of poems thought to have been composed at a given time.

[257] G. S. Kirk, *Entretiens sur l'antiquite classique* vii, p. 79.

[258] Cf. A. Meyer, *De compositione Theogoniae Hesiodeae.*

Although Meyer's thesis suggests the thematic relevance of the 'actions' within the broader context of conflict narratives, he offers no consideration of the 'concepts' embedded within such narratives, for example, by taking into account the *Theogony's* fabula and use of focalisations (and sub-focalisations) to explore aspects of the fabula. Nevertheless, the principle method of Meyer may be redefined and applied to the 'thematic concepts' of the Typhoneus episode and to how it relates to other episodes within the text.

This point puts us in a position to turn our attention to the narrative sequence of the Typhomachy, in order to assess the extent to which this episode is integral to the *Theogony* as a whole. Outlined below is the sequence of the main events which take place during the Typhomachy passage:

820-838	Genealogy and genealogical inheritance of Typhoneus.
839-852	Cosmology: The impact of Titan Typhoneus.
853-868	Counter response of Zeus.
869-880	Genealogy: Generative impact of Titan Typhoneus.
881-885	Cosmology: Acceptance of Gaia and Ascension of Zeus.
886-894	Final confirmation of the Cosmological and Genealogical supremacy of Zeus: Marriage to Metis.

Line 820 marks the descent of some Titan children into Tartaros, a locale deep within the realm of Gaia.[259] The descent of these children facilitates the creation of Typhoneus at line 821.[260]

[259]Although this discussion will focus on the thematic relevance of explicit Titan references, there are a few minor linguistic points to cite for line 820. According to West scholia bS cite ἀπ' whereas *ak* cite ἐξ. In agreement with West's thesis, the preposition ἐξ seems illogical as the Titans have already departed from the sky by their descent from Mount Othrys. Although, the Titans no longer reside within the realms associated with Ouranos, they still dwell beneath the sky upon the fighting plains. It is not until line 820 that the Titans are separated totally from Ouranos and, therefore, ἀπ' is contextually the appropriate presposition. Cf. For a compatible reference to line 820, see *Works and Days* 111.

Another paradox is Aphrodite's contribution to the ascension of Zeus. Although Aphrodite assists Gaia's creation of Typhoneus, she actually threatens matriarchal authority. The defeat of Typhoneus leads to the chthonic realm's final submission to the celestial hierarchy (881). It remains that Aphrodite actualises the curse of Ouranos of lines 207-210; therefore, the final explicit reference to Titan at line 882 confirms the definite fate of the Titans pre-determined by their introduction at line 207.

The context of line 851 describes the cosmological conflict between Zeus and Typhoneus. The conflict (*agon*) between Typhoneus and Zeus is a metaphor for the cosmological distinction between earth and sky, or rather for terrestrial and celestial cosmological realities.[261] As with line 820, line 851 details a genealogy and cosmology. Line 851 determines the cosmological significance of former, present and future genealogies both mortal and immortal. Here a clear distinction is drawn between the genealogy of the chthonic realm and the celestial realm. Line 882 confirms the ascension of Zeus as the cosmological ruler. It is at this point that Tartaros is again de-personified as an inner aspect of Gaia. The surrounding narrative to line 882 signifies the final submission of the chthonic realm to celestial authority.

From this brief contextual synopsis, it would be hubris to dismiss the Typhoneus as irrelevant to the text's narrative structure. On the contrary, the

---

[260] Although, the nature of Typhoneus is mentioned in context with the genealogy of Echnida at line 306, it is not until line 821 that the genesis of Typhoneus is made explicit. It would have been a narrative disaster for the Titan conflict and the emergence of Typhoneus to have taken place simultaneously. It seems that one major character in the *Theogony* often displaces and/or replaces another leading character. Here, Typhoneus is created through Aphrodite's influence on Gaia and Tartaros. Here Aphrodite plays a paradoxical role in the genealogical-cosmological conflicts. Aphrodite, a by-product of the castration of Ouranos, facilitates the actualisation of a cosmological threat. Therefore, she is an embodiment of the causes and consequences of genealogical and ultimately cosmological upheaval.

[261] Typhoneus is emblematic of the inner nature of Gaia and Zeus the inner nature of Ouranos.

Typhoneus forms the pivotal point of the *Theogony's* fabula, and it is this latter aspect that will shape the remaining part of this chapter.

As already stated, Typhoneus is produced (τέκε) by Gaia (821) and Tartaros (822).[262] The personification of *Tartaros* at line 822 compares with the temporary existence of the Titans and their experiences.[263] In addition the personification of Tartaros reflects the notion that, despite physical defeat, the characterizations offered for the Titans correspond to those found in later generations of offspring. It could be asserted that the Titans' descent into the underworld leads to a personification of Tartaros that enables this animated entity to procreate, resulting in the birth of Typhoneus.

More fundamental to the text's fabula is that the genesis of Typhoneus signifies and embodies the conflict between two cosmological polarities, Gaia and Ouranos. Thus the initial premise of the Typhoneus episode is as follows: each genealogy originating from the primordial hierarchy has a profound impact on cosmological formation. As a means to explore the *Theogony's* cosmological fabula, the Typhoneus episode sees the finale of the narrative fabula with the establishment and consolidation of the cosmological order, as all genealogical threats are finally suppressed.

The attributes of Typhoneus closely compare with other creation narratives in the *Theogony*. Parallels for Typhoneus are especially evident with the descriptions for Kronos which originate from his conception at line 132.[264] There are further allusions

---

[262] The use of the verb τίκτω, as with line 207, signifies the temporal and transient existence of Typhoneus. This verb had formerly been used to detail the Titan children.

[263] Suggested by line 820 which alludes explicitly to the descent of the Titans (cf. 807 with 814).

[264] For example, the term *hoplotatos* at line 821 was used initially for Kronos at line 138. Although *Hoplotatos* will be discussed more fully in the subsequent section on mental inheritance, it is worthy here to note the physical implications. Instead, ὁπλοτατον is a compound of ὁπλον - meaning weapon, and the ending -τατός could mean something *stretched.* If this is so, then ὁπλοτατον does not refer to

made between the Hundred Handers and Typhoneus.[265] In addition characteristic traits for Typhoneus can also be sought from the narrative provided for the Kyklopes and other chthonic inhabitants of Tartaros.[266]

---

other siblings - as there are none - but instead to comparative attributes with other generated forms. The use of ὁπλοτατον here expresses cosmological violence through the medium of genealogy. The creation myth of Typhoneus provides a crucial way of understanding the cosmological fabula. At the same time, ὁπλοτατον develops the evolution of genealogical violence. Typhoneus embodies incredible similarities, especially the physical attributes, of former progeny.

[265] The physical characteristics described in the birth narrative of Typhoneus at lines 820-835 correspond to those of the Hundred Handers at lines 150-152 and Kronos at lines 178-179. Lines 150-152 foreshadow physical creation, whereas lines 178-179 define the *actualised* reality of physical nature. Lines 823-825 take us a step further, as here Typhoneus physically embodies the characteristics of extreme violence described in the birth narrative of all former generations.

The physical similarities between the Hundred Handers and Typhoneus are explicitly emphasised by the language parallels between lines 150-152 and 824-825. In both instances, formidable physical power stems from the shoulders and head. The significant use of arms/hands (χεῖρες) at line 823 in context with the use of 'out of his shoulders came a hundred fearsome snake-heads' (ὠμων, ἑκατον κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος and δεινοῖο 824) alludes directly to 'a hundred arms sprung from their shoulders' (χεῖρες ἀπ' ὤμων ἀίσσοντο 150) and 'fifty heads grew from [each shoulder]' (κεφαλαὶ δὲ ἑκαστῳ πεντήκοντα 151, ἐκ ὤμων ἐπεφυκον 152), all summarised by '[those were the] most fearsome of children [to Ouranos and Gaia]' (δεινότατοι παίδων 155). The parallels between lines 824-825 and 150-152 relate directly to the violence of Kronos at line 178.

Each correlation sees an evolution in violence. The violence of Kronos at line 178 brought about the curse of 207-210 that resulted in subsequent genealogical conflicts. Following on, it was during the so-called *Titanomachia* that the Hundred Handers poignantly utilised the physical power of their hands (649) in a manner similar to Kronos (178), and this display of physical strength is poignantly used by Typhoneus against Zeus (823).

[266] Typhoneus also inherits genetic physical monstrous traits compatible with the Kyklopes narrated at lines 139-143 and 144-145. Furthermore, lines 824-828 and 854-856 link up with the violent attributes of the combatants of the Titanomachia of lines 670-673.

To summarise, cosmological necessity sees the birth of the Hundred Handers and the Kyklopes. At line 669 Zeus brings the Hundred Handers into the light to fight against the (other) Titans. Then in another instance, the Kyklopes - conceived at line141, were used by Zeus at 853. Paradoxically, the violence used against Zeus by Typhoneus is that which helped him in former conflicts. Therefore, the Typhomachy is an encounter of genealogical comparatives struggling for ultimate cosmological supremacy. Zeus and Typhoneus are signifiers of cosmological violence, poignantly noted at lines 674-677 with the juxtaposition of two explicit Titan references which notes to the initiators of the genealogical upheaval.

After all, Typhoneus is a progeny of the chthonic abyss. The narrative for the Khimaira at lines 319-324 assists our understanding for the genealogical attributes of Titan found in Typhoneus at lines 824-828. Compare line 319 with lines 827, 320 with 824, 321 with 825 and 828, 322 with 828, 323 with 825, and 324 with 828. There are strong language parallels between these lines to describe the attributes of each monstrous hybrid). Moreover, Typhoneus as Titan is only fully appreciated within context of other genealogies (i.e. 333-335).

The physical characteristics of Typhoneus, namely sights and sounds, are differentiated systematically by the term ἄλλοτε, (829-835) which corresponds stylistically to ἔνθα, ἔνθα δὲ used to delineate characteristics present within Tartaros. Cf. 729,736,758, 767, 775, 807 and 811. The stylistic compatibility between the Typhoneus and Tartaros narrative tends to qualify the authenticity of both episodes within the narrative schema of the *Theogony*. Tartaros at lines 729ff is a de-personalised locale, whereas at lines 821ff is a personified antecedent of Typhoneus.

Furthermore, the genesis of Typhoneus is supported by former genealogical accounts, such as Styx (389ff), Hekate (404ff), Phorkys and Keto (270ff), and especially the genealogy of Nux (211ff; esp. 743-745).

Further issues in narrative composition are raised from the creation passage of Typhoneus, such as the compatible language and motifs used to describe Kronos and his influence on genealogical development which are alluded to in the Typhoneus narrative. In this instance the language of conflict used to formerly describe Kronos' violence again Ouranos, picked up again in the Titanomachy, is now being deployed in the struggle between Zeus and Typhoneus. The weave of the *Theogony's* narrative structure has been achieved by the continuous thread of Kronos' separation of Gaia and Ouranos, and how this separation has shaped all of the *Theogony's* genealogical accounts.

The language associated with creation, such as φιλοτῆτι (822) and ὁπλοτατον (821), incorporate attributes such as θύμος (833) and δεινοί (825ff and 306-307, 333-334). Physical creation embodies the conceptual implications of generational violence. Indeed, the terms *philotete* (822), *hoplotatos* (821), θύμος (833) and δεινοί are not unique within the Typhoneus narrative; they are consistently referred to in genealogy and conflict narratives throughout the *Theogony*. The concept of 'love' carries with it an inherent violent nature of hate and separation (177, 164 and 165). The characteristics of generational conflict present in generated offspring have a profound impact in forming the physical and metaphysical framework for world existence.[267]

The initial term ἔνθα in line 729 locates the Titans in Tartaros and opens up to the first genealogical reference to Typhoneus. Then the successive occurrences of ἄλλοτε in lines 830, 831, 833, 834 and 835 compare with the ἔνθα, ἔνθα δέ references to Atlas, Night and Day at lines 746-757, Sleep and Death at lines 758-766, Hades and Kerberos at lines 767-773 and Styx at lines 775-806. All these genealogies, like Typhoneus, are firmly separated from Ouranos deep within Tartaros (cf. 761). The mental and physical violence of separation actualised by Kronos has clearly permeated within the formation of consequential genealogies.

[267] The principle passages for these motifs of creation are cited below in italics, and the genealogical mentality motifs are cited in bold:

306 *μιγήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι*
307 **εινόν θ' ὑβριστήν τ'**

333 *φιλότητι μιγεῖσα*
334 γείνατο **δεινὸν** ὄφιν,

The lines cited here suggest also a recurrent pattern in the use of specific verbs of 'creation' with specific mental characteristics, associated with the terms ὁπλότατος and θύμος.

Θύμος appears in connection with described violence of usurping generations. 'Οπλότατος delineates the protagonists, whereas subservient agitators are merely noted by the term θύμος. The references below list the main protagonists and subordinate agitators in the *Theogony*:

ὁπλότατος - the protagonists

Typhoneus	821	ὁπλότατον τέκε παῖδα Τυφωέα Γαῖα πελώρη
Kronos	137	τοὺς δὲ μεθ' ὁπλότατος γένετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης
Zeus	478	ὁππότ' ἄρ' ὁπλότατον παίδων ἧμελλε τεκέσθαι
	479	Ζῆνα μέγαν

Θύμος

Typhoneus	833	ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε λέοντος ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντος
Zeus	476	ἄμφὶ κρονῳ βασιλῆι καὶ υἱέι καρτεροθύμῳ

The agitators

Hundred	661	τῷ καὶ νῦν ἀτενεῖ τε νόῳ καὶ πρόφρονι θυμῷ

---

821 **ὁπλότατον** τέκε παῖδα
822 *φιλότητι*

833 ἀναιδέα **θυμὸν** *ἔχοντος*

825 ἧν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος **δεινοῖο** δράκοντος
177 *φιλότητος* ἐπέσχετο,

164 παῖδες ἐμοὶ καὶ πατρὸς **ἀτασθάλου**,
165 πατρός κε **κακὴν** τεισαίμεθα λώβην

Handers

Kyklopes 140 Βρόντην τε Στερόπην τε καὶ 'Αργην ὀβριμόθυμον

At line 821 Typhoneus is referred to as *hoplotatos*. The significance of line 821 is brought to bear in comparing with line 137. Line 137 designates the nature of Kronos, and his chthonic relation with Gaia. Kronos is generated from the inner nature of Gaia and, as stated at line 820, Tartaros is the inner nature of Gaia (841). From the textual moment of line 137, each generation presents another threat to celestial authority. In the instance of line 821, Gaia has produced the ultimate embodiment of her inner nature in the form of Typhoneus (841). Typhoneus is the newest and, indeed, most threatening weapon produced against the celestial realm which Gaia conceives as the suppressive authority.

Line 137 summarises the devious intent of Gaia by the actualisation of κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης - crafty-minded Kronos. Although ἀγκυλομήτης is an epithet for Kronos, the compatible language and context of line 137 and 821 presuppose this to be a psychological characteristic in Typhoneus, and previously at line 476 for Zeus. The internal dynamics of usurping powers is controlled by the desire to assert their own genealogy to cosmological supremacy (837-838).[268] Such a pursuit is deemed as either rational (828 νόησε) or irrational (836 ἔπλετο and 461 τὰ φρονέων). The desire for cosmological autonomy motivates deed(s) (836 and 210 ἔργον) of generative violence (475-476); and lines 836-838 consolidate the mental desire for cosmological supremacy that brings about another sequel to generative violence. Despite numerous attempts for cosmological supremacy, it is the destiny of Zeus (456 μητιόεντα) to become the 'father of gods and men' (θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν 457). It is for this

[268] Cf. lines 468-469, 462.

reason that the generative attempts of Gaia are doomed to fail, as celestial authority is predestined to overshadow Gaia.

The idea of generative violence is a consistent theme in the *Theogony*, and it has significant implications on our understanding of the psychology of the text's leading characters. Generative violence is influenced also by the mental implications of δεῖνος. Δεῖνος is used to describe the mentality of antagonists directly related to the chthonic realm, especially those related to Gaia (155, of Kronos 138, of Typhoneus 825, and also 307, 333). A reason why the term is not documented for Zeus is that his violence is not so much irrational, but it provides a rationale for cosmological necessity. For example, lines 839-849 narrate the irrationality of Typhoneus' violence in contrast with the rational response of Zeus at lines 853-868.

But the violence of Typhoneus has incredible repercussions on cosmological stability. The impact of such violence by Typhoneus is compatible with that felt during the (so-called) Titanomachia at lines 677-686. The connection between passages 839-849 and 677-686 is a cosmological theory of a personified tripartite division of the world shaped by earth (839 = 679), sky (840 = 679) and sea (841 = 679). Gaia represents the terrestrial sphere, Ouranos the celestial sphere, and Pontos forms the connective boundary between the celestial and terrestrial realms. In geological terms, these primordial elements represent dryness, vapour and moisture. The first three lines of passage 839-849 refer successively to each separate division of the world, and expand the cosmological theory that could have been easily ignored by the audience at line 679.

In addition, passages 839-849 and 677-686 both refer to associate aspects of the tripartite division. Gaia and Pontos possess physical sub-characteristics, whereas

Ouranos is a single mass.[269] The physical characteristics of Zeus at the lines following 687 contrast those of (some of) the Titans, but clearer parallels may be sought with Typhoneus. The contrast between Zeus and Typhoneus represents the dichotomy between Gaia and Ouranas (Earth and Sky).[270] Typhoneus, to some extent, represents a natural progression of the cosmological upheaval; and at this stage of the narrative there is a suggestion that if the celestial realm intends to retain its cosmological authority, then it too needs to evolve conflict strategy. A failure of celestial evolution would result, unlike at line 697, with Typhoneus' defeat of celestial order. Therefore, the celestial light would be replaced by destructive and degenerative chthonic darkness.[271]

The 'Immortals' of line 842 are a metaphor for threatened cosmological stability. The precise meaning of ἀθανάτοισι, or rather the nominative ἀθανατὸς, is 'without death'. Although phenomena 'without death' are not threatened (since 'what is will always exist'), it is their cosmological position that is in danger of being overthrown instead. The position of celestial phenomena is being shaken by the onslaught of chthonic violence. If the chthonic realm is victorious, then the cosmological stability of celestial entities will be transferred and replaced by a new cosmological regime.

Similar language describes the impact of cosmological upheaval on the 'Immortals' as for Gaia (843). The ἐπεστονάχιζε of Gaia denotes a positive desire to

[269] Paradoxically, some internal aspects of the chthonic realm, notably the the Kyklopes, are only made apparent by celestial influence during cosmological upheavals. The characteristics of Gaia are aspects embedded within and upon the terrestrial sphere. For example, line 841 refers to Tartaros (cf. 683) as a realm within Gaia (τάρταρα γαίης) and sequentially, line 842 refers to the static mountains that are presumably rooted within Gaia and firmly situated upon the earth (848). The subtenets of Pontos are Okeanos' stream (841 and 695), Sea (848) and the waves (849).

[270] Compare 687-731 with 820-870. Zeus, the Titans and Typhoneus are important characters that differentiate the tripartite division of the universe.

re-produce and generate (159-160). Paradoxically, the 'trembling' of the 'Immortals' reflects celestial fear of being usurped, whereas the 'groaning' of Gaia is through pleasurable desire to self-generate and establish her genealogy as absolute.[272] Despite the seeming desire of Gaia to generate her own genealogical hierarchy, such intentions are challenged by the celestial realm. This results in the conflict between Zeus and Typhoneus at lines 853-868.

Zeus initially responds against the chthonic threat using chthonic powers. To illustrate this point, Zeus immediately attacks Typhoneus, utilising the first generation attributes of the primordial realm. Although passage 853-855 does not specifically address the Kyklopes, similar language found at 139-146 is a clear allusion to these characters.[273]

Without doubt, passage 853-868 consolidates the main fabula of the *Theogony*. It does so by exploring inter-related themes detailed in previous episodes. The principle relevance of the passage is its cosmology which is expressed through the thematic implications of generational conflict. The cosmology of lines 853-868 is better understood in comparison with (and not apart from) the Titanomachia episode. The main difference from the Titanomachia in this instance is Typhoneus' resistance to celestial authority, followed by the final submission of Gaia at lines 883-885.

Passage 853-868 is stylistically compatible with the descriptive narrative of Zeus' involvement in the (so-called) Titanomachia. This is not to suggest that the *Theogony* is a combination of stylised interpolations. Instead, crucial themes are conveyed through comparable – that is, similar – linguistic nuances. Repeated almost

[271] Cf. Former genealogy of Nux. The destructive affects of chthonic violence are referred to explicitly in lines 851-852, reminding the reader of the fate of some of the former Titans. Certainly, lines 851-852 reiterate the dire potentiality on world existence should the chthonic realm usurp celestial authority.
[272] Cf. 164-166. Compare this with the implications of στοναχίζετο and στεινομένης at lines 159-160.

verbatim at several points are lines that describe the modes of conflict and methods of defeat; this happens, for example, in lines 687-694 which correspond to 853-857, and in 707-710 which correspond to 862.

In general the passages above describe how Zeus manipulates chthonic forces against his enemies. Although the Kyklopes are similar to the Titans in that they form part of the genealogy of the primordial realm, they are mentioned only in instances which depict their celestial allegiance as at lines 689-690, 855, and also 141. This characterises the Kyklopes as a crucial aspect of celestial being (687, 853) set against chthonic aggression. The motifs used in the *Theogony* for personified cosmological entities are emblematic of the diverse characteristics of world formation. Recurrent motifs provide continuity between each genealogical focalisation offered by the text. For example, the narrative to describe Typhoneus is what has been offered for former genealogies. Only in the instance of Typhoneus it seems that the characteristics of the former progenies of Ouranos and Gaia have merged into this single creation. A reason for this could be dramatic effect, as the Typhomachy is the cosmological finale of the *Theogony*. Typhoneus draws together all the threads of the text's principle and sub-focalisations into a single narrative episode. The Typhoneus episode brings to expression the fulfillment of the text's fabula.

It is sheer poetic skill that draws the important aspects of previous characterisations into a final succession conflict. For example, the attributes of the Kyklopes appears at lines 855-856, where it describes their terrible impact on the evil heads of Typhoneus. At line 856 πελώπου is used, which is usual in instances of

[273] Cf. especially lines 853 and 854. Furthermore, Zeus used the Kyklopes at the climax of the Titanomachia (690-692).

cosmological discomfort, and more is often applied to Gaia. At lines 858 and 861-862 the vast destruction upon Gaia is amplified by the use of πελώρη.

In a previous though similar context, πελώρη is used in the narrative of Gaia's discomfort against Ouranos (159-160). This discomfort initiated the cosmological and genealogical upheavals. Therefore, πελώρη describes both chthonic physical nature and, more crucially, chthonic mentality. Lines 856 and 861-862 account for the physical destruction of aspects of Gaia and Typhoneus which symbolise the suppression of the metaphysical powers of the chthonic realm by the celestial order. The inner monstrous nature of Gaia is slain in 866 and scourged at 861-862 by celestial power. Significantly, πελώρη summarises such suppression of chthonic power, and use of the title Titan articulates this monumental moment.

This is not to undermine the fact that Zeus has similar attributes to Typhoneus.[274] At line 856 δείνος is used to characterise Typhoneus; it is an aspect that has been part of the inheritance of all those created by the primordial realm (154, 156). Although δείνος seems to be used negatively at line 856, such an interpretation ultimately depends on context. Zeus' use of δείνος is for the positive intention to form a cosmological order; and such order can only be establishes at the demise of matriarchy.[275]

The principle thematic focus of lines 853-868 is to account for the establishment of celestial patriarchy at the suppression of chthonic matriarchy. At line 843 Gaia groans with seeming pleasure at the potential impact of Typhoneus. However, such gratification by Gaia disappears within the narrative of Zeus' counter-response at lines 853-868. Gaia at line 858 then groans with displeasure at the

[274] Cf. lines 459 and 506.
[275] Cf. 47-49, 71-74 = 881-885.

celestial attack against her. On reflection, the groaning refers to both the physical transformation of Gaia – due to celestial onslaught – and to Gaia's internal state as she realises that chthonic genealogy will always be suppressed by the celestial authority. Indeed, the complex implications of στονάχιζω are noted by the juxtaposition of πελώρη at line 858 and 861, and enhanced by the adjective πολλὴ at line 861.

The audience is repeatedly reminded here that, despite innumerable attempts, Gaia may not alter the nature of her existence and cosmological position. Gaia will always remain beneath the sky (Ouranos), and her generative ability depends on cosmological will. Irrespective of Gaia's endeavours to produce something more powerful than her celestial counterpart, patriarchy will always now have the upper hand.[276]

The legacy of Typhoneus, even within Tartaros, will affect the terrestrial void (869-880). Crucially, the chthonic powers within Typhoneus are insufficient to usurp the static nature of the celestial order, and instead are re-focused against the Sea. Passage 869-880 explores the impact of Typhoneus' redefined cosmological position within and upon the nature of humankind, and no longer as before against the celestial hierarchy. The genealogy of Typhoneus has been relegated to symbolise meteorological and climatic aspects within the physical world.

In terms of cosmology, the deeds (879) of Typhoneus' progeny show the depreciating impact of ἔργα which was cursed initially at line 210. Now deeds are seen as contained aspects of cosmological cohesion. The destructive nature of

[276] To illustrate this, in line 866 Hephaistos represents a new celestial order, able to surpass the powers of Typhoneus and the Kyklopes at lines starting at 854. Although the Kyklopes of lines 854-856 contribute to the defeat of chthonic aggression, it is the celestial power of Hephaistos that suppresses such aggression deep within the inner-Tartaros-tomb of Gaia (868).

Typhoneus' 'winds' (879) is counter-balanced by the benevolence of Πόντος.[277] In effect, the destruction of Typhoneus (876-880) is followed by a period of salvation during which humanity may flourish.

It is poignant to note that it is not until line 880, which is concerned with the final suppression of cosmological conflict, that the text turns its attention to the fate and existence of humankind. The poet is (almost) making what socio-historians would categorise as an anthropological statement. It is at this juncture of the text that the relevance of the Prometheus episode becomes evident. Fortunately for humankind, Zeus shows benevolence towards this aspect of the cosmological structure.

The conflict with Typhoneus has been concluded and lines 881-1020 narrate a cosmology governed by Zeus. Line 882 then defines the final explicit reference to the Titan characters in the *Theogony*. Here lines 882 and 885 see the appointment of τίμας. What this *honour* actually means provides confusion, which various scholars have tried to account for. For us, meaning can be sought from 881-885 and 886-900. However, before we turn our attention to these lines, we ought to respond to West's claim about this concluding passage for the *Theogony*.

Notably, West concedes that the *Theogony* actually draws to an end at line 900, though he argues the 'genuine work of Hesiod certainly ends before this point'.[278] In order to support his thesis, West cites other historical critics. In his commentary for lines 881-1020, West writes that

> 'the genuine work of Hesiod certainly ends before this point, but there is no general agreement on how far it goes. Aly, Jacoby, and Schwenn take it to 929, Wilamowitz apparently to 939, Goettling,

[277] The genealogy of Pontos is referred to at lines 252-254. Pontos forms part of the primordial genealogy alongside Ouranos 126 and Gaia 117ff.
[278] West, *Hesiod: Theogony*, p. 398.

> Paley, A. Meyer, and J. Schwartz to 962, Heyne, Sitt, Robert, Beth, and Mazon to 964. I believe it goes no further than 900.'[279]

West cites four principle arguments: (i) the structural argument that the lines following 900 are not appropriate to the structural schema of the *Theogony*; (ii) the historical argument based on the historical chronology of Herakles' deification that is assumed to be of the 6th century BCE, (iii) stylistic argument that the narrative of lines 901-1020 is a separate unity stylistically detached from lines 1-900; and (iv) the linguistic argument that is inter-related to the stylistic argument. From this, West develops the linguistic argument by providing formulas apparently unique within lines 901-1020. West argues,

> 'there are no less than four formulae relating to marriage and reproduction which are used two, three, or four times in this section 901-1020, and also in the *Catalogue*, but nowhere else in the *Theogony*. (a) θαλερὴν ποιήσατ' ἄκοιτιν 921, 946, 948, 999, fr. 14.5, 23(a)31, 33(a)7, 85.5, 180.16. (b) θέτ' ἄκοιτιν 937, 953. (c) μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότητι 923, 941, 944, 980, fr. 5.3, 169.9; also in the *Great Ehoiai*, fr. 253. (d) μιγεῖσα ἐρατῇ φιλότητι 970, 1009, 1018.'[280]

Points (i) and (ii) are viable, though West loses persuasion at (iii) and (iv). The extent to which these phrases are, indeed, unique within lines 901-1020 is questionable. There are phrases with similar conceptual implications of (iii) and (iv) prior to line 901. To illustrate these comparisons, the language of procreation is consistent throughout the *Theogony*. In fact, the expression 'mixed in love' (μιγεῖσα φιλότητι) often appears in the genealogical accounts.[281]

---

[279] Wilamowitz, *Hesiodos' Erga,* pp. 6, 7, n. 1; Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, p. 435; Beth, *Dichtung,* p. 57; West, *Hesiod Theogony,* p. 398.

[280] Ibid.

[281] A few examples are cited below:

125 οὔς τέκε κυσαμένη Ἐρέβει φιλότητι μιγεῖσα

306 τῇ δὲ Τυφάονα φασι μιγήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι
307 δεινόν θ' ὑβριστήν τ' ἄνομόν θ' ἑλικώπιδι κούρῃ

Although the complete phrase μιγεῖσα ἐρατῇ φιλότητι (mixed in charming love) does not seem to appear before line 900, ἐρατή has been used in a genealogical context. Notably, ἐρατή is used of benevolent derivatives of the third cosmological dimension Sea [water]. Such instances may be deduced from the lines below:

(Nereus) 259 Εὐάρνη τε φυὴν ἐρατὴ καὶ εἶδος ἄμωπος
(Okeanos) 355 Κερκηίς τε φυὴν ἐρατὴ Πλουτώ τε βοῶπις

Clearly, ἐρατη contrasts with ἐριδι (702). Here *erate* defines positive cosmological procreation, whereas *eris* stands for generative violence. A form of *eris* characterises Zeus during his Titan conflict at lines 705-710 (815-817), and then it describes his genealogical advancement at lines 970-1020.[282]

Finally, West's historical-critical argument is dubious. The myth of Herakles and his deified status are already suggested in the Prometheus episode at lines 523-533.[283] Difficulty lies in specifying a chronology for the myths of Herakles, and to suggest the 6th century BCE – as West does – undermines the relation of such myths to the Demeter and the Eleusinian mysteries that date back to the 8th century BCE, if not further. It also ignores comparative evidence with the *Aspis*, which formed part of the *Ehoiai.*[284]

A further objection to West's stylistic and linguistic argument is the appearance of πρώτην at line 886. Line 886 presupposes δεύτερος of line 901 and τρεῖς at line 906. Metis, Themis (901) and Eurynome (906) have already been

---

333 Κητὼ δ ὀπλότατον Φόρκυι φιλότητι μιγεῖσα

375 Κρείῳ δ Εὐρυβίη τέκεν ἐν φιλότητι μιγεῖσα

[282] Cf. 970, 1009, 1018.
[283] Cf. 315, 318.

mentioned prior to line 901. Therefore, the four-fold argument of West, though valuable, amounts to a limited appraisal of the diametric coherence of the *Theogony*.

Although the final characterisation of the Titans at line 882 which sees the defeat of Zeus' enemies, this by no means suggests that the text ends here. On the contrary, line 882 describes the cosmological enthronement of Zeus, which is then enforced by Zeus' subsequent unions – starting with his marriage to Metis. On this premise, the following sections will concentrate on the thematic implication of Titan beginning with line 882 and what follows. Three crucial points are made in line 882: (1) the acceptance of Gaia (μητήρ) of Zeus as πάτηρ, (2) the nomination of Zeus, and (3) the cosmological allocation of Titan τιμὰς at lines 882 and 885.

The acceptance by Gaia of Zeus' authority, which responds also to the *honour* of 882, is defined by her 'cunning' (φραδμοσύνῃσιν) in line 884 as opposed to her 'cunning' (ἐπεφράσσατο) in line 160.[285] At line 884 Gaia demands that the other gods accept Zeus as the cosmological (Ολύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν)[286] ruler (883 βασιλευέμεν).[287] This invocation is reinforced by the unified 'cunning' of Gaia and Ouranos at line 891.[288] Notably, the 'cunning' of Gaia at lines 884 and 891 fundamentally establishes the rationalised cosmology by Zeus at lines 896 and 894.

There are numerous cosmological implications for the nomination of Zeus as ruler of 'gods and men'. The final election of Zeus as 'ruler' does not come as much

---

[284] Cf. J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena,* p. 546; Cf. also T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* vol. 1 (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press 1993), esp. pp. 374-466 and 155-156.

[285]Cf. an inscription in *CEG* dated 5th century BCE Athens ἀνέθηκε ... μάντεων φρασμοσύναι.
The verb ἐπεφράσσατο (ἐπιφράζω) implies devious intentions involving some form of cognitive and practical irrationality. Paradoxically, φραδμοσύνη (φραδων - φρασμοσύνη) suggests a rationalised injunction.

[286] Cf. *Iliad* 8.206, 14.265, 24.331.

[287] Cf. line 403 βασιλευέμεν; also line 71, *Erga* 111; ἀνάσσειν 403, 491, 506.

[288] Ouranos and Gaia advise Zeus on means to counter a fate of potential future usurping cosmological genealogies. The unified stance of the primordial entities suggests the attainable cosmological harmony of the cosmological justice of Zeus.

of a surprise to the implied audience. Nevertheless, what is profound is the process of Zeus' final cosmological and genealogical ascension and supremacy through the 'injunction' of Gaia. The nomination of Zeus by Gaia appears at lines 883-885, and this injunction is (presumably) addressed towards the μάκαρες θεοί (881) after the forceful allocation of Τιτήνεσσι δὲ τιμάων at line 882. The Τιτήνεσσι δὲ τιμάων κρίναντο βίηφι appropriates all physical and metaphysical world phenomena within a cosmological schema. Once allocation has been achieved, Zeus is nominated to govern. Zeus accepts, and commits to maintain the cosmological order and 'τιμάς' (885).

It is debatable to what extent Zeus himself determines cosmological formation, as Zeus is elected to govern what formerly exists. Therefore, the cosmological justice of Zeus is something that has been determined by a 'former' existence. To take this argument a step further, it is Gaia who positions Zeus as 'ruler of gods and man'. After all, Gaia is the primordial root of existence, from which all phenomena are generated. Therefore, although line 884 relates Gaia's submission to patriarchal authority, it is, in fact, through her that 'honour' is determined. Indeed, the allocation of Titan τιμή (882), the nomination of Zeus and the final acceptance of Zeus firmly bind the world into some kind of rationalized schema.

The implication of τιμή at lines 882 and 885 corresponds also with the 'honour' in the Hekate episode at lines 422-425. Line 422 refers to the allocation of Titan τιμή that conceptually links with lines 882 and 885. Line 422 is endorsed by an explicit reference to the Titans at line 424. Similarly, as with the context of lines 882 and 885, Zeus at lines 411-415 does not introduce the concept of τιμή, but instead accepts and sanctions the predetermined cosmological and genealogical status of

Hekate. Therefore, it seems that Zeus governs a cosmological framework generated by matriarchy (421-422, 426-428).

The correlation between lines 422-428 and 882-885 presupposes that cosmological τιμή is predetermined before the beginning of time. Τιμή is the cosmological allocation of each aspect of genealogical development, and that cosmological harmony may only be sustained if the allotted τιμή is accepted.

The 'injunction' of Gaia is confirmed by the union between Zeus and Metis. Gaia and Ouranos advise Zeus to swallow Metis in order to prevent further generational cosmic upheavals. The consumption of Metis exemplifies the wisdom Zeus inherited from the primordial reality, and that the governance of Zeus will be of sound judgment, counsel and justice (896). The descriptive birth narrative of Athena, who at line 896 is claimed to be equal to her father in 'sound counsel' (ἐπίφρονα βουλὴν 896), confirms these attributes.

The brief descriptive narrative of the swallowing of Metis and the creation of Athena represent the generative cosmological authority of Zeus. In cosmic terms, Zeus is a metaphor of a multi-faceted world governed by the One, and it is the One that generates the Many. The single universal entity is an embodiment of past, present and future phenomena. The One is asexual in that it is self-generating and possesses the absolute cosmological mind. It is these latter claims that form the backbone of the text's main fabula, its focalisations, sub-focalisations, characterisations and sub-characterisations.

The above discussion has offered a revised understanding of the narrative fabric of the *Theogony*, and this has been achieved by the initial text-based analysis. Sections of the text that have been formerly rejected by historical scholarship have now been appreciated for their actual presence in the text's narrative. For example, the

Typhoneus episode is crucial to our understanding of the text's main fabula and without lines 820-880, the focalisation of the Titanomachy would loose its narrative importance. The characterisations of the text's main characters can now be seen as a crucial attribute of the cosmological fabula. It is from the narrative analysis of the *Theogony* in this chapter that we can turn our attention to the scholarly contributions of a historical approach.

Chapter

Three

Chapter Three

This chapter turns its attention to investigate how the text-analysis in Chapter Two might contribute to the historical research of ancient literary texts. The present chapter will concentrate on three culture-based areas of historical research. These areas are philosophy, religion and anthropology.[289]

In historical based academic debates Hesiod has often been relegated as a preface to more sophisticated treatises about (for example) philosophy, and it is this presupposition and application by modern scholarship which this chapter attempts to address critically. This chapter will explore how our understanding of the *Theogony's* main fabula, as detailed in Chapter Two, can offer a revised contribution to our appreciation of ancient Greek cosmology as expressed by early Greek philosophy and religion. In addition, it will be interesting to see whether our text-based reading of the *Theogony* has in any way altered the way we read historically based documents. In looking below at philosophy, religion and anthropology, we aim not so much to provide in-depth debates about (for example) ancient Greek philosophy, as we hope, by using our translation of the *Theogony*, to open the historical forum and, thus, to offer a basis for dialectic discussion and future research.

2) Philosophy

The modern reader faces many difficulties when trying to engage in historical analysis, especially in the area of ancient Greek philosophy. A principle difficulty may

consist in the attempt to interpret a text by means of comparison (i.e. with another literary document). However, we ought to consider the possibility that some ancient Greek authors engaged in comparative analysis, and that those who did perform such investigations invariably had a determined agenda. For example, philosophers could have cross-referenced to a mythical text about the gods, in order to demythologise its content in order to expound their their own philosophical *logos* and ideals.[290] If there is any truth to this latter claim, then it would offer justification to the imposed dichotomy between philosophical *logos* and religion by modern scholarship. It is this latter point which requires further discussion.

It is difficult to determine and, therefore, to interpret the context of ancient Greek criticisms against the ancient poets.[291] The main early sources of criticism against the likes of Hesiod and Homer stem from the Presocratic philosophers, who based their attack on a religious proviso that the ancient poets 'Homer and Hesiod attributed to the gods all things that bring shame and censure to men, theft, adultery

---

[289] I recognise that the term 'anthropology' bears with it modern connotations which would not be appropriately applied to early Greek thought. I merely use this term to encapsulate the interest in the origin and fate of humankind drawn from the ancient literary sources.

[290] Here we could cite Plato and Aristotle. Certainly Plato mentioned the corrupting nature of Homer and Hesiod in order to make credible his intellectual thesis. For example, in the *Republic* Plato consistantly negates mythical stories on the basis of moral ambiguity (cf. *Republic*, 401ff). At 400-401 Plato discusses the purpose of 'good art', bearing in mind the *Republic's* stance on types of good and bad imitation. At the expense of the poets (such as Homer and Hesiod) Plato details three types of imitation (394c): (i) pure imitation, (ii) pure narration and (iii) the blending of (i) and (ii). But there are dissiculties about Plato's support for 'imitation', as it rests on the assumption that what is being imitiated is morally good. Cf. Aristotle, *Met.* 1091*b*9 where he slows less contempt for the myth-makers than Plato, though in other instances Aristotle questions the integruity of myth in relation to its level of reason.

[291] Cf. J. Barnes, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), especially pp. 94-100 where Barnes argues that Xenophanes is a 'natural theologian'. Also K. Morgan, *Myth and Philosophy: from the Presocratics to Plato* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), esp. pp. 30-37 where Morgan cites the arguments of [for example] Nestle, who suggests that the *muthos* and *logos* dichotomy is based on the premise 'that the former is 'irrational' and lacks 'scrutiny'.' [W. Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* 2nd edition (Stuttgart: Reiner, 1942), pp. 1-2). Certainly Plato (*Laws* X. 886cd) draws the distinction between religion and the philosophy of 'wisemen'. Plato argues that the cosmology of 'wisemen' is materialistic, whereas in religion world formation is based on 'anthropomorphic' gods.

and deception'.[292] Conversely, Presocratic criticisms could be a response against the influence held by the ancient poets. To this Xenophanes speaks harshly against the authority of the ancient poets and claims that, on the principle of their deviation from 'traditional' religious values, the poets themselves should be seen as 'irreverent and irrational'.[293]

From such criticism one might make the following inferences: (a) Presocratic philosophy bore little, if any, comparative resemblance to theogonic myths; (b) the texts of the ancient poets reflected some kind of 'cult' or popular religion; (c) the ancient poets relayed generic myths; and (d) the above distinctions are not so much emphasised by ancient critics as they are formulations by contemporary philosophical critics.

The distinctions made by modern scholars between the early poets and Presocratic philosophers have been based on the portrayal of 'gods'. According to J. Burnet, the ancient poets referred to the 'gods' as emotive anthropomorphic entities, whereas the Presocratics regarded them as physical aspects of cosmological phenomena.[294] G. Vlastos rightly notes that a certain use of language draws together ancient theogonies and philosophy that 'in Parmenides and Empedocles the whole

---

[292] Xenophanes (6th Century BCE) fr. 11, cf. 14, 15, 16, 23 DK [DK is an abbreviation for H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmenta der Vorsokratiker griechisch und deutsch* 6th edition (Berlin: Weidman, 1951-1952). Cf. also Heraclitus fr. 40 and 42 DK.

[293] Xenophanes, B1.13-14 DK. While Heraclitus regards religious rites as 'madness' (B5, B16).

[294] J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* 4th edition (London: A&C Black, 1930).p. 14. Here Burnet states that, unlike gods of myth, the gods of philosophy are not objects of religious worship, but personifications of natural phenomena. Cf. also K. Algra, 'The beginnings of cosmology', in A. A. Long (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999) 45-65, especially p. 45 where Algra states that, 'traditionally such cosmic protagonists as earth, sun, and moon were thought of, and worshipped, as gods, ... [and that] some Olympians too were connected – and in some contexts even identified – with particular cosmic phenomena (Zeus the cloud gather as god of the sky, Poseidon as the god of the sea, and so on)'. Perhaps more poignantly Algra goes on to state that ' ... within the Greek world and in the cultures of the near-Eastern neighbours mythical stories circulated about the *origin* of the world conceived as the successive birth of such cosmological deities ... cosmos meant speaking about the gods, and theories about the origin of the cosmos (cosmogonies) were actually stories relating to the genealogies of the gods (theogonies). The

doctrine of Being and Nature is put forth as a religious revelation'.[295] Vlastos goes on to argue that 'the major themes of all the *physiologoi*' such as world formation and order 'were matters of vivid religious import to their contemporaries'.[296] Indeed, the theogonic nature of the *Theogony* could be correlated to the cosmology of Presocratic philosophy – especially as the *Theogony* not only provides a cosmological genealogy of the gods, but also a cosmological geography made up of Earth, Sky and Sea.[297]

But in relation to religious belief, ancient sources such as Xenophanes argue that the ancient poets 'had nothing to do with true religion'.[298] It is unclear what is meant by 'true religion', that is, whether this refers to the 'public' religion of the ancient Greeks, or to the supposed divine '*logos*' of the ancient philosophers. To this Vlastos provides a possible solution by stating that 'certainly many divinities of the *Theogony* were not worshipped', and that 'it is not Hesiod's line that personifies everything from Lightning, and Thunder to Sleep and Fear and Rumour, but the religious attitude of his people which feels the world as a theater of supernatural and superhuman forces.'[299] From this Vlastos infers a culture-determined audience that

---

classic early example of the latter category is Hesiod's *Theogony* (second half of the eighth century B.C.)', pp. 45-46.

[295] G.Vlastos, *Studies in Greek Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), esp. pp. 3-31.

[296] Vlastos, *Studies in Early Greek Philosophy,* p. 3.

[297] Although there are comparative similarities between the myth of the *Theogony* and the philosophy of Pherecydes – as both refer to a conflict myth involving Titans [Pherecydes B4 DK], there are significant deviations. For example, Kronos in Pherecydes is a Time god (cf. Anaximander B1 DK), who retains his position in the Sky having fought and defeated the Titans. Also Pherecydes B1 and B2 refers to Zeus giving Ge as a wedding present to Chthonie, and hence received the title Ge, secondly B4 refers to Greek and Near Eastern mystery religion, 'the mysteries about the Titans and Giants who are said to have made war on the gods and the [sc. Mysteries] in Egypt about Typhon and Horus and Osiris'. In contrast the Giants of our *Theogony* have marginal status and form no dominant aspect of the conflict myth other than having been produced from the blood spilt by Ouranos after Kronos' onslaught (185). Therefore, it is misleading to confuse external myths of the 'mysteries' that refer to Titan and Giants with the Titan characters of the *Theogony*. Cf. Compare 720ff with fragment B1 where Xenophanes provides a confusing conflation.
Furthermore, Vlastos suggests a forth dimension Night: but the *Theogony* provides a tripartite division of the world, and Night is a chthonic attribute within Sky. Cf. N.O. Brown, *Hesiod's Theogony* (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1953) esp. pp. 56-69 where Brown outlines the cosmology of the *Theogony*.

[298] B11 (DK), also Plato *Republic* 377e-383c.

[299] Vlastos, *Studies in Greek Philosophy*, p. 5.

possess a 'tradition' of religious belief, and that Hesiod's teaching of divinity, on the other hand, puts the 'objects of the public cult as its center'.[300]

In order to explore the issues raised by Vlastos, we will need to discuss the validity of placing Hesiod's *Theogony* within the philosophical debate of cosmology, instead of relegating Hesiodic works as a precursor to intellectual thoughts about our universe. Furthermore, we then ought to explore to what extent Hesiod merely reiterated the thoughts and expressions about *our* origin drawn from religious ideas widely known across the Greek world, and to what extent Hesiod was aware of philosophical or scientific intellectual developments.[301]

But there are still important issues in interpretation to consider when comparing the philosophies of the Presocratics with Hesiod's *Theogony*. An inherent difficulty is to identify who and what the Presocratic tradition represents, and then to determine how these philosophical thinkers differ and compare with the ideas of Hesiod. To the former question, the term 'Presocratic' has been ascribed to a group of

---

[300] Vlastos, *Studies in Greek Philosophy,* p. 10 where Vlastos cites distinctions between ancient theology and philosophy founded on a created understanding of 'traditional' religion and ancient religious belief in the 'gods'. These types of distinctions by philosophical critics have been extended by the criticisms of M. Jaeger in that the studies into Presocratic philosophy are isolated 'as an invisible organism, never considering the theological components apart from the physical or ontological'. Although Jaeger offers valid criticism, the initial point for interpreting the cosmological aspects of creation myths and its theological components should as an 'invisible organism', but not within the isolation of a perceived genre, instead a document should be 'isolated' within itself, and understood by itself, before comparison with external forms. The problem of conflating texts and tradition within an 'invisible organism' has provided scholars with a free-lance to interpret ancient 'religious' beliefs. Cf. M. Jaegar, *Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), p. 7.

[301] Turning our attention back to Vlastos, we regard it important to note that for him 'there is little overlap between the Presocratic philosophers and Hesiod. For Vlastos the early philosophers offered a new meaning to 'divine', and that (for example) the philosophers replaced sexual generation with a mechanical process', which elements were now governed, and thus the world produces through the infinity of time 'innumerable worlds' (cf. Vlastos, *Studies in Greek Philosophy*, p. 21); whereas Jaegar claims that 'theogonic writers cannot be understood except in light of their close reciprocal relationships with philosophers of their own period' (cf. *Theology*, p. 57). Despite Jaegar's appealing claim, there is no evidence of philosophical influence on theogonies before Pherecydes. One fragment of Pherecydes connects the fight of the Kronos and the Titans with Typhon, Horus and Osiris of Egypt (Pherecydes B4). This fragment is difficult to place into any culturally determined context. Cf. also J.P. Vernant, *Myth and Thought among the Greeks*, where he draws a distinction between Greek cosmology and religion (p. 183).

natural philosophers around before the time of Socrates.[302] It is important to stress that these 'natural' thinkers who sought 'material causes for all things' were not part of a formalised group in the ancient world, but instead have been categorised into a semi-cohesive group by modern philosophical scholars.[303] This then leaves the latter question to consider, as we are left wondering whether in fact Hesiod and the Presocratic philosophers addressed the same or even similar questions which justify cross-textual analysis. Furthermore, it is with caution that we as modern readers should assume that there existed among the ancient Greeks a general interest in cosmic issues relating to *our* 'existence'.

According to Mondi there was such a general interest, and Hesiod formed part of a tradition which drew upon themes such as 'births and characteristics of the gods' which corresponded to 'others narrating [about] specific divine or cosmogonic events'.[304] Therefore, for Mondi, Hesiod formed part of a cultural tradition and his *Theogony* simply arranged disparate material 'into a single cosmogonic and theogonic narrative'.[305] If this is the case, Hesiod has drawn together the different repositories of historical tradition into the weave of the *Theogony*. But Chapter Two of this current study has gone some way to underpinning the uniqueness of the *Theogony's* narrative,

---

[302] This staement excludes Democritus.

[303] Quotations for the Presocratic philosophers are often provided by Plato, Simpilicus of the 6th Century CE and late Byzantine authors (ie: John Tzetzes). Plato's references are usually mixed with paraphrases and set for ironic effect. Other sources include Aristotle, Plutarch *Moralia*, the physician Sextus Empiricus (2nd Century CE), Clement of Alexandria, a Christian of the 2nd Century CE, Hippolytus in his *Refutation of all Heresies* provides biographical doxography of Heraclitus, Diogenes of Laertius (3rd Century CE) in his *Lives of Philosophers* paraphrases Hellenistic citations, while John Stobaeus a 5th Century CE anthologist quotes as far back as Democritus. The author of some philosophical tracts can not be identified, as there is evidence suggesting that some Neo-Pythagoreans of the 2nd Century BCE used Orpheus as a pseudonym to avoid persecution. Another precarious, though important, source is Eusebius who copied from Placita thus forming his *Preparatio Evangelica*. Suidas' *Lexicon* of the 10th Century CE is invaluable. Although the above mentioned sources are very useful to our understanding of early Greek philosophy, the authenticity and agenda of their quotations has to be scrutinized. The focus of Clement of Alexandra (for example) was to undermine early Greek 'paganism' whether religious or philosophical in favour of Christianity.

[304] Mondi, 'The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*', p. 327.

[305] Mondi, 'The Ascension of Zeus', p. 329.

so that what we are concerned with here (which Mondi fails to address) is to investigate the relationship between early Greek cosmologies and the cosmology of Hesiod, assuming that there is any.

It could be argued, however, that the *Theogony* falls into the category of 'philosophical theology'; in this case, it would be appropriate for comparisons to be drawn between the Presocratic philosophers and Hesiod. But this proposal has not always been well received by philosophical critics. L. P. Gerson has made a lucid distinction between the myth of Hesiod, philosophy and religion based on Augustine's definitions.[306] But despite these distinctions, what ought to be considered is not so much St. Augustine's Christianised interpretive definitions, as the question of how Hesiod, like the Presocratic philosophers, attempted to deal with cosmological issues such as causality and effect by using discourse about the gods as a medium of interpretation.[307] In recognition of this latter point, there is a strong argument to suggest that the non-philosophical accounts of early Greek myth actually provide empirical and quasi-rationalistic views of the world and its creation.

However, we ought to concede that a blatant *a priori* dismissal of Gerson's argument could lead to fallacious comparisons being made between Hesiod and the Presocratic philosophers.[308] For example, it could be deemed untenable to compare

---

[306] L. P. Gerson, *Gods and Greek Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1990). Gerson paraphrases St. Augustine's definitions as follows: (i) Civic theology – include political groups and public cultic activities, (ii) mythical theology – stories about the gods and, (iii) natural theology – existence and nature of divine elements by philosophers.

[307] For example, Hesiod refers to the beginning of existence and how existence then flourished. First there was Chaos, then Gaia and Eros. Chaos produced Darkness and Night, who then join by the desire of Eros to create Aether and Day. Earth then produces Ouranos and Pontos. Earth and Ouranos unite to produce the Titans, and so forth. Nowhere in the *Theogony* is an origin for Chaos explained; other than later in the text when chaos describes the gap between earth and sky created by the violence of Kronos. Furthermore, the gods of the *Theogony* on the whole tend to symbolise natural elements.

[308] It is doubtful that the ancient authors saw themselves as philosophers and, more specifically, that Hesiod deliberately sought to be considered as philosopher in the same way that modern scholars view Plato.

the *apeiron* theory of Anaximander with the creation theory of Hesiod's *Theogony*.[309] For Anaximander the *apeiron* 'steers all things' and influences the movement of elemental opposites.[310] Although both the *apeiron* of Anaximander and the Zeus of Hesiod intervene to resolve cosmological upheavals, not even the most zealous reader of the *Theogony* would attempt to interpret Zeus as the *aperion*.[311]

However, Hatab argues that 'if myth is to be properly understood, it must be translated into some scientific or objective model (whether natural or biological ...).'[312] Therefore, Hatab presupposes that if we are to appreciate the myth of the *Theogony* as a 'creation myth', we ought to consider carefully that there exists in the *Theogony* narrative the same rationale applied when interpreting philosophy. We ought to investigate a hypothetical claim that the *Theogony* is saying something profound about cosmological existence of 'what is' and 'how it came to be', which should also be read alongside other texts of a similar concern. This being the case,

---

[309] A brief outline of the stages of Anaximander's cosmological philosophy are as follows: (i) the *apeiron* is a finite seed which has parted from the boundless to create hot (flame) and cold (moisture), (ii) the separation of hot and cold causes the hot (flame) to surround cold (moisture) which dries to form earth, (iii) tension between elemental extremes cause the structure to explode, thus creating celestial spheres. Anaximander's genesis of the cosmos is based on natural elements and separation, and not on any successive genealogy of the gods. Despite this latter distinction, the separation of Hesiod's earth and sky could be compared with one of Anaximander's cosmological stages. Thus, we find in Hesiod a causal theory moderately compatible to Anaximander.
Furthermore, we must not ignore that contradictions exist in Anaximander's philosophy which make it difficult either to dismiss fully or support a comparative study with (in this instance) Hesiod. For example, there are boundaries in Anaximander's 'Boundless' (ie. the earth), and such confinement is abundant in Hesiod (i.e. Okeanos and Gaia; cf. 333-336, 621-623 and 807-813). Cf. also Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, 5.109.1.

[310] Cf. A11 (DK).

[311] This tenuous link, off course, is contradicted by Zeus' direct involvement in the Typhomachy. Nonetheless, Zeus during and after the Typhomachy conflict manages to maintain an equilibrium between the polar extremes Ouranos and Gaia. Here Zeus could be seen as a 'causal' force.

[312] L. J. Hatab, *Myth and Philosophy: A Contest of Truths* (Illinois: Cornell, 1990), p. 18. For Hatab a myth of creation 'fills in a void with primal occurrences' (p.20), which is a notion easily drawn from both Hesiod and Presocratic philosophy. In extension to Hatab, W.F. Otto suggests that 'myth 'mirrors' a lived world, known as Culture. This culture begins with primal entities where the world is perceived as a plethora of divine configuration'. Cf. W. F. Otto, *Dionysus: Myth and Cult* (Indiana: Bloomington, 1965), p. 33.

then to some extent we ought to reconsider the objections of those, such as Max Müller, who regard myth as a 'childhood illness of language'.[313]

If we were to merge the mythical world view of the early ancient poets, we would in fact be left with an advanced cosmic vision compatible with early philosophical thought.[314] A conflation of world myth could appear as follows:

> Sky is a solid hemisphere similar to that of a bowl (*Iliad* 17.425, Pindar *Nemean* 6.3-4) which covers the round flat earth (*Ody.* 3.2, 15.329, 17.565). *Aer* fills the lower part of the gap between earth and sky, the upper part is filled with *aether* and Tartarus found beneath the earth (*Iliad* 8.13, Hesiod *Theogony* 726ff). The distance of Tartarus beneath the earth is the same distance between earth and sky (*Theogony* 720). Okeanos surrounds the earth (*Iliad* 18.607, 21.194, Herodotus iv.8ff).[315] The sun rises from Okeanos (*Iliad* 7.422).[316] Night forms the part of the world between sky (Zeus), sea (Poseidon) and lower earth (Hades).[317]

The difficulty with the above conflation is that it assumes both a generic presentation of the gods and the deification of natural phenomena. For example,

---

[313] Cf. M. Müller, *Contributions to the Science of Mythology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1897).

[314] Such conflated comparisons are only useful in order to ascertain some kind of understanding of ancient Greek attitudes towards cosmological ideas. We ought not to overlook, nor compromise, the principle elements, focalisations and characterisations of the *Theogony* as detailed in our Chapter Two.

[315] In Homer, Okeanos is the principle of all things which suggests something similar to Thales theory that 'all things originate from water'. Cf. *Iliad* 14.200ff and 14.244ff. Plato *Theat.* 152a states that 'Homer, who by saying that 'Okeanos begetter of all the gods and mother Tethys' declared all things to be offspring of flux and motion' Here Plato does not suggest that Homer is offering a 'flux' theory as later found in Heraclitus, but refers to a cosmological idea of initial origins. Cf. Heraclitus fr. 30. Redfield's statement that Homer represents the gods as elemental forces (Redfield, *The Nature and Culture the* ***Iliad***, pp. 225-26) is not controversial and probably would have been supported by even the most virulent of ancient philosophers (Cf. Plato *Timaeus* 40d-e).
Heraclitus suggests that 'nothing is at rest and that the whole process of 'becoming' is an eternal cycle (cf. Censorinus *De Die Nat.* 18). Nature for Heraclitus is 'ceaseless' (cf. fr. 69 Fairbank), which contrasts with (for example) Hesiod's determined account of the position of earth, sea and sky. For Hesiod, the earth is a flat disc surrounded by water with sky above it where the celestial gods dwell. The earth is a solid mass with roots to keep it in place. These roots steady the earth (*Theogony* 726). Although Hesiod refers to the existence of humankind within the void between earth and sky as a state of flux, the position and nature of the cosmological elements remain static. Cf. Xenophanes B26 states that the gods remain static. Cf. also Aristotle *Rhet.* 23.1399b6-9.

[316] For Heraclitus the sun is described as a hollow bowl filled with fire (227).

according to Homer's *Iliad*, Hesiod's *Theogony* and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Zeus is fire, Hera is earth, and Hades is air; but in Late Antiquity Zeus is fire, Hera is air, and Hades is earth.[318] Therefore, if we isolate Homer from the other textual sources, it could be argued that any apparently cosmological ideas found in the *Iliad* are more a reflection on the issues of human existence than they have to do with any real scientific discourse. If this is the case, it would be misleading from the outset to compare Homer with other cosmological tracts. It is not (perhaps) until the later philosophers, such as Parmenides and certainly Plato, that the characterisations of the gods became more abstract. The philosophers dealt with 'divine' elements as a crucial aspect of their philosophical discourse, unlike Homer whose account of the gods is central to his mythic tale about legendary heroes. However, the issue about the role of the gods in early cosmological myths raises another important consideration, namely, the issue of what methodology should be applied when selecting philosophical texts to compare with Hesiod's *Theogony*.

There are methodological difficulties when contrasting Hesiod's notion of the earth to the philosophy of, say, Xenophanes, as the narrative fabula of Hesiod lays no claim to any philosophical agenda found in Xenophanes. Xenophanes suggests that the first principle is limited and spherical, and that the earth is flat and unlimited within a finite.[319] Xenophanes goes on to claim that moisture forms the sun and stars, and the stars extinguish every morning with new ones being formed every night.[320] By contrast, Hesiod deifies cosmological elements with personifications such as Sun,

---

[317] Cf. *Iliad* 15.189-193 and 14.203ff.
[318] Homer *Iliad* 5.190, Hesiod *Theogony* 913, *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 3. For later accounts cf. Heracl. *Alleg.* 24.6-7, Diogenes Laertius 8.76, Athenagoras *Legatio* 22.1-2, Hippolytus *Refutation of all Heresies* 7.29.4-5, ps.Probus *In Bucol.* 6.31, 332.29 -334.10. Fragment 13 (Diel) Aetius shows that Empedocles gives Hera as air and Hades as earth.
[319] Cf. Simplicus *in Phys. Aristotle*, Aristotle *de Caelo* II.13.294a.
[320] Cf. Aetius II.20.

Moon, Day and Night.[321] For Hesiod, the stars do not dissolve each evening and morning respectively; rather, the sun and moon change their position daily where the earth meets the sky.

It emerges from the discussion above that a possible distinction between the Presocratics and Hesiod is their reverence to the gods. However, if we put this observation to one side we would in fact allow us to discover important similarities in their cosmological ideas. We ought to try to avoid coming up with a catalogue of the ideas of the mythmakers into a coherent literary mass, as this sets individual myths apart from the Presocratic philosophers. By putting aside the traditional interpretations of myth against philosophy by modern scholars, we will be able to investigate the concerns of the Presocratics and ask whether these differed greatly from the concerns of Hesiod's *Theogony*. In following this method, it may not be necessary so much to determine whether the Presocratics questioned the existence of the gods and their nature, but to consider what the philosophers and Hesiod tell us about the basic *principles* of our existence.[322]

Although it is evident that the 'gods' remained a crucial means of expression in early Greek philosophy, reverent language usually found in religious works was also being deployed by the philosophers to describe our cosmos.[323] Furthermore, characterisations of, for example, Parmenides' 'Being' could be compared to Hesiod's Zeus. Parmenides' 'Being' and Hesiod's divine characterisation of Zeus are both concerned with imperishable and eternally present entities, and in the case of the

---

[321] Hesiod does not even specify the shape of the Moon and stars in the way that Xenophanes and later Empedocles describes (cf. Plutarch *PQR* 101, 288b).

[322] S. Broadie, 'Rational Theology' in A. A. Long (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) pp. 205-224.

[323] Even Plato describes the cosmos as a 'blessed god' (cf. *Timaeus* 34b). However, it could be suggested that gradually the gods of philosophy were becoming more and more abstract. Cf. G. Vlastos, *Studies in Greek Philosophy*.

Theogony, Zeus remains constant throughout the narrative as permanently present and infallible.[324]

Hesiod and Parmenides also share similar notions about the cosmos. Parmenides suggests that the spherical world consists of a series of five zones arranged in concentric layers round the earth.[325] The outer layer was Olympus, a solid vault held together by Necessity which takes charge of the stars. Other layers include the morning and evening stars, and the Sun and Moon. Parmenides asserts that 'amidst it all is a divinity (*daimon*) who rules all, and she generated Eros first of all the gods'.[326] Although Hesiod does not specifically refer to the concentric layers detailed by Parmenides, he does position Sun, Moon and stars in a configured tripartite cosmos. Similar to Parmenides principle creator, Hesiod offers Chaos as a single entity of creation and that 'from Chaos Erebos and black Night came into being, and from Night in union with Erebos came Aither and Day'.[327]

According to K. Popper, Parmenides goes beyond former Presocratic philosophers by claiming that our universe is centrifocal. For Parmenides our universe is a 'ball, the limit, the perfection ... equally suspended ... a unity'.[328] Similarly, the notion of a centrifocal universe is potentially present in Hesiod through the portrayal of Zeus. During the succession conflicts of the Titanomachy and Typhomachy, Zeus is the central cosmological force, and his position as a 'centrifocal' energy is confirmed

---

[324] Parmenides' 'Way of Opinion', which is later abandoned for his 'Way of Truth', is where comparison between Hesiod and Parmenides proves to be untenable.
[325] Cf. Strabo II and Aetius III.2.
[326] Cf. Fragments 128-132 (Fairbanks). Parmenides' *daimon* is female, and it is she 'who steers all things' (28B12.3). This *daimon* created a hateful mixture of opposites and Eros is her first progeny. In many ways this *daimon* compares to Hesiod's Chaos who brings about the creation of female entities who help produce cosmological opposites. For example Night produces Day. However the only use of the term *daimon* in the *Theogony* refers to Zeus; and in this instance reflects Zeus' transient status before being finally confirmed as the cosmological ruler by Gaia of the chthonic realm.
[327] Cf. Hesiod *Theogony* 720.
[328] K. Popper, *The World of Parmenides: Essays on the Presocratic Enlightenment* (London: Routledge, 1988).

by his defeat of Typhoneus.[329] Nonetheless, despite theoretical similarities between Hesiod and Parmenides' cosmological ideas, Parmenides would have included the creation myth Hesiod's *Theogony* in his 'Way of Opinion', which only accounts for human reflections on reality.[330]

It seems that what is emerging from our discussion of Hesiod and Presocratic philosophy is actually a comparative departure: at first we set off to find points between Hesiod and the Presocratics and thus confirm for Hesiod a place in philosophical research. It seems, though, that the reverse has happened and that, although Hesiod may offer points of overlap with the Presocratics, the fabula of the *Theogony* bears only tenuous links with Presocratic philosophy. It seems almost impossible to compare the main features of the *Theogony's* cosmological fabula unilaterally with any given philosophical tract. For example, the Typhomachy of Hesiod rests uneasy with the 'Way of Opinion' and 'Way of Truth' treatise of Parmenides. In addition, it would be absurd to attempt to unify Chaos of our *Theogony* with the notion of 'principle cause' found in Anaximander. Gradually, reasons for not comparing Hesiod with the Presocratics may easily outweigh the limited benefits. But, this said, we have in fact made fundamental findings in Hesiod which have underestimated the expectations of philosophical critics. Furthermore, our appraisal of Hesiod and the Presocratics begins to gain credibility when we compare

---

[329] For Parmenides the universe was kept whole by the power of Eros (fr. 13); whereas in Hesiod Eros does not play a crucial cosmological role (unlike in Orphic theogonies. Cf. *Derveni Papyrus* col. 1). It is the tension between the celestial and chthonic cosmological extremes that maintains the universal equilibrium. According to Vlastos (*Studies in Greek Philosophy*, pp. 70-71) in his discussion on Heraclitus he claims that nowhere in the ancient fragments is there mention 'of 'equal' and 'equality': instead 'to express the harmony of opposites, Heraclitus does not say that they are equal but they are One (e.g. frs. B50, B67)'. In the *Theogony* the main notion of 'equal' appears when Hesiod describes the distance between the earth and sky, in relation to that between earth and tartaros (*Th.* 126 and 719-725).

[330] Further similarities could Parmenides' thoughts about *ananke* and *dike* which could be compared with the oath detailed in the *Theogony*, and the vague concepts about *justice* in Hesiod's account of the

the *Theogony* with some of the cosmological ideas of Empedocles. Ironically, it is our awareness of some of the main aspects of Empedocles' philosophy that will enable us to look back and appreciate our former findings between the *Theogony* and other Presocratic work.

Empedocles' universe is governed by a sequence of cosmic cycles, where the universal whole 'the sphere' is interrupted periodically by the primal tensions of Love and Hate which separates the four roots (air, earth, sea and fiery aither).[331] Both the primal elements and the roots have equal importance to the cosmological equilibrium.[332] Love does not counteract the separation caused by Hate, but creates from and by the mixture of elements. Therefore Love produces the internal structure of the sphere.[333]

---

allegiance of the gods to Zeus. However, the justice of Zeus is somewhat different to the *dike* expressed by Parmenides.

[331] Love is personified as divine Aphrodite (cf. B17.24, B73). In Empedocles Aphrodite has a principle role in the cosmological equilibrium. Although Aphrodite does not have such as central role in Hesiod as she does with Empedocles, Aphrodite is crucial to the cosmological tensions between the elemental opposites of the celestial and chthonic realms. It was Aphrodite who in the *Theogony* was created from the discarded phallus of Ouranos which was hurled into the sea. Later in the *Theogony* Aphrodite was fundamental in the union between Earth and Tartaros which brought about the creation of Typhoneus. It was the immense cosmological tension between chthonic Typhoneus and celestial Zeus which trembles the roots as they holding the cosmological structure in place. In Empedocles there are similar tensions between the elements crucial to the establishment and maintenance of the cosmological equilibrium. The difference between Hesiod and Empedocles is that: in Hesiod once Typhoneus has been defeated, Zeus retains cosmic harmony, whereas in Empedocles 'Harmony' is constantly threatened by cyclical interjections of Strife. Interestingly though, in both Hesiod and Empedocles, times of strife bring about productivity in the terrestrial void.

[332] Cf. B17.19-20 [DK].

[333] Cf. B29 and B31. There are numerous sources and quotations attributed to Empedocles. For example Plutarch states that 'Empedocles ... posits four elements – fire, air, water, earth and two governing principles Love and Strife. The first of which is unitive, the second separative ... by Zeus he means the 'boiling' and aither, life bearing aer Hera, Hades is earth, and Nestis as the spring of mortals sperm and water' (Plutarch *Epitome* 1.3, *Dox.* 286a18-287a16; 58.22-59a). According to Theophrastus *aether* was a fifth element in addition to *aer* (*de Sensu* 59). But *aer* as a fifth element is not Empedocles but possibly a writer influenced by the teachings of Stoicism (*Legatio* 6.4, 22.4). Hades as earth is frequently found in the works of the Neoplatonists (Proclus *El. Theol.* 23, Philolaus *Eucl.* 167.9; cf. also *Orphic Hymn* 18.6.

Furthermore, in Antiquity it was assumed that Empedocles' *aither* referred to fire (cf. Strob. i.121-16, also ps.Plutarch *Placita* 1.3.10). O'Brien highlights additional confusion in stating that *aer* is Empedocles' fourth element and *aither* is a mixture of fire and air. Cf. O'Brien, *Empedocles Cosmic Cycle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969) pp. ??. But solution to this confusion could be the acceptance of the change in meaning to the terms *aether* and *aer* through the transmission of time. Despite these difficulties in interpretation, for the purpose of our discussion the notion of conflicting

Aspects found in Hesiod which could be compared with Empedocles are the role of Gaia and Ouranos, especially the symbolism of the love/hate relationship between these primordial forces. It is the separation of Gaia and Ouranos which confirms the cosmic tripartite division of the universe.[334] The offspring of Ouranos and Gaia mix with each other to form additional aspects of the cosmological structure.[335] Although these generative aspects may not necessarily be harmonious, they contribute to cosmic unity.

However, what we find lacking in Hesiod but present in Empedocles is a sense of religious reverence and determined notions of good and evil which shape Empedocles' entire cosmology. For Empedocles good and evil have distinct moral boundaries which are often compared by modern scholars not only to aspects of Orphic religion, but also Christianity. Empedocles, it has been argued, was an Orphic and his cosmology sees within it a developing notion about the fate of humankind and one's soul.[336] Despite the religious context of Empedocles' work, especially the *Katharmoi*, Empedocles' sphere is not a divine personification but formed from 'mind

---

extremes and cosmological divisions found in Empedocles offers fascinating comparison with Hesiod's elemental tripartite division of the universe and, the reciprocal tensions between the celestial and chthonic realms which brought into existence the terrestrial void. It was the separation of Ouranos and Gaia which enabled generative processes to flourish, and during this eternal separation Gaia mixes with other root forces to produce further cosmological aspects (ie. Gaia mixes with Tartaros to produce Typhoneus, who in turn produced baneful winds).

[334] There is only a vague reference to aether in Hesiod, but this reference should by no means be compared to the interpretations of this term by later Hellenistic scholars.

[335] For example, the Titan children intermingle with each other to create progeny which often oppose against other genealogical offspring, but these genealogical tensions help to form a cosmological equilibrium. The progeny of Okeanos (for example) are meteorological elements which contrast with the progeny of Phorkys and Keto, and later with the elemental powers of Typhoneus. But in the end the force of Zeus prevails.

[336] It would be difficult here to discuss more fully the principle aspects of Orphic belief, Orphism and Orpheus as this would demand the attention of a separate thesis. But for the purpose of our current study, we need to be conscious of the possible influences upon Empedocles and, certainly interpretations modern scholars have imposed on Empedocles' work. Cf. G. Zuntz, *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1971) and J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena: To the Study of Greek Religion* intro. R. Ackerman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

alone' (B134). For Empedocles the theory about the sphere refers to no cosmogonic relationship, whereas the *Theogony's* fabula relies on a comprehensive cosmogony.[337]

However, we must not overlook nor underestimate the crucial link between Empedocles and Hesiod's cosmology, and that is the notion of separation. In Hesiod the initial separation takes place with Chaos, but the effect of any real separation is only felt at the separation of Ouranos and Gaia by Kronos. But for Empedocles, the first element to separate was not earth and sky but *aither*, as it was *aither* which formed the outer circumference of the cosmos. The second element to separate was fire and this filled the heavens, and the motion of this 'fire' element caused the passing of day and night.[338] Although there is nothing so articulated as this in Hesiod, the process of separation originating from a primal element and perpetuated by secondary primordial elements is something quite unique in Hesiod and, in principle, fundamental to the philosophy of Empedocles.[339]

---

[337] In the *Theogony* cosmological structuring is determined by its cosmogony. No identification is provided for a 'sphere' in Hesiod as found in Empedocles. The unitary force in the *Theogony* is Zeus, and this is consistent throughout the text's narrative. Such cohesion can nowhere be found in the fragments of Empedocles. Furthermore, in terms of cohesion, elements of Empedocles' astronomy could undermine the sophistication of his cosmology. For example, Empedocles posits that there are two suns: 'there is an archetypal sun which is fire in one hemisphere of the cosmos, ... it sits opposite its reflection. This reflection is the other hemisphere. .. the reflection is produced as a result of light bouncing off the circular earth onto the crystalline sun. In short the sun is a reflection of the fire around the earth' (Aetius 2.20.13). Aetius does not tell us how Empedocles explained the presence two hemispheres, nor about the composition of the crystalline sun. It seems impossible to fit the notion of two suns into Empedocles general cosmology, especially as further confusion emerges in Empedocles' idea that the hemisphere is comprised of fire and the other air and fire. The latter being called Night. Nowhere in Hesiod do we see Night being part of a theory about two hemispheres, for Hesiod Night is a primal goddess which produces Aither and Hemera which cross over where the earth meets the sky.

[338] Cf. ps.Plutarch *Strom.* 10, A49b, A70 and A30.

[339] Another interesting point for comparison would be Empedocles positioning of the earth within the universe. Here Empedocles displaces the central position of the earth in favour of fire. For Empedocles fire deserves the honour of central position and not earth. To an extent this notion could be compared to Hesiod's displacement of Gaia in favour of the central cosmological position of celestial Zeus. Cf. Aristotle *de Caelo* 293a27-b1 where he states that 'there are many other thinkers who might agree that it is not right to allocate the central position to the earth ... [as] fire is more honourable than earth'. Aristotle does not mention 'who' the others thinkers might be, nor does he expand on this particular point in relation to Hesiod. In Hesiod, as later found in Empedocles, honour (*time*) was a crucial aspect in determining the cosmological hierarchy.

Although both Hesiod and Empedocles refer to elemental separation and the mingling of like-with-like elements, some of the creations from such minglings are cosmological hybrids; these monstrous creations are fundamental to cosmic development. Therefore, for a moment we ought to turn our attention away from themes such as 'fire' and 'earth', and reflect on the monstrous creations of Hesiod. In the *Theogony*, the monstrous Hundred Handers and the Kyklopes (for example) contribute profoundly to the text's cosmological fabula; and it would be important to see how early philosophy deals with 'monstrous' cosmological upheavals.

According to Strabo, monsters are a creation of myth. For Strabo the presence of monsters deems myth 'unreliable'.[340] In Aristotle, a monstrous hybrid is something of a biological abnormality, and therefore not an issue of cosmology.[341] On a more popular level, the Greeks considered monstrous offspring to be a curse of the gods, and thus offering a more reverent explanation.[342] But for our purposes, if the episodes which mention the Hundred Handers were omitted from the *Theogony* as 'unreliable', then there would be no opposing combatants in the Titanomachy.[343] If such an omission were to be considered, this would amount to a concession to the advice of Goettling, which we formerly rejected in Chapter One. Furthermore, as we have already discussed in Chapter Two the exclusion of either the Titanomachy or the Typhomachy would leave an incredible void in the text's narrative and thus threaten the cohesion of the *Theogony's* cosmological fabula.

However, Empedocles provides a philosophical framework within which to recognise the cosmological importance of the monstrous hybrids. According to

[340] Strabo 1.2.35.
[341] Aristotle *GA* 771a11-14, also 769b13-14.
[342] Cf. SIG^3 360. Plato considers monstrous offspring to be civically 'impure' and should thus be destroyed (Plato *Republic* 460c).

Aetius' account 'monsters' form a crucial aspect of the process of existence which leads to the creation of humankind.[344] But more fundamentally, as shown in the *Theogony*, monstrous hybrids are crucial aspects of genealogical development which symbolise and facilitate cosmological progression. In a sense, it could be argued that the Hundred Handers are metaphors for Zeus' cosmological struggle for patriarchal authority which leads to the culture of humankind.[345]

Despite the apparent philosophical similarities between Empedocles and Hesiod, we ought not to overlook the religious ideas which, to a great extent, shape the philosophy of Empedocles' *Katharmoi* and *On Nature*. Therefore, there is now a need to consider the issues raised earlier in this section regarding the relationship between religion and philosophy; and explore how these two aspects influenced – indeed if at all – the work of Hesiod's *Theogony*. To the ancient Greeks, religion was an inherent part of their existence. It could be argued that notions about the universe with its internal fire, *aer* and cosmological monsters took shape in cultic aspects of ancient Greek religion. Therefore, the following paragraphs will explore religion and 'religious' aspects, and the aim of this inquiry will be to further our understanding of ancient Greek cosmology as described by the early Greek philosophers and, more crucially, Hesiod's *Theogony*.

2) **Religion**

[343] In response to Aristotle, the monstrous hybrids of the *Theogony* are biological abnormalities, but these mutated forms are characteristics of cosmological upheaval and imbalance.

[344] Aetius provides the following paradigm of creation: i) the separation of limbs fr. 57, (ii) monsters fr. 60 and 61, (iii) whole forms fr. 62 and then, (iv) humankind. Simplicius suggests that monsters come from the stage of separation of the limbs occurring in the latter part of the cosmic cycle under the influence of love (fr. 51), but Aetius suggests monsters to be the creation of distorted motion (5.8.1).

If we go on to assume that the *Theogony* falls into the category of 'philosophical theology', then ancient Greek religion needs a mention. This section thus aims to discuss the following issues: (i) the impact a comparative analysis with ancient Greek religion would have on our interpretation of Hesiod's *Theogony* (as detailed in chapter two), (ii) whether or not Hesiod qualifies for a place in philosophical or religious analysis and, (iii) whether the *Theogony* would contribute better to discussions on literary documents outside of the Greek world.

Firstly, we ought to discuss some of the methodological issues. Ancient texts such as those of Homer and Hesiod have been assumed by modern scholars to be part of an epic tradition relating to some cultural form of religious ideology.[346] However, despite such assumptions, there is disquiet among cultural theorists who feel uneasy about the placing of texts within the interpretive frame of cultural religion, as this literary interpretations presupposes that in archaic Greece there existed a coherent 'religious' tradition of ideas. The latter point is expressed by J.-P. Vernant, who though a structuralist, is cautious about assumptions made concerning ancient religion.[347] Crucially, Vernant's principle concern seems to be on the general interpretation of religious practice that does not necessarily focus on literary

---

[345] However Empedocles' notion of the genesis of humankind should not be confused with the Orphic notion that mankind was born from the ashes of the monstrous Titans.

[346] Certainly E. Vermeule in *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Sather Classical Lectures vol. 46; Berkeley and California: University of California Press, 1984) corresponds the *Iliad* to not only Mycenaean (p. 105) death ritual with continual statements such as 'The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* use an antique language of art for death, in the formal patterns long used for animal combats and hunting scenes' (p. 84), but also as a comparative for near Eastern practices (esp. pp. 106-107). Vermeule synthesises art and literary texts as representing some form of ancient Greek attitude towards the dead, and by doing so gives the impression that there existed in the ancient world some form of universalised religious belief and practice towards the dead, death and the hereafter. Vermeule is not alone in (re)constructing ancient sources to portray a universal system of Greek religious / cultural belief. Certainly L. Goodison in *Death, Women and the Sun* (Institute of Classics Bulletin Supplement 53: London University Press, 1989) refers to the historical relevance of Homer as an account of Minoan and Mycenaean religious belief toward the dead. Cf. also C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'To die and enter the House of Hades: Homer, Before and After', J. Whaley (eds.), *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death* (London: Europa, 1981) 15-39.

comparatives. This may be especially seen in his contention that the 'comparative study of the polytheism of antiquity leads to questioning not only the idea that an essence of religion exists...but [that] there is any continuity in religious phenomena'. Nevertheless, such a statement could be extended to apply to literary texts, in so far as the 'religiosity' of a single text should neither be extended to another text, nor should reflect any form of 'universal' religious culture of ancient Greece. Extending this further, one could argue that the apparently religious nature of the *Theogony* is only such as it appears in the text.[348]

Despite initial disquiet, Vernant's methodological approach is based firmly within structuralist historicism.[349] Vernant's phrase 'religious architecture' is debatable to the extent that the mythology and mythologies of the *Theogony* form part of a supposed real historical religious system.[350] This latter claim assumes that there

---

[347] J-P Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays* edited by F. I. Zeitlin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 272.

[348] It is the latter point that departs from the initial caution of Vernant, especially as Vernant does by default continue to develop a structuralist argument for interpreting ancient religion, nevertheless it is useful to cite the limitations structuralist research imposes on its own method for understanding the culture of ancient Greece.

[349] Cf. Vernant *Mortals and Immortals*, p. 276. In another article Vernant accounts for the cultural significance of the Prometheus myth and the creation of Pandora for human experiences and sacrifice, and in the same volume P. Vidal-Naquet firmly locates 'Hesiodic' man in the Iron Age. The consequence of these assertions is that the audience and author of the *Theogony* are assumed to be part of an accounted 'historical' construct. (Cf. J-P. Vernant 'The Union with Metis and the sovereignty of Heaven' in R. L. Gordon (ed.), *Myth, Religion and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1981) 1-16; and also 'The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod', pp. 43-56: P. Vidal-Naquet, 'Land and Sacrifice in the *Odyssey*: A Study of Religious and Mythical Meanings', pp. 80-95; also *The Black Hunter: Forms of thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World* transl. A. Szegedy-Maszak with a forward by B. Knox; (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press 1986), esp. pp. 15ff.

[350] Here it should be noted that Titan has often been discussed in terms of its significance in Orphic religion and the cult of Dionysus, and Titan in Hesiod's *Theogony* has been discussed as a comparative foundation and not within its own right.

Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* forward by L.J. Alderink (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993). Guthrie states that Orphic 'creation' mythology may be compared with Homer and Hesiod as, 'comparison with Hesiod and Homer shows that much of the mythological background is the same, the poet [Orpheus / Orphic] was imbued with Greek mythology and wished to write in its terms, but only to transform its significance' (p. 83). However, Guthrie does discuss the departure of Orphic mythology from Hesiod, in that although the principle elements are present in both mythologies, 'the differences appear rather in what is present in the Orphic versions but lacking in Hesiod' (p. 84). In simpler terms, Hesiod mentions the violent tensions between the Titans and other gods, and so too does the Orphic mythologies, but in Orphic versions the principle god is Dionysus which figures nowhere in the Titan myth of the *Theogony*. Furthermore, Titan in Hesiod has no eschatological significance,

existed in ancient Greece a universal religious and mythological ideology. Although mythologies may reflect what are regarded as 'religious phenomena', it is problematic to assume all myths correspond to or mirror religious belief and practices.[351]

There are additional difficulties which we ought to overcome, especially as the *Theogony* has sometimes been interpreted within the framework of Christianised scholarship. It should be made certain that although the ancient Greeks did not have any formal canon literature, modern scholars have frequently assumed that the works of Homer and Hesiod provided something of the equivalent. Although in the modern sense, the'bible' represents a canon of faith that reflects cultural reality, which includes both cognitive and practical teachings; such an interpretation has been applied to Hesiod's *Theogony* by historical scholars concerned with the foundations of Christian thought. For example, Bernstein in his discussion on the formation of hell assumed that the religion of the ancient Greeks formed a crucial basis of future religious practices, from Christianity and Judaism.[352]

---

whereas in Orphic myth such concepts of the hereafter and the purification of the soul were a crucial aspect of the mythologies that formed the principle basis of Orphic religion (cf. also Guthrie pp. 148ff, 153ff, and 182ff).

[351] Cf. C. G. Jung and K. Kerenyi (ed.), *Essays on the Science of Mythology: The Myth of the Divine Child and the Mysteries of Eleusis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978). The book refers to an 'archetype' for humankind, and how this archetype, irrespective of identity is part of a universal tendency among man to identify itself with an archetype (cf. esp. pp. 136ff). In the instance of the Eleusinian mysteries the participants identified themselves with Demeter, and ritually performed the experiences of Demeter in search for the revelation of Persephone. It is known that the *mustai* left Athens, wondered through the wilderness to Eleusis, and it was at Eleusis that they encountered in the Telesterion at the Sanctuary the revelation of the Mysteries. Indeed, the ritual pilgrim and procedure of the initiates has been often compared with the ritual drama of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (cf. G. Mylonas, *The Hymn to Demeter and Her Sanctuary at Eleusis* (Washington University Studies 1942), also G. E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961).

[352] Cf. A. E. Bernstein, *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds* (London: University College London Press, 1993). Although Bernstein accepts that ancient religious thinkers did not 'anticipate' a development in their thought within future religions, Bernstein does, nonetheless, imply that there existed a religious system in which such ideas could be developed, and this assumption is evident by his claim that, 'the evangelists, those earliest biographers of Jesus, nor his later defenders, including Augustine (d.430), lived in a cultural vacuum. They knew the Jewish scriptures, Greek philosophy and mythology', and then continues to state that, 'terminology used to express such ideas as ..."giants," "Titans," and "demons," which have distinctive connotations in simply the use of Greek. ... Further, because Christianity arose as one religion among many, one

Although Penglase grants, to some extent, a particularity to the author of the *Theogony* which is not determined by any Christianised notions, he does so in terms of an assumed 'theogonic and theological system' that is already 'part of a religious tradition'.[353] The suggestion of a 'religious tradition' by Penglase is misleading. It is not apparent that the ancient Greeks even had such a systematised form of belief, as Greek religious thought was so variable according to time, place and social setting. Although there seems to be a unanimous consensus that Zeus rose to supremacy, there is no unanimity about the succession itself, nor is there any universal or even widespread religious practice that also incorporates the Prometheus story.

Admittedly, there may be compatible evidence on how Prometheus introduced fire and animal sacrifice to humanity through the deception of Zeus, and there is also evidence that suggests Prometheus was closely associated with Hephaestus.[354] If so,

---

cannot reach a full appreciation of the task of forming the Christian concept of hell unless one also considers the competition.' (p. 2). It seems that Bernstein assumes that the notion of Tartaros in Hesiod's *Theogony* forms a precursor to the 'formation of hell' in Christian thought, and that although this may not have been the intended projection of Hesiod, it is something that seems to have, to some extent taken place. (cf. pp. 33 ff). A consequence of this argument is the assumption that in Hesiod there is a clear notion of Tartaros as an ancient equivalent to Christian hell, as hell is a place of punishment against those who act against God. Perhaps this could be said for the *Theogony*, as the Titans act against the will of Zeus and their punishment is their fallen status into Tartaros. However, this then presupposes that the Titans are perhaps conceptual counterparts to the 'fallen angels', and it is this sort of inquiry that could lead to a Christianised misunderstanding of the *Theogony* whose intention is to expound a theory of creation not necessarily associated to religious dogma.

[353] C. Penglase, *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influence on the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 240.

[354] Cf. Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound.* Cf. also C. Kerenyi, *Prometheus: Archetypal Image of Human Existence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991). Kerenyi cites evidence, both archaeological and literary, suggesting the close association between Prometheus and Hephaistos, 'an ancient relief at the entrance to the sanctuary represented Prometheus as the older, and Hephaistos as the younger god. This should not necessarily be taken to mean that the cult of Prometheus was the older one.' (p. 58). Kerenyi then goes on to argue that in relation to the birth of Athena Hephaistos and Prometheus seem to be symmetrically portrayed (cf. C. Kerenyi, *The Gods of the Greeks* (London and New York: Thames and Hudson, 2000, esp. pp. 120ff.), and that often Prometheus is omitted from myths of ancient poets for example, 'it is only Hephaistos who occurs in Homer. The great epic poet, who passes over so many archaic elements of the Greek religion, makes no reference to Prometheus. Thus, although in a number of extremely archaic contexts Hephaistos takes the place of Prometheus, it is still quite possible that he is only the successor of this particular mysterious Titan.' (*Prometheus*, pp. 58-59), and a cylix from the fifth century BCE presenting Prometheus before Hera is used to support Kerenyi's argument (cylix, Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale).

Kerenyi tends to universalize myths, in that similar accounts are merged and that characters of one really allude or in some instances are the same as those found in other mythologies. By using such an

then it questions to what extent one can reconstruct a systematised account for this religious tradition in antiquity. Penglase later recognises the limitations of historical method:

> 'while it is abundantly clear that the ideas and motifs manipulated by the poets are expressing a whole belief system, there is much to the mythology and the significance of its motifs which cannot be penetrated by the modern scholar.'[355]

It seems then, that while Penglase appreciates the limitations of the modern scholar to penetrate the reality of the ancient world and its culture, he ends up assuming a 'belief system' by which Hesiod should be interpreted in terms of a single traditional reality.

Furthermore, Penglase, in partial agreement with Barthes, suggests that literature is formed by external influences though not only from Greece, but also from Near Eastern culture.[356] One cannot wholly disagree with Penglase. Indeed, the *Theogony* (of Hesiod) may well have been influenced by other literary forms, such as the *Kumarbi, Ullikummi* and the *Epic of Gilgamesh.*[357] The assumption that episodes

---

interpretive method, Kerenyi develops a paradigm for understanding Greek religion, of which myths are an inherent and almost dogmatic aspect. This line of inquiry should not be developed for understanding Prometheus in the *Theogony*, on the contrary, Prometheus is not or even associated with Hephaistos, but son of Iapetos who represents the generative embodiment of cosmological violence against Zeus.

[355] Penglase, *Greek Myths,* p. 243.

[356] Penglase, *Greek Myths,* p. 241.

[357] R. Caldwell notes that, 'the derivative of both Greek and Hindu myths from a common Indo-European tradition in Neolithic times helps to explain some of the striking similarities of symbolic patterns in the two cultural systems. However, the lapse of more than two millennia between the Neolithic period and the early Iron Age, when the first written versions of these myths appeared in both India and Greece, makes it impossible to trace either descent of separate traditions or connections between different traditions.'(R. Caldwell, *The Origin of the Gods: A Psychoanalytical Study of Greek Theogonic Myth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 99. Despite Caldwell's admssion of the impossibility 'to trace either descent of separate traditions or connections between different traditions', he assumes that myths reflect some form of cross-cultural infusion. W. Burkert too reflects this tendency by stating that 'instead of individual motifs, therefore, we must focus on more complex structure, where sheer coincidence is less likely; a system of deities and a basic cosmological idea, the narrative structure of a whole scene, decrees of the gods about mankind, or a very special configuration of attack and defense. Once the historical link, the fact of transmission, has been established, then further connections, including linguistic borrowings become more likely, even if these alone do not

in the *Theogony* (of Hesiod), such as the Titanomachy and Typhomachy, are but a combination of older oriental ideas which 'convey the overall, and largely traditional picture of the origins of the present order of the divine world and the cosmos', could amount to a blatant *a priori* dismissal of the inner unity of the text, and of the dialectic discourse between the author and audience.[358] The tendency to interpret episodes of the *Theogony* solely through the lens of, for example, Near Eastern traditions can reduce the aesthetic qualities of the narrative of the *Theogony*. But at the same time, this is not to negate the value of comparison once literary reading of the *Theogony* has taken place.

Furthermore, characters in the *Theogony* have not only been interpreted in relation to Near Eastern traditions, but also often relegated as an aside in discussions on Orphic religion.[359] Yet when comparing Orphic Titans with those of the *Theogony*, differences emerge, and it is the differences between the Orphic texts that illuminate comparative similarities.[360] Although both theogonies have Ge / Gaia producing the

---

suffice to carry the burden of proof.' (W. Burkert, The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age trans. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert (London, England and Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 88. Cf. also M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), esp. pp. 276-333.

This is not to reject the benefits of cross-cultural comparisons, the dynamics of comparing multi-cultural mythologies as part of an anthropological research is invaluable, but as a means to interpret the characterizations made in the *Theogony* would encourage the construction of too many 'mythical' paradigms. For example, the Titans of the *Theogony* would transform from a reality presented by the text into an 'ideal' of (conflated) cross-cultural expectation.

[358] Penglase, *Greek Myths*, p. 241.

[359] According to West Homer corresponds more closely than Hesiod to Orphic theogonies – Cf. M. L. West, *Orphic Hymns* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 120.

[360] Mythology forms the basis of comparative similarities between the *Theogony* and Orphic texts. For example, the *Derveni Papyrus* (cf. A. Laks and G. W. Most eds., *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) has been used as a point of comparison. According to C. Calame ('Sexuality and Initiatory Transition' in *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* pp. 65-80) in his discussion on sexuality and procreation of column xiv cites 'Finally, in a typically Orphic vein of polemic against traditional theology, the succession narrative of the Hesiodic theogony – in which Cronos, after having castrated his father Ouranos, is forced to swallow a stone in place of his son Zeus – might well have been transformed and reversed: this time it would be the grandson who ingests a solar penis identified with a grandfather dethroned by his son.' (p. 68).

Cf. Tsantsanoglou K. and G.M. Parassoglou, 'Heraclitus in the *Derveni Papyrus*', in A. Brancacci *et al., Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta Philosophica*, Studi e Testi per il Corpus dei papri filosofici

Hundred Handers, the Kyklopes and the Titans, only the Orphic *Theogonies* explicitly identify Titans.[361] If West's interpretation of *Theogony* 207 is correct – in that the Titan children referred to here are those of lines 138ff – then the Orphic theogonies provide additions to the 'traditional' twelve, to include Phorkys and Dione. That aside, the *Theogony* refers to 'Titans' as a term at line 207 invented by Ouranos.[362]

However, the ritual significance of Titan in Orphic mythology undermines the credibility of comparison with Titan of the *Theogony*. The primary function of Orphic theogonies, hymns, exegesis and poems is to provide guidelines for the practitioner; such a purpose does not apply to the *Theogony*.[363] Initiation ritual in Orphic religion is set as a paradigm for human existence.[364] Orphism stresses the importance for the initiate to purify their soul from 'original sin'.[365] This process of purification bears

---

greci e lataini (Florence, 1988) 125-33. A crucial difference between the theogonies is the role of Dionysus. Olympiodorus links the theogonies by suggesting that the Dionysus myth (of the Orphics) is a sequel to previous traditions, as Dionysus after Ouranos, Kronos and Zeus, is the forth divine ruler of the world; cf. his commentary on Plato's *Phaedo* 61c.

[361] According to the Orphic tradition Ge produces the Titans in secret (*OF* 57, 114), she asks the Titans to castrate Ouranos, and only Okeanos refuses to perform the deed (*OF* 154 cf. *Theogony* 164ff) - yet all the children are hurled into Tartaros by Ouranos (*OF* 57, 121, 126) – whereas in the *Theogony* Titans are hurled by Zeus (715ff and728ff). Titans of the Orphic tradition are destroyed by Zeus' thunderbolt in the context of violence against Dionysus (*OF* 220, 224), and not as in the *Theogony* as part of cosmological separation between Gaia and Ouranos.

[362] Although Titan identity Orphic Dionysus is not specified of the Titans, it may be possible to identify these Titans as those referred to in the previous conflict myth against Ouranos.

[363]Nevertheless, scholars, such as Lamberton, have given ritual significance to the texts of Homer and Hesiod and, therefore, assumed a historical appraisal for literary interpretation and that the texts of Homer and Hesiod developed alongside Panhellenic religion. Lamberton states that, 'these are the primary concerns, and their resolution has been seen to be in the humanizing power of poetry. It is difficult to be specific concerning the relationship of the poem to the scattered and varied cults of Archaic Greece, but it has rightly been emphasized that the Homeric and Hesiodic poems seem to have taken something like the shapes in which we know them during the period of rapid development of major Panhellenic institutions such as Delphi and Olympia.' R. Lamberton, *Homer: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989) pp. 103-104. F. M. Cornford, 'A Ritual Basis for Hesiod's *Theogony*', in R. A. Segal ed., *The Myth and Ritual Theory: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998) 118-35, sees the hymn of the succession of Zeus formed part of an old ritual practice. Although it is conceded that by the time of Hesiod the ritual context may have been lost, Cornford goes on to assert the ritual implications within the 'debris' of Hesiod's 'creation myth' (p. 132, also 119 and 129). Not doubt this would be followed through for interpreting the ritual of Orphic religion.

[364] Cf. S. G. F. Brandon, *The Judgment of the Dead* (New York: Scribner's, 1967), p. 94: cf. also Apollodorus. *Bibliotheca* I.iii.2.

[365] There is much secondary evidence for this, as Olympiodorus of the sixth century C.E. (OF 220) refers to the dismemberment of Dionysus, the punishment of the Titans and the generation of mankind.

eschatological and soteriological weight.[366] Such Orphic mythologies derive from Titan savagery against Dionysus, and the consequence of Titan violence forms the biological and metaphysical aspects of existence.[367] Although the *Theogony* does not provide an account to be placed in service of religious ritual *per se*, it does offer comparison with other 'religious' texts (such as the Orphic) in terms of cosmology and theogony.[368]

Despite the concerns for comparative studies outlined above, there is a way which we can appreciate historical analysis and at the same time preserve our text. Chapter Two has offered the *Theogony* a detailed narrative interpretation, and it is at this point of our research that we can make comparisons without conflating our text

---

Also Pausanias of the second century C.E. (OF 210) refers to the dismemberment of Dionysus and the punishment of the Titans, and Plato (Laws 701c = OF 9) and Xenokrates (fr. 20) both of the fourth century refer to dismemberment and punishment. It is the acts of dismemberment, punishment and generation that form the said ritual basis of Orphic religion. Therefore, if mankind is created from the remnants of the Titans, then mankind must recognized their previous crimes and undergo some form of ritual purification (Pindar fr. 133).

[366] It is important not to interpret the concept of 'original sin' of the Titans inherent in humankind within a Christianised framework. The context and concept of Orphic original sin is very different form say - John Calvin's notion of predestination. Indeed, as W. K. C. Guthrie suggests, much modern scholarship has interpreted ancient religions within the framework of christianised expectations, 'we are brought up in the atmosphere of Christianity, and whether we like it or not, Christian notions of behaviour have sunk into the very marrow of our thought and expression.' (*Orpheus and Greek Religion* (1952), p. 200). Although it is possible to identify similarities between Orphic theogonies and rituals with Christian religions, it would be fallacious to impose a Christian interpretive framework upon these seeming similarities, practice. The 'Christianised' interpretation of Orphic religions is beyond the boundaries of this paper. Here the importance is to be conscious of the thin-line of cross-referential interpretations. The principle reason for consciousness of the Christianised approach towards Orphic religion is the knock-on effect it has had on interpreting Hesiod, and how interpretation of Titan as 'fallen angel' in the Orphic theogonies could be inappropriately imposed on the Titans of the *Theogony*.

[367] W. Burkert discusses not only the ritual connection between Titan violence and the genesis of mankind, but also of divergent Titan myths referring to violence against Dionysus W. Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), p. 73.
Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortations to the Greeks* ii.15.

[368] More recently classical scholars have noted the similarities between the myths and stories surrounding Dionysus and Christ. However the nature of these discussions extent beyond this present thesis. It is the explicit reference to mankind and explicit audience that differentiates the Orphic theogonies from the *Theogony* (of Hesiod), which make the 'thematic' correlations between the texts totally separate. To further this, it has been suggested by Nilsson, that the ritual nature of Orphism 'beginning with Chaos and ending with the creation of man the cosmology is rounded off into a systematic whole which has not only in myth but also a religious meaning. Its final aim is not to relate tales of the world and of the gods, but to explain the composite nature of man and his fate.' cf. M. Nilsson, 'Early Orphism and Kindred Movements', *Harvard Theological Review* 28 (1935) 181-230, esp. p. 225.

with other literary sources that refer to the 'creation'. Fundamentally: if we abandon the premise that the *Theogony* reflects any formalised thread of (an) ancient Greek religion, then we, as readers, could open ourselves to the possibility that our text has more in common with Near Eastern cosmological myths that predate the *Theogony*, than with other (so-called) religious literary texts found in Greece during and after the time of Hesiod.[369]

In order to determine possible correlations between our *Theogony* and Near Eastern sources, we ought to engage in a preliminary discussion on the relationship between Greek and Near Eastern world.[370] Greek history begins with the 8th century BCE as this was the time of great cultural expansion throughout the Greek world. Very little is known of Greek religion and culture prior to the 8th century BCE other than disparate fragments originating from the Minoan and Mycenaean periods. Although a cultural renaissance took place in central Greece during the Proto-

[369] Significantly, the ritual context of the Orphic theogonies and the Near Eastern myths sets these texts apart from Hesiod's *Theogony*. Despite Cornford's claims namely for the *Works and Days,* there is no evidence in the narrative of the *Theogony* to suggest any ritual importance. The ritual significance of the Near Eastern and Orphic texts provides these narratives with a determined cultural framework, which will have a profound impact on their interpretation. However, the *Theogony* is not bound by any cultural ritual of a set historical time and place. It is for these reasons that the *Theogony* continues to retain its independent literary position. Thus, although comparisons with (for example) Near Eastern myths offer an interesting discussion, such comparisons will not affect our text-based interpretation of the *Theogony*. Examples of the ritual importance of the Near Eastern myths are as follows: *The Wrath of Telipinu* was part of a fertility ritual. The Sumerian myth *The Descent of Inanna* resembles to an extent the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. The standard Babylonian myth was known as *Nergal and Erishkigal*. Two main versions of this myth are found at Sultanepe and Uruk, the former dating from the 15th century B.C.E. while the latter is more generally late Babylonian. The myth generally refers to Nergal's descent into the underworld and the encounter with the goddess of the underworld Erishkigal. This myth sees the decent and return of the deity in the same way Persephone returns to the upper-world, only the Homeric Persephone's descent was not voluntary. Both the Greek and Babylonian myths refer to the ritual katabasis of a follower, and their eventual release into some kind of salvation. The *Enuma Elish* was incorporated into a New Year festival to ensure civic order. The *Atrahasis* was used to assist childbirth. Cf. F.M. Cornford, 'A Ritual Basis for Hesiod's *Theogony*', esp. pp. 118-125.

[370] This point is important, especially as succession myths of Zeus have often been compared by contemporary scholars to Hittite and Akkadian myths. Cf. W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995); W. G. Lamberton and P. Walcot (eds.), 'A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod', *Kadmos* 4 (1965) 64-72; W. L. Moran, 'The Creation of Man in Atrahasis I.192-248', *BASOR* (1979) 200; P. Walcot, 'The Text of Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Hittite Epic of *Kumarbi*', *C.Q. 64* (1956) 198-206, idem,, *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff: Wales University Press, 1966); L. B.

Geometric period, the main literary sources for the creation myths have been based on collations of oral compositions from an earlier date.[371] It was during these early periods that strong links existed between Greece and the Near Eastern world.[372]

G. S. Kirk gives an incredible sense of cultural vibrancy between the Babylonian world and parts of Greece at a very early date, especially during the third and second millennia.[373] Kirk suggests that customs and ideas, probably facilitated by trading routes, flourished between the states of Mesopotamia to Egypt, all along the coastline routes of the Aegean sea and that, more fundamentally 'Indo-European speaking Hittites derived their theology from the non-Indo European Hurrians', and that the interactions of these civilizations were boundless.[374] Kirk almost leaves us with the impression that the culture of the Near East shaped that of the Greek world.[375] But, if Kirk's assumption is to be taken further, then it could be supposed that the religion and myths of the ancient Greeks were those taken from oriental influence.

More specific to our study, Walcot suggests that Near Eastern influence extended not only in the culture of the Greek world, but more fundamentally into the weave of Greek myths. Walcot claims that Hesiod's *Theogony* is based 'primarily

---

Zaidman and P. Schmitt-Pantel (eds.), *Religion in the Ancient Greek City* trans. P. Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

[371] For example, Hittite myths originated from Mesopotamia, and those likewise were probably Hurrian in origin coming from South East Asia, Syria and Mesopotamia. It should not go unnoticed that the Hittite world and Syria were connected to the Minoan and Mycenaean worlds of the same period. Therefore, cultural influence is likely.

[372] Furthermore, Greek language is Indo-European derived from the Neolithic age of the third millennium B.C.E. which bears influence from the Near East.

[373] Kirk, *Greek Myths*, p. 255.

[374] Ibid. There is evidence suggesting that there strong trading links between Syria and Ugarit, and the Greek world between 1450-1350 BCE. Cf. L. B. Zaidman and P. Schmitt-Pantel (eds.), *Religion in the Ancient Greek City* trans. P. Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

[375] In fact, scholars, such as Kirk, have not fully accounted for the chronological and geographical inconsitencies when suggesting that Near Eastern culture lies behind the Greek civilisation.

from the *Enuma Elish* and other Babylonian texts'.[376] Walcot goes on to suggest that 'these' Near Eastern texts and myths became abundant in Greece during Archaic period of 8th century Greece. However, Walcot supposes two things: (i) that Hesiod was influenced by Near Eastern sources and, (2) assuming that influence did occur, that it did not take place prior to the time of the 8th century. To this latter point Kirk argues that Oriental influence had taken hold in Greece well before the archaic era.[377] If Kirk is correct, then Hesiod could have based his composition of the *Theogony* on very ancient material prior to the Babylonian influences of his own time.

However, West raises our attention to more fundamental issues about methodology and posits the following question: 'Is it to be supposed that at the beginning of the orientalising period a complex theological myth was taken over bodily from some Near Eastern source, translated into Greek poets terms, and immediately retailed by Greek poets...?'[378]

In order to consider West's question we need to compare some of the myths of the Near East with Hesiod, and by doing so, to determine the extent to which there were possible links between the ancient Near Eastern and Greek cultures as posited by Kirk. The following paragraphs will examine Hittite, Akkadian and Ugarit myths, and in addition to this an old Babylonian myth known as the *Enuma Elish.*[379] Attention will be placed on structure and content of these Near Eastern myths when drawing comparisons to Hesiod's *Theogony.*

---

[376] Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East*, p. 81.
[377] G. S. Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient Greece and Other Cultures* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), p. 218.
[378] M. L. West, *Theogony*, p. 29.
[379] There are inherent methodological difficulties in interpreting Babylonian texts. Some evidence for Near Eastern myths comes from Herennius Philo of Byblos who wrote around 64-140 CE, and published nine books of the Greek translation of *Phoenician History* by Sanchuniathon. This priest is a principle source of early eastern mythology. Cf. Porphyry, *abst.* 2.56, also Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, esp. 1.9.23, also 1.9.20-1.10.53.

The rejection of the *Theogony's* Typhomachy by Jacoby and Aly could be undermined by mythical parallels found in the Hittite corpus.[380] However, by rejecting the objections of Jacoby on Hittite evidence, we presuppose that Hesiod's *Theogony* is to some extent, if not greatly, influenced by the Hittite myths of *Kumarbi* and the *Song of Ullikummi.* Certainly the strong parallels may be seen between the *Theogony's* characterisation of Typhoneus and the 'storm-god's' fight against the monster Ullikummi.[381]

Both of the above mentioned myths are concerned with succession conflicts, and the processes of cosmological development. In the *Kumarbi* Ullikummi is able to counter the attack of Ea who is using a sword to sever Earth and Sky; and in our *Theogony* Kronos successfully attempts to sever Earth and Sky by using an *adamantos*. In the *Kumarbi*, Kumarbi replaced Anu as the Sky-god, as did Kronos in the *Theogony*. Kumarbi then bites off and swallows Anu's genitals. Kumarbi vomits what he has swallowed, but remains impregnated with the storm-god. Although the *Theogony* does not entirely follow the narrative structure of the *Kumarbi* there are similarities; elements of the *Kumarbi* can be seen in Kronos' treatment of his father and then his own children. In the *Theogony* Kronos severs his father's phallus and throws it into the sea, thus producing Aphrodite. The blood spilt from the severed phallus produced the Giants, Meliai and the Erinyes. Kronos does not vomit from swallowing his father's phallus; but instead, later in the narrative when he is 'ruler', he regurgitates the stone he had consumed thinking it was his son Zeus.

---

[380] Our Chapter Two has already qualified the authenticity of the Typhomachy as crucial to the *Theogony's* narrative cohesion.

[381] Other similarities include the structure of the succession conflicts. Although the *Kumarbi* refers to four generation of gods, and the *Theogony* only four, the upheavals between each generation and the characters involved in those upheavals are too similar to overlook.

It could be argued that the similarities between Hesiod and the *Kumarbi* are tenuous, but this is only the case when other Hittite myths have not been brought into consideration.[382] A text often compared to the *Theogony* by Near Eastern scholars is the *Song of Ullikummi*.[383] The structure and content of the *Song of Ullikummi* appears as follows:

> The story begins with the reign of Alalu in heaven. After a cycle of nine years Alalu is usurped by Anu, and sent to reside in the underworld. Anu is then defeated after a cycle of nine years rule by Kumarbi. Anu tries to escape to the sky; but, having caught him by his feet, Kumarbi consumes the genitals of Anu. Kumarbi is informed by Anu that he bears within him the gods Heshub (storm), Aranzaha (Tigris) and Tasmisu (a servant god). Anu then successfully flees to the sky. Kumarbi tries to regurgitate the genitals, but remains impregnated by the Storm-god Heshub. Anu plots Heshub's escape. Ea gives Kumarbi, at his request, which caused Heshub to be borne through Kumarbi's phallus. In anger, Kumarbi plots revenge and conceals Ullikummi in the shoulder of Ubelluri. Ullikummi grew to over nine thousand leagues high and momentarily defeats Heshub in combat. Ea ordered the former gods to bring forward a sickle which had been used to separate Heshub could cut Ullikummi's feet. Heshub defeats Ullikummi.

---

[382] For example, the *Wrath of Telipinu* conveys corresponding cosmological issues as the *Theogony* and *Kumarbi*. It appears that *Wrath of Telipinu* is, likewise, concerned with cosmological formation and human existence. The Hittite myth of Telipinu and the abandoning of his cosmological position could easily be compared with the narrative of the Greek *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. But in the Hittite myth it was the storm-god who intervened to find Telipinu, and who in anger at Telipinu sent lightning and thunderbolts to scourge the earth. It was the intervention of Kamrusepa that ended the storm-god's wrath, and through ritual the earth recovered and became fertile again. Although there may not seem to be obvious narrative similarities between this text and the *Theogony*, there are mutual threads of cosmological understanding. Both the Hittite myth and the *Theogony* are concerned with the causes and consequences of cosmological upheaval. The intervention of Kamrusepa may be compared to the deception of Gaia. Furthermore, the scourging of the earth tends to symbolize patriarchal authority which dominates the general theme of cosmological myths. The scourging of the earth is what happened after the final defeat of Gaia's progeny in the Typhomachy episode in our *Theogony*. However, the myth of Telipinu, unlike the *Theogony*, is based on cult ritual. Evidence for *Telipinu* can be found on tablet 1.57; cf. J. B. Pritchard, *The Ancient Near East: Volume One: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

[383] Numerous accounts of the *Song of Ullikummi* have been found at Hattusas dating from the third / second millennia BCE.

The motifs of deceit, severance, generational conflict, impregnation, regurgitation, phallus and eventual defeat of one's cosmological enemy found in this Hittite myth can also be identified in the *Theogony*. In the *Theogony* the severed genitals of Ouranos are not consumed by Kronos but thrown into the sea; instead Kronos swallows his children as it has been foreshadowed that he will usurped by one of his own offspring. Kronos regurgitates the stone of Zeus after he had been tricked to eat something by his wife.

An equivalent to the monstrous hybrid Ullikummi could be Hesiod's Typhoneus. In Hesiod's text Typhoneus is produced from the union between Gaia and Tartaros, and Ullikummi from the shoulders of Ubelluri.[384] However, unlike Ullikummi, Typhoneus is not cut down by a sickle used to sever Gaia and Ouranos, but by the power of Zeus. The '*former gods*' (i.e. the Titans) do not assist Zeus in the same way Ea orders for assistance. But, Typhoneus, like Ullikummi, is finally defeated.

What is lacking in the cosmological *Song to Ullikummi* is any real significance to humankind, similar to the Akkadian myth of *Atrahasis* and, to some extent, Hesiod's *Theogony.*[385] The *Atrahasis* starts with the gods and how the former and new gods enter into conflict, a theme not dissimilar to the *Theogony's* generational upheavals.[386] After the violent onslaughts, a tripartite cosmological system is established: Anu as Sky, Enlil as wind and Enki as water. But as for references to

---

[384] The description of Ullikummi could remind a myth-reader of the shoulders of the Hundred Handers or the height of Atlas as described by the *Theogony*. The role of Atlas in the *Theogony*, is to maintain the cosmological distance between Gaia and Ouranos, similarly Ullikummi has a defined cosmological position.

[385] The first version of the Akkadian myth appears in three books dating from the 17th century BCE. Much evidence has been found at Ugarit. Cf. S. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989). Cf. also Lambert and Millard, *Atrahasis*, especially the introduction.

humankind and their involvement in the cosmological upheavals, this aspect of the *Atrahasis* would better be compared with Orphic cosmology than with the *Theogony*.[387]

The notion of a tripartite universe is evident in both Greek and Near Eastern creation myths. According to a myth recorded by Damascius, Kronos created from his own seed three elemental forces which constituted fire, wind and water. Evidence from the B Scholion on *Iliad* 2.783 suggests that Chronos created Typhoneus. This account almost seems to merge the creative powers of Kronos in the Ugarit myth with the creation of Typhoneus from the demise of Titan in the *Theogony*. However, this latter suggestion is spurious and reflects a desperate attempt to find historical links between this myth and Hesiod's *Theogony*.

Philo of Byblos possibly provides a more suitable Near Eastern myth to compare with the *Theogony*. Philo's account suggests four generations of gods: (1) Hypsistos and Beruth, (2) Ouranos and Gaia, (3) Kronos and (4) Zeus.[388] Furthermore, Hypsistos was killed by wild monsters. According to Walcot, Philo states that

> 'Hypsistos and Beruth dwelt about Byblos. Ouranos and Ge had four sons, Kronos, Baitylos, Dagon and Atlas. Ouranos' abominable conduct towards his consort and his desire to kill their offspring led

---

[386] In the *Atrahasis* there is no initial mention to humankind which, like the *Theogony*, sees the gods as the main focal characters.

[387] According to the *Atrahasis* humankind were crafted by Enki and his mother to serve the gods and thus prevent conflict among the deities. After six hundred years, the gods felt threatened by humankind and plotted their destruction. The gods commissioned three regular attempts to destroy humankind at one thousand two hundred year intervals (the first was plague, second famine and the third was a flood). But Atrahasis and Enki favoured humankind and cunningly created conflict among the gods. Atrahasis and Enki succeed then to form their own pantheon. Although the concept of humankind creating divine conflict is absent in the *Theogony* devious scheming by some gods against others is a recurrent motif (Gaia deceives Ouranos, Kronos deceives Ouranos, Rhea deceives Zeus and so forth). However, the notion of human creation to be a servant of the gods and the cyclical punishment of physical afflictions is something prevalent in Orphic religion. Cf. M. L. West, *The Orphic Hymns* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983) and *OF* 131, 132a and 133.

[388] Cf. Philo, *History of the Phoenicians*. For Walcot, cf. P.Walcot., *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff: Wales University Press, 1966), p. 23.

> to the struggle between Kronos and his father'. In the end, Kronos was victorious and Ouranos exiled.

There are obvious parallels in Philo's account above with Hesiod's *Theogony*. Although in the *Theogony* Ouranos and Ge produce more than four sons, the conflict and the causes of the upheaval between Kronos and Ouranos essentially remain the same in both myths. In the *Theogony*, Ouranos' actions of desire towards Gaia resulting in the suppression of the Titan children are described as 'evil'. These evil deeds of Ouranos culminate in Gaia asking her children to act against their father. Kronos caused the separation of Ouranos from Gaia resulting in his permanent exile in the sky.

According to Philo, Ouranos was castrated by an *adamantos*, but this severance takes place later on in the Ugarit narrative when Kronos was already ruler. The blood from Ouranos' severed phallus formed the springs and rivers of Byblos. Philo goes on to state that Kronos then buried his brother Atlas under the earth, and Zeus became a sub-servant of Kronos. This Ugaritic myth accounts for the formation of the physical world. Rivers and springs were created as a consequence of cosmological upheaval and Atlas acts as a pillar under the earth, presumably keeping it in position.

Although there is no mention to Kronos swallowing his children in the Ugarit myth, as in the *Theogony*; both stories refer to the displacement of potential cosmological threats. For example, in the Ugarit myth Ouranos is exiled and Atlas is banished. In the *Theogony* Ouranos keeps hidden in the earth the Titan children and the Hundred Handers, Kronos keeps his children confined in his belly and Zeus banishes the Titans into Tartaros.

However, possibly the most profound Near Eastern parallel to the *Theogony*, in terms of both narrative structure and content, is the *Enuma Elish*.[389] The narrative structure of the *Enuma Elish* appears as follows:

Tablet I: This tablet refers to the first generation:
The myth begins at a time when heaven and earth did not exist. There was only Apsu, the fresh water ocean. 'the first principle joined by Tiamat the salt water sea, and it was she who bore all things' by mixing her waters with Apsu (1-5) Tiamat and Apsu produced Lohmu and Lahamu (10), Anshar and Kishar (12). Then Anu was created by Anshar (15).

Violence among the gods:
The gods bellowed inside the atrahasis causing Tiamat distress, which Apsu unsuccessfully tried to stop (25). Apsu then summoned Mummu for assistance (30).

There is a gap in the text which reconvenes at line 44, which reads '[for] he had urged evil upon her.' It seems that Tiamat endured the evil bellow and Mummu told Apsu to take revenge on their children. But Ea discovered what Mummu and Apsu had conspired and while Apsu slept Ea tied him up and slaughtered him (69). Ea then bound Mummu with a lead rope (72) above [the mound of] Apsu.

There is a further gap in the text, and at line 81 'in the midst of Apsu Marduk was formed'. Anu produced four winds, a storm brewed against Tiamat, who then churned day and

[389] The *Enuma Elish* myth dates back to the Old Babylonian era of the eighteenth-century B.C.E. Texts for this myth date to c.1100 BCE of the Late Assyrian period. Tablets have been recovered from Sultanepe. The text comprises of seven tablets. Cf. S. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) where Dalley provides a comprehensive critique of the Babylonian texts; cf. also J. B. Pritchard, *The Ancient Near East: Volume One: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973) who offers a good synopsis of the *Enuma Elish*.

night (105-109). Distressed, Tiamat, summoned the other gods to relieve her discomfort. Tiamat received help from serpents, dragons and monstrous hybrids (141). Tiamat raised Qingu and gave to him as war commander the *Tablet of Destinies* (157). Qingu had now assumed supremacy (159).

Tablet II: Tiamat draws up an army to fight against Apsu. Ea informed Anshar of Tiamat's intentions (14). Anshar was glad with Ea (75), and told him to subdue Tiamat with a spell (78-150), as not even Anu could stop Tiamat (90).

Tablet III: Marduk with the assistance of Kakka was sent to rescue patriarchal rule from the matriarchal control of Tiamat.

Tablet IV: Marduk is rewarded by the gods with a throne, sceptre and invincible weaponry (29). The gods order Marduk to sever the life of Tiamat. Marduk transforms into fire and ensnares Tiamat. Marduk had to confront the storm god (50) and raised the Deluge (75). Tiamat and Marduk engage in single combat (94). Marduk lances Tiamat's belly and pierced the life out of her heart. Despite attempts to flee, Tiamat's enemies were caught and imprisoned (114). Marduk used Tiamat's body to model half of the world (136).

Tablet V: The physical world is given shape. For example, the constellations were formed from Tiamat's ribs, the mountains from her eyes. Marduk becomes the principle craftsman.

Tablet VI: This tablet describes the creation of humankind. The death of a god was required to create humankind. Thus, Qingu was sacrificed.

Tablet VII: This tablet sees the stratification of the universe under the authority of Marduk.

Although there are obvious narrative inconsistencies between each tablet of *Enuma Elish*, thematic similarities can be sought with the *Theogony*.[390] Tablet I refers to a time of primordial creation, and the formation of the first generation of gods. Similarly, in the *Theogony* the creation myth begins at a time when there were no gods except Chaos (116). Earth was created by Chaos, and she in turn produced Ouranos (126-127). Ouranos and Gaia, like Tiamat and Apsu, create the first generation of gods. In the *Theogony* a series of twelve progeny are formed, whereas there are only four in the *Enuma Elish*. The discomfort of Gaia and Tiamat sees the start of cosmological upheaval. In the *Enuma Elish*, however, Tiamat's initial discomfort is not caused by the suppression of Apsu, unlike Ouranos' suppression of Gaia in the *Theogony*. Nonetheless, in both accounts Gaia and Tiamat's disquiet is caused by the confinement of the gods within their belly.

Further similarities between the *Theogony* and *Enuma Elish* are the motifs of deception, night and violence against paternal authority. It is at night that Kronos (*Th.* 176-180) and Ea (*Enuma Elish* 69) sever their paternal link. However, in the *Theogony*, Kronos commits violence against Ouranos at Gaia's request (so that she may be freed from internal discomfort), whereas Ea in the *Enuma Elish* initially responds against the conspiracy of Mummu and Apsu to release Tiamat from the anguish in her belly. It is only later in the narrative that Apsu, having been killed by Ea, sends forces which cause Tiamat further distress. It is at this point in the myth that the text concentrates on a cosmological struggle between patriarchy and matriarchy, as Tiamat calls upon the other gods and raises Qingu to act against Apsu. It is these

[390] For example, the flow between Tablet I and II is awkward. Tablet II refers to Tiamat's discomfort which Apsu tries to alleviate. As a result, Apsu is destroyed. Then in Tablet II Tiamat draws an army to fight against Apsu. There seems to be a gap in the narrative to allow, thus making the text inconsistent.

latter points which correlate to Gaia's appeal to her offspring for them to act against Ouranos in the *Theogony* (164-169). The notion of generative violence seems to form a fundamental aspect of both the *Enuma Elish* and the *Theogony.* In both accounts, it appears that generative violence originates from within the primordial mother.[391]

Therefore, in both the *Theogony* and the *Enuma Elish* the maternal aspect is the root cause of succession conflicts. At Tablet II we are told of the attempts made by Ea to subdue Tiamat, and in his failure to do so in Tablet III Marduk with his assistant Kakka is sent to rescue the patriarchal authority once held by Apsu. At this point we could compare Marduk to the *Theogony's* Zeus. Although Zeus was not produced by Ouranos in the same way Marduk was by Apsu, Zeus had to confront a series of violent elements produced from the primordial mother in order to reclaim patriarchal supremacy.[392]

The descriptive narrative of Marduk's defeat of Tiamat in Tablet IV offers significant parallels to the Typhoneus episode of the *Theogony.*[393] Marduk has to face a monstrous storm-god almost similar to Gaia's creation of Typhoneus. The single handed combat between Tiamat and Marduk could be seen to parallel the final

---

[391] For example, Gaia in the *Theogony* produced Kronos, the Titans and Typhoneus; and Tiamat in the *Enuma Elish* created Ea and the storm-god.

[392] Zeus, like Marduk, was assisted in the cosmological upheavals by the Hundred Handers and the Kyklopes. This is evident in both the Titanomachia and the Typhomachy episodes. In the *Theogony* Zeus does not fail to defeat either his Titan enemies in the Titanomachia or Typhoneus in the Typhomachy, nor is the patriarchal supremacy of Zeus in the succession conflicts undermined or replaced by another character. However, in the *Enuma Elish* when Ea fails to suppress Tiamat Marduk is sent. The conflict involving Ea prepares the reader for the intervention of Marduk who was introduced earlier on in the narrative of Tablet I. Similarly, the Titanomachy in the *Theogony* prepares the reader for the main dual between Zeus and Typhoneus at lines 820-880, which in fact is the climatic episode in the *Theogony's* succession conflicts.

[393] Interestingly, the appeal of the gods to Marduk in Tablet IV is almost reminiscent to the ascent of the Hundred Handers (615-623), and Zeus' call for their assistance against the Titans. Although the Hundred Handers were not offered a throne by Zeus as Marduk was by the gods, they were offered celestial hospitality. However, there are no other correlations to be made between the Hundred Handers and Marduk. On the contrary, if Marduk is to be compared to any characters in the *Theogony* it has to be Zeus.

conflict between the Typhoneus and Zeus.[394] The defeat of the storm-god directly led to the defeat of Tiamat, in the same way Typhoneus' demise led to the final submission of matriarchal authority of Gaia.[395]

The final Tablets of the *Enuma Elish* after the defeat of Tiamat, like the defeat of Typhoneus in the *Theogony*, the narrative concentrates on the generative powers of the cosmological ruler. A new cosmic order is crafted by the patriarchal ruler and all aspects of the universe are allocated their cosmological position.[396]

The creation of humankind in the *Enuma Elish* presents us with a problem in comparing the *Theogony*. According to Tablet VI humankind were created from the sacrifice of a god. Nowhere in the *Theogony*, however, is there either a direct reference to the genesis of humankind, nor is there any mention of humankind being derived from the destruction of a divine element. Evidence from the Greek world of humankind being formed from fallen deities can be found in the Orphic corpus, and as mentioned in the above discussion, Orphic theogonies bear little if any relation to our interpretation of the *Theogony*.[397]

To make a brief summary, it is evident that it is difficult to determine just to what extent Hesiod was in fact influenced by Babylonian culture, or whether the thematic similarities found between the Near Eastern texts are more accidental than

---

[394] Cf. Tablet IV of the *Enuma Elish* for the conflict between Tiamat and Marduk, and *Th.* 820-880 for the battle between Zeus and Typhoneus.

[395] Cf. *Theogony* 884.

[396] Cf. Tablet V where the constellations and mountains are formed. In the *Theogony*, these aspects of the physical world were created at the time of Chaos, and not after the ascension of Zeus. Instead, the order Zeus creates is that of the Olympian deities. Zeus also confirms the cosmological structure of the world as we know it. Cf. *Theogony* 880-1020 and *Enuma Elish* Tablet VII.

[397] The myth of Dionysus refers to how the Titans were killed by the thunderbolts of Zeus and from their ashes humankind was created. Cf. Pausanius 8.37.5. An informative discussion for Orphic religion and mythology is offered by W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* with a new foreword by L. J. Alderink (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), esp. pp. 83-127 where Guthrie compares the relationship between Orphic theogonies and Hesiod. A. Laks provides a comprehensive discussion on the Orphic corpus in A. Laks and G. W. Most (eds.), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

design. It could be possible that the culture of the Near East just happened to share similar concerns about the nature of our world as the Greeks. But, as a means to express these concerns authors, whether early Greek or Babylonian authors, drew upon aspects from the physical world and animated them through the narrative of a cosmological discourse. If this is so, then the methodological analysis often applied by historical scholars such as Kirk could allow us to further our understanding about 'ancient' beliefs and attitudes towards world formation. At the same time we ought to reflect again on the caution raised by West that it is difficult to believe that there ever existed a common thread between Babylonian texts and the narrative of Hesiod's *Theogony*. Furthermore, if we extended West's concerns, we ought to apply them to our comparative study on Presocratic philosophy and Hesiod.

The similarities between Hesiod to the Presocratics (especially Empedocles) and the Near Eastern myths (notably the *Enuma Elish*) should not go unnoticed. It is interesting how early cosmologies defined the elemental universe, which relate directly to the foundations of human existence. The *Theogony*, *Enuma Elish* and Empedocles all provide us with a theory about the universe based on the separation of primordial forces, which brings about another generation of elements / gods. This period of separation is then followed by a period of calm, followed by another cycle of cosmological upheaval until another period of harmony takes control. However, despite these interesting thematic coincidences, there is no real evidence to suggest that the *Theogony* was based on any Near Eastern influence or philosophical discourse. The Zeus of the *Theogony* only makes narrative sense in the text itself, and when compared, for example, to Marduk of the *Enuma Elish*, the *Theogony*'s narratological coherence should not be pressed to such an extent that it is compromised. For example, we may have to explain the any compromises offered for

the text's main characterisations. We have to be careful that the sub-focalisations of the *Theogony's* fabula have not been altered slightly to allow cross-textual comparison.[398]

However, despite some of the skepticism mentioned above, the cross-textual approach of historical analysis of this thesis allows us to see the text of the *Theogony* not as part of a literary, religious or philosophical tradition, but as a text that can independently contribute to cross-textual discussions. This invaluable contribution can only be achieved when text-based-analysis has already taken place, and then followed by historical appraisal.

3) **Anthropology**

The term 'anthropology' alone has inherent difficulties for interpretation. It is complex enough trying to establish the meaning of the word 'anthropology', let alone attempting to apply such an interpretive framework in understanding what the ancient Greeks thought about the nature of human existence. Further complications arise when, in our instance, we try to ascertain how anthropological based research can contribute to a text-based interpretation of a text composed in the 8th century B.C.E. Conversely, it will be difficult to decide to what extent our interpretation for the *Theogony* will contribute to the anthropological analysis for the culture of human existence.

As a more fundamental initial point of departure, then, we ought to offer a basic understanding for the term 'anthropology', and then try to address some of the

---

[398] In relation to this, a section on anthropology will follow.

issues raised above. After a preliminary discussion, we may then be able to determine whether the often structuralist and functionalist analysis of anthropological research can apply to the narrative content of the *Theogony*.[399]

The main purpose of 'anthropology' is to explore the nature of human existence and experience concentrating primarily on the cultural frameworks of given societies. Anthropologists, in assessing 'cultural' attitudes, responses and interpretations of human existence, tend to concentrate on religion and religious rituals. For example, R. Girard describes a strong relationship between mythology and religious ritual, and suggests that both of these aspects are jointly concerned with confronting the uncertainties of human existence.[400] If we take Girard's thesis into consideration, then we ought to investigate whether the myth(s) of Hesiod's *Theogony* ask(s) fundamental questions about the nature of human existence and whether these enquiries reflect any cultural understanding.

---

[399] This section has no intention to discuss at length the implications of anthropological analysis, as this would extend the boundaries of this thesis. However, the social issues raised by anthropologists and socio-historians provide the basis of an in depth debate about the ideas humans have about their own individual and collective existence. Anthropologists explore the mediums of expression regarding notions about human existence, often concentrating on the experiences of an individual and how this affects the community and practices the individual performs as part of a cultural system. Cf. The following sources provide socio-anthropological discussions for ancient societies and refer to Hesiod's *Theogony* as a source for cultural interpretation: C.J. Bleeker, *The Sacred Bridge* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979), E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Theories of Primitive Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965) and R. Segal (ed.), *The Myth and Ritual Theory: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998). Social-anthropologists who provide a more generalised discussion are (for example), S.F. Nadel, *The Foundations of Social Anthropology* (London: Cohen &West Ltd., 1963), A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (New York: Free Press, 1965), E.R. Leach, *Rethinking Anthropology* London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology No. 22 (London: Athlone Press, 1966).

[400] R. Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* translated by P. Gregory (London: The Athlone Press, 1995), esp. pp. 89-118. Girard's thesis may be compared to Burkert's notion of reciprocal violence and the occasional need for humankind to relieve its anxieties about their own existence and perform some kind of scapegoat ritual, often sacrifice to overcome and empower these tensions. (Cf. Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, pp. 68-88. Also, W. Burkert, *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religions* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1996), esp. pp.51-53, 85-90 and 149-152). It appears that in times of cultural crisis, at the early stages of cultural development humankind, through a ritual act of sacrifice, tried to empower suppressive forces which under normal circumstances were beyond human control. However, for the few moments of the ritual humankind possesses the power through ritual to overcome social anxieties in order to then return to cultural normality.

Socio-historians often concentrate on religion as a means to explore a society's attitude towards the cosmological significance of humankind. If this trend is to be applied as an interpretation for the *Theogony*, then to an extent we need to presuppose that the text itself reflects some kind of religious model. However, as stated in the section on religion above, our preliminary conclusions there were that the narrative of the *Theogony* bears little, if any, resemblance to any known religious system. Nonetheless, the principle concerns of anthropological research encourage us to question once again the relationship between the myth of the *Theogony* and ancient Greek religion.

However, C.J. Bleeker warns us of the problems in assuming that one set of ideas concerning the nature of human existence resembles the concerns of another societal system of religious beliefs. According to Bleeker 'ideas on the nature and destiny of man as evolved by various religious ... are so different that justice may be served by studying them separately.'[401] In response to Bleeker, one may acknowledge the benefit of studying religions separately; however, if we adopt such micro-vision, we are left to confront the constraints imposed by a scholarly approach about our cultural past. Therefore, one the other hand, if comparisons are to be made between different religions and cultures, caution is to be assured that not too many generalised statements are made about the 'beliefs' of humankind. Thus, we ought to some extent be careful of the energetic sway of anthropological research.

Although M. Eliade is a key figure in socio-historical analysis, in his support of this discipline he embeds some interpretative advice.[402] According to Eliade 'the metaphysical concepts of the archaic world were not always formulated in theoretic

[401] Cf. C.J. Bleeker, *Sacred Bridge* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), p. 136.
[402] M. Eliade, *Cosmos and History* (New York, Free Press, 1959).

language: but the symbol, the myth, ... express ... a complex system ... about the reality of things.'[403] Eliade informs us that archaic ideas about human existence were not always conveyed in scientific speak, (ie. for example the theoretic discourse of the Presocratic philosophers), but in other communicative mediums such as visual, ritual, symbolic and myth. Although Eliade offers reservations about the complexities of diverse mediums of expression, it seems, at the same time, that Eliade is in fact suggesting that by piecing all these mediums together we can formulate the anthropological concerns of the archaic Greeks.

It is debatable to what extent the *Theogony* can be categorised alongside other myths and translated in relation to other symbols and symbolic ritual. Indeed, our comparative discussion with the creation myths of the Near Eastern texts above, especially the comparison between the *Enuma Elish* and the *Theogony*, has led us to recognise that there exists among disparate cultures a universal thread of human self-consciousness. It is questionable whether this conceptual thread of concern about existence is entirely a result of cross-cultural interaction, or merely an inherent concern of the human *psyche*. The Near Eastern myths, like the *Theogony*, offer an expression about the nature of human existence and the cosmological aspects which fundamentally affects humanity. However, it is the central issue of 'ritual' that differentiates the *Theogony* from the Near Eastern corpus.[404]

If we are to assume that the symbolic processes and ritual performances of religious discourse assist humankind to understand its own identity, then the

---

[403] Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, p. 3.

[404] The narrative of the *Theogony* does no rely on nor contributes to any external ritual which involves any ritual worship. There is no suggestion in the text that the *Theogony* was functionary to any totem worship. It could be argued that the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, unlike the *Theogony*, did form an aspect of the totem worship of Demeter and Persephone which took place at the cult sanctuary at Eleusis. For a further discussion on the significance of totem worship refer to C.J. Bleeker, *Sacred Bridge* (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

Theogony has no place among scholarly discussions about ancient religions.[405] The *Theogony's* narrative does not focus on offering any practical procedure for the collective or individual to understand their own cultural or individual identity: instead what it does appear to offer is a sequence of narrative focalisations which humankind (whether collective or individual) can relate to in terms of their own external experiences.[406]

Furthermore, the *Theogony* provides the reader with a distinction between the concepts *sacred* and *profane* which may appear to be similar to that found in Greek religion.[407] In fact the *Theogony* refers to the *sacred* (ie. divine existence) and *profane* (ie. human experience) in terms of cosmological progression.[408] Therefore, in rather more basic terms, the *Theogony* offers a crude distinction between divine and human reality, a reality which can not be superseded by any ritual performance.[409]

In order to relate the *Theogony* to some religious and / or social custom, social historians have often extracted the Prometheus episode of the *Theogony* and compared it alongside the literary works of Hesiod's *Works and Days,* Aeschylus' *Prometheus*

---

[405] Cf. D.J. Davies, *Death, Ritual and Belief: The Rhetoric of Funerary Rites* (London & Washington: Cassell, 1997), esp. pp.1-22.

[406] To an extent anthropology incorporates psycho-analysis in its approach to investigating humankind's understanding about their *own* existence and cultural behaviour.

[407] Cf. R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), esp. pp.32-74 and 281-308.

[408] Some socio-anthropologists, such as Otto and Müller, have suggested that religion flourished from the attempt to rationalise human existence. While other anthropologists see religion as a process of ritual behaviour focusing on cultural behaviour. (Cf. R.R. Marriett, *The Threshold of Religion and Other Essays* (London: Bloomsbury, 1914), esp. p. xxxi.
Although there is evidence for a cult dedicated to Kronos and a temple in Athens, there is no evidence to suggest that the *Theogony* formed a crucial aspect of any of the Kronos cult religions. Instead, it is likely that Pinder refers to the worship of Kronos at Olympia in some of his Olympian Odes (for example, cf. *Ol.*2 and 6). For a historical source on the religious importance of Kronos refer to Pausanius 1.18.7 and 9.39.3).

[409] A distinction between the terms *sacred* and *profane* is offered by E. Durkheim in his *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (London: Allen & Urwin, 1915), esp. pp. 380-382. While religious rituals are taking place, the participants either feel one with the god (as in the Eleusinian mysteries) or in control of their own destiny – which is ordinarily the function of the gods. This sense of liberation is only present whilst the ritual is taking place, once the ritual has been performed and cultural activities have resumed, then the individual and the society once again is vulnerable to the aggression of cosmological elements. The place of humankind in the cosmological spectrum is again reinforced.

Bound and the religious literature associated with the Orphic tradition.[410] It could be said that other than the *Theogony* each of the other literary documents has a set cultural function. For example Aeschylus' play was probably performed at a religious dramatic festival and the Orphic corpus offers ritual and spiritual guidance to the initiate. The *Theogony*, like these other documents, expresses a concern about the individual and collective fate of humanity. Issues such as life and death are a consistent anthropological thread.

In response to this latter point, it is important now to focus on the narrative of the *Theogony* and attempt to pick out areas which may be of anthropological concern. The findings of Chapter Two tend to led us to the Prometheus episode and the Typhomachy as means of illustration. Focusing on these two passages does not exclude the importance of (for example) the Titanomachy. The reasons why the Titanomachy will not be more fully discussed here are that: (i) the Titan characters are the usual focus of socio-historians which often results in the exclusion of other crucial focalisations in the *Theogony*; (ii) the Titan episode would demand a more detailed discussion for comparisons to other Titan mythology and cult (which would be beyond the boundaries of this section here); and (iii) the Typhomachy episode has been underestimated by classical and socio-historians in terms of its anthropological output.[411]

---

[410] Secondary discussions on the Prometheus myth have formed part of scholarly discussions on the Titan / Dionysus myth. Cf. Kerényi, *Dionysus: Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life*, esp. p. 142 where he discusses the myth of 'cultural bringers'. Dionysus was the 'bringer of the wine culture', and Prometheus 'the fire bringer'. It was the fire which Prometheus introduced that formed the basis of ritual sacrifice. Aspects of sacrificial ritual are referred to in the *Theogony*, and its significance in the narrative will be explored more fully in the discussions to follow above. Cf. also D. Obbink, 'Dionysus Poured Out: Ancient and Modern Theories of Sacrifice and Cultural Formation', in Carpenter T.H. and Faraone C.A. (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993) pp. 85-86.

[411] There is a void in scholarly contribution in terms of including all the focalisations in the *Theogony* into one discussion on socio-anthropology, which at the same time offers a comparison to other associated creation mythologies and cults that, similar to the *Theogony*, focus on the principle human

The main fabula of the *Theogony* informs us that humankind are not at the centre of the world, and that humanity bears no real influence on the structuring of the cosmological hierarchy. The allocation of humankind's cosmological position is only considered - though not specified explicitly in the *Theogony* - once the *honour* of the gods has been awarded. The allocation of *honour* depends on the benevolence of Zeus as the cosmological '*ruler of gods and men*'.

Furthermore, in the *Theogony*, humankind is set apart from the divine elements. In fact, the purpose of humanity is to occupy the terrestrial void, though significantly, they play no part in the cosmological formation of the void. Upheaval in the terrestrial void which humankind occupy occurs only when there is cosmological disquiet among the divine elements, and not vice-versa. For example, upheaval amongst the human race does not so much cause cosmological conflict as it brings about hardship in the mortal realm.

The most obvious but brief reference to the human race in the *Theogony* appears at lines 512-616. These lines describe the fate of Atlas, Menoitios and Epimetheus. The passage then describes the fate of Prometheus who was released from the fetters by Herakles, in the same way that the Hundred Handers were released from the darkness by Zeus.[412] The narrative goes onto describe how Prometheus deceived Zeus, and introduced sacrificial rituals to benefit humankind and the 'bringer of fire'. Lines 570-590 refer to the manufacture of a maiden with the help of Athena and Hephaistos: this maiden is known in other myths to be Pandora, but unnamed in the *Theogony*. The genesis of womankind at line 590 is the only reference to the

concerns towards of life and death. This area of research would prove to be an invaluable contribution to the historical analysis of classical research.

[412] The text tells us that Prometheus was released so that Zeus can honour his son Herakles.

origin of part of the human race, as the *Theogony* does not account but assumes the creation of mankind.

Chronologically, the Prometheus episode appears out of place in the narrative. Prior to lines 512 the narrative focuses on the cosmological structuring of the world after the separation of Gaia and Ouranos. It seems peculiar to suddenly face an account about humankind's established presence in the terrestrial void when the process of cosmological structuring remains incomplete. In fact the Prometheus episode links with the narrative of the intermediary digression of Hekate (404-452). It was in Zeus' appeal to Hekate and the other gods for assistance against the Titans that the relevance of humankind comes into focus.

In connection to the Hekate episode, the fate of the Titans compares neatly with the fears and hopes of humankind.[413] The Titans tried to collectively combat celestial will, but failed.[414] Similarly, the Prometheus episode speaks to the human audience a similar warning: irrespective of man's attempts to surpass the cosmological hierarchy. humankind is fated to a cyclical existence of hardship, harmony, eventual defeat and death. The only real hope for humanity is the occasional benevolence of the divine cosmological elements, but we ought to remember that ritual sacrifice, although necessary as a means of communication to the divine hierarchy, may bear no real effect on life's turbulent encounters.

Thematically, the wretched fate of humankind as described in the Prometheus episode allows a natural progression to one of the main focalisations of the *Theogony*. Directly after the Prometheus episode we encounter the Titanomachy. It could be argued then, that the focalisation on the cosmological role of humankind is not fully

[413] Cf, J. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope* (London: Routledge, 1965), esp. pp. 15ff.

articulated in the *Theogony*, as it would detract us from the text's main cosmological fabula that sees greater expression through the primary, focalised succession conflicts (and that includes both the Titanomachy and the Typhomachy). Therefore, the reference to Prometheus as an explicit reference to humankind is merely a sub-focalisation which contributes to, and not stands independently from, the other main focalisations of the narrative.

A possible reason why the genesis of womankind has been accounted for in the *Theogony* is that it contributes to one of the text's main tensions – matriarchy versus patriarchy. Here the creation of the mortal female-self ensures that mankind does not try, as the Titans did, to usurp the supremacy of the celestial realm. Furthermore womankind is borne from the earth, that is, from the very place to which the Titans are sent in punishment for their deeds against the celestial father. The earth was also the creator of Typhoneus who, like the Titans, was destroyed by the thunderbolts of Zeus. The generative powers of mother earth were then scourged by celestial patriarchy, and anything produced since from the earth can either plague or provide for humankind.

While Prometheus represents a collective human consciousness, Typhoneus represents an individual consciousness that tries singularly to defeat the powers of celestial force. Typhoneus through his chthonic creation from the Earth and Tartaros attempts '*to become ruler of gods and men*'. This attempt by Typhoneus to control his own destiny reflects the desire of every individual human to control their own fate. But the narrative of the *Theogony* tells us that self-autonomy is not available to those produced from the earth, and that destiny is controlled by cosmological necessity. The

[414] Parallels between Kronos' 'crafty mind' and Prometheus crafty deceit are found at lines 511, 521, 546, 559 and 614.

only impression humankind, like Typhoneus, can leave behind after their destruction is their progeny. Although the unstoppable progression of generational development is what keeps alive the collective culture of humankind, and at the same time can be humankind's greatest enemy.

For the *Theogony*, ritual has no function. The reference to sacrifice in the Prometheus episode, if anything, suggests the pointlessness of the intentions of religious ritual. Although sacrifice is part of cultural behaviour, for Hesiod it serves no real purpose or influence against the cosmological elements which through periods of harmony and conflict make our existence what it is.

In terms of scholarship in anthropology, the *Theogony's* narrative provides its own contribution about the nature of existence which stands outside of mainstream interpretations of the culture of human nature. However, elements of the *Theogony* do reflect the general trend of humanity to explore aspects of its own existence, in terms of both the collective and the individual. It is these treads which this section has highlighted that would in fact contribute to a great discussion on Hesiod and the culture of human experience.

Conclusion

Conclusion

The aim of Chapter One was to discuss a new approach for interpreting Hesiod's *Theogony*. Chapter One was not concerned so much with establishing a method resulting in the exclusion of other scholarly approaches. Instead our primary concern at the beginning of this thesis was to explore both the benefits and problems of the approaches applied by scholars for the *Theogony*. In the chapter, I expressed apprehension with regard to the generic approach of historical research for a text from the 8th century B.C.E., a text that has been assumed to be part of an oral culture. Our intention has not been to negate the historical pathway straight to the ancient world, but to draw attention to the likelihood that that not all roads of historical enquiry lead us to a close understanding of ancient Greek literary documents. Therefore the conclusion of Chapter One was to put aside the functionalist and structuralist approaches to cultural interpretations of which the *Theogony* has been included, and instead to *read* the *Theogony* insofar as it presents itself as a self -contained literary document that forms no part of a cultural paradigm.

The text-based analysis of Chapter Two led us on a journey of narrative discovery. We came to realise that the *Theogony* focuses on not just one succession conflict commonly identified as the Titanomachy, but informs the reader of three cosmological conflicts: (i) conflict between earth and sky which brought about the birth of the Titan children, (ii) as a result of the separation between Gaia and Ouranos, a conflict between the first and second generation of divine elements and, (iii) the final cosmological dual between celestial Zeus and chthonic Typhoneus for the prestige of cosmological supremacy. The narrative sequences of the episodes interspersed among these conflicts are neither literary asides, nor interpolations, nor

distorted reflections of other succession conflicts found outside the literary world of the *Theogony*. Instead the intermediary episodes have proved to be crucial sub-focalisations within the text's narrative structure that have guided our interpretation of the primary focalisations (ie. the succession conflicts). Thus, the sub-focalisations and primary focalisations have allowed us to identify the *Theogony's* main fabula – cosmology. Furthermore, the primary and secondary characters of the various focalisations and sub-focalisations, together with their characterisations, have enabled us the audience to identify the narrative development of the *Theogony's* main fabula.

The intermediary digressions of the text are deliberate, in that the genealogical accounts of the first generation allow us to understand the elemental forces which contribute toward the text's main fabula, and that being the processes of cosmological development.[415] It becomes apparent that although each force has a polar opposite, only one of these elemental forces is in each instance given cosmological superiority while the other polar opposite remains dormant.[416] This alternating process of cosmological supremacy is cyclical. This means that no given elemental force has unequal power to any other elemental force.

The Prometheus episode has often been thought to have been an interpolation and / or interpreted by classical scholars on the premise of historical research. Chapter Two has helped us move away from the historical-based emphasis and see in a more detailed manner the narrative importance of the Prometheus sub-focalisation. The Prometheus episode, although chronologically misplaced, introduces the Titanomachy; more importantly, however, the episode assists us in understanding the anthropological aspects of the Typhomachy focalisation.

---

[415] Each genealogy contributes to the elements of the cosmological structure. For example, the rivers of Okeanos and the abstract forces of Nux.

In a sense, the Prometheus episode helps to make relevant the third succession conflict. Prometheus allows us to see the consequences of Zeus' withdrawn favour, and that the alternative to Zeus would be an existence of hardship. This dire existence is emphasised by the Typhomachy episode as it is then that the reader comes to realise that if Typhoneus were to have realised his hopes to be '*ruler of gods and men*', there would have been constant cosmological upheaval. Therefore, the Prometheus episode makes a crucial plea for Zeus to overcome any cosmological aggressors for his supremacy, and in the *Theogony* this includes the Titans and Typhoneus. Although the defeat of the Titans is almost a foregone conclusion, the conflict between Typhoneus and Zeus gives rise to a dramatic narrative crescendo which we, the audience, were not fully anticipating.

The unanticipated character of the narrative of the Typhomachy does not provide an adequate rationale for regarding the episode as non-genuine. To be sure, historical analysis has led us to believe that the Typhomachy is an interpolation; but in view of the discussion in Chapter Two, such findings need reconsideration. Chapter Three has attempted to consider the importance of historical research in literary appraisal - albeit briefly. Therefore, our Chapter Three has not so much dismissed the benefit of historical research as to reconsider the *Theogony's* place in such discussions. To this latter point, Chapter Three has redefined the 'transhistorical' importance of the *Theogony* as defined by the historical structuralists.[417]

As we have seen, Kirk has identified a number of areas in which mythological accounts of the ancient Greeks generally resembled the following narrative and thematic structure: (i) cosmology, (ii) development of the Olympian deities, (iii)

---

[416] For example, the benevolent forces Oceanos and Tethys against the maleficent forces of Typhoneus.
[417] Cf. Bal, *Narratology*, p. 179.

history of humankind, (iv) legendary heroes, (v) imitative heroes, and (vi) accounts about the beginning of the historical period.[418] The paradigm of Kirk has also been applied to interpretations of Near Eastern literature when discussing their striking similarities to the narrative content of the *Theogony*.[419] Chapter Two supports our initial reservations - as set forth in Chapter One - that the paradigm of Kirk can not be applied to the *Theogony*, nor can any relationship between the *Theogony* and other literary texts, whether Greek or Near Eastern, be reconstructed on the basis of Kirk's criteria. However, Kirk does offer us insight into the types of themes that were of concern to the ancient mythographers, though not each myth-maker dealt with a singular theme in an identical narrative manner. Furthermore, we ought not to assume that even if there were narrative threads similar to other extant cosmologically-based texts, there existed in the ancient world a model of literary expression that unifies all ancient authors and thinkers.[420]

Although there are similarities in the narrative style and content of the *Theogony* and the Near Eastern text *Enuma Elish*, we ought not to assume that these are a result of Hesiod's plagiarism of Babylonian mythology. Instead, the comparisons between literary forms throw light on a basic concern of humans for the nature of their own origin. Therefore, the narrative appraisal of the *Theogony* in Chapter Two and the

---

[418] G. S. Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths* (London: Harmondsworth, 1990). Cf. also Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Function in Ancient and Other Cultures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 8-31.

[419] Cf. W. Burkert, The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), esp. pp. 114-120. Also, R. Caldwell, *The Origin of the Gods: A Psychoanalytic Study of Greek Theogonic Myth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

[420] For example, we ought not to assume that the Presocratic philosophers were concerned with the same cosmological issues as Hesiod and, furthermore, that the *Theogony* based itself on the narrative structure and themes of the Near East. This is not to say that the Presocratic philosophers, Hesiod and the Near Eastern documents have nothing in common in terms of thematic concerns (ie. cosmology), but that comparisons are more accidental than deliberate. It is the possible 'accidental' similarities between the ancient thinkers, Greek and Near Eastern, which makes comparative research more productive.

reappropriation of a historical framework in Chapter Three make it possible to assign a place to the *Theogony's* within anthropological-based research. Indeed, it is this latter stance that underscores the transhistorical importance of the *Theogony* as an autonomous literary form.

Appendix

Appendix

Hesiod, *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica* with an English Translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press & London William Heinemann Ltd., 1914).

The Text: *Theogony*

Μουσάων Ἑλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' ἀείδειν,
αἵθ' Ἑλικῶνος ἔχουσιν ὄρος μέγα τε ζάθεόν τε
καί τε περὶ κρήνην ἰοειδέα πόσσ' ἁπαλοῖσιν
ὀρχεῦνται καὶ βωμὸν ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος.

καί τε λοεσσάμεναι τέρενα χρόα Περμησσοῖο
ἢ Ἵππου κρήνης ἢ Ὀλμειοῦ ζαθέοιο
ἀκροτάτῳ Ἑλικῶνι χοροὺς ἐνεποιήσαντο
καλούς, ἱμερόεντας: ἐπερρώσαντο δὲ ποσσίν.
ἔνθεν ἀπορνύμεναι, κεκαλυμμέναι ἠέρι πολλῇ,

ἐννύχιαι στεῖχον περικαλλέα ὄσσαν ἱεῖσαι,
ὑμνεῦσαι Δία τ' αἰγίοχον καὶ πότνιαν Ἥρην
Ἀργείην, χρυσέοισι πεδίλοις ἐμβεβαυῖαν,
κούρην τ' αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην
Φοῖβόν τ' Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν

ἠδὲ Ποσειδάωνα γεήοχον, ἐννοσίγαιον,
καὶ Θέμιν αἰδοίην ἑλικοβλέφαρόν τ' Ἀφροδίτην
Ἥβην τε χρυσοστέφανον καλήν τε Διώνην
Λητώ τ' Ἰαπετόν τε ἰδὲ Κρόνον ἀγκυλομήτην
Ἠῶ τ' Ἠέλιόν τε μέγαν λαμπράν τε Σελήνην

Γαῖάν τ' Ὠκεανόν τε μέγαν καὶ Νύκτα μέλαιναν
ἄλλων τ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων.
αἵ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδήν,
ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὕπο ζαθέοιο.
τόνδε δέ με πρώτιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπον,

Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο:
ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἷον,
ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
ἴδμεν δ', εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι.

ὣς ἔφασαν κοῦραι μεγάλου Διὸς ἀρτιέπειαι:
καί μοι σκῆπτρον ἔδον δάφνης ἐριθηλέος ὄζον
δρέψασαι, θηητόν: ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν
θέσπιν, ἵνα κλείοιμι τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα.
καί μ' ἐκέλονθ' ὑμνεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων,
σφᾶς δ' αὐτὰς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀείδειν.

ἀλλὰ τί ἢ μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῦν ἢ περὶ πέτρην;
τύνη, Μουσάων ἀρχώμεθα, ταὶ Διὶ πατρὶ
ὑμνεῦσαι τέρπουσι μέγαν νόον ἐντὸς Ὀλύμπου,
εἰρεῦσαι τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα,
φωνῇ ὁμηρεῦσαι: τῶν δ' ἀκάματος ῥέει αὐδὴ

ἐκ στομάτων ἡδεῖα: γελᾷ δέ τε δώματα πατρὸς
Ζηνὸς ἐριγδούποιο θεᾶν ὀπὶ λειριοέσσῃ
σκιδναμένῃ: ἠχεῖ δὲ κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου
δώματά τ' ἀθανάτων. αἳ δ' ἄμβροτον ὄσσαν ἱεῖσαι
θεῶν γένος αἰδοῖον πρῶτον κλείουσιν ἀοιδῇ

ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὓς Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ἔτικτεν,
οἵ τ' ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο θεοί, δωτῆρες ἐάων.
δεύτερον αὖτε Ζῆνα, θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
ἀρχόμεναί θ' ὑμνεῦσι καὶ ἐκλήγουσαι ἀοιδῆς,
ὅσσον φέρτατός ἐστι θεῶν κράτεί τε μέγιστος.

αὖτις δ' ἀνθρώπων τε γένος κρατερῶν τε Γιγάντων
ὑμνεῦσαι τέρπουσι Διὸς νόον ἐντὸς Ὀλύμπου
Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.
τὰς ἐν Πιερίῃ Κρονίδῃ τέκε πατρὶ μιγεῖσα
Μνημοσύνη, γουνοῖσιν Ἐλευθῆρος μεδέουσα,

λησμοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων.
ἐννέα γάρ οἱ νυκτὸς ἐμίσγετο μητίετα Ζεὺς
νόσφιν ἀπ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν λέχος εἰσαναβαίνων:
ἀλλ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐνιαυτὸς ἦεν, περὶ δ' ἔτραπον ὧραι
μηνῶν φθινόντων, περὶ δ' ἤματα πόλλ' ἐτελέσθη,

ἣ δ' ἔτεκ' ἐννέα κούρας ὁμόφρονας, ἦσιν ἀοιδὴ
μέμβλεται ἐν στήθεσσιν, ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἐχούσαις,
τυτθὸν ἀπ' ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου.
ἔνθα σφιν λιπαροί τε χοροὶ καὶ δώματα καλά.
πὰρ δ' αὐτῆς Χάριτές τε καὶ Ἵμερος οἰκί' ἔχουσιν

ἐν θαλίῃς: ἐρατὴν δὲ διὰ στόμα ὄσσαν ἱεῖσαι
μέλπονται πάντων τε νόμους καὶ ἤθεα κεδνὰ
ἀθανάτων κλείουσιν, ἐπήρατον ὄσσαν ἱεῖσαι.
αἳ τότ' ἴσαν πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἀγαλλόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ,
ἀμβροσίῃ μολπῇ: περὶ δ' ἴαχε γαῖα μέλαινα

ὑμνεύσαις, ἐρατὸς δὲ ποδῶν ὕπο δοῦπος ὀρώρει
νισσομένων πατέρ' εἰς ὅν: ὃ δ' οὐρανῷ ἐμβασιλεύει,
αὐτὸς ἔχων βροντὴν ἠδ' αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,
κάρτει νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον: εὖ δὲ ἕκαστα
ἀθανάτοις διέταξεν ὁμῶς καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμάς.

ταῦτ' ἄρα Μοῦσαι ἄειδον, 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι,
ἐννέα θυγατέρες μεγάλου Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖαι,
Κλειώ τ' Εὐτέρπη τε Θάλειά τε Μελπομένη τε
Τερψιχόρη τ' 'Ερατώ τε Πολύμνιά τ' Οὐρανίη τε
Καλλιόπη θ': ἣ δὲ προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἁπασέων.

ἣ γὰρ καὶ βασιλεῦσιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ.
ὅν τινα τιμήσωσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο
γεινόμενόν τε ἴδωσι διοτρεφέων βασιλήων,
τῷ μὲν ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ γλυκερὴν χείουσιν ἐέρσην,
τοῦ δ' ἔπε' ἐκ στόματος ῥεῖ μείλιχα: οἱ δέ τε λαοὶ

πάντες ἐς αὐτὸν ὁρῶσι διακρίνοντα θέμιστας
ἰθείῃσι δίκῃσιν: ὃ δ' ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύων
αἶψά κε καὶ μέγα νεῖκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσεν:
τοὔνεκα γὰρ βασιλῆες ἐχέφρονες, οὕνεκα λαοῖς
βλαπτομένοις ἀγορῇφι μετάτροπα ἔργα τελεῦσι

ῥηιδίως, μαλακοῖσι παραιφάμενοι ἐπέεσσιν.
ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀν' ἀγῶνα θεὸν ὡς ἱλάσκονται
αἰδοῖ μειλιχίῃ, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισιν:
τοίη Μουσάων ἱερὴ δόσις ἀνθρώποισιν.
ἐκ γάρ τοι Μουσέων καὶ ἑκηβόλου 'Απόλλωνος

ἄνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ κιθαρισταί,
ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες: ὃ δ' ὄλβιος, ὅν τινα Μοῦσαι
φίλωνται: γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή.
εἰ γάρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέι θυμῷ
ἄζηται κραδίην ἀκαχήμενος, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς

Μουσάων θεράπων κλέεα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων
ὑμνήσῃ μάκαράς τε θεούς, οἳ 'Ολυμπον ἔχουσιν,
αἶψ' ὅ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων
μέμνηται: ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.
χαίρετε, τέκνα Διός, δότε δ' ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδήν.

κλείετε δ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων,
οἳ Γῆς τ' ἐξεγένοντο καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
Νυκτός τε δνοφερῆς, οὓς θ' ἁλμυρὸς ἔτρεφε Πόντος.
εἴπατε δ', ὡς τὰ πρῶτα θεοὶ καὶ γαῖα γένοντο
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ πόντος ἀπείριτος, οἴδματι θυίων,

ἄστρα τε λαμπετόωντα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθεν
[οἵ τ' ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο θεοί, δωτῆρες ἐάων]

ὥς τ' ἄφενος δάσσαντο καὶ ὡς τιμὰς διέλοντο
ἠδὲ καὶ ὡς τὰ πρῶτα πολύπτυχον ἔσχον Ὄλυμπον.
ταῦτά μοι ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι

ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ εἴπαθ', ὅ τι πρῶτον γένετ' αὐτῶν.
ἦ τοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
[ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,]
Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῷ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης,

ἠδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,
λυσιμελής, πάντων δὲ θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων
δάμναται ἐν στήθεσσι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν.
ἐκ Χάεος δ' Ἐρεβός τε μέλαινά τε Νὺξ ἐγένοντο:
Νυκτὸς δ' αὖτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἐξεγένοντο,

οὓς τέκε κυσαμένη Ἐρέβει φιλότητι μιγεῖσα.
Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἶσον ἑαυτῇ
Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ', ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα καλύπτοι,
ὄφρ' εἴη μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεί.
γείνατο δ' Οὔρεα μακρά, θεῶν χαρίεντας ἐναύλους,

Νυμφέων, αἳ ναίουσιν ἀν' οὔρεα βησσήεντα.
ἠ δὲ καὶ ἀτρύγετον πέλαγος τέκεν, οἴδματι θυῖον,
Πόντον, ἄτερ φιλότητος ἐφιμέρου: αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Οὐρανῷ εὐνηθεῖσα τέκ' Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην,
Κοῖόν τε Κρῖόν θ' Ὑπερίονά τ' Ἰαπετόν τε

Θείαν τε Ῥείαν τε Θέμιν τε Μνημοσύνην τε
Φοίβην τε χρυσοστέφανον Τηθύν τ' ἐρατεινήν.
τοὺς δὲ μέθ' ὁπλότατος γένετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης,
δεινότατος παίδων: θαλερὸν δ' ἤχθηρε τοκῆα.
γείνατο δ' αὖ Κύκλωπας ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντας,

Βρόντην τε Στερόπην τε καὶ Ἄργην ὀβριμόθυμον,
οἳ Ζηνὶ βροντήν τε δόσαν τεῦξάν τε κεραυνόν.
οἳ δή τοι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιοι ἦσαν,
μοῦνος δ' ὀφθαλμὸς μέσσῳ ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ.
Κύκλωπες δ' ὄνομ' ἦσαν ἐπώνυμον, οὕνεκ' ἄρα σφέων

κυκλοτερὴς ὀφθαλμὸς ἓεις ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ:
ἰσχὺς δ' ἠδὲ βίη καὶ μηχαναὶ ἦσαν ἐπ' ἔργοις.
ἄλλοι δ' αὖ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο
τρεῖς παῖδες μεγάλοι τε καὶ ὄβριμοι, οὐκ ὀνομαστοί,
Κόττος τε Βριάρεώς τε Γύης θ', ὑπερήφανα τέκνα.

τῶν ἑκατὸν μὲν χεῖρες ἀπ' ὤμων ἀίσσοντο,
ἄπλαστοι, κεφαλαὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ πεντήκοντα

ἐξ ὤμων ἐπέφυκον ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσιν:
ἰσχὺς δ' ἄπλητος κρατερὴ μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἴδει.
ὅσσοι γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο,

δεινότατοι παίδων, σφετέρῳ δ' ἤχθοντο τοκῆι
ἐξ ἀρχῆς: καὶ τῶν μὲν ὅπως τις πρῶτα γένοιτο,
πάντας ἀποκρύπτασκε, καὶ ἐς φάος οὐκ ἀνίεσκε,
Γαίης ἐν κευθμῶνι, κακῷ δ' ἐπετέρπετο ἔργῳ
Οὐρανός. ἣ δ' ἐντὸς στοναχίζετο Γαῖα πελώρη

στεινομένη: δολίην δὲ κακὴν τ' ἐφράσσατο τέχνην.
αἶψα δὲ ποιήσασα γένος πολιοῦ ἀδάμαντος
τεῦξε μέγα δρέπανον καὶ ἐπέφραδε παισὶ φίλοισιν:
εἶπε δὲ θαρσύνουσα, φίλον τετιημένη ἦτορ:
παῖδες ἐμοὶ καὶ πατρὸς ἀτασθάλου, αἴ κ' ἐθέλητε

πείθεσθαι, πατρός κε κακὴν τισαίμεθα λώβην
ὑμετέρου: πρότερος γὰρ ἀεικέα μήσατο ἔργα.
ὣς φάτο: τοὺς δ' ἄρα πάντας ἔλεν δέος, οὐδέ τις αὐτῶν
φθέγξατο. θαρσήσας δὲ μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης
ἄψ αὖτις μύθοισι προσηύδα μητέρα κεδνήν:

μῆτερ, ἐγώ κεν τοῦτό γ' ὑποσχόμενος τελέσαιμι
ἔργον, ἐπεὶ πατρός γε δυσωνύμου οὐκ ἀλεγίζω
ἡμετέρου: πρότερος γὰρ ἀεικέα μήσατο ἔργα.
ὣς φάτο: γήθησεν δὲ μέγα φρεσὶ Γαῖα πελώρη:
εἷσε δέ μιν κρύψασα λόχῳ: ἐνέθηκε δὲ χερσὶν

ἅρπην καρχαρόδοντα: δόλον δ' ὑπεθήκατο πάντα.
ἦλθε δὲ νύκτ' ἐπάγων μέγας Οὐρανός, ἀμφὶ δὲ Γαίῃ
ἱμείρων φιλότητος ἐπέσχετο καί ῥ' ἐτανύσθη
πάντῃ: ὃ δ' ἐκ λοχέοιο πάις ὠρέξατο χειρὶ
σκαιῇ, δεξιτερῇ δὲ πελώριον ἔλλαβεν ἅρπην

μακρὴν καρχαρόδοντα, φίλου δ' ἀπὸ μήδεα πατρὸς
ἐσσυμένως ἤμησε, πάλιν δ' ἔρριψε φέρεσθαι
ἐξοπίσω: τὰ μὲν οὔ τι ἐτώσια ἔκφυγε χειρός:
ὅσσαι γὰρ ῥαθάμιγγες ἀπέσσυθεν αἱματόεσσαι,
πάσας δέξατο Γαῖα: περιπλομένων δ' ἐνιαυτῶν

γείνατ' Ἐρινῦς τε κρατερὰς μεγάλους τε Γίγαντας,
τεύχεσι λαμπομένους, δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερσὶν ἔχοντας,
Νύμφας θ' ἃς Μελίας καλέουσ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.
μήδεα δ' ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ἀποτμήξας ἀδάμαντι
κάββαλ' ἀπ' ἠπείροιο πολυκλύστῳ ἐνὶ πόντῳ,

ὣς φέρετ' ἄμ πέλαγος πουλὺν χρόνον, ἀμφὶ δὲ λευκὸς
ἀφρὸς ἀπ' ἀθανάτου χροὸς ὥρνυτο: τῷ δ' ἔνι κούρη

ἐθρέφθη: πρῶτον δὲ Κυθήροισιν ζαθέοισιν
ἔπλητ', ἔνθεν ἔπειτα περίρρυτον ἵκετο Κύπρον.
ἐκ δ' ἔβη αἰδοίη καλὴ θεός, ἀμφὶ δὲ ποίη

ποσσὶν ὕπο ῥαδινοῖσιν ἀέξετο: τὴν δ' Ἀφροδίτην
[ἀφρογενέα τε θεὰν καὶ ἐυστέφανον Κυθέρειαν]
κικλήσκουσι θεοί τε καὶ ἀνέρες, οὕνεκ' ἐν ἀφρῷ
θρέφθη: ἀτὰρ Κυθέρειαν, ὅτι προσέκυρσε Κυθήροις:
Κυπρογενέα δ', ὅτι γέντο πολυκλύστῳ ἐνὶ Κύπρῳ:

ἠδὲ φιλομμηδέα, ὅτι μηδέων ἐξεφαάνθη.
τῇ δ' Ἔρος ὡμάρτησε καὶ Ἵμερος ἕσπετο καλὸς
γεινομένῃ τὰ πρῶτα θεῶν τ' ἐς φῦλον ἰούσῃ.
ταύτην δ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς τιμὴν ἔχει ἠδὲ λέλογχε
μοῖραν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,

παρθενίους τ' ὀάρους μειδήματά τ' ἐξαπάτας τε
τέρψιν τε γλυκερὴν φιλότητά τε μειλιχίην τε.
τοὺς δὲ πατὴρ Τιτῆνας ἐπίκλησιν καλέεσκε
παῖδας νεικείων μέγας Οὐρανός, οὓς τέκεν αὐτός:
φάσκε δὲ τιταίνοντας ἀτασθαλίῃ μέγα ῥέξαι

ἔργον, τοῖο δ' ἔπειτα τίσιν μετόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι.
νὺξ δ' ἔτεκεν στυγερόν τε Μόρον καὶ Κῆρα μέλαιναν
καὶ Θάνατον, τέκε δ' Ὕπνον, ἔτικτε δὲ φῦλον Ὀνείρων:
δεύτερον αὖ Μῶμον καὶ Ὀιζὺν ἀλγινόεσσαν
οὔ τινι κοιμηθεῖσα θεὰ τέκε Νὺξ ἐρεβεννή,

Ἑσπερίδας θ', ἧς μῆλα πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο
χρύσεα καλὰ μέλουσι φέροντά τε δένδρεα καρπόν.
καὶ Μοίρας καὶ Κῆρας ἐγείνατο νηλεοποίνους,
Κλωθώ τε Λάχεσίν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον, αἵτε βροτοῖσι
γεινομένοισι διδοῦσιν ἔχειν ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε,

αἵτ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε παραιβασίας ἐφέπουσιν:
οὐδέ ποτε λήγουσι θεαὶ δεινοῖο χόλοιο,
πρίν γ' ἀπὸ τῷ δώωσι κακὴν ὄπιν, ὅς τις ἁμάρτῃ.
τίκτε δὲ καὶ Νέμεσιν, πῆμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι,
Νὺξ ὀλοή: μετὰ τὴν δ' Ἀπάτην τέκε καὶ Φιλότητα

Γῆράς τ' οὐλόμενον, καὶ Ἔριν τέκε καρτερόθυμον.
αὐτὰρ Ἔρις στυγερὴ τέκε μὲν Πόνον ἀλγινόεντα
Λήθην τε Λιμόν τε καὶ Ἄλγεα δακρυόεντα
Ὑσμίνας τε Μάχας τε Φόνους τ' Ἀνδροκτασίας τε
Νείκεά τε ψευδέας τε Λόγους Ἀμφιλλογίας τε

Δυσνομίην τ' Ἄτην τε, συνήθεας ἀλλήλῃσιν,
Ὅρκον θ', ὃς δὴ πλεῖστον ἐπιχθονίους ἀνθρώπους
πημαίνει, ὅτε κέν τις ἑκὼν ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ.

Νηρέα δ' ἀψευδέα καὶ ἀληθέα γείνατο Πόντος,
πρεσβύτατον παίδων: αὐτὰρ καλέουσι γέροντα,

οὔνεκα νημερτής τε καὶ ἤπιος, οὐδὲ θεμιστέων
λήθεται, ἀλλὰ δίκαια καὶ ἤπια δήνεα οἶδεν:
αὖτις δ' αὖ Θαύμαντα μέγαν καὶ ἀγήνορα Φόρκυν
Γαίῃ μισγόμενος καὶ Κητὼ καλλιπάρῃον
Εὐρυβίην τ' ἀδάμαντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἔχουσαν.

Νηρῆος δ' ἐγένοντο μεγήρατα τέκνα θεάων
πόντῳ ἐν ἀτρυγέτῳ καὶ Δωρίδος ἠυκόμοιο,
κούρης' Ὠκεανοῖο, τελήεντος ποταμοῖο,
Πλωτώ τ' Εὐκράντη τε Σαώ τ' Ἀμφιτρίτη τε
Εὐδώρη τε Θέτις τε Γαλήνη τε Γλαύκη τε

Κυμοθόη Σπειώ τε Θόη θ' Ἁλίη τ' ἐρόεσσα
Πασιθέη τ' Ἐρατώ τε καὶ Εὐνίκη ῥοδόπηχυς
καὶ Μελίτη χαρίεσσα καὶ Εὐλιμένη καὶ Ἀγαυὴ
Δωτώ τε Πρωτώ τε Φέρουσά τε Δυναμένη τε
Νησαίη τε καὶ Ἀκταίη καὶ Πρωτομέδεια

Δωρὶς καὶ Πανόπεια καὶ εὐειδὴς Γαλάτεια
Ἱπποθόη τ' ἐρόεσσα καὶ Ἱππονόη ῥοδόπηχυς
Κυμοδόκη θ', ἣ κύματ' ἐν ἠεροειδέι πόντῳ
πνοιάς τε ζαέων ἀνέμων σὺν Κυματολήγῃ
ῥεῖα πρηΰνει καὶ ἐυσφύρῳ Ἀμφιτρίτῃ,

Κυμώ τ' Ἠιόνη τε ἐυστέφανός θ' Ἁλιμήδη
Γλαυκονόμη τε φιλομμειδὴς καὶ Ποντοπόρεια
Ληαγόρη τε καὶ Εὐαγόρη καὶ Λαομέδεια
Πουλυνόη τε καὶ Αὐτονόη καὶ Λυσιάνασσα
Εὐάρνη τε φυήν τ' ἐρατὴ καὶ εἶδος ἄμωμος

καὶ Ψαμάθη χαρίεσσα δέμας δίη τε Μενίππη
Νησώ τ' Εὐπόμπη τε Θεμιστώ τε Προνόη τε
Νημερτής θ', ἣ πατρὸς ἔχει νόον ἀθανάτοιο.
αὗται μὲν Νηρῆος ἀμύμονος ἐξεγένοντο
κοῦραι πεντήκοντα, ἀμύμονα ἔργα ἰδυῖαι.

Θαύμας δ' Ὠκεανοῖο βαθυρρείταο θύγατρα
ἠγάγετ' Ἠλέκτρην: ἣ δ' ὠκεῖαν τέκεν Ἶριν
ἠυκόμους θ' Ἅρπυίας' Αελλώ τ' Ὠκυπέτην τε,
αἵ ῥ' ἀνέμων πνοιῇσι καὶ οἰωνοῖς ἅμ' ἔπονται
ὠκείῃς πτερύγεσσι: μεταχρόνιαι γὰρ ἴαλλον.

Φόρκυϊ δ' αὖ Κητὼ Γραίας τέκε καλλιπαρῄους
ἐκ γενετῆς πολιάς, τὰς δὴ Γραίας καλέουσιν
ἀθάνατοί τε θεοὶ χαμαὶ ἐρχόμενοί τ' ἄνθρωποι,
Πεμφρηδώ τ' εὐπέπλον Ἐνυώ τε κροκόπεπλον,
Γοργούς θ', αἳ ναίουσι πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο

ἐσχατιῇ πρὸς Νυκτός, ἵν' Ἑσπερίδες λιγύφωνοι,
Σθεννώ τ' Εὐρυάλη τε Μέδουσά τε λυγρὰ παθοῦσα.
ἣ μὲν ἔην θνητή, αἳ δ' ἀθάνατοι καὶ ἀγήρῳ,
αἱ δύο: τῇ δὲ μιῇ παρελέξατο Κυανοχαίτης
ἐν μαλακῷ λειμῶνι καὶ ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν.

τῆς δ' ὅτε δὴ Περσεὺς κεφαλὴν ἀπεδειροτόμησεν,
ἔκθορε Χρυσαωρ τε μέγας καὶ Πήγασος ἵππος.
τῷ μὲν ἐπώνυμον ἦεν, ὅτ' Ὠκεανοῦ περὶ πηγὰς
γένθ', ὃ δ' ἄορ χρύσειον ἔχων μετὰ χερσὶ φίλῃσιν.
χὠ μὲν ἀποπτάμενος προλιπὼν χθόνα, μητέρα μήλων,

ἵκετ' ἐς ἀθανάτους: Ζηνὸς δ' ἐν δώμασι ναίει
βροντήν τε στεροπήν τε φέρων Διὶ μητιόεντι.
Χρυσάωρ δ' ἔτεκεν τρικέφαλον Γηρυονῆα
μιχθεὶς Καλλιρόῃ κούρῃ κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο.
τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ἐξενάριξε βίῃ Ἡρακληείη

βουσὶ παρ' εἰλιπόδεσσι περιρρύτῳ εἰν Ἐρυθείῃ
ἤματι τῷ ὅτε περ βοῦς ἤλασεν εὐρυμετώπους
Τίρυνθ' εἰς ἱερὴν διαβὰς πόρον Ὠκεανοῖο
Ὄρθον τε κτείνας καὶ βουκόλον Εὐρυτίωνα
σταθμῷ ἐν ἠερόεντι πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο.

ἣ δ' ἔτεκ' ἄλλο πέλωρον ἀμήχανον, οὐδὲν ἐοικὸς
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐδ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν,
σπῆι ἔνι γλαφυρῷ θείην κρατερόφρον' Ἐχιδναν,
ἥμισυ μὲν νύμφην ἑλικώπιδα καλλιπάρῃον,
ἥμισυ δ' αὖτε πέλωρον ὄφιν δεινόν τε μέγαν τε

αἰόλον ὠμηστὴν ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης.
ἔνθα δέ οἱ σπέος ἐστὶ κάτω κοίλῃ ὑπὸ πέτρῃ
τηλοῦ ἀπ' ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν θνητῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων:
ἔνθ' ἄρα οἱ δάσσαντο θεοὶ κλυτὰ δώματα ναίειν.
ἣ δ' ἔρυτ' εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν ὑπὸ χθονὶ λυγρὴ Ἐχιδνα,

ἀθάνατος νύμφη καὶ ἀγήραος ἤματα πάντα.
τῇ δὲ Τυφάονά φασι μιγήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι
δεινόν θ' ὑβριστήν τ' ἄνομόν θ' ἑλικώπιδι κούρῃ:
ἣ δ' ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο κρατερόφρονα τέκνα.
Ὄρθον μὲν πρῶτον κύνα γείνατο Γηρυονῆι:

δεύτερον αὖτις ἔτικτεν ἀμήχανον, οὔ τι φατειὸν
Κέρβερον ὠμηστήν, Ἀίδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον,
πεντηκοντακέφαλον, ἀναιδέα τε κρατερόν τε:
τὸ τρίτον Ὕδρην αὖτις ἐγείνατο λυγρὰ ἰδυῖαν
Λερναίην, ἣν θρέψε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη

ἄπλητον κοτέουσα βίῃ Ἡρακληείῃ.
καὶ τὴν μὲν Διὸς υἱὸς ἐνήρατο νηλέι χαλκῷ
Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδης σὺν ἀρηιφίλῳ Ἰολάῳ
Ηρακλέης βουλῇσιν Ἀθηναίης ἀγελείης.
ἣ δὲ Χίμαιραν ἔτικτε πνέουσαν ἀμαιμάκετον πῦρ,

δεινήν τε μεγάλην τε ποδώκεά τε κρατερήν τε:
τῆς δ' ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί: μία μὲν χαροποῖο λέοντος,
ἣ δὲ χιμαίρης, ἣ δ' ὄφιος, κρατεροῖο δράκοντος,
[πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα,
δεινὸν ἀποπνείουσα πυρὸς μένος αἰθομένοιο.]

τὴν μὲν Πήγασος εἶλε καὶ ἐσθλὸς Βελλεροφόντης.
ἣ δ' ἄρα Φῖκ' ὀλοὴν τέκε Καδμείοισιν ὄλεθρον
Ὀρθῳ ὑποδμηθεῖσα Νεμειαῖόν τε λέοντα,
τόν ῥ' Ἥρη θρέψασα Διὸς κυδρὴ παράκοιτις
γουνοῖσιν κατένασσε Νεμείης, πῆμ' ἀνθρώποις.

ἔνθ' ἄρ' ὃ οἰκείων ἐλεφαίρετο φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων,
κοιρανέων Τρητοῖο Νεμείης ἠδ' Ἀπέσαντος:
ἀλλά ἑ ἷς ἐδάμασσε βίης Ἡρακληείης.
Κητὼ δ' ὁπλότατον Φόρκυι φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
γείνατο δεινὸν ὄφιν, ὃς ἐρεμνῆς κεύθεσι γαίης

πείρασιν ἐν μεγάλοις παγχρύσεα μῆλα φυλάσσει+.
τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ Κητοῦς καὶ Φόρκυνος γένος ἐστίν.
Τηθὺς δ'' Ωκεανῷ Ποταμοὺς τέκε δινήεντας,
Νεῖλόν τ'' Αλφειόν τε καὶ' Ηριδανὸν βαθυδίνην
Στρυμόνα Μαίανδρόν τε καὶ' Ιστρον καλλιρέεθρον

Φᾶσίν τε' Ρῆσόν τ'' Αχελώιόν τ' ἀργυροδίνην
Νέσσον τε' Ροδίον θ'' Αλιάκμονά θ'' Επτάπορόν τε
Γρήνικόν τε καὶ Αἴσηπον θεῖόν τε Σιμοῦντα
Πηνειόν τε καὶ' Ερμον ἐυρρείτην τε Κάικον
Σαγγάριόν τε μέγαν Λάδωνά τε Παρθένιόν τε

Εὔηνόν τε καὶ' Αρδησκον θεῖόν τε Σκάμανδρον.
τίκτε δὲ θυγατέρων ἱερὸν γένος, αἳ κατὰ γαῖαν
ἄνδρας κουρίζουσι σὺν' Απόλλωνι ἄνακτι
καὶ Ποταμοῖς, ταύτην δὲ Διὸς πάρα μοῖραν ἔχουσι,
Πειθώ τ'' Αδμήτη τε' Ιάνθη τ'' Ηλέκτρη τε

Δωρίς τε Πρυμνώ τε καὶ Οὐρανίη θεοειδὴς
' Ιππώ τε Κλυμένη τε' Ρόδειά τε Καλλιρόη τε
Ζευξώ τε Κλυτίη τε' Ιδυῖά τε Πασιθόη τε
Πληξαύρη τε Γαλαξαύρη τ' ἐρατή τε Διώνη
Μηλόβοσίς τε Φόη τε καὶ εὐειδὴς Πολυδώρη

Κερκηίς τε φυὴν ἐρατὴ Πλουτώ τε βοῶπις
Περσηίς τ' Ἰάνειρά τ' Ἀκάστη τε Ξάνθη τε

Πετραίη τ' ἐρόεσσα Μενεσθώ τ' Εὐρώπη τε
Μῆτίς τ' Εὐρυνόμη τε Τελεστώ τε Κροκοπεπλος
Χρυσηίς τ' Ἀσίη τε καὶ ἱμερόεσσα Καλυψὼ

Εὐδώρη τε Τύχη τε καὶ Ἀμφιρὼ Ὠκυρόη τε
καὶ Στύξ, ἣ δή σφεων προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἁπασέων.
αὗται δ' Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ Τηθύος ἐξεγένοντο
πρεσβύταται κοῦραι: πολλαί γε μέν εἰσι καὶ ἄλλαι.
τρὶς γὰρ χίλιαί εἰσι τανύσφυροι Ὠκεανῖναι,

αἵ ῥα πολυσπερέες γαῖαν καὶ βένθεα λίμνης
πάντη ὁμῶς ἐφέπουσι, θεάων ἀγλαὰ τέκνα.
τόσσοι δ' αὖθ' ἕτεροι ποταμοὶ καναχηδὰ ῥέοντες,
υἱέες Ὠκεανοῦ, τοὺς γείνατο πότνια Τηθύς:
τῶν ὄνομ' ἀργαλέον πάντων βροτὸν ἀνέρ' ἐνισπεῖν,

οἳ δὲ ἕκαστοι ἴσασιν, ὅσοι περιναιετάωσιν.
θεία δ' Ἠέλιόν τε μέγαν λαμπράν τε Σελήνην
Ἠὼ θ', ἣ πάντεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοισι φαείνει
ἀθανάτοις τε θεοῖσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι,
γείναθ' ὑποδμηθεῖσ' Ὑπερίονος ἐν φιλότητι.

Κρίῳ δ' Εὐρυβίν τέκεν ἐν φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
Ἀστραῖόν τε μέγαν Πάλλαντά τε δῖα θεάων
Πέρσην θ', ὃς καὶ πᾶσι μετέπρεπεν ἰδμοσύνῃσιν.
Ἀστραίῳ δ' Ἠὼς ἀνέμους τέκε καρτεροθύμους,
ἀργέστην Ζέφυρον Βορέην τ' αἰψηροκέλευθον

καὶ Νότον, ἐν φιλότητι θεὰ θεῷ εὐνηθεῖσα.
τοὺς δὲ μέτ' ἀστέρα τίκτεν Ἑωσφόρον Ἠριγένεια
ἄστρα τε λαμπετόωντα, τά τ' οὐρανὸς ἐστεφάνωται.
Στὺξ δ' ἔτεκ' Ὠκεανοῦ θυγάτηρ Πάλλαντι μιγεῖσα
Ζῆλον καὶ Νίκην καλλίσφυρον ἐν μεγάροισιν:

καὶ Κράτος ἠδὲ Βίην ἀριδείκετα γείνατο τέκνα,
τῶν οὐκ ἔστ' ἀπάνευθε Διὸς δόμος, οὐδέ τις ἕδρη,
οὐδ' ὁδός, ὅππῃ μὴ κείνοις θεὸς ἡγεμονεύῃ,
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ πὰρ Ζηνὶ βαρυκτύπῳ ἑδριόωνται.
ὣς γὰρ ἐβούλευσεν Στὺξ ἄφθιτος Ὠκεανίνη

ἤματι τῷ, ὅτε πάντας Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητὴς
ἀθανάτους ἐκάλεσσε θεοὺς ἐς μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον,
εἶπε δ', ὃς ἂν μετὰ εἷο θεῶν Τιτῆσι μάχοιτο,
μή τιν' ἀπορραίσειν γεράων, τιμὴν δὲ ἕκαστον
ἐξέμεν, ἣν τὸ πάρος γε μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν

τὸν δ' ἔφαθ', ὅστις ἄτιμος ὑπὸ Κρόνου ἠδ' ἀγέραστος,
τιμῆς καὶ γεράων ἐπιβησέμεν, ἣ θέμις ἐστίν.

ἦλθε δ' ἄρα πρώτη Στὺξ ἄφθιτος Οὔλυμπόνδε
σὺν σφοῖσιν παίδεσσι φίλου διὰ μήδεα πατρός.
τὴν δὲ Ζεὺς τίμησε, περισσὰ δὲ δῶρα δέδωκεν.

αὐτὴν μὲν γὰρ ἔθηκε θεῶν μέγαν ἔμμεναι ὅρκον,
παῖδας δ' ἤματα πάντα ἑοῦ μεταναιέτας εἶναι.
ὡς δ' αὔτως πάντεσσι διαμπερές, ὥς περ ὑπέστη,
ἐξετέλεσσ': αὐτὸς δὲ μέγα κρατεῖ ἠδὲ ἀνάσσει.
φοίβη δ' αὖ Κοίου πολυήρατον ἦλθεν ἐς εὐνήν:

κυσαμένη δὴ ἔπειτα θεὰ θεοῦ ἐν φιλότητι
Δητὼ κυανόπεπλον ἐγείνατο, μείλιχον αἰεί,
ἤπιον ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν,
μείλιχον ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἀγανώτατον ἐντὸς Ὀλύμπου.
γείνατο δ' Ἀστερίην εὐώνυμον, ἣν ποτε Πέρσης

ἠγάγετ' ἐς μέγα δῶμα φίλην κεκλῆσθαι ἄκοιτιν.
ἣ δ' ὑποκυσαμένη Ἑκάτην τέκε, τὴν περὶ πάντων
Ζεὺς Κρονίδης τίμησε: πόρεν δέ οἱ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα,
μοῖραν ἔχειν γαίης τε καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης.
ἣ δὲ καὶ ἀστερόεντος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἔμμορε τιμῆς

ἀθανάτοις τε θεοῖσι τετιμένη ἐστὶ μάλιστα.
καὶ γὰρ νῦν, ὅτε πού τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
ἔρδων ἱερὰ καλὰ κατὰ νόμον ἱλάσκηται,
κικλήσκει Ἑκάτην. πολλή τέ οἱ ἕσπετο τιμὴ
ῥεῖα μάλ', ᾧ πρόφρων γε θεὰ ὑποδέξεται εὐχάς,

καί τέ οἱ ὄλβον ὀπάζει, ἐπεὶ δύναμίς γε πάρεστιν.
ὅσσοι γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο
καὶ τιμὴν ἔλαχον, τούτων ἔχει αἶσαν ἁπάντων.
οὐδέ τί μιν Κρονίδης ἐβιήσατο οὐδέ τ' ἀπηύρα,
ὅσσ' ἔλαχεν Τιτῆσι μετὰ προτέροισι θεοῖσιν,

ἀλλ' ἔχει, ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔπλετο δασμός,
καὶ γέρας ἐν γαίῃ τε καὶ οὐρανῷ ἠδὲ θαλάσσῃ:
οὐδ', ὅτι μουνογενής, ἧσσον θεὰ ἔμμορε τιμῆς,
ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον, ἐπεὶ Ζεὺς τίεται αὐτήν.
ᾧ δ' ἐθέλει, μεγάλως παραγίγνεται ἠδ' ὀνίνησιν:

ἔν τε δίκῃ βασιλεῦσι παρ' αἰδοίοισι καθίζει,
ἔν τ' ἀγορῇ λαοῖσι μεταπρέπει, ὅν κ' ἐθέλῃσιν:
ἠδ' ὁπότ' ἐς πόλεμον φθεισήνορα θωρήσσωνται
ἀνέρες, ἔνθα θεὰ παραγίγνεται, οἵς κ' ἐθέλῃσι
νίκην προφρονέως ὀπάσαι καὶ κῦδος ὀρέξαι.

ἐσθλὴ δ' αὖθ' ὁπότ' ἄνδρες ἀεθλεύωσιν ἀγῶνι,
ἔνθα θεὰ καὶ τοῖς παραγίγνεται ἠδ' ὀνίνησιν:

νικήσας δὲ βίῃ καὶ κάρτεϊ καλὸν ἄεθλον
ῥεῖα φέρει χαίρων τε, τοκεῦσι δὲ κῦδος ὀπάζει.
ἐσθλὴ δ' ἱππήεσσι παρεστάμεν, οἷς κ' ἐθέλῃσιν.

καὶ τοῖς, οἳ γλαυκὴν δυσπέμφελον ἐργάζονται,
εὔχονται δ' Ἑκάτῃ καὶ ἐρικτύπῳ Ἐννοσιγαίῳ,
ῥηιδίως ἄγρην κυδρὴ θεὸς ὤπασε πολλήν,
ῥεῖα δ' ἀφείλετο φαινομένην, ἐθέλουσά γε θυμῷ.
ἐσθλὴ δ' ἐν σταθμοῖσι σὺν Ἑρμῇ ληίδ' ἀέξειν:

βουκολίας δ' ἀγέλας τε καὶ αἰπόλια πλατέ' αἰγῶν
ποίμνας τ' εἰροπόκων ὀίων, θυμῷ γ' ἐθέλουσα,
ἐξ ὀλίγων βριάει κἀκ πολλῶν μείονα θῆκεν.
οὕτω τοι καὶ μουνογενὴς ἐκ μητρὸς ἐοῦσα
πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι τετίμηται γεράεσσιν.

θῆκε δέ μιν Κρονίδης κουροτρόφον, οἳ μετ' ἐκείνην
ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδοντο φάος πολυδερκέος Ἠοῦς.
οὕτως ἐξ ἀρχῆς κουροτρόφος, αἳ δέ τε τιμαί.
Ῥείη δὲ δμηθεῖσα Κρόνῳ τέκε φαίδιμα τέκνα,
Ἱστίην Δήμητρα καὶ Ἥρην χρυσοπέδιλον

ἴφθιμόν τ' Ἀίδην, ὃς ὑπὸ χθονὶ δώματα ναίει
νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, καὶ ἐρίκτυπον Ἐννοσίγαιον
Ζῆνά τε μητιόεντα, θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
τοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ βροντῆς πελεμίζεται εὐρεῖα χθών.
καὶ τοὺς μὲν κατέπινε μέγας Κρόνος, ὥς τις ἕκαστος

νηδύος ἐξ ἱερῆς μητρὸς πρὸς γούναθ' ἵκοιτο,
τὰ φρονέων, ἵνα μή τις ἀγαυῶν Οὐρανιώνων
ἄλλος ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔχοι βασιληίδα τιμήν.
πεύθετο γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
οὕνεκά οἱ πέπρωτο ἑῷ ὑπὸ παιδὶ δαμῆναι

καὶ κρατερῷ περ ἐόντι, Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλάς:
τῷ ὅ γ' ἄρ' οὐκ ἀλαὸς σκοπιὴν ἔχεν, ἀλλὰ δοκεύων
παῖδας ἑοὺς κατέπινε: Ῥέην δ' ἔχε πένθος ἄλαστον.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ Δί' ἔμελλε θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν
τέξεσθαι, τότ' ἔπειτα φίλους λιτάνευε τοκῆας

τοὺς αὐτῆς, Γαῖάν τε καὶ Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα,
μῆτιν συμφράσσασθαι, ὅπως λελάθοιτο τεκοῦσα
παῖδα φίλον, τίσαιτο δ' ἐρινῦς πατρὸς ἑοῖο
παίδων θ', οὓς κατέπινε μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης.
οἳ δὲ θυγατρὶ φίλῃ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἠδ' ἐπίθοντο,

καί οἱ πεφραδέτην, ὅσα περ πέπρωτο γενέσθαι
ἀμφὶ Κρόνῳ βασιλῆι καὶ υἱέι καρτεροθύμῳ.

πέμψαν δ' ἐς Λύκτον, Κρήτης ἐς πίονα δῆμον,
ὁππότ' ἄρ' ὁπλότατον παίδων τέξεσθαι ἔμελλε,
Ζῆνα μέγαν: τὸν μέν οἱ ἐδέξατο Γαῖα πελώρη

Κρήτῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ τραφέμεν ἀτιταλλέμεναί τε.
ἔνθα μιν ἶκτο φέρουσα θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν
πρώτην ἐς Λύκτον: κρύψεν δέ ἑ χερσὶ λαβοῦσα
ἄντρῳ ἐν ἠλιβάτῳ, ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης,
Αἰγαίῳ ἐν ὄρει πεπυκασμένῳ ὑλήεντι.

τῷ δὲ σπαργανίσασα μέγαν λίθον ἐγγυάλιξεν
Οὐρανίδῃ μέγ' ἄνακτι, θεῶν προτέρῳ βασιλῆι.
τὸν τόθ' ἑλὼν χείρεσσιν ἑὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδὺν
σχέτλιος: οὐδ' ἐνόησε μετὰ φρεσίν, ὥς οἱ ὀπίσσω
ἀντὶ λίθου ἑὸς υἱὸς ἀνίκητος καὶ ἀκηδὴς

λείπεθ', ὅ μιν τάχ' ἔμελλε βίῃ καὶ χερσὶ δαμάσσας
τιμῆς ἐξελάειν, ὃ δ' ἐν ἀθανάτοισι ἀνάξειν.
καρπαλίμως δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα μένος καὶ φαίδιμα γυῖα
ηὔξετο τοῖο ἄνακτος: ἐπιπλομένων δ' ἐνιαυτῶν
Γαίης ἐννεσίῃσι πολυφραδέεσσι δολωθείς

ὃν γόνον ἄψ ἀνέηκε μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης
[νικηθεὶς τέχνῃσι βίηφί τε παιδὸς ἑοῖο.]
πρῶτον δ' ἐξέμεσεν λίθον, ὃν πύματον κατέπινεν:
τὸν μὲν Ζεὺς στήριξε κατὰ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ γυάλοις ὕπο Παρνησσοῖο

σῆμ' ἔμεν ἐξοπίσω, θαῦμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν.
λῦσε δὲ πατροκασιγνήτους ὀλοῶν ὑπὸ δεσμῶν
Οὐρανίδας, οὓς δῆσε πατὴρ ἀεσιφροσύνῃσιν:
οἳ οἱ ἀπεμνήσαντο χάριν ἐυεργεσιάων,
δῶκαν δὲ βροντὴν ἠδ' αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνὸν

καὶ στεροπήν: τὸ πρὶν δὲ πελώρη Γαῖα κεκεύθει:
τοῖς πίσυνος θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει.
κούρην δ' Ἰαπετὸς καλλίσφυρον Ὠκεανίνην
ἠγάγετο Κλυμένην καὶ ὁμὸν λέχος εἰσανέβαινεν.
ἣ δέ οἱ Ἄτλαντα κρατερόφρονα γείνατο παῖδα:

τίκτε δ' ὑπερκύδαντα Μενοίτιον ἠδὲ Προμηθέα
ποικίλον αἰολόμητιν, ἁμαρτίνοόν τ' Ἐπιμηθέα
ὃς κακὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γένετ' ἀνδράσιν ἀλφηστῆσιν:
πρῶτος γάρ ῥα Διὸς πλαστὴν ὑπέδεκτο γυναῖκα
παρθένον. ὑβριστὴν δὲ Μενοίτιον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς

εἰς Ἔρεβος κατέπεμψε βαλὼν ψολόεντι κεραυνῷ
εἵνεκ' ἀτασθαλίης τε καὶ ἠνορέης ὑπερόπλου.

'Ατλας δ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχει κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης
πείρασιν ἐν γαίης, πρόπαρ Εσπερίδων λιγυφώνων,
ἑστηὼς κεφαλῇ τε καὶ ἀκαμάτῃσι χέρεσσιν:

ταύτην γάρ οἱ μοῖραν ἐδάσσατο μητίετα Ζεύς.
δῆσε δ' ἀλυκτοπέδῃσι Προμηθέα ποικιλόβουλον
δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοισι μέσον διὰ κίον' ἐλάσσας:
καί οἱ ἐπ' αἰετὸν ὦρσε τανύπτερον: αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἦπαρ
ἤσθιεν ἀθάνατον, τὸ δ' ἀέξετο ἶσον ἁπάντῃ

νυκτός ὅσον πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἔδοι τανυσίπτερος ὄρνις.
τὸν μὲν ἄρ' 'Αλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱὸς
'Ηρακλέης ἔκτεινε, κακὴν δ' ἀπὸ νοῦσον ἄλαλκεν
'Ιαπετιονίδῃ καὶ ἐλύσατο δυσφροσυνάων
οὐκ ἀέκητι Ζηνὸς 'Ολυμπίου ὑψιμέδοντος,

ὄφρ' 'Ηρακλῆος Θηβαγενέος κλέος εἴη
πλεῖον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν.
ταῦτ' ἄρα ἀζόμενος τίμα ἀριδείκετον υἱόν:
καί περ χωόμενος παύθη χόλου, ὃν πρὶν ἔχεσκεν,
οὕνεκ' ἐρίζετο βουλὰς ὑπερμενέι Κρονίωνι.

καὶ γὰρ ὅτ' ἐκρίνοντο θεοὶ θνητοί τ' ἄνθρωποι
Μηκώνῃ, τότ' ἔπειτα μέγαν βοῦν πρόφρονι θυμῷ
δασσάμενος προέθηκε, Διὸς νόον ἐξαπαφίσκων.
τοῖς μὲν γὰρ σάρκας τε καὶ ἔγκατα πίονα δημῷ
ἐν ῥινῷ κατέθηκε καλύψας γαστρὶ βοείῃ,

τῷ δ' αὖτ' ὀστέα λευκὰ βοὸς δολίῃ ἐπὶ τέχνῃ
εὐθετίσας κατέθηκε καλύψας ἀργέτι δημῷ.
δὴ τότε μιν προσέειπε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε:
'Ιαπετιονίδη, πάντων ἀριδείκετ' ἀνάκτων,
ὦ πέπον, ὡς ἑτεροζήλως διεδάσσαο μοίρας.

ὣς φάτο κερτομέων Ζεὺς ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδώς.
τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε Προμηθεὺς ἀγκυλομήτης
ἦκ' ἐπιμειδήσας, δολίης δ' οὐ λήθετο τέχνης:
ζεῦ κύδιστε μέγιστε θεῶν αἰειγενετάων,
τῶν δ' ἔλε', ὁπποτέρην σε ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἀνώγει.

Φῆ ῥα δολοφρονέων: Ζεὺς δ' ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδὼς
γνῶ ῥ' οὐδ' ἠγνοίησε δόλον: κακὰ δ' ὄσσετο θυμῷ
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι, τὰ καὶ τελέεσθαι ἔμελλεν.
χερσὶ δ' ὅ γ' ἀμφοτέρῃσιν ἀνείλετο λευκὸν ἄλειφαρ.
χώσατο δὲ φρένας ἀμφί, χόλος δέ μιν ἵκετο θυμόν,

ὡς ἴδεν ὀστέα λευκὰ βοὸς δολίῃ ἐπὶ τέχνῃ.
ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων
καίουσ' ὀστέα λευκὰ θυηέντων ἐπὶ βωμῶν.
τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς:

Ἰαπετιονίδη, πάντων πέρι μήδεα εἰδώς,

ὦ πέπον, οὐκ ἄρα πω δολίης ἐπιλήθεο τέχνης.
ὣς φάτο χωόμενος Ζεὺς ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδώς:
ἐκ τούτου δὴ ἔπειτα δόλου μεμνημένος αἰεὶ
οὐκ ἐδίδου Μελίῃσι πυρὸς μένος ἀκαμάτοιο
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἳ ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναιετάουσιν.

ἀλλά μιν ἐξαπάτησεν ἐὺς πάις Ἰαπετοῖο
κλέψας ἀκαμάτοιο πυρὸς τηλέσκοπον αὐγὴν
ἐν κοΐλῳ νάρθηκι: δάκεν δέ ἑ νειόθι θυμόν,
Ζῆν' ὑψιβρεμέτην, ἐχόλωσε δέ μιν φίλον ἦτορ,
ὡς ἴδ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισι πυρὸς τηλέσκοπον αὐγήν.

αὐτίκα δ' ἀντὶ πυρὸς τεῦξεν κακὸν ἀνθρώποισιν:
γαίης γὰρ σύμπλασσε περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις
παρθένῳ αἰδοίῃ ἴκελον Κρονίδεω διὰ βουλάς.
ζῶσε δὲ καὶ κόσμησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
ἀργυφέῃ ἐσθῆτι: κατὰ κρῆθεν δὲ καλύπτρην

δαιδαλέην χείρεσσι κατέσχεθε, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι:
[ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ στεφάνους, νεοθηλέος ἄνθεα ποίης,
ἱμερτοὺς περίθηκε καρήατι Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.]
ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ στεφάνην χρυσέην κεφαλῆφιν ἔθηκε,
τὴν αὐτὸς ποίησε περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις

ἀσκήσας παλάμῃσι, χαριζόμενος Διὶ πατρί.
τῇ δ' ἐνὶ δαίδαλα πολλὰ τετεύχατο, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι,
κνώδαλ', ὅσ' ἤπειρος πολλὰ τρέφει ἠδὲ θάλασσα,
τῶν ὅ γε πόλλ' ἐνέθηκε,--χάρις δ' ἀπελάμπετο πολλή,--
θαυμάσια, ζῴοισιν ἐοικότα φωνήεσσιν.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε καλὸν κακὸν ἀντ' ἀγαθοῖο.
ἐξάγαγ', ἔνθα περ ἄλλοι ἔσαν θεοὶ ἠδ' ἄνθρωποι,
κόσμῳ ἀγαλλομένην γλαυκώπιδος ὀβριμοπάτρης.
θαῦμα δ' ἔχ' ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς θνητούς τ' ἀνθρώπους,
ὡς εἶδον δόλον αἰπύν, ἀμήχανον ἀνθρώποισιν.

ἐκ τῆς γὰρ γένος ἐστὶ γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων,
[τῆς γὰρ ὀλώιόν ἐστι γένος καὶ φῦλα γυναικῶν,]
πῆμα μέγ' αἳ θνητοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσι ναιετάουσιν
οὐλομένης πενίης οὐ σύμφοροι, ἀλλὰ κόροιο.
ὡς δ' ὁπότ' ἐν σμήνεσσι κατηρεφέεσσι μέλισσαι

κηφῆνας βόσκωσι, κακῶν ξυνήονας ἔργων--
αἳ μέν τε πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα
ἠμάτιαι σπεύδουσι τιθεῖσί τε κηρία λευκά,
οἳ δ' ἔντοσθε μένοντες ἐπηρεφέας κατὰ σίμβλους
ἀλλότριον κάματον σφετέρην ἐς γαστέρ' ἀμῶνται—

ὣς δ' αὕτως ἄνδρεσσι κακὸν θνητοῖσι γυναῖκας
Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης θῆκεν, ξυνήονας ἔργων
ἀργαλέων: ἕτερον δὲ πόρεν κακὸν ἀντ' ἀγαθοῖο:
ὅς κε γάμον φεύγων καὶ μέρμερα ἔργα γυναικῶν
μὴ γῆμαι ἐθέλῃ, ὀλοὸν δ' ἐπὶ γῆρας ἵκοιτο

χήτεϊ γηροκόμοιο: ὅ γ' οὐ βιότου ἐπιδευὴς
ζώει, ἀποφθιμένου δὲ διὰ κτῆσιν δατέονται
χηρωσταί: ᾧ δ' αὖτε γάμου μετὰ μοῖρα γένηται,
κεδνὴν δ' ἔσχεν ἄκοιτιν ἀρηρυῖαν πραπίδεσσι,
τῷ δέ τ' ἀπ' αἰῶνος κακὸν ἐσθλῷ ἀντιφερίζει

ἐμμενές: ὃς δέ κε τέτμῃ ἀταρτηροῖο γενέθλης,
ζώει ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔχων ἀλίαστον ἀνίην
θυμῷ καὶ κραδίῃ, καὶ ἀνήκεστον κακόν ἐστιν.
ὣς οὐκ ἔστι Διὸς κλέψαι νόον οὐδὲ παρελθεῖν.
οὐδὲ γὰρ Ἰαπετιονίδης ἀκάκητα Προμηθεὺς

τοῖό γ' ὑπεξήλυξε βαρὺν χόλον, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀνάγκης
καὶ πολύιδριν ἐόντα μέγας κατὰ δεσμὸς ἐρύκει.
Βριάρεῳ δ' ὡς πρῶτα πατὴρ ὠδύσσατο θυμῷ
Κόττῳ τ' ἠδὲ Γύῃ, δῆσεν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ
ἠνορέην ὑπέροπλον ἀγώμενος ἠδὲ καὶ εἶδος

καὶ μέγεθος: κατένασσε δ' ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης.
ἔνθ' οἵ γ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντες ὑπὸ χθονὶ ναιετάοντες
εἵατ' ἐπ' ἐσχατιῇ, μεγάλης ἐν πείρασι γαίης,
δηθὰ μάλ' ἀχνύμενοι, κραδίῃ μέγα πένθος ἔχοντες.
ἀλλά σφεας Κρονίδης τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,

οὓς τέκεν ἠύκομος Ῥείη Κρόνου ἐν φιλότητι,
Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν ἀνήγαγον ἐς φάος αὖτις:
αὐτὴ γάρ σφιν ἅπαντα διηνεκέως κατέλεξε
σὺν κείνοις νίκην τε καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἀρέσθαι.
δηρὸν γὰρ μάρναντο πόνον θυμαλγέ' ἔχοντες

Τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ καὶ ὅσοι Κρόνου ἐξεγένοντο,
ἀντίον ἀλλήλοισι διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας,
οἳ μὲν ἀφ' ὑψηλῆς Ὀθρυος Τιτῆνες ἀγαυοί,
οἳ δ' ἄρ' ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο θεοί, δωτῆρες ἐάων,
οὓς τέκεν ἠύκομος Ῥείη Κρόνῳ εὐνηθεῖσα.

οἵ ῥα τότ' ἀλλήλοισι χόλον θυμαλγέ' ἔχοντες
συνεχέως ἐμάχοντο δέκα πλείους ἐνιαυτούς:
οὐδέ τις ἦν ἔριδος χαλεπῆς λύσις οὐδὲ τελευτὴ
οὐδετέροις, ἶσον δὲ τέλος τέτατο πτολέμοιο.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κείνοισι παρέσχεθεν ἅρμενα πάντα,

νέκταρ τ' ἀμβροσίην τε, τά περ θεοὶ αὐτοὶ ἔδουσι,
πάντων ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀέξετο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ.

ὡς νέκταρ τ' ἐπάσαντο καὶ ἀμβροσίην ἐρατεινήν,
δὴ τότε τοῖς μετέειπε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε:
κέκλυτε μευ, Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,

ὄφρ' εἴπω, τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.
ἤδη γὰρ μάλα δηρὸν ἐναντίοι ἀλλήλοισι
νίκης καὶ κράτεος πέρι μαρνάμεθ' ἤματα πάντα
Τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ καὶ ὅσοι Κρόνου ἐκγενόμεσθα.
ὑμεῖς δὲ μεγάλην τε βίην καὶ χεῖρας ἀάπτους

φαίνετε Τιτήνεσσιν ἐναντίοι ἐν δαΐ λυγρῇ
μνησάμενοι φιλότητος ἐνηέος, ὅσσα παθόντες
ἐς φάος ἆψ ἀφίκεσθε δυσηλεγέος ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ
ἡμετέρας διὰ βουλὰς ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος.
ὣς φάτο: τὸν δ' ἐξαῦτις ἀμείβετο Κόττος ἀμύμων:

Δαιμόνι', οὐκ ἀδάητα πιφαύσκεαι: ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ
ἴδμεν, ὅ τοι περὶ μὲν πραπίδες, περὶ δ' ἐστὶ νόημα,
ἀλκτὴρ δ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀρῆς γένεο κρυεροῖο.
σῇσι δ' ἐπιφροσύνῃσιν ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος
ἄψορρον δ' ἐξαῦτις ἀμειλίκτων ὑπὸ δεσμῶν

ἠλύθομεν, Κρόνου υἱὲ ἄναξ, ἀνάελπτα παθόντες.
τῷ καὶ νῦν ἀτενεῖ τε νόῳ καὶ ἐπίφρονι βουλῇ
ῥυσόμεθα κράτος ὑμὸν ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι
μαρνάμενοι Τιτῆσιν ἀνὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας.
ὣς φάτ': ἐπῄνεσσαν δὲ θεοί, δωτῆρες ἐάων,

μῦθον ἀκούσαντες: πολέμου δ' ἐλιλαίετο θυμὸς
μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθε: μάχην δ' ἀμέγαρτον ἔγειραν
πάντες, θήλειαι τε καὶ ἄρσενες, ἤματι κείνῳ,
Τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ καὶ ὅσοι Κρόνου ἐξεγένοντο,
οὕς τε Ζεὺς Ἐρέβευσφιν ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἧκε φόωσδε

δεινοί τε κρατεροί τε, βίην ὑπέροπλον ἔχοντες.
τῶν ἑκατὸν μὲν χεῖρες ἀπ' ὤμων ἀίσσοντο
πᾶσιν ὁμῶς, κεφαλαὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ πεντήκοντα
ἐξ ὤμων ἐπέφυκον ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσιν.
οἳ τότε Τιτήνεσσι κατέσταθεν ἐν δαΐ λυγρῇ

πέτρας ἠλιβάτους στιβαρῇς ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες.
Τιτῆνες δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἐκαρτύναντο φάλαγγας
προφρονέως, χειρῶν τε βίης θ' ἅμα ἔργον ἔφαινον
ἀμφότεροι: δεινὸν δὲ περίαχε πόντος ἀπείρων,
γῆ δὲ μέγ' ἐσμαράγησεν, ἐπέστενε δ' οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς

σειόμενος, πεδόθεν δὲ τινάσσετο μακρὸς Ὄλυμπος
ῥιπῇ ὕπ' ἀθανάτων, ἔνοσις δ' ἵκανε βαρεῖα

Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα, ποδῶν τ' αἰπεῖα ἰωὴ
ἀσπέτου ἰωχμοῖο βολάων τε κρατεράων:
ὣς ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις ἵεσαν βέλεα στονόεντα.

φωνὴ δ' ἀμφοτέρων ἵκετ' οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα
κεκλομένων: οἳ δὲ ξύνισαν μεγάλῳ ἀλαλητῷ.
οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι Ζεὺς ἶσχεν ἐὸν μένος, ἀλλά νυ τοῦ γε
εἴθαρ μὲν μένεος πλῆντο φρένες, ἐκ δέ τε πᾶσαν
φαῖνε βίην: ἄμυδις δ' ἄρ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἠδ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου

ἀστράπτων ἔστειχε συνωχαδόν: οἱ δὲ κεραυνοὶ
ἵκταρ ἅμα βροντῇ τε καὶ ἀστεροπῇ ποτέοντο
χειρὸς ἄπο στιβαρῆς, ἱερὴν φλόγα εἰλυφόωντες
ταρφέες: ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα φερέσβιος ἐσμαράγιζε
καιομένη, λάκε δ' ἀμφὶ πυρὶ μεγάλ' ἄσπετος ὕλη.

ἔζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα
πόντος τ' ἀτρύγετος: τοὺς δ' ἄμφεπε θερμὸς ἀυτμὴ
Τιτῆνας χθονίους, φλὸξ δ' αἰθέρα δῖαν ἵκανεν
ἄσπετος, ὄσσε δ' ἄμερδε καὶ ἰφθίμων περ ἐόντων
αὐγὴ μαρμαίρουσα κεραυνοῦ τε στεροπῆς τε.

καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν Χάος: εἴσατο δ' ἄντα
ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν ἠδ' οὔασι ὄσσαν ἀκοῦσαι
αὔτως, ὡς εἰ Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε
πίλνατο: τοῖος γάρ κε μέγας ὑπὸ δοῦπος ὀρώρει
τῆς μὲν ἐρειπομένης, τοῦ δ' ὑψόθεν ἐξεριπόντος:

τόσσος δοῦπος ἔγεντο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων.
σὺν δ' ἄνεμοι ἔνοσίν τε κονίην τ' ἐσφαράγιζον
βροντήν τε στεροπήν τε καὶ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,
κῆλα Διὸς μεγάλοιο, φέρον δ' ἰαχήν τ' ἐνοπήν τε
ἐς μέσον ἀμφοτέρων: ὄτοβος δ' ἄπλητος ὀρώρει

σμερδαλέης ἔριδος, κάρτος δ' ἀνεφαίνετο ἔργων.
ἐκλίνθη δὲ μάχη: πρὶν δ' ἀλλήλοις ἐπέχοντες
ἐμμενέως ἐμάχοντο διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας.
οἳ δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ πρώτοισι μάχην δριμεῖαν ἔγειραν
Κόττος τε Βριάρεώς τε Γύης τ' ἄατος πολέμοιο,

οἵ ῥα τριηκοσίας πέτρας στιβαρῶν ἀπὸ χειρῶν
πέμπον ἐπασσυτέρας, κατὰ δ' ἐσκίασαν βελέεσσι
Τιτῆνας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
πέμψαν καὶ δεσμοῖσιν ἐν ἀργαλέοισιν ἔδησαν
χερσὶν νικήσαντες ὑπερθύμους περ ἐόντας,

τόσσον ἔνερθ' ὑπὸ γῆς, ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης:
τόσσον γάρ τ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα.

ἐννέα γὰρ νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα χάλκεος ἄκμων
οὐρανόθεν κατιὼν δεκάτῃ κ' ἐς γαῖαν ἵκοιτο:
ἐννέα δ' αὖ νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα χάλκεος ἄκμων

ἐκ γαίης κατιὼν δεκάτῃ κ' ἐς Τάρταρον ἵκοι.
τὸν πέρι χάλκεον ἕρκος ἐλήλαται: ἀμφὶ δέ μιν νὺξ
τριστοιχεὶ κέχυται περὶ δειρήν: αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν
γῆς ῥίζαι πεφύασι καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης.
ἔνθα θεοὶ Τιτῆνες ὑπὸ ζόφῳ ἠερόεντι

κεκρύφαται βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο
χώρῳ ἐν εὐρώεντι, πελώρης ἔσχατα γαίης.
τοῖς οὐκ ἐξιτόν ἐστι. θύρας δ' ἐπέθηκε Ποσειδέων
χαλκείας, τεῖχος δὲ περοίχεται ἀμφοτέρωθεν.
ἔνθα Γύης Κόττος τε καὶ Ὀβριάρεως μεγάθυμος

ναίουσιν, φύλακες πιστοὶ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.
ἔνθα δὲ γῆς δνοφερῆς καὶ Ταρτάρου ἠερόεντος
πόντου τ' ἀτρυγέτοιο καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος
ἑξείης πάντων πηγαὶ καὶ πείρατ' ἔασιν
ἀργαλέ' εὐρώεντα, τά τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ,

χάσμα μέγ', οὐδέ κε πάντα τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
οὖδας ἵκοιτ', εἰ πρῶτα πυλέων ἔντοσθε γένοιτο,
ἀλλά κεν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα φέροι πρὸ θύελλα θυέλλῃ
ἀργαλέη: δεινὸν δὲ καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι
τοῦτο τέρας. Νυκτὸς δ' ἐρεβεννῆς οἰκία δεινὰ

ἕστηκεν νεφέλῃς κεκαλυμμένα κυανέῃσιν.
τῶν πρόσθ' Ἰαπετοῖο πάις ἔχει οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν
ἑστηὼς κεφαλῇ τε καὶ ἀκαμάτῃσι χέρεσσιν
ἀστεμφέως, ὅθι Νύξ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἆσσον ἰοῦσαι
ἀλλήλας προσέειπον, ἀμειβόμεναι μέγαν οὐδὸν

χάλκεον: ἡ μὲν ἔσω καταβήσεται, ἣ δὲ θύραζε
ἔρχεται, οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμφοτέρας δόμος ἐντὸς ἐέργει,
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ἑτέρη γε δόμων ἔκτοσθεν ἐοῦσα
γαῖαν ἐπιστρέφεται, ἣ δ' αὖ δόμου ἐντὸς ἐοῦσα
μίμνει τὴν αὐτῆς ὥρην ὁδοῦ, ἔστ' ἂν ἵκηται,

ἡ μὲν ἐπιχθονίοισι φάος πολυδερκὲς ἔχουσα,
ἣ δ' Ὕπνον μετὰ χερσί, κασίγνητον Θανάτοιο.
Νὺξ ὀλοή, νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένη ἠεροειδεῖ.
ἔνθα δὲ Νυκτὸς παῖδες ἐρεμνῆς οἰκί' ἔχουσιν,
Ὕπνος καὶ Θάνατος, δεινοὶ θεοί: οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοὺς

Ἠέλιος φαέθων ἐπιδέρκεται ἀκτίνεσσιν
οὐρανὸν εἰς ἀνιὼν οὐδ' οὐρανόθεν καταβαίνων.

τῶν δ' ἕτερος γαῖάν τε καὶ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης
ἥσυχος ἀνστρέφεται καὶ μείλιχος ἀνθρώποισι,
τοῦ δὲ σιδηρέη μὲν κραδίη, χάλκεον δέ οἱ ἦτορ

νηλεὲς ἐν στήθεσσιν: ἔχει δ' ὃν πρῶτα λάβῃσιν
ἀνθρώπων: ἐχθρὸς δὲ καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν.
ἔνθα θεοῦ χθονίου πρόσθεν δόμοι ἠχήεντες
ἰφθίμου τ' Ἀίδεω καὶ ἐπαινῆς Περσεφονείης
ἑστᾶσιν, δεινὸς δὲ κύων προπάροιθε φυλάσσει

νηλειής, τέχνην δὲ κακὴν ἔχει: ἐς μὲν ἰόντας
σαίνει ὁμῶς οὐρῇ τε καὶ οὔασιν ἀμφοτέροισιν,
ἐξελθεῖν δ' οὐκ αὖτις ἐᾷ πάλιν, ἀλλὰ δοκεύων
ἐσθίει, ὅν κε λάβῃσι πυλέων ἔκτοσθεν ἰόντα.
[ἰφθίμου τ' Ἀίδεω καὶ ἐπαινῆς Περσεφονείης.]

ἔνθα δὲ ναιετάει στυγερὴ θεὸς ἀθανάτοισι,
δεινὴ Στύξ, θυγάτηρ ἀψορρόου Ὠκεανοῖο
πρεσβυτάτη: νόσφιν δὲ θεῶν κλυτὰ δώματα ναίει
μακρῇσιν πέτρῃσι κατηρεφέ': ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντη
κίοσιν ἀργυρέοισι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται.

παῦρα δὲ Θαύμαντος θυγάτηρ πόδας ὠκέα Ἶρις
ἀγγελίην πωλεῖται ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης.
ὁππότ' ἔρις καὶ νεῖκος ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ὄρηται
καί ῥ' ὅστις ψεύδηται Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἐχόντων,
Ζεὺς δέ τε Ἶριν ἔπεμψε θεῶν μέγαν ὅρκον ἐνεῖκαι

τηλόθεν ἐν χρυσέῃ προχόῳ πολυώνυμον ὕδωρ
ψυχρόν, ὅτ' ἐκ πέτρης καταλείβεται ἠλιβάτοιο
ὑψηλῆς: πολλὸν δὲ ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
ἐξ ἱεροῦ ποταμοῖο ῥέει διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν
Ὠκεανοῖο κέρας: δεκάτῃ δ' ἐπὶ μοῖρα δέδασται:

ἐννέα μὲν περὶ γῆν τε καὶ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης
δίνῃς ἀργυρέῃς εἰλιγμένος εἰς ἅλα πίπτει,
ἡ δὲ μί' ἐκ πέτρης προρέει μέγα πῆμα θεοῖσιν.
ὅς κεν τὴν ἐπίορκον ἀπολλείψας ἐπομόσσῃ
ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,

κεῖται νήυτμος τετελεσμένον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν:
οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμβροσίης καὶ νέκταρος ἔρχεται ἆσσον
βρώσιος, ἀλλά τε κεῖται ἀνάπνευστος καὶ ἄναυδος
στρωτοῖς ἐν λεχέεσσι, κακὸν δέ ἑ κῶμα καλύπτει.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νοῦσον τελέσῃ μέγαν εἰς ἐνιαυτόν,

ἄλλος γ' ἐξ ἄλλου δέχεται χαλεπώτερος ἄεθλος.
εἰνάετες δὲ θεῶν ἀπαμείρεται αἰὲν ἐόντων,

οὐδέ ποτ' ἐς βουλὴν ἐπιμίσγεται οὐδ' ἐπὶ δαῖτας
ἐννέα πάντα ἔτεα: δεκάτῳ δ' ἐπιμίσγεται αὖτις
εἴρας ἐς ἀθανάτων, οἳ 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσιν.

τοῖον ἄρ' ὅρκον ἔθεντο θεοὶ Στυγὸς ἄφθιτον ὕδωρ
ὠγύγιον, τὸ δ' ἴησι καταστυφέλου διὰ χώρου.
ἔνθα δὲ γῆς δνοφερῆς καὶ Ταρτάρου ἠερόεντος
πόντου τ' ἀτρυγέτοιο καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος
ἐξείης πάντων πηγαὶ καὶ πείρατ' ἔασιν

ἀργαλέ' εὐρώεντα, τά τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ.
ἔνθα δὲ μαρμάρεαί τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδὸς
ἀστεμφής, ῥίζῃσι διηνεκέεσσιν ἀρηρώς,
αὐτοφυής: πρόσθεν δὲ θεῶν ἔκτοσθεν ἁπάντων
Τιτῆνες ναίουσι, πέρην Χάεος ζοφεροῖο.

αὐτὰρ ἐρισμαράγοιο Διὸς κλειτοὶ ἐπίκουροι
δώματα ναιετάουσιν ἐπ' 'Ωκεανοῖο θεμέθλοις,
Κόττος τ' ἠδὲ Γύης: Βριάρεών γε μὲν ἠὺν ἐόντα
γαμβρὸν ἐὸν ποίησε βαρύκτυπος' Εννοσίγαιος,
δῶκε δὲ Κυμοπόλειαν ὀπυίειν, θυγατέρα ἥν.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Τιτῆνας ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐξέλασεν Ζεύς,
ὁπλότατον τέκε παῖδα Τυφωέα Γαῖα πελώρη
Ταρτάρου ἐν φιλότητι διὰ χρυσέην 'Αφροδίτην:
οὗ χεῖρες μὲν ἔασιν ἐπ' ἰσχύι, ἔργματ' ἔχουσαι,
καὶ πόδες ἀκάματοι κρατεροῦ θεοῦ: ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμων

ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος, δεινοῖο δράκοντος,
γλώσσῃσιν δνοφερῇσι λελιχμότες, ἐκ δέ οἱ ὄσσων
θεσπεσίης κεφαλῇσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι πῦρ ἀμάρυσσεν:
πασέων δ' ἐκ κεφαλέων πῦρ καίετο δερκομένοιο:
φωναὶ δ' ἐν πάσῃσιν ἔσαν δεινῇς κεφαλῇσι

παντοίην ὄπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον: ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ
φθέγγονθ' ὥστε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ταύρου ἐριβρύχεω, μένος ἀσχέτου, ὄσσαν ἀγαύρου,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε λέοντος ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντος,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ σκυλάκεσσιν ἐοικότα, θαύματ' ἀκοῦσαι,

ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ ῥοίζεσχ', ὑπὸ δ' ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά.
καί νύ κεν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἀμήχανον ἤματι κείνῳ
καί κεν ὅ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἄναξεν,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
σκληρὸν δ' ἐβρόντησε καὶ ὄβριμον, ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα

σμερδαλέον κονάβησε καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε
πόντος τ' 'Ωκεανοῦ τε ῥοαὶ καὶ Τάρταρα γαίης.

ποσσὶ δ' ὕπ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγας πελεμίζετ' Ὄλυμπος
ὀρνυμένοιο ἄνακτος: ἐπεστενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.
καῦμα δ' ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων κάτεχεν ἰοειδέα πόντον

βροντῆς τε στεροπῆς τε, πυρός τ' ἀπὸ τοῖο πελώρου,
πρηστήρων ἀνέμων τε κεραυνοῦ τε φλεγέθοντος.
ἔζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα:
θυΐε δ' ἄρ' ἀμφ' ἀκτὰς περί τ' ἀμφί τε κύματα μακρὰ
ῥιπῇ ὕπ' ἀθανάτων, ἔνοσις δ' ἄσβεστος ὀρώρει:

τρέε δ' Ἀΐδης, ἐνέροισι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσων,
Τιτῆνές θ' ὑποταρτάριοι, Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες,
ἀσβέστου κελάδοιο καὶ αἰνῆς δηιοτῆτος.
Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν κόρθυνεν ἐὸν μένος, εἵλετο δ' ὅπλα,
βροντήν τε στεροπήν τε καὶ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,

πλῆξεν ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο ἐπάλμενος: ἀμφὶ δὲ πάσας
ἔπρεσε θεσπεσίας κεφαλὰς δεινοῖο πελώρου.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή μιν δάμασεν πληγῇσιν ἱμάσσας,
ἤριπε γυιωθείς, στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη.
φλὸξ δὲ κεραυνωθέντος ἀπέσσυτο τοῖο ἄνακτος

οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃσιν ἀιδνῇς παιπαλοέσσῃς,
πληγέντος. πολλὴ δὲ πελώρη καίετο γαῖα
ἀτμῇ θεσπεσίῃ καὶ ἐτήκετο κασσίτερος ὡς
τέχνῃ ὕπ' αἰζηῶν ἐν ἐυτρήτοις χοάνοισι
θαλφθείς, ἠὲ σίδηρος, ὅ περ κρατερώτατός ἐστιν.

οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃσι δαμαζόμενος πυρὶ κηλέῳ
τήκεται ἐν χθονὶ δίῃ ὑφ' Ἡφαίστου παλάμῃσιν.
ὣς ἄρα τήκετο γαῖα σέλαι πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο.
ῥῖψε δέ μιν θυμῷ ἀκαχὼν ἐς Τάρταρον εὐρύν.
ἐκ δὲ Τυφωέος ἔστ' ἀνέμων μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων,

νόσφι Νότου Βορέω τε καὶ ἀργέστεω Ζεφύροιο:
οἵ γε μὲν ἐκ θεόφιν γενεή, θνητοῖς μέγ' ὄνειαρ:
οἱ δ' ἄλλοι μαψαῦραι ἐπιπνείουσι θάλασσαν:
αἵ δή τοι πίπτουσαι ἐς ἠεροειδέα πόντον,
πῆμα μέγα θνητοῖσι, κακῇ θυίουσιν ἀέλλῃ:

ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλαι ἄεισι διασκιδνᾶσί τε νῆας
ναύτας τε φθείρουσι: κακοῦ δ' οὐ γίγνεται ἀλκὴ
ἀνδράσιν, οἵ κείνῃσι συνάντωνται κατὰ πόντον:
αἵ δ' αὖ καὶ κατὰ γαῖαν ἀπείριτον ἀνθεμόεσσαν
ἔργ' ἐρατὰ φθείρουσι χαμαιγενέων ἀνθρώπων

πιμπλεῖσαι κόνιός τε καὶ ἀργαλέου κολοσυρτοῦ.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσσαν,

Τιτήνεσσι δὲ τιμάων κρίναντο βίηφι,
δή ῥα τότ' ὤτρυνον βασιλευέμεν ἠδὲ ἀνάσσειν
Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν

ἀθανάτων: ὃ δὲ τοῖσιν ἐὰς διεδάσσατο τιμάς.
Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεὺς πρώτην ἄλοχον θέτο Μῆτιν
πλεῖστα τε ἰδυῖαν ἰδὲ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἄρ' ἔμελλε θεὰν γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην
τέξεσθαι, τότ' ἔπειτα δόλῳ φρένας ἐξαπατήσας

αἱμυλίοισι λόγοισιν ἑὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδὺν
Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος.
τὼς γάρ οἱ φρασάτην, ἵνα μὴ βασιληίδα τιμὴν
ἄλλος ἔχοι Διὸς ἀντὶ θεῶν αἰειγενετάων.
ἐκ γὰρ τῆς εἵμαρτο περίφρονα τέκνα γενέσθαι:

πρώτην μὲν κούρην γλαυκώπιδα Τριτογένειαν
ἶσον ἔχουσαν πατρὶ μένος καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν.
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἄρα παῖδα θεῶν βασιλῆα καὶ ἀνδρῶν
ἤμελλεν τέξεσθαι, ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντα:
ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν Ζεὺς πρόσθεν ἑὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν,

ὡς δή οἱ φράσσαιτο θεὰ ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε.
δεύτερον ἠγάγετο λιπαρὴν Θέμιν, ἣ τέκεν Ὥρας,
Εὐνουμίην τε Δίκην τε καὶ Εἰρήνην τεθαλυῖαν,
αἳ ἔργ' ὠρεύουσι καταθνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι,
Μοίρας θ', ᾗ πλείστην τιμὴν πόρε μητίετα Ζεύς,

Κλωθώ τε Λάχεσίν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον, αἵτε διδοῦσι
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχειν ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε.
τρεῖς δέ οἱ Εὐρυνομη Χάριτας τέκε καλλιπαρῄους,
Ὠκεανοῦ κούρη, πολυήρατον εἶδος ἔχουσα,
Ἀγλαΐην τε καὶ Εὐφροσύνην Θαλίην τ' ἐρατεινήν:

τῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ἔρος εἴβετο δερκομενάων
λυσιμελής: καλὸν δέ θ' ὑπ' ὀφρύσι δερκιόωνται.
αὐτὰρ ὁ Δήμητρος πολυφόρβης ἐς λέχος ἦλθεν,
ἣ τέκε Περσεφόνην λευκώλενον, ἣν Ἀιδωνεὺς
ἥρπασε ἧς παρὰ μητρός: ἔδωκε δὲ μητίετα Ζεύς.

μνημοσύνης δ' ἐξαῦτις ἐράσσατο καλλικόμοιο,
ἐξ ἧς οἱ Μοῦσαι χρυσάμπυκες ἐξεγένοντο
ἐννέα, τῇσιν ἄδον θαλίαι καὶ τέρψις ἀοιδῆς.
Λητὼ δ' Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν,
ἱμερόεντα γόνον περὶ πάντων Οὐρανιώνων,

γείνατ' ἄρ' αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς φιλότητι μιγεῖσα.
λοισθοτάτην δ' Ἥρην θαλερὴν ποιήσατ' ἄκοιτιν:
ἣ δ' Ἥβην καὶ Ἄρηα καὶ Εἰλείθυιαν ἔτικτε
μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότητι θεῶν βασιλῆι καὶ ἀνδρῶν.

αὐτὸς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς γλαυκώπιδα Τριτογένειαν
δεινὴν ἐγρεκύδοιμον ἀγέστρατον Ἀτρυτώνην
πότνιαν, ᾗ κέλαδοί τε ἄδον πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε,
Ἥρη δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτὸν οὐ φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
γείνατο, καὶ ζαμένησε καὶ ἤρισε ᾧ παρακοίτῃ,
ἐκ πάντων τέχνῃσι κεκασμένον Οὐρανιώνων.

.....
ἐκ ταύτης δ' ἔριδος ἣ μὲν τέκε φαίδιμον υἱὸν
Ἥφαιστον, φιλότητος ἄτερ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
ἐκ πάντων παλάμῃσι κεκασμένον Οὐρανιώνων:
αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ Τηθύος ἠυκόμοιο
κούρῃ νόσφ' Ἥρης παρελέξατο καλλιπαρήῳ,
...
ἐξαπαφὼν Μῆτιν καίπερ πολυδήνε' ἐοῦσαν.
συμμάρψας δ' ὅ γε χερσὶν ἑὴν ἐγκάτθετο νηδὺν
δείσας, μὴ τέξῃ κρατερώτερον ἄλλο κεραυνοῦ.
τοὔνεκά μιν Κρονίδης ὑψίζυγος αἰθέρι ναίων
κάππιεν ἐξαπίνης: ἣ δ' αὐτίκα Παλλάδ' Ἀθήνην
κύσατο: τὴν μὲν ἔτικτε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
πὰρ κορυφὴν Τρίτωνος ἐπ' ὄχθῃσιν ποταμοῖο.
Μῆτις δ' αὖτε Ζηνὸς ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοις λελαθυῖα
ἧστο, Ἀθηναίης μήτηρ, τέκταινα δικαίων
πλεῖστα θεῶν τε ἰδυῖα καταθνητῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων,
ἔνθα θεὰ παρέδεκτο ὅθεν παλάμαις περὶ πάντων
ἀθανάτων ἐκέκασθ' οἳ Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσιν,
[αἰγίδα ποιήσασα φοβέστρατον ἔντος Ἀθήνης:]
σὺν τῇ ἐγείνατό μιν πολεμήια τεύχε' ἔχουσαν.>

Ἐκ δ' Ἀμφιτρίτης καὶ ἐρικτύπου Ἐννοσιγαίου
Τρίτων εὐρυβίης γένετο μέγας, ὅστε θαλάσσης
πυθμέν' ἔχων παρὰ μητρὶ φίλῃ καὶ πατρὶ ἄνακτι
ναίει χρύσεα δῶ, δεινὸς θεός. αὐτὰρ Ἄρηι
ῥινοτόρῳ Κυθέρεια Φόβον καὶ Δεῖμον ἔτικτε

δεινούς, οἵτ' ἀνδρῶν πυκινὰς κλονέουσι φάλαγγας
ἐν πολέμῳ κρυόεντι σὺν Ἄρηι πτολιπόρθῳ,
Ἁρμονίην θ', ἣν Κάδμος ὑπέρθυμος θέτ' ἄκοιτιν.
Ζηνὶ δ' ἄρ' Ἀτλαντὶς Μαίη τέκε κύδιμον Ἑρμῆν,
κήρυκ' ἀθανάτων, ἱερὸν λέχος εἰσαναβᾶσα.

Καδμείῃ δ' ἄρα οἱ Σεμέλη τέκε φαίδιμον υἱὸν
μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότητι, Διώνυσον πολυγηθέα,
ἀθάνατον θνητή: νῦν δ' ἀμφότεροι θεοί εἰσιν.
Ἀλκμήνη δ' ἄρ' ἔτικτε βίην Ἡρακληείην
μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότητι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο.

ἀγλαΐην δ' Ἥφαιστος, ἀγακλυτὸς ἀμφιγυήεις,

ὁπλοτάτην Χαρίτων θαλερὴν ποιήσατ' ἄκοιτιν.
χρυσοκόμης δὲ Διώνυσος ξανθὴν Ἀριάδνην,
κούρην Μίνωος, θαλερὴν ποιήσατ' ἄκοιτιν.
τὴν δέ οἱ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήρω θῆκε Κρονίων.

ἦβην δ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱός,
ἷς Ἡρακλῆος, τελέσας στονόεντας ἀέθλους,
παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἥρης χρυσοπεδίλου,
αἰδοίην θέτ' ἄκοιτιν ἐν Οὐλύμπῳ νιφόεντι,
ὄλβιος, ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας

ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἤματα πάντα.
ἠελίῳ δ' ἀκάμαντι τέκεν κλυτὸς Ὠκεανίνη
Περσηὶς Κίρκην τε καὶ Αἰήτην βασιλῆα.
Αἰήτης δ' υἱὸς φαεσιμβρότου Ἠελίοιο
κούρην Ὠκεανοῖο τελήεντος ποταμοῖο

γῆμε θεῶν βουλῇσιν Ἰδυῖαν καλλιπάρῃον.
ἣ δέ οἱ Μήδειαν ἐύσφυρον ἐν φιλότητι
γείναθ' ὑποδμηθεῖσα διὰ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην.
ὑμεῖς μὲν νῦν χαίρετ', Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες,
νῆσοί τ' ἤπειροί τε καὶ ἁλμυρὸς ἔνδοθι πόντος.

νῦν δὲ θεάων φῦλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυέπειαι
Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
ὅσσαι δὴ θνητοῖσι παρ' ἀνδράσιν εὐνηθεῖσαι
ἀθάναται γείναντο θεοῖς ἐπιείκελα τέκνα.
Δημήτηρ μὲν Πλοῦτον ἐγείνατο, δῖα θεάων,

Ἰασίων' ἥρωι μιγεῖσ' ἐρατῇ φιλότητι
νειῷ ἔνι τριπόλῳ, Κρήτης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ,
ἐσθλόν, ὃς εἶσ' ἐπὶ γῆν τε καὶ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης
πάντη: τῷ δὲ τυχόντι καὶ οὗ κ' ἐς χεῖρας ἵκηται,
τὸν δ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε, πολὺν δέ οἱ ὤπασεν ὄλβον.

Κάδμῳ δ' Ἁρμονίη, θυγάτηρ χρυσέης Ἀφροδιτης,
Ἰνὼ καὶ Σεμέλην καὶ Ἀγαυὴν καλλιπάρῃον
Αὐτονόην θ', ἣν γῆμεν Ἀριστα῀ος βαθυχαίτης,
γείνατο καὶ Πολύδωρον ἐυστεφάνῳ ἐνὶ Θήβῃ.
κούρη δ' Ὠκεανοῦ, Χρυσάορι καρτεροθύμῳ

μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότητι πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης,
Καλλιρόη τέκε παῖδα βροτῶν κάρτιστον ἁπάντων,
Γηρυονέα, τὸν κτεῖνε βίη Ἡρακληείη
βοῶν ἕνεκ' εἰλιπόδων ἀμφιρρύτῳ εἰν Ἐρυθείῃ.
Τιθωνῷ δ' Ἠὼς τέκε Μέμνονα χαλκοκορυστήν,

Αἰθιόπων βασιλῆα, καὶ Ἡμαθίωνα ἄνακτα.
αὐτὰρ ὑπαὶ Κεφάλῳ φιτύσατο φαίδιμον υἱόν,
ἴφθιμον Φαέθοντα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελον ἄνδρα.

τόν ῥα νέον τέρεν ἄνθος ἔχοντ' ἐρικυδέος ἥβης
παῖδ' ἀταλὰ φρονέοντα φιλομμειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη

ὧρτ' ἀναρεψαμένη, καί μιν ζαθέοις ἐνὶ νηοῖς
νηοπόλον νύχιον ποιήσατο, δαίμονα δῖον.
κούρην δ' Αἰήταο διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος
Αἰσονίδης βουλῇσι θεῶν αἰειγενετάων
ἦγε παρ' Αἰήτεω, τελέσας στονόεντας ἀέθλους,

τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπέτελλε μέγας βασιλεὺς ὑπερήνωρ,
ὑβριστὴς Πελίης καὶ ἀτάσθαλος, ὀβριμοεργός.
τοὺς τελέσας Ἰαωλκὸν ἀφίκετο, πολλὰ μογήσας,
ὠκείης ἐπὶ νηὸς ἄγων ἑλικώπιδα κούρην
Αἰσονίδης, καί μιν θαλερὴν ποιήσατ' ἄκοιτιν.

καί ῥ' ἥ γε δμηθεῖσ' ὑπ' Ἰήσονι, ποιμένι λαῶν,
Μήδειον τέκε παῖδα, τὸν οὔρεσιν ἔτρεφε Χείρων
Φιλυρίδης: μεγάλου δὲ Διὸς νόος ἐξετελεῖτο.
αὐτὰρ Νηρῆος κοῦραι,: ἁλίοιο γέροντος,
ἥ τοι μὲν Φῶκον Ψαμάθη τέκε δῖα θεάων

Αἰακοῦ ἐν φιλότητι διὰ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην,
Πηλέι δὲ δμηθεῖσα θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
γείνατ' Ἀχιλλῆα ῥηξήνορα θυμολέοντα.
Αἰνείαν δ' ἄρ' ἔτικτεν ἐυστέφανος Κυθέρεια
Ἀγχίσῃ ἥρωι μιγεῖσ' ἐρατῇ φιλότητι

Ἴδης ἐν κορυφῇσι πολυπτύχου ὑληέσσης.
Κίρκη δ', Ἠελίου θυγάτηρ Ὑπεριονίδαο,
γείνατ' Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ἐν φιλότητι
Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε:
[Τηλέγονον δ' ἄρ' ἔτικτε διὰ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην.]

οἳ δή τοι μάλα τῆλε μυχῷ νήσων ἱεράων
πᾶσιν Τυρσηνοῖσιν ἀγακλειτοῖσιν ἄνασσον.
Ναυσίθοον δ' Ὀδυσῆι Καλυψὼ δῖα θεάων
γείνατο Ναυσίνοόν τε μιγεῖσ' ἐρατῇ φιλότητι.
αὗται μὲν θνητοῖσι παρ' ἀνδράσιν εὐνηθεῖσαι

ἀθάναται γείναντο θεοῖς ἐπιείκελα τέκνα.
νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν φῦλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυέπειαι
Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.

Bibliography

Selected Bibliography

I) General Bibliography

Adomenas, M., 'Heraclitus on Religion', *Phronesis* 44 (1999), pp. 87-114.

Alderink, L.J., 'Mythical and Cosmological Structure in the Homeric **Hymn to Demeter**', *Numen: International Review for the History of Religions* 29 (1982), pp. 1-16.

Algra, K., 'The Beginnings of Cosmology', in A.A. Long (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 45-65.

Alexander, L., 'The Living Voice: Scepticism Towards the Written Word in Early Christian and Graeco-Roman Texts' in Clines D.J., S.E. Ford & S.E. Porter (eds.) *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, suppl. 87 (Sheffield, 1990), pp. 221-247.

Allen, G., *The Evolution of the Idea of God* (London: Watts and Co., 1931).

Allen, T.W., *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

Andersen, O., 'Mundlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im frühen Griechentum', *Antike und Abendland* 33 (1987), pp. 24-44.

Arafat, K., 'Pausanias' Attitude to Antiquities', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 87 (1992), pp. 387-409.

Armandry, P., *La Mantique Apolliniennne a Delphes* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950).

Arthur, M.B., 'Culture and Removal', *Hermes* 15 (1982), pp. 63-82.

Arthur, M.B., 'Cultural Strategies in Hesiod's *Theogony*: Law, Family and Society', *Arethusa* 15 (1982), pp. 68-70.

Baddeley, A.D., *Your Memory: A Viewer's Guide* (London: Penguin, 1983).

Bagnall, R.S., *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History* (London: Routledge, 1995).

Barlow, S., 'Some Problems of a Translator', in L. Rodley (ed.) *Papers given at a Colloquium on Greek Drama in Honour of R.P. Winnington-Ingram* (London: Stephen Austin and Sons Ltd. Hertford, 1987).

Barnes, J., *The Presocratic Philosophers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979).

Barron, J.P., & P.E. Easterling (eds.), 'Hesiod', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 95-105.

Bernstein, A.E., *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in Ancient and Early Christian Worlds* (London: University College London Press, 1993).

Bianchi, U., *The Greek Mysteries* Iconography of Religions XVII.3: Institute of Religious Iconography, State University Groningen (Leiden: Brill, 1976).

Bleeker, C.J., *The Sacred Bridge* (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

Bloom, H., *Poetry and Repression: revisionism from Blake to Stevens* (New Haven: Yale University Press,1976).

Booth, N.B., 'The Chorus of Prometheus and Hesiod's *Theogony* 563', unpublished article.

Boulogne, J., Pensée Scientifique et Pensée Mythique en Grèce Ancienne', *Les Etudes Classiques* 64 (1996), pp. 213-226.

Brandon, S.G.F., *The Judgment of the Dead* (New York: Scribner's Sons,1967).

Bremmer, J., 'Analyse van de Mythe', *Lampas* 17 (1984), pp. 126-141.

Bremmer, J. (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London: Routledge, 1988).

Bremmer, J.N., *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Bremmer, J.N., *Greek Religion* Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics 24 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Broadie, S., 'Rational Theology' in A.A. Long (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 205-224.

Brower, R.A., *Alexander Pope: The Poetry of Allusion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959).

Brown, N.O., *Hesiod's Theogony* (New York: Liberal Arts Press,1953).

Brunt, P.A., *Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

Bultmann, R., 'The Significance of the Old Testament for Christian Faith', in B.W. Anderson (ed.) *The Old Testament and Christian Faith* (New York: 1963), pp. 8-35.

Burkert, W., *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979).

Burkert, W., *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* trans. P. Bing (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983).

Burkert, W., *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical* (Cambr. Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985).

Burkert, W., *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987).

Burkert, W., *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

Burkert, W., *Creation of the Sacred* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996).

Burkert, W., 'The Logic of Cosmogony', in R. Buxton (ed.), *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 87-107.

Burnet, J., *Early Greek Philosophy* 4th ed. (London: A & C Black, 1930).

Burton, T., *Ancient Astrology* (London: Routledge, 1994).

Buxton, R. (ed), *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,1999).

Caldwell, J., Caldwell, C. and Caldwell, B. 'Anthropology and Demography: The Mutual Reinforcement of Speculation and Research' *CA* 28 (1987) 25-46.

Caldwell, R., *The Origin of the Gods: A Psychoanalytic Study of Greek Theogonic Myth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

Carlisle, M., and Levaniouk, O. (eds.), *Nine Essays on Homer* (Boston: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999).

Cartledge, P.A., 'Hoplite and Heroes: Sparta's contribution to the Techniques of Ancient Warfare', *JHS* 97 (1977), pp. 11-28.

Carpenter, T., & Faraone, C. (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993).

Charles, R.H., *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912).

Clark, S.R.L., 'Ancient Philosophy' in A. Kenny (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Western Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 1-55.

Clay, J., "Hekate in the *Theogony*" *G.R.B.S.* 25 (1984), pp. 27-38.

Clay, J.S., *The Politics of Olympos: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

Cohn, N., *Cosmos, Chaos and the World to come: The Ancient Roots of Apocalyptic Faith* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993).

Cornford, F.M., 'A Ritual Basis for Hesiod's *Theogony*' in R. Segal (ed.) (see below), pp.118-135.

Culler, J.D., *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981).

Dalley, S., *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

Daly, L.W., 'Hesiod's Fable', *T.A.P.A.* 92 (1961), pp. 45-51.

Davies, D.J., *Meaning and Salvation in Religious Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1984).

Davies, D.J., *Death, Ritual and Belief: The Rhetoric of Funerary Rites* (London and Washington: Cassell, 1997).

Davies, D. J., *Death, Burial and Rebirth in the Religions of Antiquity: Religion in the First Christian Centuries* (London: Routledge, 1999).

Davies, J.K., 'Demosthenes on Liturgies: A Note', *JHS* 87 (1967), pp. 33-40.

Detienne, M., and Vernant, J.P. (eds.), *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* translated by J. Lloyd (Chicago: Chicago University Press,1991).

Diels, H., and Kranz, W., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker griechisch und deutsch* 6th edition (Berlin: Weidmann, 1951-1952).

Dodds, E.R., *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951).

Dodds, E.R. (ed), *Euripides* ***Bacchae*** with introduction and commentary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

Dollimore, J., *Death, Desire and Loss in Western Culture* (London: Allen Lane Penguin Press, 1998).

Dowden, K., 'Grades in the Eleusinian Mysteries', *Revue d'histoire des religions* 197 (1980), pp. 409-427.

Dreyer, J.L.E., *A History of Astronomy from Thales to Kepler* (New York: Dover Press, 1953).

Duchemin, J., *Prométhée: Histoire dú Myth, de ses Origenés Orientalés à ses Incarnations Modernes* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1974).

Duchemin, J., 'Les Myths de la *Theogonie* Hesiodique: Origines Orientalés Essai d'Interpretation' in J.Hani (ed.) *Problemes dú Myth ét dè son Interpretation* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1976).

Durkheim, E., *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (London: Allen & Urwin, 1915)

Easterling, P.E., and Muir, J.V. (eds.), *Greek Religion and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1993).

Edwards, G.P., *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

Eliade, M., 'Mythologies of Memory and Forgetting', *History of Ideas* 2 (1963), pp. 329-346.

Eliade, M., *Death, Afterlife and Eschatology* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1974).

Eliade, M., *Occultism, Witchcraft and Cultural Fashions* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1976).

Eliade, M., *A History of Religious Ideas: From the Stone Age to the Eleusinian Mysteries* vol. 1 trans. W.R. Trask (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1978).

Evans-Pritchard, E.E., *Theories of Primitive Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965).

Fenik, B.C. (ed), *Homer: Tradition and Innovation* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).

Finkelberg, A., 'On the Unity of Orphic and Milesian Thought', *Harvard Theological Review* 79.4 (1986) 321-335.L

Finley, M.I., *The World of Odysseus* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1977).

Finley, M.I., *Early Greece: The Bronze and Archaic Ages* (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981).

Finley, M.I., *Ancient History: Evidence and Models* (London: Penguin, 1987).

Finnegan, R., *Oral Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

Foley, H.P. (ed.), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary and Interpretive Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

Fontenrose, J., 'Work, Justice and Hesiod's Five Ages', *Classical Philology* 69 (1974), pp. 1-16.

Forsyth, N., *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

Foster, B.R., *Before the Muses: Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (California: CDL, 1987).

Fox, R.L., *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the second century A.D. to the conversion of Constantine* (London: Penguin Hammondsworth, 1988).

Fränkel, H., *Dichtung ¨und Philosophie* second edition (Lieden: Brill, 1962).

Fränkel, H., *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1975).

Friedlander, P., "Das Proomium von Hesiod's *Theogonie*", *Hermes* 49 (1914), pp. 1-16.

Fritz von, K. et al., *Hesiodé et son influence: six éxposes et discussions* Entretriens sùr l' antiquite classique (Geneve: Fondation Hardt,1962).

Furley, D., *The Greek Cosmologists: Volume One* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Furley, D., *Cosmic Problems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Gager, J.G., 'Body-Symbols and Social Reality: Resurrection, Incarnation, and Asceticism in Early Christianity', *Religion: Journal of Religion and Religions* 12 (1982), pp. 345-363.

Gager, J.G., (ed.) *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Galan, F.W., *Historic Structures: The Prague School Project 1928-1946* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

Gantz, T., *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* vol. 1 (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1993).

Garland, R.S.J., 'The Well-Ordered Corpse: An Investigation into the Motives behind Greek Funerary Legislation', *BICS* 36 (1989), pp. 1-15.

Garland, R. *The Greek Way of Death* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).

Gasset, J.O., *The Revolt of the Masses* (London: Unwin, 1961).

Gill, C., *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Girard, R., *Violence and the Sacred* translated by P. Gregory (London: Athlone Press, 1995).

Goodison, L., 'Death, Women and the Sun', *ICS suppl.* 53 (London) 1989.

Grabbe, L.L., 'The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation', *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 18 (1987), pp. 152-167.

Grant, M., *Myths of the Greeks and Romans* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1962).

Graves, R., *The Greek Myths* vol. 2 (London: Penguin Press, 1955).

Greene, T.M., *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).

Griffith, M., 'Personality in Hesiod', *Classical Antiquity* 2 (1983), pp. 37-65.

Griffiths, J.G., *The Divine Verdict: A Study of Divine Judgment in Ancient Religions* Studies in the History of Religion *Numen* supplement 52 (Leiden: Brill, 1983).

Griffin, J., *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

Griffin, J. 'Greek Myth and Hesiod' in *The Oxford History of the Classical World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 78-98.

Grube, G.M., *The Greek and Roman Critics* (London: Methuen, 1965).

Guterbock Hans, V., 'The Hittite Version of the Hurrian *Kumarbi* myths: Oriental Fore-Runners of Hesiod', *AJA* 52 (1948), pp. 123-134.

Guthrie, W.K.C., *The Greeks and Their Gods* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1962).

Guthrie, W.K.C., *Orpheus and Greek Religion* foreword L.J. Alderink (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Halbwachs, M., *On Collective Memory*, edited, translated and with introduction by L.A. Coser (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992).

Hallo, W. (ed.), *Context of Scripture: Volume 1 Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (New York: Leiden & Brill, 1997).

Hamilton, R., *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1989).

Harrison, J.E., *Prolegomena: To the Study of Greek Religion* intro. R. Ackerman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

Harrison, S., 'Smoke Rising from the Villages of the Dead: Seasonal Patterns of Mood in a Papua New Guinea Society', *Journal of RAI* 7 (2001), pp. 257-275.

Hatab, L.J., *Myth and Philosophy: A Contest of Truths* (Illinois: Cornell, 1990).

Hays, R.B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

Heitsch von, E., *Hesiod* (Dermstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966).

Helm, P. (ed.), *Faith and Reason* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Hernandez, P.N., 'Back in the Cave of the Cyclopes', *American Journal of Philology* 121 (2000), pp. 345-366.

Huxley, G., 'On Aristotle's Historical Method', *GRBS* 13 (1972), pp. 157-168.

Homans, P. (ed.), *The Dialogue between Theology and Psychology* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1968).

Jaegar, W.W., *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947).

Johnston, S.I., *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

Jacopin, P.Y., 'On Syntactic Structure of Myth, or the Yukura Invention of Speech', *Cultural Anthropology* 3 (1988) 131-159.

Jaegar, W., *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers: The Gifford Lectures 1936* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960).

Jakobson, R., *Remarques sur L'Evolution Phonologique du Russe Compareé à Celle des aûtres Langue Slaves* (Paris: Seuil, 1927-1928).

James, E.O., *Comparative Religion: An Introductory and Historical Survey* (London: Bloomsbury, 1938).

Janko, R., *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

Jung, C.G. and Kerenyi, K., *Essays on the Science of Mythology: The Myth of the Divine Child and the Mysteries of Eleusis* trans. R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Kambylis, A., *Die Dichterweiche und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchengen zur Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1965).

Kaufmann, D., 'Hesiod und die Tisis under', *Hermes* 84 (1982), pp. 63-82.

Keller, M.L., 'The Eleusinian Mysteries of Demeter and Persephone: Fertility, Sexuality and Rebirth', *Journal of Feminism Studies in Religion* 4 (1988), pp. 27-54.

Kerenyi, K., *Pythagoras and Orpheus* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949).

Kerenyi, K., *Eleusis: Archetypal Image of Mother and Daughter* trans. R. Manheim (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967).

Kerenyi, K., *Dionysus: Archetypal Image of Destructive Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

Kerenyi, K., *Prometheus: The Archtypal Image of Human Existence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1997).

Kerenyi, K., *The Gods of the Greeks* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000).

Kiparsky, P., 'Oral Poetry: Some Linguistic and Typological Considerations', in Stolz & Shannon (eds.), pp. 95-104.

Kilmer, A.D., 'The Mesopotamian Concept of Over-Population and its Solution as Reflected in Mythology', *Orientalia* 41 (1972).

Kingsley, P., 'Empedocles' Sun', *Classical Quarterly* 44 (1994), pp. 316-324.

Kingsley, P., 'Empedocles and his Interpreters: The Four Element Doxography', *Phronesis* 39.3 (1994), pp. 235-255.

Kingsley, P., *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Kirk, G.S., 'The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*', in K. von Fritz (ed) *Hesiodé et son Influence: six exposés et discussions* Entretriens sur l'antiquite classique (Geneve: Fondation Hardt, 1962), pp. 61-109.

Kirk, G.S., *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient Greece and Other Cultures* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970).

Kirk, G.S., *The Nature of Greek Myths* (London: Penguin 1990).

Kirk, G.S., Raven, J.E. and Schofield, M. (eds.), *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Koller, H., 'Das Kitharodische Prooimion Eine Formgeschichtlische Untersuchung', *Philologus* 100 (1970), pp. 159-206.

Laks, A., and Most, G.W., (eds.), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

Lamberton, W.G., & Walcot, P. (eds.), 'A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod', *Kadmos* 4 (1965), pp. 64-72.

Lamberton, R., *Hesiod* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

Lamberton, R., *Homer: The Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and Growth of Epic Tradition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989).

Lawrence, P., & Meggitt, M.J. (eds.), *Gods, Ghosts and Men in Melanesia: Some religions of Australian New Guinea and the New Hebrides* (London and Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1965).

Leach, E.R., *Rethinking Anthropology* London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology No. 22 (London: Athlone Press, 1966).

Lenfant, D., 'Monsters in Greek Ethnography and Society in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.E.', in R. Buxton (ed.), *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 197-215.

Levi-Strauss, C., *Totenism* (London: Merlin Press, 1962).

Levi-Strauss, C., *The Savage Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966).

Lincoln, B., 'Death by Water: Strange Events at the Strymon (*Persae* 492-507) and the Categorical Opposition of East and West', *Classical Philology* 95 (2000), pp. 12-20.

Lloyd, G.E.R., *Magic, Reason and Experience: Studies in the Origins and Development of Greek Science* (London: Bristol Classical Press Duckworth, 1999).

Long, A.A. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1999).

Loraux, N., *Mothers in Mourning* translated by C. Paché (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998).

Lord, A.B., *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

Mahler, M.S., and Furer, W.M. (eds.) , *On Human Symbiosis and the Vicissitudes of Individuation: vol 1 Infantile Psychosis* (New York: International University Press,1968).

MacCormack, C., & Strathern, M. (eds.), *Nature, Culture and Gender* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

Mair, A.W., *Hesiod: The Poems and the Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908).

Makin, S., 'How can we find out what Ancient Philosophers said?', *Phronesis* 33.2 (1998), pp. 121-132.

Mansfeld, J., *Studies in the History of Greek Philosophy* (New York: Assen, 1990).

Maranda, P. (ed.), *Mythology: Selected Readings* (Harmondsworth, England and Berkeley: Penguin, 1972).

Marquardt, P., 'A Portrait of Hekate', *A.J.P.* 102 (1961), pp. 250-251.

Martin, A., & Primavesi, O. (eds.), *L'Empédocle de Stasbourg: (P.Strasb. gr.* Inv. 1665-1666) *Introduction, Édition et Commentaire* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998).

Martin, T.W., 'The Cronus Myth in Cynic Philosophy', *G.R.B.S.* 38 (1997), pp. 85-108.

Mazon, P., *Theogonie, Les Travaux at les Jours, Le Boucher* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1944).

Meyer, B.E., & Sanders, E.P. (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition vol. III: Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: SCM Press, 1982).

Meyer, M.W., *The Ancient Mysteries: A Sourcebook: Sacred Texts of the Mystery Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean World* (San Francisco: Harper, 1987).

Millet, P., 'Hesiod and his World' *P.C.PhS* 210 (1984), pp. 84-115.

Minton, W., 'Innovation and Catalogue in Hesiod and Homer', *T.A.P.A.* 93 (1962), pp. 188-202.

Minton, W., 'The Proem of Hesiod's *Theogony*', *T.A.P.A.* 101 (1970), pp. 357-377.

Mondi, R., 'The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*', *G.R.B.S.* 25 (1984), pp. 325-344.

Moran, W.L., 'The Creation of Man in Atrahasis I.192-248', *BASOR* (1979), p. 200-201

Morgan, K., *Myth and Philosophy: From the Presocratics to Plato* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Mueller, L., *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996).

Müller, M., *Contributions to the Science of Mythology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1897).

Murray, G., *Five Stages of Greek Religion: Studies based on a Course of Lectures delivered in April 1912 at Columbia University* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925).

Mylonas, G.E., *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961).

Nadel, S.F., *The Foundations of Social Anthropology* (London: Cohen &West Ltd., 1963).

Nagy, G., *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge Mass.: Princeton University Press, 1974).

Nagy, G., *The Best of the Achaeans: Concept of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1999).

Neusner, J., Frerichs, E.S., and Flesher, P.V.M. (eds.), *Religion, Science and Magic: In Concert and in Conflict* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

Nilsson, M.P., 'New Evidence for the Dionysiac Mysteries', *Eranos* 53 (1955), pp. 28-40.

O' Brien, D., 'Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle', *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967), pp. 29-41.

O' Brien, D., *Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Oberhuber, K. (ed.), *Das Gilgamesh Epos* Wege der Forschung, 215 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977).

Ong, W.T., *Orality and Literacy: the technologizing of the Word* (London: Methuen, 1982).

Otto, W.F., *Dionysus: Myth and Cult* (Indiana: Bloomington, 1965).

Padel, R., *In and Out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Padel, R., *Whom the Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

Pardee, D., 'The Ba'lu Myth (1.86), in Hallo W. (ed.), *Context of Scripture: Volume 1 Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (New York: Leiden & Brill, 1997), pp. 241-375.

Parker, R., *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press,1996).

Parker, R., *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

Pearson, B.W.R., 'Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans', in a forthcoming publication.

Pelling, C., *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London: Routledge 2000).

Phillips, F.C., 'Narrative Compression and the Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod', *C.J.* 68 (1973), pp. 289-305.

Popper, K., *The World of Parmenides: Essays on the Presocratic Enlightenment* (London: Routledge, 1988).

Porter, H.N., 'The Early Hexameter', *YCS* 12 (1951), pp. 33-35.

Pritchard, J.B., *Ancient and Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

Pritchard, J.B., *The Ancient Near East: Volume One: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

Pucci, P., *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1977).

Redfield, J.M., *Nature and Culture in the **Iliad**: The Tragedy of Hector* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994).

Reinach, S., *Orpheus: A History of Religions* (New York: Liveright, 1930).

Rice, D.G., and Stambaugh, J.E. (eds.), *Sources for the Study of Greek Religion*, SBL Sources for Biblical Study 14: Scholars Press, 1979.

Rohde, E., *Psyche: The Cult of the Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1925).

Romm, J.S., *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Rose, H.J., *A Handbook of Greek Mythology* (New York: Dutton, 1959).

Rowe, C.J., 'Archaic Thought in Hesiod', *JHS* 103 (1983), pp. 124-135.

Russell, J.B., *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977).

Sahlins, M.D., *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom* (Ann Arbour: University of Michigan Press, 1981).

Saussure, de F., *Coúrs de Linguistiqué Generale* (Paris: Payot, 1949).

Sawyer, J.F., *Sacred languages and Sacred Texts* (London: Routledge, 1999).

Seaford, R., *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

Segal, R.A. (ed.), *The Myth and Ritual Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Skinner, Q., 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory* 8 (1969), pp. 3-53.

Smart, N., *The Religious Experience of Mankind* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1969).

Schmitt, R., *Dichtung ünd Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Damstardt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968).

Seaford, R., 'Dionysiac Drama and Dionysiac Mysteries' *CQ* 31 (1981), pp. 252-275.

Sechan, L., *Le Mythe de Promethee* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1951).

Segal, R. (ed.), *The Myth and Ritual Theory: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).

Solmsen, F., 'Nature as Craftsman in Greek Thought', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24.4 (1963), pp. 473-496.

Solmsen, F., 'Love and Strife in Empedocles' Cosmology', *Phronesis* 10 (1965), pp. 109-149.

Solmsen, F., 'The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text', *H.S.C.P.* 86 (1982), pp. 1-31.

Stanley, K., *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the* ***Iliad*** (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Stevens, A., *Ariadne's Clue: A Guide to the Symbols of Humankind* (London: Allen Lane Penguin Press, 1998).

Stewart, Z. (ed.), *Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

Stokes, M.C., *One and the Many in Presocratic Philosophy* (Massachusetts: Cornell, 1971).

Stolz, B.A., & Shannon, R.S. (eds.), *Oral Literature and its Formula* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1976).

Tambiah, S.J., *Magic, Science, and the scope of Rationality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1990).

Taplin, O., *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the **Iliad*** (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

Teggart, F.J., 'Argument of Hesiod's *Erga*', *Journal of the History of Ideas* (1847), pp. 45-77.

Terpening, R.H., *Charon and the Crossing: Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance Transformations of a Myth* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1985).

Thalmann, W.A., *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1984).

Thomas, R., *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Tigay, H., *The Evolution of Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: 1982).

Thrower, J. *Religion: The Classical Theories* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999).

Turner, E.G. (ed.), *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

Turner, V., *The Ritual Process* (London: Routledge, 1969).

Van Gennep, A., *The Rites of Passage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).

Vandvik, E., *The Prometheus of Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Oslo: I Kommisjon hos J. Dybwad, 1943).

Verdenius, W.J., 'Notes on the Proem of Hesiod's *Theogony*', *Mnemosyne* 25 (1972), pp. 225-260.

Vermeule, E., *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979).

Vernant, J-P., & Detienne, J. (eds.), *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* trans. J. Lloyd (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1978).

Vernant, J.-P., *Mythe et Societé en Grèce Ancienne* trans. J. Lloyd (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1980).

Vernant, J-P., *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays* (ed.) F.I. Zeitlin (Princeton: Princeton University Press,1998).

Versnel, H.S. (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).

Vidal-Naquet, P., *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

Vlastos, G., *Studies in Greek Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

Wade-Gery, H.T., 'Hesiod', *Phoenix* 3 (1949), pp. 81-93.

Walcot, P., 'The Text of Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Hittite Epic of *Kumarbi*', *C.Q.* 64 (1956), pp.198-206.

Walcot, P., 'Hesiod's Hymns to the Muses, Aphrodite, Styx and Hecate', *SymbOslo.* 34 (1958), pp. 5-14.

Walcot, P., *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff: Wales University Press, 1966).

Wehrli, F., *Navicula Chiloniensis* (Leiden: Brill, 1956).

Weil, S., *Imitations of Christianity among the Ancient Greeks* (London and New York: Routledge, 1957).

West, M.L., 'More Notes on the Text of Hesiod', *C.Q.* 60 (1962), pp. 177-181.

West, M.L., *The Orphic Hymns* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

West, M.L., 'Hesiod's Titans', *JHS* 105 (1985) 174-175.

West, M.L., *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

White, D.A., *Myth and Metaphysics in Plato's* ***Phaedo*** (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1989).

Wright, M.R., (ed.) *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments* with Introduction, Commentary, Concordance and New Bibliography (London: Bristol Classical Press / Duckworth, 1995).

Wright, M.R., *The Presocratics* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1995).

Zaidman, L.B., & Schmitt-Pantel, P. (eds.), *Religion in the Ancient Greek City* Trans. P. Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Zuntz, G., *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1971).

II) Texts and Editions

H. Buse, *Quaestiones Hesiodeae et Orphica* (Diss. Halle, 1937).

T. Gaisford, *Poetae Minores Graeci* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1814).

E. Gerhard, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin: Reimer, 1856).

C. Goettling, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Leipzig: Gothae Henning, 1843).

F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1930).

A. Meyer, *De Compositione Theogonie Hesiodeae* (Diss. Berlin, 1887).

P. Mazon, *Hesiode* Bude series (Paris: 1928); cf. also T Gaisford, *Poetae Minories Graeci* 4 vols.(Oxford Clarendon Press 1814-1820).

A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1902).

F. Solmsen *Hesiodi Theogonie, Opera et dies, Scutum* edited by R. Merkelbach and M.L.West (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

M.L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

F.A. Wolf, *Theogonia Hesiodae* (Halle 1783).

III) Lexica

M. Hofinger, *Lexicon Hesiodeum cum Indice Inverso*, vols. 1-4 (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

H.G. Liddell & R. Scott *A Greek – English Lexicon* revised by H.S. Jones 9th edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).