Tradition and Innovation in the Hesiodic Titanomachy

Robert Mondi

Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-), Vol. 116. (1986), pp. 25-48.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0360-5949%281986%29116%3C25%3ATAIITH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-%23

Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-) is currently published by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Transactions of the American Philological Association 116 (1986) 25–48

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN THE HESIODIC TITANOMACHY

ROBERT MONDI
Randolph-Macon Woman's College

The prevailing challenge in contemporary Homeric studies has been to redefine poetic originality within the confines of a seemingly rigid tradition: to discover how, if at all, the composer has left his individual stamp on the mass of inherited diction, theme, and plot that constitutes the raw material of his craft. One response to this challenge has been to see the individual poet at work in the transferring of inherited material from its traditional context to new situations or characters, possibly of the poet's own invention: "Whatever he takes he first transforms, assimilating it to its new environment, and in this way it finally becomes his own personal creation."[1] The smooth and seamless incorporation of such material into a new context would generally demand some degree of adaptation, and it is in those cases where the poet has not satisfactorily made such alterations that this compositional method is most patent. Of particular interest are those instances in which the poet is reusing traditional material for a new *thematic* purpose of his own; the resulting composition, even though largely manufactured from traditional elements, can in such a case be so individual that we might call it, as does one recent commentator on the *Iliad*, "almost counter-traditional."[2]

Analysis of this sort can be particularly productive when brought to bear on the *Theogony*, both because Hesiod's theme—the glorification of Zeus and legitimation of his authority—is so unmistakable and because his compositional technique is at times sufficiently unrefined to be

[1] J. Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* (Lund 1971) 35. For a description of this neoanalytical methodology and its potential for "bridging the chasm" between Analysts and Unitarians, see Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (Lund 1949) 1–10; A. Heubeck, *Die Homerische Frage* (Darmstadt 1974) 40–48; and, most recently, W. Kullmann, "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research," *GRBS* 25 (1985) 307–23.

[2] S. L. Schein, *The Mortal Hero* (Berkeley 1984) 9–10. The poet "selectively reworks the tradition in accordance with the characteristic themes of his poem and achieves a depiction of human existence that is distinctively Iliadic" (68). For a study of the ways in which the poet of the *Iliad* endows typical scenes, objects, and situations with thematic significance, see J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980), especially chapter 1.

transparent upon close scrutiny. A well-known and, for my present purpose, illustrative example of Hesiod's reapplication of traditional material for an innovative thematic purpose is his use of the Prometheus tale as a moral exemplum for the necessity of bending to the will of Zeus. He has retained enough of the narrative in its traditional form to make its conventional purpose clear: it was traditionally meant as an *aition* for the sacrificial practice of offering the inedible portions of the slaughtered animal to the gods. Given this explanatory function, it is imperative that Zeus be completely hoodwinked by the cunning culture-hero and choose for himself the worthless portions of the sacrifice, for this is the crux of the aetiology. In transforming the intent of this tale from aetiological to cautionary, Hesiod is compelled to alter it in a manner which weakens its narrative logic but preserves the omnipotence and omniscience of Zeus:

> φῆ ῥα δολοφρονέων· Ζεὺς δ' ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδὼς
> γνῶ ῥ' οὐδ' ἠγνοίησε δόλον· κακὰ δ' ὄσσετο θυμῷ
> θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι, τὰ καὶ τελέεσθαι ἔμελλε. (550–52)

The eventual freeing of Prometheus by Heracles is likewise antithetical to Hesiod's new exemplary purpose, and here too we sense the poet's own voice offering a somewhat weak explanation which nonetheless allows the will of Zeus to remain unbowed:

> τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱὸς
> Ἡρακλέης ἔκτεινε, κακὴν δ' ἀπὸ νοῦσον ἄλαλκεν
> Ἰαπετιονίδῃ καὶ ἐλύσατο δυσφροσυνάων,
> οὐκ ἀέκητι Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ὕψι μέδοντος,
> ὄφρ' Ἡρακλῆος Θηβαγενέος κλέος εἴη
> πλεῖον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν. (526–31)

These examples illustrate not only Hesiod's grappling with tradition but also the pervasive strength of that tradition. For if the meaning that he is trying to extract from the Prometheia is compromised by Heracles' liberation of Prometheus, why should he mention it at all? The answer surely must be that the intended audience of the *Theogony* already knew about it, and would be intolerant of too great an omission or deviation from the conventional form of the story. So what appears in the final result to the modern critic as a careless or hopelessly muddled narrative can in some cases be the outcome of a conscious and labored effort by the poet to put a new face on an old story without intolerably contradicting it.[3]

[3] On the "adaptation of the story which is to be used as an example to the main narrative" and the dilemma that it presents to the poet, see Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (above, note 1) 41–42. For specific examples of such adaptation in the epics, see Kakridis' discussion of the Homeric Niobe (96–105); B. K. Braswell, "Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*," *CQ* 21 (1971) 16–26; M. M. Willcock, "Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*,"

The Titanomachy as it is narrated in *Th.* 617–720 is another episode repeatedly censured by modern criticism. I propose in the following discussion to analyze these lines likewise as a melding of traditional narrative and Hesiodic special pleading. Here too I think we have the opportunity to glimpse the individual poet at work, redeploying old material in an innovative way to satisfy the needs of a dogmatic theological program—transforming Zeus, whose conventional role in the Titanomachy does not appear to have been crucial, into what one student of Hesiod has termed "ein idealer Volksführer der heroischen Zeit."[4]

I

The structure of the Hesiodic Titanomachy has been divided by most who have analyzed it into three discrete sections. The first of these sections (617–86) tells of the liberated Hecatoncheires combining forces with the children of Kronos and renewing their ten-year struggle with the Titans. Lines 687 and following interrupt the narrative of this general theomachy to present a fiery vision of Zeus in single combat and are therefore conventionally referred to as the "aristeia" of Zeus; the allies are momentarily lost from view, and Zeus relies solely on the destructive force of the thunderbolt. It has been customary to regard this second section as extending as far as line 712, at which point the tide of the battle appears to have been turned by Zeus' single-handed efforts:

> ἐκλίνθη δὲ μάχη· πρὶν δ' ἀλλήλοις ἐπέχοντες
> ἐμμενέως ἐμάχοντο διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας. (711–12)

The outcome still seems to be hanging in the balance, however, when we are abruptly plunged back into the general melee in lines 713–20, where this time it is the Hecatoncheires who turn the tide. In this second denouement we do not hear of Zeus or his storm weaponry playing any part, and the victory appears to be determined solely by the actions of the three allies.

In his 1831 edition of the *Theogony* Goettling effectively eliminated the problem by ejecting 687–712 on the ground that Zeus' aristeia intolerably interrupts the "seriem narrationis." This remedy has subsequently received the sympathy of Meyer, Rzach, Aly, Mazon, Jacoby, van Groningen, and Kirk.[5] Wilamowitz objected forcefully, however,

---

CQ 14 (1964) 141–54; J. H. Gaisser, "Adaptation of Traditional Material in the Glaucus-Diomedes Episode," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 165–76.

[4] F. Schwenn, *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos* (Heidelberg 1934) 14–15.

[5] C. Goettling, *Hesiodi Carmina* (Leipzig 1831); A. Meyer, *De Compositione Theogoniae Hesiodeae* (Berlin 1887) 38–43; A. Rzach, *RE* 8 (1912) s.v. "Hesiodos," col. 1190–91; W. Aly, "Hesiodos von Askra und der Verfasser der Theogonie," *RhM* 68 (1913)

that the retention of the aristeia is demanded by the thematic structure of the poem, as well as by everything that we can infer about Hesiod's theological convictions; without the aristeia, in his words, "hat die ganze Theogonie keinen Sinn und Hesiod keinen Glauben."[6] He resolved the problem of the doubly-determined victory by arguing that the imprisoning of the wounded Titans "schickt sich nicht für die Olympier" and that this task therefore must fall to the Hecatoncheires, who first come into action for this purpose.[7] Other defenders of the received text have similarly attempted to diminish the significance of the allied contribution. Schwenn felt that the only real importance of the Hecatoncheires is to arouse and incite the Olympians (and Zeus in particular) to greater efforts; it is then Zeus who does the "Hauptarbeit," with the allies merely finishing the job.[8] P. Walcot likewise speaks of "'mopping-up' operations" carried out by the Hecatoncheires after Zeus has done the lion's share of the work.[9]

Recent arguments for the retention of Zeus' aristeia have generally been on more formal grounds. West excuses the jarring introduction of the aristeia in 687 as a conventional "transition from general to particular."[10] Solmsen terms this sudden shift from theomachy to aristeia and back again a "matter of composition"; to describe both simultaneously would have "overtaxed the powers of an epic poet more sophisticated than Hesiod."[11] In a similar vein, R. M. Frazer sees here a manifestation of Zieliński's Law.[12] The sequential narration of simultaneous events is of course well attested in early poetry, and any of these three explanations would adequately account for the parallel narratives in lines 687–712 and 713–20. But beyond exhibiting a conventional treatment of contemporaneity, these two narratives are actually carried to alternative conclusions: "We are led up to the point when the battle is

---

36–37 = E. Heitsch ed., *Hesiod* (Darmstadt 1966) 66; P. Mazon, *Hésiode* (Paris 1928) 13–14; F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin 1930); B. A. van Groningen, *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958) 276–77; G. S. Kirk, "The Structure and Aim of the Theogony," in *Hésiode et son influence* (Geneva 1962) 82–83. Cf. also E. Lisco, *Quaestiones Hesiodeae criticae et mythologicae* (Göttingen 1903) 77–80.

[6] *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I (Berlin 1931) 342, note 1. Cf. also K. Friederichs, "Die Bedeutung der Titanomachie für die Theogonie Hesiods," *Prog. des Gymn. Rostock* (1907) 11.

[7] "Lesefrüchte," *Hermes* 63 (1928) 369–71.

[8] Schwenn (above, note 4) 13–15.

[9] *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff 1966) 28–29. Cf. also S. Said, "Les Combats de Zeus et le problème des interpolations dans la Théogonie d'Hésiode," *REG* 90 (1977) 183–210; C. J. Rowe, "'Archaic Thought' in Hesiod," *JHS* 103 (1983) 131–32.

[10] *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 349; this commentary will hereafter be referred to as "West."

[11] "The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text," *HSCP* 86 (1982) 5–6.

[12] "Hesiod's Titanomachy as an Illustration of Zieliński's Law," *GRBS* 22 (1981) 5–9. West, on the other hand, sees in the Hesiodic Titanomachy a breach of Zieliński's Law (355).

decisively turned by Zeus, then snatched back into the midst of it, and led from there by a different path to its conclusion by the Hundred-Handers."[13] This suggests that the problem confronting Hesiod was more significant than a simple need to relate simultaneous events, and that further analysis might be rewarded with a deeper insight into Hesiod's aims and the compositional methods by which he carried them out.

As the representative examples cited above suggest, it has been typical of previous analyses of the Hesiodic Titanomachy to concentrate attention on Zeus at the expense of the Hecatoncheires. To understand why Hesiod has composed the Titanomachy as he has, it will be useful if we first examine more closely the role played by these allies; in particular, we should attempt to distinguish between the representation of the Hecatoncheires in Hesiod's poem and their significance in the traditional, pre-Hesiodic form of the myth. We can of course know nothing about the latter with certainty, but an analysis of Hesiod's text supplemented by the judicious use of comparative data can at least establish some strong probabilities.

II

A popular mythological tradition is seldom dogmatic or theologically consistent in its representation of divinity; given its tendency to portray gods as more human than divine, there can be much in the popular tradition that would strike a serious religious thinker as frivolous or even impious. The Greek traditions about Zeus are no exception. The narratives of his birth and rise to power consist almost entirely of elements characteristic of the human folk hero:[14] the father's attempt to destroy the fateful child; cleverness as the hero's primary attribute (cf. Zeus' traditional epithets μητίετα and μητιόεις); the youngest son who succeeds in some task where his older siblings have failed; the outwitting of an ogre by intoxication or drugging; and the man-eating monster that is forced to regurgitate ingested but as yet undigested victims.[15]

[13] West 355.

[14] On the validity of distinguishing "folktale motifs in imaginative myths" see G. S. Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures* (Cambridge and Berkeley 1970) 31–41; cf. also F. Solmsen's discussion of Hesiod's use of "pre-epic mythology" in *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca 1949) 24–25. For the prominence of folktale motifs in the mythology of Zeus in particular, see M. P. Nilsson, *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* (Lund 1950²) 537–41; West 293.

[15] For the last two motifs, cf. S. Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (Bloomington 1932–36) G521: "Ogre Made Drunk and Overcome"; F914: "Person Swallowed and Disgorged." See also Nilsson (above, note 14) 537; A. Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion* I (London 1899²) 295; K. Meuli, *Odyssee und Argonautika* (Berlin 1921) 71–73. Hesiod is

More immediately relevant to the Titanomachy is the common narrative motif of critical assistance rendered to the hero in his greatest struggle by one or more helpers, often inferior to the hero in status (e.g., a god helped by a mortal, or a human helped by an animal) and often just previously released by the hero from captivity. This assistance can be so important to the hero's success that the enlisting of it becomes in itself "the motivating force in the action of the tale."[16] V. Propp in fact defined the hero of such a tale as the person who receives assistance and profits by it:[17]

> The employment of a magical agent follows its receipt by the hero; or, if the agent received is a living creature, its help is directly put to use on the command of the hero. With this *the hero outwardly loses all significance* [my emphasis]; he himself does nothing, while his helper accomplishes everything. ... In the course of the action the hero is the person who is supplied with a magical agent (a magical helper) and who makes use of it or is served by it.

In the Greek tradition as elsewhere, variations of this motif commonly appear in tales of divine warfare. In the Apollodoran narrative of the Gigantomachy (1.6.1) the Olympian gods are advised by an oracular response that victory over the Giants is attainable only with the assistance of a mortal; and in later mythographic versions of the Typhonomachy Zeus is temporarily overcome by Typhon and must himself be rescued—in one version by Hermes and Aigipan and in another by Cadmus and Pan—before he can rearm and rally himself for the final victory.[18] In one version of the Hittite Illuyankas myth, a human ally must first render the dragon bound and helpless so that the Storm God can "defeat" him, and similar narratives can also be found among the Egyptians and in India.[19] It is against the background of such typological

---

very vague about the means by which Kronos was tricked into vomiting and releasing his children. According to the Apollodoran *Bibliotheca* (1.2.1) Metis administered an emetic φάρμακον to Kronos; in the theogonic poetry ascribed to Orpheus, Zeus first makes Kronos drunk with honey and then binds and castrates him (fr. 154 Kern).

[16] See S. Thompson, *The Folktale* (Berkeley 1946) 47–67; cf. also *Motif-Index* (above, note 15) N810: "Supernatural Helpers," and N812: "Giant or Ogre as Helper."

[17] *Morphology of the Folktale* (Austin 1968²) 50. A version of the myth ascribed to Musaios (B8 DK) employs the motif of a magic agent rather than helper: an impenetrable goatskin. See Meuli (above, note 15) 1–24 for an explication of the legend of the Argonauts as arising from a primitive "Helfermärchen" in which the hero ("ein Auserlesener") is aided in difficult tasks by helpers with specialized skills and abnormalities.

[18] *Bib.* 1.6.3, Nonnos 1.140ff., Oppian, *Hal.* 3.15–25. The most forceful proponent of the antiquity of the Apollodoran version of the Typhonomachy is J. Fontenrose; see *Python* (Berkeley 1959) 74–76 and "Typhon among the Arimoi," in *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan* (Ithaca 1966) 73–82; cf. also H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology* (New York 1929) 59.

[19] See Fontenrose, *Python* (above, note 18) 177–216.

parallels that I believe we must see the traditional role of the Hecatoncheires in the Titanomachy. With their profusion of limbs they appear to have been mythologically tailored precisely for the hurling of many projectiles in rapid succession—i.e., designed specifically for the part they play in the Titanomachy. Nothing in our sources compels us to think that *as a group* the Hecatoncheires originally had an existence apart from this myth.

Although Hesiod has significantly altered certain elements in the tale in ways we shall examine presently, there are nonetheless indications in his text of this crucial role traditionally played by these allies. After ten years of indecisive warfare, the Olympians free the Hecatoncheires from captivity on the advice of Gaia:

> αὐτὴ γάρ σφιν ἅπαντα διηνεκέως κατέλεξε,
> σὺν κείνοις νίκην τε καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἀρέσθαι.
> δηρὸν γὰρ μάρναντο πόνον θυμαλγέ' ἔχοντες
> ἀντίον ἀλλήλοισι διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας
> Τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ καὶ ὅσοι Κρόνου ἐξεγένοντο. (627–31)

This prophecy is characteristically vague regarding just what the Hecatoncheires will contribute, but clearly they are to be thought of as somehow necessary for victory: to tell someone who has been fighting without success for ten years that he will be victorious if he solicits the support of certain allies is surely to imply that without that support the stalemate will continue. (Cf. the less ambiguous oracle in the Apollodoran Typhonomachy cited above.) The narrative convention which guarantees that such prophecies always come true also guarantees that they are never superfluous. Moreover, in the description of the final action of the battle (713–20), the Titans are not ultimately scorched by lightning (as was Typhon, a true victim of Zeus' thunderbolt) but overwhelmed by rocks—exactly three hundred rocks hurled, we must assume, by three hundred hands (715). It could not be made more numerically explicit that neither Zeus nor any of the other Olympians plays any part in this final action. In the end it is the Hecatoncheires who send the defeated Titans down to Tartaros (717–18), bind them in chains (718–19), and guard them, presumably for eternity (734–35).

Considering both the physical peculiarity of the allies and the manner of the Titans' final defeat, I would suggest that in the popular conception of this primordial battle the rocks were seen as the decisive weapon in the defeat of the Titans, rather than Zeus' thunderbolt, which he presumably had been wielding throughout the ten-year stalemate.[20] It has on occasion even been suggested that in the earlier tradi-

[20] Cf. O. Gigon and J. Dörig, *Der Kampf der Götter und Titanen* (Olten 1961) xii: "Urtümlich soll es wirken dass Felsbrocken die einzigen Waffen sind, mit denen gekämpft wird"; Meyer (above, note 5) 43–44.

tion the Titanomachy was exclusively a battle between the Titans and the Hecatoncheires.[21] It is debatable whether we are justified, on the basis of such slim evidence, in eliminating completely the role of Zeus and the other Olympians in the pre-Hesiodic conception of this conflict. But I think that we can at least say that any reasonable interpretation of Hesiod's Titanomachy must recognize at the outset that the poet is bound by a popular tradition in which the hundred-handed allies are a decisive factor, if not *the* decisive factor, in the victory which first brought Zeus to power.[22]

In keeping with his idealization of Zeus' regency, Hesiod is trying to recast the Titanomachy, and especially Zeus' role in it, in the mold of heroic epic while perforce remaining within the broad limits set by this tradition. To this end many of the thematic trappings of human heroic warfare are present or at least suggested; the typical motifs of the hero's aristeia, arming with special weapons (cf. 501–6), war councils, and the pre-combat feast all serve to lend a heroic atmosphere to the struggle with the Titans, as does the fact that, like Homer's war, this one has been waged inconclusively for ten years. But the traditionally critical assistance provided by the Hecatoncheires poses something of an embarrassment; the need for special weaponry, armor, horses, etc. is a common enough theme in heroic poetry, but the need for surrogates to fight the battle is quite something else. The following analysis of the Titanomachy is an examination of how Hesiod used the compositional methods available to him in attempting to reconcile this vision of Zeus as the invincible Divine Hero with the traditional expectations of his audience.

III

The Titanomachy is generally conceived of as a mass engagement, and the descriptive language in the earlier part of the battle (674–86) emphasizes the tumultuous confusion created by the fighting. The Hecatoncheires shower the Titans with rocks (675), and they in turn respond with projectiles of their own, of an unspecified nature (cf. βέλεα in 684). To render the effects of this continuous bombardment as vivid as possible, the poet has described it in terms of one of the most awesome

[21] E.g., van Groningen (above, note 5) 275–78; Lisco (above, note 5) 73–74.

[22] It is in any case highly unlikely that Hesiod himself has *introduced* the Hecatoncheires into the story, as implied by Kirk (above, note 5) 92–93 and Solmsen (above, note 14) 18. On the unlikelihood of a "Prophet einer Zeusreligion" thus gratuitously diminishing the importance of Zeus in this battle, see K. Ziegler in Roscher, *Lex.* s.v. "Theogonien," 1506. West attributes the addition of the aristeia to a desire on Hesiod's part to enhance Zeus' role in the Titanomachy "more than the facts of mythology warranted" (355). For similar statements see K. von Fritz, "Das Hesiodische in den Werken Hesiods," in *Hésiode et son influence* (above, note 5) 21; Wilamowitz (above, note 7) 370; T. A. Sinclair, *Gnomon* 5 (1929) 623; Gigon (above, note 20) xii; C. J. Rowe, *Essential Hesiod* (Bristol 1978) 94–95.

natural phenomena that the Greeks are likely to have experienced—the earthquake (678–82): the thunderous crashing on land and sea is echoed in the heavens, Olympus is shaken to its very foundations, and the quake (ἔνοσις) reaches even to the depths of Tartaros. Special emphasis is placed on the audible effects thus produced; the conflict raises a screeching din (682–83), and the cries of the clashing combatants reach to the sky:

φωνὴ δ' ἀμφοτέρων ἵκετ' οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα
κεκλομένων· οἱ δὲ ξύνισαν μεγάλῳ ἀλαλητῷ. (685–86)

This general description is followed by Zeus' aristeia. The practice of most recent commentators has been to treat lines 687–712 as a unit and defend or delete them as such. I would like to begin my analysis by redefining the aristeia to extend only as far as the bucolic diaeresis of line 700:[23]

οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι Ζεὺς ἴσχεν ἑὸν 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' ἠέρα δῖαν ἵκανεν
ἄσπετος, ὄσσε δ' ἄμερδε καὶ ἰφθίμων περ ἐόντων
αὐγὴ μαρμαίρουσα κεραυνοῦ τε στεροπῆς τε.
καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν χάος. (687–700)

These lines focus solely on the pyrotechnics of Zeus' individual combat; every descriptive word pertains to some aspect of lightning or fire: heat, light, smoke, flame, burning, crackling, boiling, and blinding. This is of course precisely what we expect in a heroic aristeia: Zeus' activities are magnified to the exclusion of all else. But in lines 700b–712—the remainder of the aristeia as it is usually defined—the poet has again taken a step back and broadened his field of vision:

εἴσατο δ' ἄντα
ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν ἠδ' οὔασιν ὄσσαν ἀκοῦσαι
αὖτως, ὡς ὅτε γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε
πίλνατο· τοῖος γάρ κε μέγας ὑπὸ δοῦπος ὀρώρει,
τῆς μὲν ἐρειπομένης, τοῦ δ' ὑψόθεν ἐξεριπόντος·

[23] Lines 687–99 were isolated as an independent unit in the exegeses of Meyer (above, note 5) 38–39 and Lisco (above, note 5) 73–80. Their approach to the problems posed by the Titanomachy is similar to that presented here, but their strict Analytical premises led them to different conclusions.

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, κάρτευς δ' ἀνεφαίνετο ἔργον.
ἐκλίνθη δὲ μάχη· πρὶν δ' ἀλλήλοις ἐπέχοντες
ἐμμενέως ἐμάχοντο διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας.

Upon closer examination this passage seems better interpreted as a continuation of the general description in lines 674–86 than that of the immediately preceding fire-storm.

In lines 700b–705 the impact of the battle on the senses is likened to a hypothetical crash of the sky upon the earth. Although the text of this simile is very problematic and may well be corrupt, the one thing that is obvious is that it is intended to emphasize a very loud noise. This is clear not only from the repetition of δοῦπος in lines 703 and 705 as the point of comparison but also from the content of the simile itself. If the earth and sky were to come crashing together, we might expect the result to be a very loud noise; we would not expect such an event to generate heat, light, or any other aspect of fire. Consequently, the simile follows rather inappropriately upon Zeus' actions which directly precede it in our text. The sound represented by the word δοῦπος can best be described as a dull thud, the sort of noise produced when a moving object strikes against an immovable one, usually the earth. It is used of waves pounding the shore (*Od.* 5.401, 12.202), rocks or other weapons thrown in battle (*Il.* 11.364 = 12.289, 16.361, 20.451), and the sound of pounding feet (*Il.* 10.354, 23.234, *Od.* 10.556, 16.10).[24] It seems most likely that this simile was intended to underscore the deafening confusion of the general theomachy, particularly one which has been characterized by the loud crashing of projectiles and consequent shaking of the earth.[25] The transitional line with which the simile concludes also points in this direction:

τόσσος δοῦπος ἔγεντο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων. (705)

The phrase θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων would be an odd way to refer to Zeus fighting in single combat, and seems rather to echo the ξύνισαν μεγάλῳ ἀλαλητῷ (686) of the larger struggle.[26]

[24] Although the adjective ἐρίγδουπος is a common epithet of Zeus, neither the noun nor the derivative verb is ever used of his thunder; the latter is used almost exclusively of falling warriors, in the formula δούπησε πεσών. In the single instance in which the verb might conceivably be used of thunder (ἐγδούπησαν at *Il.* 11.45), it is strangely Athena and Hera who produce the noise.

[25] Cf. Meyer (above, note 5) 39: "tali modo acies duae pugnantes optime comparantur; at ad Jovem unum fulgura spargentem haec comparatio non pertinet."

[26] Following Heyne, Solmsen brackets line 705 on the ground that it properly pertains to a theomachy, not to Zeus' aristeia. The mock theomachy at *Il.* 20.56–74 contains language

Although the integrity of the text in the lines which follow this simile is open to question, the remainder of the description (706–10) seems likewise to refer to the overall conflict. We no longer hear of the apocalyptic conflagration that accompanied Zeus' onslaught; instead, these lines present a more realistic description of all nature in turmoil. It is the winds that here convulse the environment; they excite seismic activity similar to that in the earlier description of the theomachy (*ἔνοσίν τε κονίην τ'*), and they also somehow generate thunder and lightning. The emphasis in this instance, however, is on these meteorological phenomena as just one part of the overall picture of natural turmoil, rather than on Zeus as an active agent; the phrase *κῆλα Διὸς μεγάλοιο* seems almost an appositional afterthought.[27] The description once again dwells on the cacophonous din of the battle at large: *ἰαχήν τ' ἐνοπήν τε* (708), *ὄτοβος* (709). On the basis of Homeric attestations of the phrase *μέσον* (*μέσῳ*) *ἀμφοτέρων*, it is more likely that it refers to the space between opposing groups than that between individuals (cf. *Il.* 3.416, 6.120, 20.159; the only doubtful case is *Il.* 7.277). And the use of the phrase *κάρτευς δ' ἀνεφαίνετο ἔργον* echoes the previous general description of the opposing forces, *χειρῶν τε βίης θ' ἅμα ἔργον ἔφαινον* (677).[28]

---

and imagery very similar to Hesiod's: Zeus thunders on high (56), but the larger part of the description concerns the more terrestrial seismic effects of the theomachy, here symbolized by Poseidon shaking the foundations of the earth:

> *αὐτὰρ νέρθε Ποσειδάων ἐτίναξε*
> *γαῖαν ἀπειρεσίην ὀρέων τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα.*
> *πάντες δ' ἐσσείοντο πόδες πολυπίδακος Ἴδης*
> *καὶ κορυφαί, Τρώων τε πόλις καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν.*
> *ἔδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Αἰδωνεύς,*
> *δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἆλτο καὶ ἴαχε, μή οἱ ὕπερθε*
> *γαῖαν ἀναρρήξειε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων.* (57–63)

This descriptive passage ends with essentially the same line as the Hesiodic simile:

> *τόσσος ἄρα κτύπος ὦρτο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων.* (66)

Cf. also *Il.* 21.390, 394 for similar phraseology in the context of a theomachy.

[27] The word *κῆλα* is rare in epic diction and has a very specific meaning: applied to a natural phenomenon, it expresses the belief that in reality it is the manifestation of an unseen god. So the plague which ravages the Achaian camp is twice referred to as the *κῆλα* of Apollo (*Il.* 1.53, 383), and at *Il.* 12.280 snow is called the *κῆλα* of Zeus. Cf. also *h. Ap.* 444. In each case the phenomenon is seen from the point of view of a human observer, to whom the divine agent is invisible and only the effect is evident. See West 355.

[28] Schwenn (above, note 4) 40–41 argued for the deletion of 705–10 on the basis of similar observations: "V. 705 weicht vom Gehalt des vorhergehenden Abschnittes (v. 687/704) völlig ab, da es die Wirkung der Keraunoi vernachlässigt und das ungeheure Getöse wie in v. 681/6 den beiden Parteien zuschreibt. ... Und von neuem wird v. 709/10 auf den Lärm und auf die Kämpfer im allgemeinen die Aufmerksamkeit gelenkt. Das ist in

With the shift in descriptive focus from aristeia back to theomachy thus placed in line 700, the problems surrounding 711–12 largely disappear. The tide of battle is now turned not by Zeus' individual efforts, the depiction of which ends at 700, but by the combined forces of the Olympians and the Hecatoncheires. So the first step toward an understanding of the composition of the Titanomachy is to see it as a composite of two interlaced narratives describing two equally traditional but very different types of divine conflict. The battle in 617–86, 700b–720 is a theomachy between all the Olympians (with the assistance of the Hecatoncheires) and all the Titans: Τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ καὶ ὅσοι Κρόνου ἐξεγένοντο (630 = 668). On the other hand, the representation of Zeus in lines 687–700a is patterned on that of the divine Dragon-Slayer, fighting in single combat and relying solely on his own prowess to defeat the enemy. Leaving these lines aside for the moment, I would like first to examine Hesiod's narrative of the theomachy, and in particular the manner in which he has adapted this traditional tale to suit his idea of what Zeus' role ought to have been.

IV

Like the poet of the *Iliad*, Hesiod embarks upon his narrative of this conflict *in medias res*. We can certainly assume (as we can also in the case of the *Iliad*) that the intended audience of the *Theogony* knew what the opposing forces were fighting for and how the hostilities began. In incorporating this narrative into the *Theogony*, Hesiod merely summarizes the first ten years of the war (629–38) and concentrates his attention instead on an incident which may well have been just a minor event in the traditional tale (if it was present at all), but which is of paramount importance for Hesiod: the divine assembly in which Zeus wins the promise of assistance from the Hecatoncheires. Modern criticism has sometimes taken the poet to task for the resulting narrative imbalance: the preliminaries of freeing the Hecatoncheires and soliciting their support occupy 46 lines, while their decisive actions in winning the battle are narrated in just five (713–17). But if we keep in mind Hesiod's intent in the *Theogony* to magnify Zeus' role in his rise to power in any way possible within the constraints of tradition, his reasons for telling the story in this way become comprehensible. He is essentially trying to make the best of a bad tradition, seeking to give Zeus the ultimate credit for the victorious fighting of the Hecatoncheires, since he cannot alter or ignore the tradition which attributed that victory directly to them. Consequently he relates their critical actions in a man-

---

der Tat ein anderer Geist als v. 687/704, und die Verse sind denn auch mit Recht vielfach verworfen." Cf. also Gigon (above, note 20) xii.

ner which could hardly be more cursory and instead dwells piously on Zeus' skill and cleverness in bringing these allies into the battle.[29]

To this end Hesiod contrives to use the second of the paired speeches in lines 644–63, that of Kottos promising assistance on behalf of his brothers, as a vehicle for his own theological discourse. In the voice of the narrator he has just told us that the Hecatoncheires were released on the basis of Gaia's advice (Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν 626) and through the agency of all the children of Kronos (Κρονίδης τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι 624). Zeus himself, at the end of his speech, uses language which does not flagrantly misrepresent the truth:

ἐς φάος ἆψ ἀφίκεσθε δυσηλεγέος ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ
ἡμετέρας διὰ βουλὰς ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος. (652–53)

He makes no mention of Gaia, but the word βουλάς is sufficiently vague to leave open the possibility that someone else put the idea into his mind in the first place. The opening of Kottos' response, however, is mildly surprising and has long puzzled critics:

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 ἐξαῦτις ἀμειλίκτων ὑπὸ δεσμῶν
ἠλύθομεν, Κρόνου υἱὲ ἄναξ, ἀνάελπτα παθόντες. (655–60)

The expression of gratitude and promise of assistance that we expect are postponed in favor of a somewhat excessive encomium on Zeus' shrewdness and effectiveness, culminating in an expressed belief that it was through Zeus' own prudence (σῇσι δ' ἐπιφροσύνῃσιν) that Kottos and his brethren were rescued. This could be excused as a slight misinterpretation of the end of Zeus' speech, but to search for a rationale behind these words within the dramatic context is to miss the point of what Hesiod is doing here, just as it is beside the point to ask what specific event in the context of the poem the phrase ἀλκτὴρ δ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀρῆς refers to. Kottos' laudatory speech to Zeus is at the same time Hesiod's homily to his audience and has every aspect of a speaker protesting too much. Hesiod has Kottos praise Zeus' shrewdness at this

[29] Griffin (above, note 2) 18–19 makes a similar observation about the importance with which Homer endows the interview between Nestor and Patroclus in *Iliad* 11: "getting Patroclus into battle is the ἀριστεία, the heroic achievement, of Nestor in the *Iliad*." On the oral poet's license in expanding or compressing portions of the tale see A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960) 102–23. I have elsewhere discussed Hesiod's use of these compositional techniques in his narrative of Zeus' birth and overthrow of Kronos, "The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*," *GRBS* 25 (1985) 325–44; for their application in the Prometheia, see F. C. Phillips, "Narrative Compression and the Myths of Prometheus in Hesiod," *CJ* 68 (1973) 289–305.

point precisely because the rescue of the Hecatoncheires on which the whole outcome of the battle rests was in fact *not* Zeus' idea, as Hesiod and the audience both know. Similarly, Kottos is made to call Zeus the "protector of the gods" precisely because in the present circumstances Zeus *cannot* sufficiently function as the protector of the gods; otherwise, there would be no need for the Hecatoncheires in the first place. Hesiod cannot change the story, but with this effusive praise he can distract the audience's attention from its more embarrassing details.[30] Kottos' speech functions as the same type of *apologia* that we have seen in Hesiod's narrative of the deception of Zeus in the Prometheia; the difference is that in that case it was enunciated less subtly in the narrator's own voice and consequently with less convincing results.

Needless to say, in any other realization of the Titanomachy by a singer without Hesiod's theological purpose, the balance and emphasis of the song could have been quite different. We can see that purpose at work again in Hesiod's brief narrative of events in the aftermath of the victory over the Titans (a narrative postponed 161 lines by the intrusion of the description of Tartaros and the Typhonomachy). After the Hecatoncheires banish the Titan gods to Tartaros (717–20) and the Olympians strip them of their τιμαί (881–82)—actions, it will be noted, in which Zeus is not said to play any preeminent part[31]—the new rulership is to be determined. In other literary sources the kingship in Heaven is decided by lot from among the three male children of Kronos, and this may well have been part of the traditional Titanomachy that Hesiod knew.[32] But he has been portraying Zeus as *primus inter pares* all through his Titanomachy, and consequently the denouement is slightly but significantly different. Nothing is left to chance; the gods unanimously "urge" (ὦτρυνον) Zeus to take up the scepter, and he unilaterally doles out the new τιμαί to the other gods.[33]

These adjustments of detail suggest that on the whole Hesiod has been sufficiently faithful to the traditional narrative of the Titanomachy

[30] On the effusive nature of these lines cf. Schwenn (above, note 4) 13, note 4: "Bei diesen Versen [655–60], die über die eigentliche Leistung des Zeus immerhin etwas hinausgehen, hat der Zeusglaube den Dichter mitgerissen."

[31] By way of contrast, cf. the summary line at the opening of the Hesiodic Typhonomachy (820): αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Τιτῆνας ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐξέλασε Ζεύς.

[32] Cf. *Il.* 15.187–93, *h. Dem.* 85–86, Pind. *O.* 7.54–55, Plato *Gorg.* 523A, Verg. *Aen.* 1.139, *Bib.* 1.2.1.

[33] A more explicit protest against the popular tradition of the divine lottery is voiced in the Callimachean hymn to Zeus (58–67). Perhaps it is an indication that Hesiod feels a special need to justify his assertion that the gods proclaimed Zeus king without contest that they are said to have done so under the influence of yet another instance of the rather shopworn Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν (884). In contrast to her two previous admonitory interventions at 463 and 626, this is not an exercise of her prophetic power but merely a divine sanction for the coronation of the youngest son.

that we can extract its general outline from his text: for some time the Olympians and Titans battle to a stalemate (ἶσον τέλος 638); Gaia reveals that an alliance with the imprisoned Hecatoncheires will bring victory to the Olympian cause; when they are duly released and agree to help, the Olympians are filled with renewed vigor and courage (μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθε 666); as prophesied, these new reinforcements break the stalemate (ἐκλίνθη δὲ μάχη 711), with the Hecatoncheires providing the ultimate victory (713–17) and sending the defeated Titans down to Tartaros (717–20); finally, Zeus is chosen leader, and the new divine offices and prerogatives are apportioned (881–85). We have seen how Hesiod, working within this tradition, has shifted the balance in his narrative so as to enhance Zeus' personal role in forging this crucial alliance while at the same time de-emphasizing the actual contribution of the allies. I would now like to consider in more detail what I suppose to be Hesiod's other significant innovation in his Titanomachy, the insertion of Zeus' aristeia.

V

In composing the aristeia Hesiod has made use of two thematic units, both of which also appear elsewhere in the *Theogony*. Their realization in the context of the Titanomachy has resulted in a number of infelicities that have long provided grist for the mill of those who would excise the entire aristeia. An analysis of lines 687–700a as the Hesiodic reapplication of conventional themes to this new context furnishes a ready explanation for these peculiarities without recourse to the last resort of multiple authorship, and in the process provides a solution for three exegetic *cruces* of long standing.

The first compositional unit is the epiphany of an enraged Zeus, primed for battle and storming down from Olympus:

> οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι Ζεὺς ἴσχεν ἑὸν 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. (687–93)

Critical reservations have been voiced on occasion over the impropriety of this sudden onslaught in the context of the tenth year of the war, especially the implication that Zeus had been somehow restrained until this moment.[34] Even among those who defend the authenticity of the

[34] For comments typical of those who object to Zeus' sudden decisive action at this point in the war, cf. Mazon (above, note 5) 14.

aristeia there is wide disagreement over how these lines are to be interpreted. Responding to Mazon's argument for deletion, Sinclair gives lines 687–88 a severely literal interpretation: "That Zeus was unsuccessful for ten years is due to the fact that he had not taken a serious part in the fight at all."[35] West, on the other hand, sees nothing more than conventional phraseology in 687: "We need not suppose that he [Zeus] had really been abstaining from the fight. It is the description of his activity that has been retarded, not the activity itself."[36] The difficulty of reconciling this delay with the image of Zeus that Hesiod elsewhere takes pains to portray is felt more strongly by Rowe: "The best that can be done to save the narrative is to suppose that Zeus' entry into the fray is itself caused by that of the Hundred-Handers; in other words, that they gave him new heart, just as they do to the other Olympians. But it hardly seems consistent with Hesiod's aims to imply even a relative lack of heart in Zeus."[37]

We can better appreciate what Hesiod is about here if we keep in mind that he is applying to Zeus thematic material intended for the human heroic aristeia. What temporarily distinguishes the hero during his aristeia—and often betokens its onset—is a sudden upsurge in the quality of μένος. This heightened state is not necessarily the result of a conscious act of will on the part of the hero, and is therefore often attributed to divine agency. The introduction to Diomedes' aristeia in the *Iliad* (5.1–8) is a representative example in which the thematic similarity to *Th.* 687ff. is worthy of note:[38]

ἔνθ' αὖ Τυδεΐδῃ Διομήδεϊ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
δῶκε μένος καὶ θάρσος, ἵν' ἔκδηλος μετὰ πᾶσιν
Ἀργείοισι γένοιτο ἰδὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄροιτο·
δαῖέ οἱ ἐκ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος ἀκάματον πῦρ,
ἀστέρ' ὀπωρινῷ ἐναλίγκιον, ὅς τε μάλιστα
λαμπρὸν παμφαίνῃσι λελουμένος Ὠκεανοῖο·
τοῖόν οἱ πῦρ δαῖεν ἀπὸ κρατός τε καὶ ὤμων,
ὦρσε δέ μιν κατὰ μέσσον, ὅθι πλεῖστοι κλονέοντο.

In the case of Zeus, however, there obviously can be no question of this burst of μένος being brought on by an external influence. The best that Hesiod can do in transferring this human heroic theme to a divine warrior is to have Zeus excite his own μένος (as human warriors are occasionally capable of doing in the *Iliad*) and thus formally mark the beginning of his aristeia. It is a theme that he uses again in the very similar epiphany of Zeus in the Typhonomachy:

[35] Sinclair (above, note 22) 623.

[36] West 349; cf. also Frazer (above, note 12) 6–7.

[37] Rowe (above, note 22) 95.

[38] For a comparison of the Hesiodic aristeia with that of Diomedes in the *Iliad*, see Schwenn (above, note 4) 14–15.

Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν κόρθυνεν ἑὸν μένος, εἵλετο δ' ὅπλα,
βροντήν τε στεροπήν τε καὶ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,
πλῆξεν ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο ἐπάλμενος. (853–55)

To say that Zeus' μένος is heightened at this point in the narrative is unavoidably to imply that it had previously been at a lower level. It may thus indeed appear at first glance that in attempting to magnify Zeus through the use of this heroic motif Hesiod has in fact produced the opposite effect. But no Homeric commentator discussing Diomedes' extraordinary actions during his aristeia has ever accused him of laxity during the previous ten years of combat. The whole point of an aristeia is that it enables the hero temporarily to *transcend* his normal human capability. There arises a slight problem, perhaps, when this theme is applied to a god, particularly a god whom Hesiod would have us regard as consistently omnipotent; but it is at worst a very slight problem. A more important consideration is that epic poetry characteristically presents the audience with just one scene at a time, and for the duration of that episode no other action exists, prior or simultaneous. This is especially true of a scene as intense and concentrated as an aristeia: what the hero did or will do outside of this moment is as irrelevant as what the other characters do during it. In light of the ancient audience's familiarity with these poetic conventions, it seems highly unlikely that lines 687–88 would have aroused in them any sense of awkwardness. On the contrary, these lines achieve Hesiod's purpose admirably, and for the duration of Zeus' aristeia it is quite easy to forget all else—in particular, the Hecatoncheires—and focus attention exclusively on the terrifying potency of his wrath.

This description of Zeus' angry onslaught is continued and intensified in the subsequent lines, culminating in a second thematic element: a harrowing portrayal of its effects on the world at large:

ἔζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα
πόντος τ' ἀτρύγετος· τοὺς δ' ἄμφεπε θερμὸς ἀυτμὴ
Τιτῆνας χθονίους, φλὸξ δ' ἠέρα δῖαν ἵκανεν
ἄσπετος, ὄσσε δ' ἄμερδε καὶ ἰφθίμων περ ἐόντων
αὐγὴ μαρμαίρουσα κεραυνοῦ τε στεροπῆς τε.
καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν χάος. (695–700a)

This passage has long been a conundrum of Hesiodic criticism, arousing discussion at three separate but, as I hope to show, related points. The main problem lies in the interpretation of χθονίους. This adjective is found in only one other place in the *Theogony*, where Hades is described as θεοῦ χθονίου (767); and in its sole occurrence in the *Works and Days* Hesiod's audience is instructed to pray at the time of plowing to Διὶ χθονίῳ Δημήτερί θ' ἁγνῇ (465), to "Zeus operating in the earth."[39] The

[39] M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works & Days* (Oxford 1978) 276. Cf. *Il.* 9.457: Ζεύς τε καταχθόνιος καὶ ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνεια.

word is attested nowhere else in archaic verse, but the earliest and most common post-Hesiodic usage is likewise in the sense of "subterranean."[40] Furthermore, to mention the Titans with explicit reference to their permanent underground location in Tartaros is a commonplace attested in every genre of hexametric poetry:[41]

> Τιτῆνές θ' ὑποταρτάριοι Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες (*Th.* 851)
>
> τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους, οἳ Τιτῆνες καλέονται (*Il.* 14.279)
>
> Τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ τοὶ ὑπὸ χθονὶ ναιετάοντες
> Τάρταρον ἀμφὶ μέγαν (*h. Ap.* 335–36).

The problem, of course, is that in the larger context of the Titanomachy the Titans cannot yet be in their underground prison while they are still fighting Zeus above ground. This apparent contradiction has given rise to two less obvious ways to interpret χθονίους: to understand it as equivalent to ἐπιχθονίους, a virtually unparalleled use of the word at any period of Greek, or to γηγενέας, an equivalence somewhat better attested in post-epic writers but with equally serious drawbacks of a different sort.[42] Those who have rightly insisted on retaining the most natural sense of the word as ὑποχθονίους have generally explained the resulting contextual inconsistency as a matter of prolepsis: "the Titans were not then in the underworld, but they are now: a typical anticipation."[43] But if we temporarily put aside consideration of the larger context of the Titanomachy and examine lines 695–700a as a self-contained thematic unit, we will have cause to believe that Hesiod meant χθονίους literally rather than proleptically here, and that his audience almost certainly would have understood it that way.

It is often noted that the archaic Greek lexicon had no single term for the totality of the cosmos, but rather expressed the concept of the entire universe more concretely by a list of its constituent regions, conventionally four in number: earth, sea, sky, and the underworld.[44]

[40] E.g., Pindar *P.* 4.43, 159, *P.* 5.101; Aesch. *Ag.* 89, *Ch.* 1, 399, *Pers.* 628, 641; Hdt. 6.134, 7.153.

[41] Cf. also *Il.* 5.898, 8.478–81, 14.274, 15.225.

[42] For the former, see, e.g., Schwenn (above, note 4) 39: "Sie müssen in der Ebene stehen, die sich am Fusse des Olympos erstreckt"; cf. also Wilamowitz (above, note 7) 370. For the meaning "earth-born" see G. F. Schoemann, *Die hesiodische Theogonie* (Berlin 1868) 228–29; W. Aly, *Hesiods Theogonie* (Heidelberg 1913) 45; Mazon (above, note 5) 57. The difficulty with this latter interpretation lies not only in the unusual use of the matronymic but also in the fact that Gaia is never referred to as χθών in epic diction. See West 351.

[43] West 351; Said (above, note 9) 188. Cf. also J.-P. Vernant and M. Detienne, *Les Ruses de l'intelligence: la mètis des grecs* (Paris 1974) 88–89.

[44] E.g., *Th.* 678–82, 736–37 = 807–8, 839–41, 847–51. These same four elements occur in the Homeric δασμός of the universe among the three sons of Kronos; cf. *Il.* 15.189–93 (Poseidon speaking):

One particular application of this expression is as a thematic element in traditional narratives of divine warfare: such combat is so tremendous that the entire universe—designated by this catalogue of its elements—suffers its effects. We have already seen one realization of this motif, which we might label the Cosmic Disturbance, in the Titanomachy prior to Zeus' aristeia (678–82), and it also appears twice in the Typhonomachy, in lines 839–41 and again in 847–51.[45] It is this last passage that is to be compared with 695–700a:

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.

Lines 695–96 are clearly recognizable as the beginning of this thematic unit. We could do little more than speculate about Hesiod's reason for omitting the sky and making instead a second reference to the sea in line 696.[46] In any case it seems highly likely that the Τιτῆνας χθονίους in 697 are meant to represent the fourth cosmic element (corresponding to the mention of Hades and the Titans in 850–51) and that consequently the epithet was intended to be taken literally, referring to Titans already in the underworld. This certainly would have been the *immediate*

τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς·
ἤτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἅλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ
παλλομένων, Ἀΐδης δ' ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα,
Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσι·
γαῖα δ' ἔτι ξυνὴ πάντων καὶ μακρὸς Ὄλυμπος.

That the earth is to be held in common seems intended to reconcile a quadripartite universe with the number of Kronos' male children. In the proem of the *Theogony* (105–7) earth, sea, and sky are joined with night as the progenitors of all the gods. See West 363; Schwenn (above, note 4) 106; C. H. Kahn, *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology* (New York 1960) 134–37; W. Karl, *Chaos und Tartaros in Hesiods Theogonie* (Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg 1967) 18–19.

[45] Cf. also the theomachy at *Il.* 20.56–65, along with the commentary on this passage in the *De sublimitate* (9.6): ἐπιβλέπεις, ἑταῖρε, ὡς ἀναρρηγνυμένης μὲν ἐκ βάθρων γῆς, αὐτοῦ δὲ γυμνουμένου ταρτάρου, ἀνατροπὴν δὲ ὅλου καὶ διάστασιν τοῦ κόσμου λαμβάνοντος, πάνθ' ἅμα, οὐρανὸς ᾍδης, τὰ θνητὰ τὰ ἀθάνατα, ἅμα τῇ τότε συμπολεμεῖ καὶ συγκινδυνεύει μάχῃ; See J. Kroll, *Gott und Hölle* (Darmstadt 1963) 368–69 and 478–79; he characterizes this theme as the "erregten Anteilnahme der ganzen Welt an einem grossartigen, meist furchterregenden Ereignis" (368).

[46] There seems to be a combination in 695–96 of phraseology found in the two separate realizations of this motif in the Typhonomachy:

ἔζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα (847)
πόντος τ' Ὠκεανοῦ τε ῥοαὶ καὶ τάρταρα γαίης (841)

It should be noted, however, that Hesiod has retained the conventional *number* of four elements, even though two of them are now essentially the same.

and instinctive understanding of the audience—to whom the Cosmic Disturbance motif must have been quite familiar, as well as the cliché of the "subterranean Titans"—in spite of the discrepancy with the larger context of the Titanomachy.[47]

Could such a glaring discrepancy have been part of Hesiod's original text? It is not difficult to find examples of the misapplication of thematic material in epic poetry, even if most cases are less egregious than this one. I would suggest that in composing this aristeia Hesiod decided to place special emphasis on the intensity of Zeus' rage by employing an incendiary version of the Cosmic Disturbance theme, just as he does in the passage from the Typhonomachy quoted above.[48] Much of the language in this realization of the theme also occurs there (e.g., 695 ~ 847, 700 ~ 844), and in particular he creates the subterranean component of the theme by using the imprisoned Titans to represent the underworld, as he did in 851. But of course this last idea can properly be used only in a context where the Titans are already imprisoned in Tartaros and feeling only the indirect effects of a battle between Zeus and some other foe.[49] Its use in the Titanomachy is remarkably awkward, but the mechanics of thematic composition can at least render it explicable. It is much harder to imagine circumstances under which a later hand would have purposefully inserted such nonsense into the text.

An attractive feature of this thematic interpretation of 695–700a is that it solves, or rather eliminates, two other problems frequently noted in this passage, problems created by the unquestioned assumption that the Titans referred to in 697 are above ground and battling the Olympians. The first is the reading *ἠέρα* in the manuscripts at 697. This was first emended to *αἰθέρα* by S. A. Naber in 1855 and has been printed as

[47] For this explanation of *Τιτῆνας χθονίους* as representing one of the "vier Weltteilen," see Karl (above, note 44) 18–19. Cf. also Meyer (above, note 5) 41–42; Lisco (above, note 5) 79; U. Hölscher, "Anaximander und die Anfänge der Philosophie (II)," *Hermes* 81 (1953) 400.

[48] Cf. the very similar manifestations of divine wrath in the literature of the Old Testament, e.g., Deut. 32.22: "For a fire is kindled by my anger, and it burns to the depths of Sheol, devours the earth and its increase, and sets on fire the foundations of the mountains"; see especially Ps. 18.7–15.

[49] Cf. the more appropriate use of this motif at *Il.* 15.224–25, where Zeus boasts that should a conflict have arisen between himself and Poseidon, it would have been of such magnitude as to affect even *οἵ περ ἐνέρτεροί εἰσι θεοί, Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες*. In his highly Analytical dissection of the Titanomachy, Meyer (above, note 5) 52–53 had suggested that the "compositor" of these lines transferred 687–99 from a separate poetic source in which Zeus' opposition is someone or something other than the Titans: "tunc autem [compositor] sequi jussit vv. 644–686, quibus perverse compilans addidit Jovem contra nescio quem fulmina jacientem (–v. 699). videbat enim lectores desideraturos esse Jovem in hac pugna contra Titanes pugnata." Building upon Meyer's analysis, Lisco (above, note 5) 78–80 identified the interpolator's source for 687–99 more specifically as a "vetustum carmen" relating the battle between Zeus and Typhon.

such by both Rzach and West. The latter's main argument for adopting the emendation is that "ἀήρ in early epic always means mist, darkness, the stuff of invisibility, etc.; it is a substance with no fixed location, and not a part of the world framework."[50] But whether it is a substance or a region is less relevant to the question at hand than where it is to be found. Although ἀήρ may have no "fixed location" when the word appears in its nominal form, the derived adjective ἠερόεις has a rigidly fixed semantic field. In its 30 appearances in early epic, it modifies Tartaros 9 times and ζόφος 16 times.[51] If the subterranean regions are so regularly called ἠερόεις, we are fairly safe in assuming that they must contain ἀήρ; and it should occasion no surprise that the fiery effects of Zeus' rage must pass through this subterranean murk to affect Titans imprisoned in Tartaros.[52]

The second point is the significance of the term χάος in 700 and the larger question of just where Hesiod imagined χάος to be situated in the completed universe. Hesiod's initial statement of the temporal primacy of χάος (116) of course tells us little about where he imagined it ultimately to be located; by virtue of its being the first thing to exist, it obviously had as yet no spatial relationship to anything else. The fact that Night and Erebos are born from χάος (123) serves to characterize it somewhat, since both of these entities are at home in the underworld: in line 515 Erebos is used as a synonym for Tartaros, and in 744 we are told that νὺξ ἐρεμνή resides there.[53] There is also a reference to the cosmological χάος in the description of Tartaros, significantly in connection with the underground prison of the deposed Titans:

πρόσθεν δὲ θεῶν ἕκτοσθεν ἁπάντων
Τιτῆνες ναίουσι, πέρην χάεος ζοφεροῖο. (813–14)

Should it be the case that these lines are not Hesiod's, this evidence might lose some force, but not all; this is in any case likely to be one of the earliest contexts in which the word χάος has been preserved.

[50] West 351; cf. also N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) 279.

[51] The noun ζόφος is always used in the Hesiodic corpus specifically of the nether-gloom (*Th.* 653, 658, 729, *Sc.* 227) and is most commonly so used in the Homeric poems (e.g., *Il.* 15.191, 21.56, 23.51, *Od.* 11.57, 155, 20.356). An argument could easily be made that in each of the five cases where ἠερόεις modifies something other than Tartaros or ζόφος (*Th.* 294, *Od.* 20.64, *h. Herm.* 172, 234, 359) the Stygian connotations of the adjective are consciously exploited.

[52] Cf. Epimenides B5 DK, where Tartaros is the offspring of Aer and Night. On the original meaning of ἀήρ see Kahn (above, note 44) 143–46; Karl (above, note 44) 9–20 goes so far as to argue that for Hesiod ἀήρ and χάος are identical. Cf. also Hölscher (above, note 47) 396; W. Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Oxford 1947) 65; M. Stokes, "Hesiodic and Milesian Cosmogonies—II," *Phronesis* 8 (1963) 23–30.

[53] The first four entities born in Aristophanes' bird cosmogony (*Av.* 693–702) are Chaos, Night, Erebos, and Tartaros.

Outside of line 700, the weight of the internal evidence thus seems to indicate that the Hesiodic χάος in the completed universe is to be imagined as lying beneath the surface of the earth.[54] With the implicit assumption that the Titans in 697 are above ground, line 700 has provided the principal argument for those who have maintained the opposite—that Hesiod imagined χάος to be the region between earth and sky.[55] Although there is some indication that a few later writers may have interpreted Hesiod's χάος as the upper atmosphere, if we locate the Titans in 697 underground there remains no reason whatever to think that Hesiod himself so imagined it, and nothing to prevent us from seeing in all Hesiodic attestations of the word a consistent representation of χάος as a subterranean region somehow bordering on Tartaros.[56]

So the retention of the manuscripts' ἠέρα, the locating of χάος in 700 underground, and the literal interpretation of χθονίους in 697 as ὑποχθονίους are mutually supportive solutions to these three critical problems; all three contribute to a uniform and coherent description in lines 697–700a of the underworld and its inhabitants. Most compelling of all, they are solutions which retain in each case the most natural Hesiodic meaning of the word in question. If we now combine this result with that of the foregoing discussion of the Cosmic Disturbance motif, we can say that lines 697–700a constitute an expansion of the fourth element of this motif, in which Tartaros, the Titans, and the surrounding χάος all feel the indirect effects of Zeus' rage on the earth's surface.[57] That Hesiod

[54] For this view see West 193 and "Three Presocratic Cosmologies," *CQ* 13 (1963) 172; Hölscher (above, note 47) 399–400; Said (above, note 9) 187–88; G. Vlastos, *Gnomon* 27 (1955) 74–75, note 4; F. Solmsen, "Chaos and 'Apeiron'," *SIFC* 24 (1950) 247.

[55] For χάος as the "gap" between earth and sky see F. M. Cornford, *Unwritten Philosophy* (Cambridge 1950) 98 and *Principium Sapientiae* (Cambridge 1952) 194; Wilamowitz (above, note 6) 343; Jaeger (above, note 52) 13; G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1983²) 36–41. Cf. also O. Gigon, *Der Ursprung der griechischen Philosophie von Hesiod bis Parmenides* (Basel 1945) 29.

[56] Cf. Kirk (above, note 55) 37–38; his arguments for Hesiodic χάος as the upper atmosphere rely heavily on his interpretation of *Th.* 695–700. Kirk's conclusion is accepted by Stokes (above, note 52) 17–23 "with some misgivings"; in order to reconcile the occurrence of χάος in 700 with the rest of the Hesiodic evidence, he is compelled to claim that "Hesiod and/or his successors can be shown to have associated Chaos now with the upper, now with the lower darkness" (18).

[57] For a similar elaboration of the subterranean element of the Cosmic Disturbance motif cf. *Il.* 20.61–65:

> ἔδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀϊδωνεύς,
> δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἆλτο καὶ ἴαχε, μή οἱ ὕπερθε
> γαῖαν ἀναρρήξειε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων,
> οἰκία δὲ θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι φανείη
> σμερδαλέ' εὐρώεντα, τά τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ.

In this case it is the marine element which is left out, perhaps because it is Poseidon himself who is causing the natural upheaval here. On the other hand, in the real-

would be so anxious to remind us of the ultimate disposition of the Titans should come as no surprise; he surely must have found satisfaction in the notion that Zeus' might continues to intimidate and harass his enemies even after they are securely locked away in the depths of the earth, under the constant surveillance of their hundred-handed jailers.

VI

What begins to emerge from these considerations, albeit in shadowy outline, is a coherent characterization of the author of the *Theogony*. It is not a portrait based on allegedly autobiographical information about Hesiod's father, his dispute with his brother, or the tripod he won at Chalcis. Even if such details could be proved to have some historical value (which they cannot), they would be at best incidental to the interpretation of a poem like the *Theogony*. What does aid our understanding of the poem immeasurably is an appreciation of Hesiod's theological convictions and the compositional methods by which he translated those convictions into a poetic medium which imposed stringent restrictions on both content and expression. In the narratives of the Prometheia and the Titanomachy we have two examples of a consistent program on Hesiod's part to portray Zeus in accordance with a strict ideological vision in the face of a sometimes contrary tradition; and in each case he has employed the same compositional techniques of compression, expansion, and shift of emphasis to accommodate the demands of that tradition to the requirements of his theme. In the particular case of the Titanomachy he has attempted (with no small degree of success, as evidenced by the remarks of Schwenn, Wilamowitz, and Walcot cited in section I above) to deflect our attention from the decisive importance of the hundred-handed allies forced on him by tradition by first giving Zeus his own heroic moment on center stage; the paradoxical result is a terrifying epiphany of a vengeful god whose actions are at the same time awesome and inconsequential.

In reaching this conclusion we have, in a sense, returned to the point from which we began, for this observation is very much in the same spirit as that made by Goettling long ago: Zeus' aristeia was inserted into a context in which it did not traditionally belong "ne Juppiter honore suo defrauderetur." The sole but crucial difference is that we are not saying that this insertion was made by a post-Hesiodic interpolator to correct an omission in Hesiod's text, but by Hesiod himself to correct what his dogmatic outlook convinced him was an omission in the traditional narrative about the battle for supremacy between the

---

ization of the theme at *Th.* 847–51 it is the marine element which is expanded over two lines.

former and present gods: a featured role for the chief god of the contemporary pantheon. For if a strong feeling of reverence toward Zeus is truly the spiritual impetus behind the insertion of these lines (and this is the one point on which the Analysts and Unitarians generally agree), there are few Greek literary figures known to us from any period to whom we could attribute such a religious sentiment with more confidence than we can to the author of the *Theogony*.[58]

[58] This paper has profited to a notable degree from the suggestions of its anonymous referees. I offer special thanks for their very apt and helpful criticism.