



HESIOD AND AESCHYLUS



WITH A NEW FOREWORD
BY G. M. KIRKWOOD

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

Copyright © 1949 by Cornell University
Foreword copyright © 1995 by Cornell University

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or parts thereof, must not be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher. For information, address Cornell University Press, Sage House, 512 East State Street, Ithaca, New York 14850.

First published 1949 by Cornell University Press.
First printing, Cornell Paperbacks, 1995.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Solmsen, Friedrich, 1904–

Hesiod and Aeschylus / by Friedrich Solmsen ; with a new foreword by Gordon M. Kirkwood.

p. cm. — (Cornell studies in classical philology ; v. 30)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8014-8274-7 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Aeschylus—Criticism and interpretation. 2. Greek drama (Tragedy)—History and criticism. 3. Hesiod—Criticism and interpretation. 4. Influence (Literary, artistic, etc.) 5. Gods, Greek, in literature. 6. Aeschylus—Religion. 7. Hesiod—Influence. I. Title. II. Series.

PA3829.S55 1995

882'.01—dc20

95-15711

Printed in the United States of America

Ⓢ The paper in this book meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Contents

Foreword	ix
Preface	xiii
<u>PART ONE: HESIOD</u>	
CHAPTER I. The <i>Theogony</i>	3
Introduction, p. 3. The Origin of the World: Three Generations of Gods, p. 5. Powers of Good and of Evil in the World of Hesiod, p. 27. The Role of Zeus in the <i>Theogony</i> , p. 47. Cosmology and Theogony, p. 58. The Synthesis of Old and New Figures, Earlier and Later Generations, p. 66.	
CHAPTER II. The <i>Works and Days</i>	76
PART TWO: SOLON AND AESCHYLUS	
Introduction	103
CHAPTER I. Solon	107
CHAPTER II. Aeschylus: The <i>Prometheia</i>	124
Zeus and Prometheus, p. 124. The Crisis of the Olympian Dynasty, p. 157.	
CHAPTER III. Aeschylus: The <i>Eumenides</i>	178
<u>Index</u>	<u>225</u>



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

PART ONE

HESIOD



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

was at once an inspiration and a challenge. The tradition which he inherited may have been more complex than we realize, but one element of it stands out as supremely important and was invested for him with a special authority. The heroic epos forms the starting point of Hesiod's interpretation of the world and of things divine and human. It is not at all necessary for us to assume that Hesiod knew the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in exactly the form in which we read them. In fact, a good part of the *Odyssey* may not yet have existed when he composed his *Theogony*.³ He may well have known more and at the same time less than we know of the heroic epos. Opinions on this subject differ and are bound to differ as long as some scholars hold that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are in all essentials the work of one poet, while others assert that in these works are incorporated large bodies of earlier poetry; as long as for some these two epics represent the consummation, for others the decline of epic poetry.⁴ The writer of this study finds little force in the arguments advanced in support of the 'decline' theory, but on the other hand he does not believe in a creation *e nihilo* and thinks that analysis is—in spite of its many failures—justified. It does not, however,

³ See in particular Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1884) 17,229; *Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1916) 467; *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (Berlin, 1927) 49,77. For the view that Hesiod is older than 'Homer,' i.e., the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in their present form, see, e.g., Erich Bethe, *Homer, Dichtung und Sage* 2 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1922) 303ff., 329ff.; Friedrich Schwenn, *Hesiod's Theogonie* (Heidelberg, 1934) 72ff. and *passim*. For an expression of the alternative opinion see Felix Jacoby, *Hermes* 68 (1933).44 n.3, and for a discussion which leaves the question undecided see C. M. Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad* (Oxford, 1930) 261ff. A careful study of the relation between Hesiod and the *Odyssey* has been made by Inez Sellschopp (*Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod* [Diss. Hamburg, 1934]), whose observations suggest that large sections of the *Odyssey*, especially Book I-IV, V-VIII, and the whole second half of the epos as we have it, were unknown to Hesiod (p. 76). I have found no flaw in her arguments. However, if Wilamowitz' comments on *Op.* 705 (*Hesiodos Erga* [Berlin, 1928] 121) are correct, this line would be dependent on *Od.* 15.357 and could be used to invalidate Miss Sellschopp's conclusions. To me, Wilamowitz' explanation of the relationship between these lines does not seem so cogent as to exclude alternative explanations. See further on the relation between *Odyssey* and *Theogony* Peter Von der Mühl, *Die Dichter der Odyssee* (Aarau, 1940) 2. For our purposes, the *Iliad* will be found to be more important than the *Odyssey*.

⁴ The latest survey of different approaches to the Homeric question will be found in M. P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae* (London, 1933) 1ff. In recent years the position of the unitarians has been strengthened by the publication of S. E. Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer* (Berkeley, Calif., 1938) and W. Schadewaldt 'Iliasstudien,' (*Abhdlg. Sächs. Akad.* 43 [1938].6). If the unitarians are correct, Hesiod's familiarity with and dependence on our *Iliad* may be taken for granted. I have, however, judged it safer to make a special study of the relationship between the *Theogony* and those sections of the *Iliad* which are relevant to my argument.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

scheme of his work crystallize around these two pairs. That Zeus finds himself in undisputed control of the world is due to a decisive victory in a tremendous battle, the so-called Titanomachia, in which Zeus defeated the generation of Cronus. It was a terrific trial of strength and physical prowess, though Zeus' wisdom too contributed materially to the outcome. The Zeus of the *Theogony* rules with 'might'; it is by might that he has attained his present position, which can no longer be challenged.

That Zeus' immediate predecessors did not yield peacefully and with good grace is indicated also in a section of the *Iliad* to which we must now give somewhat closer attention. It is the section to which we have already alluded as containing a reference—the only reference in Homer—to a division of the world among the three chief gods, Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades.¹⁰ Here it is assumed that each of the three is in control of a third of the world. The passage forms part of the *Dios Apate*, the well-known episode in which Hera employs her charm (enhanced by Aphrodite's girdle) to beguile Zeus and then with the assistance of the god Hypnos puts him to sleep, giving the hard-pressed Danaans a breathing space and her brother Poseidon an opportunity of exerting himself on their behalf. From a student of Hesiod's *Theogony* this episode of the *Iliad* demands special attention, since the poet, whoever he may have been and whatever his relation to the poet of the whole *Iliad*, shows a particular speculative interest in theological and, if the term is permissible, theogonical problems. If he is 'Homer,' we have to admit that Homer here indulges in a special interest, not so marked elsewhere in his work; if he is not identical with the author of the whole epic, we may regard this penchant for theological matters as his individual characteristic.¹¹ Only in this section of the *Iliad*, and nowhere in the *Odyssey*, do we find an answer to the question how the different provinces were parceled out among the gods; we learn that it was done by lot, and the individual 'honors' or 'provinces' (τιμαί) given to the three principal gods are specified.¹² But this is not all. The poet also wonders

¹⁰ *Il.* 15.187ff. I prefer Wilamowitz' explanation of the passage (*Glaube d. Hell.* 1.337f.) to that of Nilsson (*Homer and Mycenae* 270), who suggests that it reflects Mycenaean conditions of life.

¹¹ Two very different approaches to this problem will be found in Wilamowitz, *Ilias und Homer*, and in W. Schadewaldt, 'Iliasstudien,' (see note 4) 17, 54, and especially 114ff. (115 n.1; 116 n.3). See also Erich Bethe, *op. cit.* (note 3) 1.280ff., 288ff., and some short but interesting statements of George Calhoun, *A. J. Ph.* 61 (1940).262ff.

¹² *Il.* 15.185-195.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

power and charm of Aphrodite and that *φιλότης* and *ἡμερος* were not sufficiently conspicuous characteristics of her personality before Hesiod pointed them out in vv. 203ff. Surely Hesiod's lines 'This honor she has from the beginning and this is the portion allotted to her amongst men and undying gods—the whisperings of maidens and smiles and deceits with sweet delight and love and graciousness' sum up the character and domain of the Homeric deity, and the personality of Aphrodite is as clearly a Homeric creation as that of Dike is a Hesiodic. Again Schwenn believes that the oath by Styx, which Hera swears in 15.37 or is asked to swear in 14.271, goes back to Hesiod's conception of the Styx. Yet an examination of the Styx passage in the *Theogony*²⁴ will show that Hesiod is at pains—and difficulties—to explain why Styx is the oath. Although the passages in the *Apate* are the only ones in the *Iliad* in which gods actually swear by Styx, I should not maintain that Hesiod depends on them, for there are references to this function of Styx elsewhere in Homer,²⁵ and the poet of the *Apate* treats the oath as a traditional motif to which he is anxious to add something new, namely, the further oath by the gods below Tartarus.²⁶ That Zeus in the *Iliad* respects Night and is reluctant to offend her because the location which Hesiod assigned to her is a loathsome one,²⁷ is a very far-fetched hypothesis. If in both poems it is suggested that the power of Hypnos extends to the water,²⁸ this is done in such altogether different ways that it is very difficult to believe that there is any connection between the two passages. I must again with regret refrain from discussing all the arguments adduced by Schwenn and content myself with making two more points. That a catalogue of Zeus' mistresses in the *Apate* is inspired by that of his wives in the *Theogony*²⁹ is of course not absolutely impossible, but this is one of those ingenious ideas on which one had better not build important conclusions. Finally, it is true that Themis is on Olympus in 15.87ff. but decidedly not in her Hesiodic capacity as the wife of Zeus; for if she were, how could Hera be so friendly to her?

If one poet—presumably a colonial poet—suggests that the ocean, 'the perfect river,' is the origin of all things, and if another poet, who hails from Boeotia, suggests the same of the earth, it is not immediately possible to say who replies to whom. Yet Hesiod, for whom Uranus and Gaea are the first pair of gods, takes care at the same time to de-

²⁴ Below, pp. 32f. ²⁵ *Il.* 2.755; *Od.* 5.185. Compare Schwenn 76.

²⁶ See below, pp. 15f. ²⁷ *Il.* 14.259ff.; *Theog.* 744f. Schwenn 77.

²⁸ *Il.* 14.245f.; *Theog.* 762. ²⁹ *Il.* 14.315-327; *Theog.* 901-923.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

from three sons of Uranus and Gaea in recognition of the fact that he freed them from their imprisonment. We shall study the motif of mutually advantageous pacts between Zeus and older deities—or groups of deities—at a later stage of our investigation.³⁹ Here it must suffice to say that it is one of Hesiod's favorite motifs and that it supplied him with the other main feature of the great struggle, the freeing of the hundred-armed Giants before the battle and their effective help in the actual fight.⁴⁰ Yet if both this motif and the role of Zeus in the battle are Hesiod's own ideas, it would seem that very little is left by which those anxious to make him dependent on an earlier *Theogony* or *Titanomachia* could support their theory—unless it is maintained that the uproar of the elements, which forms the accompaniment to the stupendous battle, goes back to the hypothetical source and that a poet of such pronounced cosmological interests as Hesiod could not bring Heaven and Earth, Sea and Chaos into the description.⁴¹ If Hesiod is responsible for the 'personnel' of the Titans as well as for the account of their battle with the gods, we had better dismiss speculations about an earlier *Titanomachia* and recognize Hesiod as the creator of this phase of Greek mythology, while we admit that he had received a clue from the poet of the *Apate*.⁴²

ever, find the slightest confirmation in an analysis of Hesiod's *Titanomachia*. 'Die der Zeit geläufigen Vorstellungen' is a phrase which will fit more periods than one; after all, Hesiod lived at a time when the heroic epos flourished.

³⁹ See below, pp. 73f. ⁴⁰ Vv. 616ff., 624ff., 713ff. ⁴¹ See esp. vv. 678ff., 700ff.

⁴² It appears from my discussion how pointless it is to suppose that Hesiod was acquainted with the 'cyclical *Titanomachia*' (I cannot help using this unfortunate and indeed incorrect name). Wolfgang Aly based his explanations in *Hesiods Theogonie* (Heidelberg, 1913) on this supposition. As a matter of fact, it is not only pointless but also false, as was shown by J. Dietze, *Rh. Mus.* 69 (1914). 522ff. I will not here examine Dietze's analysis of the first sections of 'Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*; it suffices for our purpose that he has made the decisive points about frgg. I and VI (Allen)—Chiron as civilizer and *πρῶτος εὐρετής*, and the aether as the first entity of the Universe—which prove the later origin of the poem. The *Αἰθήρ* as father of Uranus is no longer 'theogony'; in Hesiod (vv. 124f.) Night and dark Erebus produce Day and bright Aether, a good and indeed typically Hesiodic thought, not least in that one child represents the opposite of the mother, the other of the father. What Photius reports from the *Chrestomathia* regarding the first entities (96,32ff., Allen) can hardly be a summary of the 'cyclical *Titanomachia*,' for even the little that we know of it includes divergencies from his report. E. Bethe was in all probability correct (*Hermes* 26 [1891].631ff., repeated with some modifications in his *Homer* [Leipzig and Berlin, 1922] 2.200ff.) in suggesting that Proclus—or someone else—confused the epic and the mythical 'cycle'; for the former he rightly relies on the alternative definition in Clem. Al. *Protrept.* 2.30. Thus, the source from which Proclus has his *μυθολογούμενα* is probably a handbook which drew on Hesiod's *Theogony*. On Eumelus and Arctinus, whom late writers mention as authors of the 'cyclical *Titanomachia*,' cf. Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1884) 330.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

up. He does not place in Crete the whole story of Cronus' deception but tries to do justice to Cretan traditions⁵⁴ by reporting that Rhea took Zeus to Crete in order to save him from Cronus and by naming two places which in all probability figured in stories about Zeus' birth and childhood, just as in his account of the birth of Aphrodite he is at pains to recognize—though naturally within proper limits—the claims of Cyprus and Cytherae which were familiar to him from her epithets.⁵⁵

As has already been said, the stories and speculations which Hesiod inherited have become his own. It is, in fact, crude and unfair to him if we speak of Heaven and Earth as a pair; for not only has each a very definite individuality, but even the fundamental idea of the poet's approach is different in each case. They mate, it is true, and produce children, but for Gaea, what she does jointly with Uranus is only a small part of her record and experience. Uranus has a fate, Gaea a function. She is a woman and mother par excellence, yet at the same time is felt as a cosmic principle. She first bears Heaven, then the mountains, next

⁵⁴ This was noticed by K. O. Müller in his *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie* (Göttingen, 1825) 376. See, further, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (Note 51) 285, 296f., and *Min-Myc. Rel.* 392ff., 462 n.2, 469, 501.

⁵⁵ *Theog.* 477-483, 192-199. The authenticity of both passages has been questioned, but may be defended along the lines indicated in the text. On vv. 192ff. cf. Friedländer *Gött. Gel. Anz.* (1931) 255ff. In the other passage, the combination of two traditions begins at v. 468 or, more precisely, at v. 469, where Rhea turns to her parents for help. The editors should consider that the parents are expected *μητρὶν συμπαράσχειν*; by telling Rhea about the future (vv. 475f.) they do less than that. In vv. 479ff. Hesiod may do justice not only to Cretan claims but also to a traditional role of Gaea (Nilsson, *Min-Myc. Rel.* 501; *Gesch. d. gr. Rel.* 1.297). In any case, Hesiod's own hand can be discovered throughout the account. Note, for instance, the reference to the *Ἐπιχθόνι* of Uranus (v. 472; it is probably better to eliminate v. 473 than to add *θ'* after *παίδων*), which connects this section with vv. 209f., also the introduction of Gaea's persuasive powers, v. 494, which makes it possible to leave Cronus' actual fall from power to a later section, the *Titano-machia*; cf. p. 25. See also Pohlenz, *loc. cit.* (note 17) 568. Wilamowitz (*Pindaros* [Berlin, 1922] 82 n.1) prefers v. 496 to v. 494. In referring to Cretan traditions it may be pertinent to distinguish again between two different stories, one connected with Lyctus, the other centering in the cave of the *Αἰγαίον ὄρος* (see vv. 482, 484; cf. J. Dietze, *Rh. Mus.* 69 [1914] 529). Unfortunately, philological as well as archaeological problems stand in the way of a decision: v. 484 is one of the numerous lines which may easily have been added later to a story that was complete without it, and the cave has been variously identified and may conceivably be quite close to Lyctus (cf. Nilsson, *Gesch. d. gr. Rel.* 1.242). It may be questioned whether Hesiod had very clear notions of Cretan topography. I should attach importance to the word *πρώτην* (v. 482), however, and regard it as an indication that Hesiod is anxious to do justice to the claims of more than one place in Crete (cf. *πρώτον* at v. 192).



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

kept them in the womb of Gaea.⁶⁹ The parallelism of Uranus' and Cronus' misdeeds is obvious, so obvious indeed that one cannot escape the conclusion that the poet either invented or refashioned his stories so that they would parallel each other. If pressed for a decision as to which of the two stories is more likely to have been invented by the poet, I should say that the story of Uranus' outrageous conduct includes no feature comparable to the stone in Delphi and that it may, therefore, well be the product of Hesiod's own imagination—an imagination which the poet put at the service of his ethical idea. The whole sequence of crime, punishment, new crime, and again punishment could spring from the realization that the stone in Delphi bore testimony to an outrage of Cronus which he expiated by the loss of his power. An alternative possibility is that Hesiod knew more than one story about Cronus and chose that which would best fit his construction of the divine history. We cannot pretend to know or to define precisely the boundaries between his inventive and his selective activity, but we realize that the series of events which make up the history of the divine dynasty from the birth of Uranus to Zeus' advent to power has been determined by, and owes its intrinsic unity to, the idea of guilt and retribution. It forms one great conception, and even if Hesiod's poems included no references at all to Justice it would still be absurd to believe that Hesiod reproduced the narrative of an earlier poet and that this earlier poet should have introduced this fundamental idea into the construction of the divine history and be the inventor of the trilogic scheme.

To complete our account of this phase of Hesiod's creativeness we must mention another feature which unlike most of those hitherto discussed has been duly recognized as an expression of Hesiod's own thought and as a significant new contribution to the theological 'system.' I refer to the introduction of Eros as a deity. Eros was worshipped as a stone fetish in Hesiod's environment.⁷⁰ In the *Theogony* he is as old as Gaea; his birth is recorded in the same sentence as hers.⁷¹ Although Hesiod does not explicitly assign to Eros a role in the processes of cosmic creation and of divine procreation, scholars⁷² are probably cor-

⁶⁹ *Theog.* 154ff.

⁷⁰ Paus 9.27.1.

⁷¹ *Theog.* 120-122.

⁷² See, e.g., Wilamowitz, *Glaube d. Hell.* 1.342; Werner Jaeger, *Paideia* (New York, 1945) 1.65; Paula Philippson, *Genealogie als Mythische Form* (*Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet.* 7 [Oslo, 1936]) 12; Pizzagalli, *op. cit.* (note 7) 123. Waser (*R. E.*, s.v. 'Eros,' 485f.) takes Hesiod to task for not making better use of the 'cosmogonical' Eros (see also A. Furtwängler in Roscher, s.v. 'Eros'), whereas Kern (*op. cit.*, note 49, 1.250f.) denies Hesiod's Eros a cosmological function or significance. W. C. Greene's suggestion (*op. cit.*, note 1, 53) that the author of the

rect in regarding the appearance of the un-Homeric god at this early stage of the narrative as Hesiod's recognition of the important function which sexual union and the procreative instinct must have had in the origin of the divine families.

POWERS OF GOOD AND OF EVIL IN THE WORLD OF HESIOD

Chaos, we learn in v. 116, arose first,⁷³ and after Chaos came Gaea and Eros. While Hesiod does not say clearly, and probably does not even mean to say, that Gaea and Eros were born of Chaos, the great void, he teaches explicitly that Erebus and Night are its offspring. We can understand that Night is as empty and devoid of substance (*κενόν* in later philosophical terminology) as the original void and Erebus too is a *χάσμα*, a realm of large unfilled spaces—*domus vacuae* and *inania regna*.⁷⁴ By contrast, the solid masses of Earth could scarcely be 'born' of this unlimited emptiness. Yet, Erebus and Night are, if not coeval, at least of the same generation as Earth, the 'Urmutter' of all other divine and cosmic entities.

Night and Erebus together produce Day (*Ἡμέρα*) and the bright Air (*Αἰθήρ*), a process which Hermann Fränkel⁷⁵ has aptly instanced as evidence that Hesiod in constructing his genealogies would sometimes think in terms of opposites.

Theogony borrowed Eros from an earlier source seems very unfortunate; after all Eros was worshiped (even though as a stone fetish) in Hesiod's environment. The fullest treatment of the question that I know is G. F. Schoemann's (*Opuscula Academica* [Berlin, 1853] 2.60ff). Konrat Ziegler (in Roscher, s.v. 'Theogonien') condemns the three lines on Eros as spurious, whereas Jacoby eliminates the characterization of him as found in the MSS (completing the first line from Aristotle).

⁷³ *Theog.* 116ff. For the meaning of *χάος* in Hesiod and for the history of the concept cf. Hermann Fränkel, *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds* (Berkeley, Calif., 1945) 75 and 209. See also Olof Gigon, *Der Ursprung der griechischen Philosophie von Hesiod bis Parmenides* (Basel, 1945) 28ff.

⁷⁴ *Theog.* 740, cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 6.268f.

⁷⁵ *Festschrift für Richard Reitzenstein* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1931) 3. This section of my book owes to Fränkel's paper more than my references indicate. Paul Kretschmer in a paper dealing among other matters with '*Abstrakta im Indogermanischen*' (*Glotta* 13 [1924].101f.) refers to not a few of the Hesiodic deities whom I am considering in this chapter. Following in the footsteps of Hermann Usener's famous *Götternamen* (Bonn, 1895), he tries to clarify the relationships between '*Daemonen*' and '*Abstrakta*' and comes to the conclusion that the latter have developed out of the former. If the thesis is sound at all, it certainly does not apply to as many figures as Kretschmer believes; regarding Hesiod, he errs in treating as '*Volksglaube*' entities that are Hesiod's own creations.

Even more interesting, however, is a different set of Night's children,⁷⁶ which is described 85 lines later. 'Night gave birth,' we read in v. 211, 'to Moros, and to dark Ker,' two personifications or aspects of death well known to us from Homer; to Thanatos himself; and to Hypnos, who we know—again from Homer—was Thanatos' twin brother, and who certainly belongs to the sphere of Night just as properly as the 'tribe of dreams' that is mentioned next.⁷⁷ Two other powers of evil follow, Blame and Woe,⁷⁸ whom Hesiod evidently felt to be of such fundamental importance that he could not enumerate them along with other, and to our minds similar, powers which are a few lines later classed as children of Eris, Night's daughter. The next group of Night's children are the Hesperides, who guard the golden fruits 'beyond glorious Ocean.'⁷⁹ Why are they children of Night? Are they not altogether different from Death and Sleep, Blame and Woe? They are, but they had perhaps been called her children in some tale which was known to Hesiod. And if they had not it is sufficient to remember that they dwell in the farthest West, where Night too is located.⁸⁰ Are we then to eliminate these two lines in which the Hesperides are mentioned, because these figures are so different from all other children of Night and because their presence is due to reasons very different from those which account for the mention of the others, or are we to recognize that Hesiod's theogonic speculation is complex and synthetic, not at all committed to one track? Evidently the latter course is preferable, unless we decide to

⁷⁶ *Theog.* 211ff. Note that the passage in which the progeny of Νύξ are enumerated is separated by the whole account of Uranus' children and of their rebellion from the other passage in which Aether and Hemera are named as children of Night. And yet, nobody would for this reason believe that either of the passages is a later addition. The later passage springs, however, from a quite different approach to Night and may well have been conceived at a different time. Note that Night is this time not thought of as uniting with Erebus (οὐτὶνι κοιμηθεῖσα) but is herself now called ἐρεβεννή.

⁷⁷ *Il.* 16.454, 672, 682 (διδυμάονες). At *Il.* 14.259ff. Sleep finds refuge with Night. Although Homer does not say explicitly that she is the mother of Sleep, the poet of a *Theogony* might understand the passage as suggesting this relationship. Cf. E. G. Sihler *T. A. P. A.* 33 (1902). xxvi. It is, perhaps, not absolutely necessary to assume that these lines of *Il.* 14 inspired Hesiod's genealogical statement. Incidentally, if we think hard we realize that the relationship between Sleep (or Dreams) and Night is somewhat different from that between Death and Night.

⁷⁸ *Theog.* 214. For διζύς cf. Hesiod, *Op.* 177 (the present generation) οὐδέ ποτ' ἡμᾶρ παύσονται καμάτων καὶ διζύος οὐδέ τι νύκτωρ.

⁷⁹ *Theog.* 215f.

⁸⁰ At *Theog.* 274 the Gorgons are said to live πέραν κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο ἐσχατιῇ πρὸς Νυκτὸς ἢν' Ἑσπερίδες λιγύφωνοι. Here the same relationship is expressed in local terms. See below, p. 61. Cf. also frg. 67 Rzsch (of the Eoëae) regarding the reason why Circe is called Ἑσπερίη.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

sion of his own philosophy of life.⁹² For the rest, one has only to read the *Works and Days* attentively to find numerous evidences of his peculiar tendency to think of factors like Famine and Helplessness, not to mention Justice, Reverence, and Nemesis, as active powers whose actions are described in terms commonly used of living beings.⁹³ There are sections in which literally every line supplies proof of this trend of his thinking.

But what has the *Theogony* to say about the more pleasant features of life? In the *Works and Days* we read 'notwithstanding, even these' (the fifth generation) 'shall have some good mingled with their evils' (ἀλλ' ἐμπης καὶ τοῖσι μεμίζεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν). We shall find some of the more cheerful features of life recognized in the account of Zeus' marriages and of the children who sprang from them, but there is also another group of powers who likewise belong to the entourage of Zeus. They are Nike, Kratos, Bia, and Zelos. We easily recognize them as essential qualities of Zeus as ruler: αὐτὸς δὲ μέγα κρατεῖ ἡδὲ ἀνάσσει.⁹⁴ His figure is enhanced by the acquisition of such permanent allies and inseparable companions, and to exalt the status and personality of Zeus was one of Hesiod's principal objects. Yet while it is very important that Zeus should have these allies, what Hesiod especially emphasizes is that these four figures are never found in the company of anyone else: only Zeus has Power and Victory, Strength and Zeal⁹⁵—the good Zeal, of course, for the *Works and Days* knows a bad one,⁹⁶ and to say οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην ζήλου γένος would be just as correct from Hesiod's point of view as what he says about the two Erides.

Curiously enough, Nike, Kratos, Bia, and Zelos are children of Styx. It is not at all difficult to realize that Hesiod is particularly fascinated by Styx, and this fact would be clear even if the other section of the *Theogony* in which Styx is described were the work of a later rhapsode, as Jacoby thinks it is.⁹⁷ We have already noted that this section shows

⁹² For a different view see A. Rzach, *R. E.*, s.v. 'Hesiod' 1189.

⁹³ See below, pp. 89f.

⁹⁴ *Theog.* 403. Cf. 688f. ἐκ δὲ τε πᾶσαν φαίνει βίην (Zeus).

⁹⁵ Cf. the decisive role of Zeus in the Titanomachia: 687ff. On *Theog.* 383–403 cf. Fränkel, *loc. cit.* (note 75) 10ff. See also J. E. Harrison (*Themis* [Cambridge, 1912] 72), whose explanation I cannot accept.

⁹⁶ *Op.* 195f. ζῆλος δ' ἀνθρώποισιν διζυροῖσιν ἅπασιν δυσκέλαδος κακόχαρτος ὁμαρτήσσει στυγερώπης. The ζῆλος which accompanies (ὁμαρτεῖ) Zeus is certainly neither κακόχαρτος nor στυγερώπης. See above for two different conceptions of Eris (pp. 31f.) and of Nemesis (note 82). Cf. Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften* (Halle, 1924) 2.28 n.1.

⁹⁷ That section forms part of the 'geography' of Tartarus which Jacoby condemns *in toto*; see below, pp. 60f.

Hesiod's conception of Oath (*ὄρκος*), this 'greatest woe,' as it were, projected from the human sphere into the divine; but this is by no means the only argument that suggests itself in favor of the genuineness of the passage. Homer does not know Styx as a person; he only knows the 'water of Styx,' *Στυγὸς ὕδωρ*, which Wilhelm Schulze and Wilamowitz⁹⁸ prefer to write as a single word *Στυγούδωρ*, and he refers to its place in the Underworld.⁹⁹ Granted Hesiod's special interest in the importance and the effect of Oath and Perjury, the scanty information which he could find in Homer on the subject of the divine Oath and Styx could not satisfy him. The *Στυγὸς ὕδωρ* is one of the Homeric topics on which Hesiod kept brooding (the position of Zeus, the relationship between Zeus and his father, and the overthrow of the Titans are others). Evidently, more and more ideas came to crystallize in Hesiod's mind around the puzzling Homeric phrase. Why should a well of the Underworld have the exceptional honor to serve as the 'great Oath of the gods'?¹⁰⁰ The section that introduces these four powers contains Hesiod's answer. It was Styx who provided Zeus at a juncture of dire emergency with invaluable helpers. Yet what could have been this emergency but the one real danger which faced Zeus during his career, namely, the rebellion of the Titans,¹⁰¹ and who should be the invaluable helpers but those entities or qualities which symbolize Zeus' invincible strength and mastery? For let us note that the character of Kratos, Nike, and the two others bears no specific resemblance to the personality of Styx. In other words, the point of view which created so many parent-children relationships in Hesiod has not determined this one. The poet's primary idea was not that the mother of Nike and the three others must be Styx but that what Zeus needs to secure his rule is these four powers.¹⁰² This idea has led him to assign to Styx children who bear very little resemblance to her. The section is different from the account of Night's children, since, unlike the evils, Nike, Kratos, Bia, and Zelos have not found a mother who fits their own character. This time the desire to

⁹⁸ Wilhelm Schulze, *Quaestiones Epicae* (Güterslohe, 1892) 441; Wilamowitz, *Glaube d. Hell.* 1.388, n.2.

⁹⁹ *Il.* 2.755; 8.369; 14.271; 15.37; *Od.* 5.185; 10.514.

¹⁰⁰ *Θεῶν μέγαν ὄρκον Theog.* 400. The words recur in *Od.* 2.377, where I. Sellschopp (*op. cit.*, Note 3, 67) regards them as an echo of the passage in Hesiod. Her arguments seem strong.

¹⁰¹ Cf. below, pp. 73f.

¹⁰² Schwenn, *op. cit.* 99, comments thus on Styx and her children: 'Also wird man verstehen: Unter Göttern wenigstens steht der Erfolg im Zusammenhang mit dem Recht, wie es durch einen Eid erhärtet werden kann.' I can find no trace of this thought in Hesiod.

explain the privileged position of Styx in the Homeric epics was stronger with the poet than any other consideration.

Were these four figures destined to become a part of Greek religion? One of them was and, if popularity is the criterion of a happy invention, the palm must go to Nike. There was not much in the concept of Kratos, Zelos, and Bia that could convince the Greeks of their existence as individual entities, but the Greeks emphatically agreed that Nike was a goddess.¹⁰³ In the experience and enjoyment of victory—whether won in battle or in an athletic contest—they felt the presence of something divine. They continued to think of Nike as a companion of Zeus, but they also set up a new association, close to the point of identity, between her and Athena. But whether or not they were aware that they owed that goddess to the creative genius of Hesiod, they certainly did not often celebrate her as daughter of Styx¹⁰⁴ or remember her genealogical connection with Oceanus.

Hesiod did not see fit to make Kratos, Nike, Bia, and Zelos children of Zeus. It seemed more satisfactory that Zeus should win them than that he should beget them. But some of Zeus' children have a bearing on the present subject of our study and may illustrate the particular aspect of Hesiod's creativity which we are now investigating. They are scarcely by accident those children whom Homer does not know. Homer, to begin with, neither knows Themis as wife of Zeus (to be sure, she appears on Olympus,¹⁰⁵ but who would have the courage to imagine Hera's reactions toward her, if she were or ever had been the wife of Zeus?) nor the Horae as his daughters.¹⁰⁶ Homer's Horae are the gate-keepers of Olympus,¹⁰⁷ but Hesiod on the strength of a new etymological explanation of their name turned the Horae into deities who protect (ὠρεύουσι) the peaceful work of men. He determined their number and identified them as Dike, Eirene, and Eunomie (Justice, Peace, and well-ordered community life). Thus defined and specified, the Horae are worthy daughters of Zeus. They symbolize the new order of the world

¹⁰³ Cf. Bernert, *R. E.* s.v. 'Nike' and L. Preller and C. Robert, *Griechische Mythologie* (4th ed.; Berlin, 1894) 1.494.

¹⁰⁴ See, however, Bacchyl. 11.9, where κούρα (Στυγὸς ὄρ)θοδίκου has been well supplied by Friedrich Blass.

¹⁰⁵ *Il.* 15.87ff.; 20.4. For an interesting joint invocation of Zeus and Themis see *Od.* 2.68.

¹⁰⁶ *Theog.* 901ff. δεύτερον ἡγάγετο λιπαρὴν Θέμιν ἢ τέκεν "Ωρας Εὐνομίην τε Δίκην τε καὶ Εἰρήνην τεθαλυῖαν αἵτ' ἔργ' ὠρεύουσι καταθητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν. For the following discussion cf. Schwenn, *op. cit.* 49ff.; also Ziegler, *loc. cit.* (note 72) 1507, and Jaeger, *Paideia* 1.70.

¹⁰⁷ *Il.* 5.749; 8.393, 432ff.

which Zeus has brought about. Their mother Themis stands for everything that is and has always been right, proper, and common practice (*ἡ θέμις ἐστίν*).¹⁰⁸ She is felt to be older, therefore, and in view of her archaic quality even more venerable than Dike. She is the one norm to which human activities have always conformed, and must have been a power even before Zeus was born. Modern scholars agree that her name has a more archaic ring than that of her younger, and on the whole, more humanly conceived rival.¹⁰⁹ Themis was present even among the Titans, but only in the same sense in which Mnemosyne was present (see below, p. 70), and it is a most profound thought that Zeus unites himself with the power of the eternal right and custom so as to beget Dike, who now reigns or ought to reign among men. Eirene and Eunomie too should reign among them, protecting and guaranteeing the success of human efforts. We remember that we have found Dysnomie, the antonym of Eunomie, among the progeny of Night (above, p. 29) as daughter of Strife (*Ἔρις*) and close companion of Disaster (*Ἄτη*), and we recognize the significance of the conception by which Eunomie has become a part and exponent of Zeus' world order.

Hesiod's new conception of the Horae is all the more remarkable as he uses the noun *ῥαί* in the traditional sense of 'seasons'¹¹⁰ and as in the *Works and Days*—unless we believe in the interpolation of v. 75—

¹⁰⁸ J. E. Harrison in her well-known book on *Themis* (see note 95) 515 cites *Theog.* 901ff., and while paying due attention to the names of the three Horae wants nevertheless to have them understood as 'Seasons.' I do not see how this can be done, though the Horae who in *Op.* 75 provide Pandora with a wreath of spring flowers are indeed likely to be the Seasons. (Pindar, *Ol.* 13.6ff., praises Hesiod's Horae, mentioning them by name and calling them children of Themis, yet a few lines later (v. 77) gives them the epithet *πολύανθεμοι*; cf. also Pindar frg. 63.1ff. Bowra). For a suggestion which represents a compromise between the two conceptions of the Horae but fails to do justice to *Theog.* 901ff., see Preller and Robert, *op. cit.* (note 103) 478. The three Attic Horae (Thallo, Karpo, and Auxo) have nothing to do with Hesiod. Cf. also G. F. Schoemann, *op. cit.* (note 72) 2.50, 113.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Rudolf Hirzel, *Themis, Dike und Verwandtes* (Leipzig, 1907) *passim*; Victor Ehrenberg, *Die Rechtsidee im frühen Griechentum* (Leipzig, 1921) 67, 68 n.4, 95, and *passim*. In Pindar, *Ol.* 8.21f. *Θέμις* is the *πάρεδρος* of Zeus, yet Pindar specifies him as *Xenios* (cf. vv. 25ff.; see also *Nem.* 11.8; Aesch., *Suppl.* 360). Wilamowitz, *Hesiodos Erga* 67, has some interesting observations which show how *δική* in language and thought came to occupy the place of *θέμις*. Gustav Glotz' definitions of the concepts (*La Solidarité de la famille dans le droit criminel en Grèce* [Paris, 1904]) seem somewhat narrow and need correction in the light of the more recent studies cited. Many questions remain unanswered.—See now Kurt Latte's brilliant paper in *Antike und Abendland* 2 (1946).63ff.

¹¹⁰ See *Op.* 30 with Wilamowitz' note *ad loc.*



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

witz¹²⁰ could venture to declare the nine names Hesiod's invention, without troubling to adduce arguments; he relied on his intuition. If it is argued that some earlier epics which left no traces on either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* had the nine names, what are we to reply, if we too do not believe that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* represent or include all epic poetry that was composed in pre-Hesiodic days? We have a right to argue that the nine names of the *Theogony* fit into and complete the picture of Hesiod's creative achievement which has hitherto emerged. The factors of evil in the stemma of Night, the powers of Glee, Strength, and Prosperity associated with Zeus—this is the pattern which we understand as an expression of Hesiod's own philosophy of life, of his effort to explain the conditions and the setting of human life in the present era.¹²¹ Furthermore, it is recognized¹²² that Hesiod conceived a rhapsode's, i.e. his own, relation to the Muses in a much more personal fashion than epic poets normally did, and that the rich and elaborate Proem of the *Theogony*, which celebrates the power and activities of the Muses, reflects his peculiar and very personal devotion to these goddesses. The mention of the Muses in the catalogue of Zeus' marriages naturally puts us in mind of what was said about them in the Proem, and it is clearly the poet's idea that we should remember the earlier description. In the Proem, as well as in the catalogue of the marriages, Zeus is called their father and Mnemosyne is introduced as their mother.¹²³ But the only reason why the individual names of the children are absent from the latter passage is that they have been recorded in the former.¹²⁴ Because of the connection of the Muses with poetry and

clusions of this kind. It must be supplemented by an analysis of Hesiod's own account of the Muses, by a study of the relations between this account and 'Homer,' and finally by a comparison between Hesiod's approach to the Muses and his approach to the Graces, Horae, and Fates. If this is done one will feel less sure than Calhoun that 'there is not a vestige of proof' for the Hesiodic origin of the nine deities.

¹²⁰ *Die Ilias und Homer* 468, 474; cf. *Hesiodos Erga* 155; *Glaube d. Hell* 1.343. Cf. also Preller and Robert, *op. cit.* (note 109) 490. The painter of the François vase uses the Hesiodic names for the Muses (it is immaterial that he calls one of them Stesichore instead of Terpsichore, Preller and Robert, 490 n.1).

¹²¹ I stress 'in the present era,' although I do not believe that the idea of the 'five generations of man' forms the background to the *Theogony*. Yet a historical point of view is present in the *Theogony* too.

¹²² Cf. Wilamowitz, *Ilias und Homer* 464, and Friedländer, *Hermes* 49 (1914).1ff., *Gött. Gel. Anz.* (1931) 251 and *passim*.

¹²³ *Theog.* 53ff. Cf. Schwenn, *op. cit.* (Note 3) 51.

¹²⁴ It should also be noted that the anticipation of the proper names of the Muses in the Proem enabled Hesiod to keep up his scheme of triads in the cata-



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

abandon their view. A specific argument for Hesiod's authorship of this idea cannot in fact be adduced, nor do I know why Hesiod refers to her as γουννοῖσι Ἐλευθῆρος μεδέουσα, but I am unable to believe that a goddess Mnemosyne had a well-established cult at Eleutheria, and I am not aware that any historian of Greek religion has taken this view or tried to support it by analogous cults elsewhere.¹³⁶ The mnemonic feats of the ancient rhapsode which are apt to arouse our admiration must yet not lead us to think that Mnemosyne primarily represents his personal power of memory. She stands for something more objective. Epic song perpetuates the glorious deeds performed by earlier generations of men. While the Muses tell Hesiod the truth (v. 28), i.e., while they illuminate for him the order and structure of the world in which he lives, they also tell about the past and, to put the matter for a moment in modern terms, give historical perspective to his existence. What would Hesiod and his contemporaries know about the past if it had not been enshrined in the works of the epic poets who confessed that they owed their knowledge to the Muses? It looks indeed as if Hesiod when he made Mnemosyne the mother of the Muses was thinking of the heroic epos—even more than of his own.

Hesiod includes Mnemosyne with the Titans, but it has rightly been said that it would be absurd to think of her as participating in the Titanomachia on the side opposed to Zeus¹³⁷—just as it would be absurd to think of Themis in this sense, and these two goddesses are, in fact, anything but congenial to the rest of the Titans. Both, as we know, will be married to Zeus after he has secured his reign. In both instances the union of Zeus with an older power (with something venerable that existed before Zeus) issues in the birth of goddesses representative of a new order and harmony of life: in the one instance, in that of Dike, Eunomie, and Eirene; in the other, in that of the Muses,¹³⁸ although Themis, stern goddess that she is, is also the mother of the Moirai, who give both good and bad.

The three Graces have a somewhat less interesting mother. The poet has been content to choose for this position one of the Oceanids, Eurynome.¹³⁹ We do not know whether she had any special claim to promi-

¹³⁶ Ziegler in Roscher s.v. 'Theogonien' seems to take back on p. 1508 what he says on pp. 1499f.

¹³⁷ See below, pp. 69f.

¹³⁸ Schwenn, *op. cit.* (note 3), 51. Although it sounds a trifle too modern to say (Schwenn 49) that Zeus after his victory '*organisiert . . . ein neues Reich . . . der Schönheit und Kunst*,' I yet consider myself in fundamental agreement with Schwenn's interpretation.

¹³⁹ Vv. 907-909; cf. v. 358. On vv. 910-911 cf. note 124.

nence—I see no particular need or probability for this supposition—and it is not even easy to say whether the three words which the poet uses for her characterization *πολυήρατον εἶδος ἔχουσα*, have a reference to the beauty and the ‘great loveliness’ of her children or whether this description is purely conventional. The names of the Graces themselves, Aglaia, Euphrosyne, and Thalia, hardly require a commentary, but I am glad to quote Professor Schwenn,¹⁴⁰ with whose appraisal of some of these groups I find myself in agreement: “*Im Reich des Zeus gibt es was Freude macht, χάρις, also personenhafte Chariten, deren Dreiverein den festlichen Glanz, das heitere Geniessen beim Mahle und den Frohsinn bezeichnet.*”^{140a} We have seen before that Hesiod lives in a world of ‘saure Wochen, frohe Feste’ (Goethe).

As the ‘Titans’ Themis and Mnemosyne are to become wives of Zeus, two of the male Titans have to marry outside the clan. Crius finds his wife among the children of Pontus, Iapetus his among the Oceanids. Thus, there are four marriages in which both partners are Titans and six in which the male partner is a Titan. The six couples are Oceanus and Tethys, Hyperion and Theia, Crius and Eurybie, Coeus and Phoebe, Cronus and Rhea, Iapetus and Clymene. The progeny of Cronus and Rhea was fixed; it had to consist of Zeus and his brothers and sisters. We have seen and come to understand that Oceanus and Tethys are the parents of the rivers and wells. Iapetus and Clymene head a special group which we shall presently study in detail; their sons are rebels or potential rebels against the government of Zeus. Tradition may or may not have included a hint of the particular character which attaches to this group; if it did not, life itself may have acquainted Hesiod with ‘kings’ (*βασιλῆις*) who had to be wary of their cousins. Hyperion cannot be separated from Helius; one day Hesiod became aware that Moon and Dawn should have the same parents as the Sun. There remained the need of providing the two other couples, Crius and Euribie, Coeus and Phoebe, with a progeny. Here, if anywhere, Hesiod seems to have assigned the children rather arbitrarily. We can understand why Phoebe

¹⁴⁰ *Op. cit.* 50f. For Homer the Graces are on the whole a rather indefinite group, though an individual name—Pasithea—occurs in the *Διὸς Ἀπάτη* (*Il.* 14.267). On the other hand, Hephaestus’ wife is simply called Charis (*Il.* 18.382). Paus 9.35.3 suggests that the cult of three Charites spread from Orchomenus; reporting on their cult in different regions of Greece, he stresses the variations in their number and names, but I do not see that he refers to them as deities of vegetation as Louis Gernet says he does (in Louis Gernet and André Boulanger, *Le Génie grec dans la religion* [Paris, 1932] 250).

^{140a} *Od.* 9.6 helps us to understand the association of *Εὐφροσύνη* and *Θαλίη*.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

only as evidence of the poet's continued pondering over the story and of his persistent efforts to get from it as much light as possible upon the condition of man.

We can clearly see what new points Hesiod brought out in the *Works and Days*, but it is less easy to determine how much of the version which we find in the *Theogony* reflects Hesiod's own thought and which essential features belonged to the Prometheus story before he reinterpreted or refashioned it. We may agree with Eduard Schwartz¹⁵⁴ that the harsh judgment passed on woman and her part in man's life is Hesiod's own, and we may make use of some other of his observations to disentangle the different strands of Hesiod's narrative. When the Greeks wondered why the gods in sacrifices received the worse part and man himself ate the better, they explained it by the act of Prometheus, or whoever else may have figured in the story of the successful deception of Zeus.¹⁵⁵ Zeus himself was clearly the dupe who when he was offered the choice between two piles of meat chose that which had a thin layer of fat on its top but consisted underneath entirely of bones. The theft of the fire, which Prometheus accomplished next, was another deception of Zeus.¹⁵⁶ But for Hesiod Zeus is the all-knowing god who notices quite

true that these lines weaken the vigor of the condemnation of the entire γένος γυναικῶν, but this argument is perhaps not quite strong enough to decide the case against them. The whole passage about the woman has something of the *χαρακτήρ* of the *Works and Days* rather than of the *Theogony*; in other words it has a personal touch. Cf. Eduard Schwartz, 'Prometheus bei Hesiod,' *Sitz. Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1915.145; 'Die Echtheit dieses Glaubens lässt sich durch kein Stil- und Formgefühl davon abhalten, sich die Zänkereien mit einem unordentlichen, verschwenderischen Weibe sub specie aeternitatis vorzustellen.' Wilamowitz' view (*Glaube d. Hell.* 1.344) seems less convincing. He suggests that Hesiod found the 'antifeminist' tendency in an earlier poem dealing with Prometheus and Epimetheus and retained it because it accorded with his own feeling.

¹⁵⁴ Schwartz's important paper (see preceding note) should be compared throughout for this section.

¹⁵⁵ See, e.g., H. J. Rose, *Modern Methods in Classical Mythology* (St. Andrews, 1930) 6; Wilamowitz, *Glaube d. Hell.* 1.287. Schwartz, *loc. cit.* 144, suggests that the story how the gods lost the better part of the sacrifices had originally no connection at all with Prometheus and that it was Hesiod who made Prometheus the agent in this story and at the same time credited him with the introduction of Fire into the life of man. On the sacrificial habits involved cf. Ada Thomsen in *Archiv für Religionswiss.* 12 (1909).460ff.

¹⁵⁶ Vv. 535-557 the first deception of Zeus, 558-569 the second ἀπάτη (ἐξαπάτησε 565; cf. *Op.* 48). Cf. Carl Robert, *Mélanges Nicole* (Geneva, 1905) 482. If Hesiod were anxious to preserve the temporal sequence of events, he would only now (after 569) speak of the punishment of Prometheus, but as he has anticipated it in v. 512 he can immediately proceed to the punishment which Zeus metes out to mankind (vv. 570ff).

well what Prometheus has in mind when he offers him the choice between the two piles. 'He knew the scheme and did not fail to recognize it'¹⁵⁷—and yet he does the stupid thing by which he puts the gods forever at a disadvantage. Hesiod could of course not alter this part of the story for the simple reason that human beings 'still burn for the immortal gods the white bones on the fragrant altars.'¹⁵⁸ Verses 551ff. seem to suggest that Zeus allowed the deception to achieve its result, because when he realized what kind of game Prometheus was playing he forthwith conceived a desire to inflict woe upon mankind.¹⁵⁹ Hesiod has worked his conception of the all-knowing Zeus into the story regardless of the improbable situation which he thus created. At the end he sums up the lesson which the story teaches: 'So it is not possible to deceive or go beyond the will of Zeus.'¹⁶⁰ These words refer primarily to the punishment which Prometheus could not escape, but they also embody Hesiod's exalted view of Zeus, which he has tried to work into the story against its original conception.

Hesiod has good reasons for thus reaffirming the lessons of the story, for he actually concludes his narrative on a rather different note, emphasizing the destructive function of woman.¹⁶¹ Quite clearly the whole tale as he has fashioned or refashioned it serves three purposes. It still fulfills its old function of explaining the customs observed at sacrifices; it enables us to understand the presence of evil—the cardinal evil, woman—in man's life; and finally it shows that it is impossible to cheat Zeus and escape punishment. We recognize Hesiod's own mind in the second and third of these ideas. The fact that the poet, when he has told the entire story, gives special emphasis to the last lesson is evidence of

¹⁵⁷ V. 551. Cf. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology* (2nd ed.; London, 1933) 72 n.57; Eduard Meyer, *op. cit.* (note 96) 32 n.1.

¹⁵⁸ Vv. 556–557. The lines are eliminated by Paley and Jacoby.

¹⁵⁹ But the woe is either Hesiod's own woe (see Schwartz, *loc. cit.*, note 153) or at least reflects his conception of human woe. The explanation of Zeus' reaction must therefore be considered as Hesiod's own contribution. Eirik Vandvik in his recent study (*The Prometheus of Hesiod and Aeschylus* [Oslo, 1943] 8ff. argues that Zeus throughout this episode has the true interests of man at heart and wishes to keep him from a life of luxury and sloth. It will scarcely be possible to find support for this view in the story of the *κακόν* inflicted by Zeus upon mankind. Hesiod stresses (v. 534) the *ἔρις* between the *βουλαί* of Zeus and those of Prometheus. The *βουλαί* of Zeus are inspired by his *χόλος*, his anger and resentment (vv. 554, 567; cf. *Op.* 47, 53); he is anxious to assert himself against Prometheus and has the *κράτος* to do so.

¹⁶⁰ Vv. 613–616; cf. *Op.* 105 (on which see P. Mazon, *Rev. ét. anc.* 14 [1912].337).

¹⁶¹ Vv. 591ff.; see above, note 153.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

the Titans, they pressed far-seeing Olympian Zeus to reign and to rule over them.¹⁷²

Only now would it be, so to speak, historically correct to consider Zeus as ruler of the world,¹⁷³ but Hesiod is not a historian who meticulously reserves each fact for its proper place in the sequence of events. He draws us into the atmosphere of Zeus' reign long before it is finally and securely established; he unfolds it by degrees and guides us to the realization of its existence before it is historically achieved. It would certainly be unfair to his constructive genius and poetic power to think that he could not describe the fight between the gods and the Titans before in the system of pedigrees he had reached the point at which he could properly speak of the 'Hundred-arms'.¹⁷⁴ It is perfectly true that the 'Hundred-arms' have their appropriate place after the Titans and their progeny; it is also true that the story of the 'Hundred-arms' and of Zeus' alliance with them is used as the starting point for the Titanomachia. It may even be added that the motif of alliances of Zeus with older powers is important for Hesiod's conception of the emergence and the nature of the present world order.¹⁷⁵ But to think that such reasons determine the place where the Titanomachia was to be described means to set arbitrary limitations to the poet's creative energy and designing intelligence. Against such a view it is sufficient to recall that in two other places allies of Zeus are brought in, in v. 383 the children of Styx, and in v. 501 another group of Uranus' children, who provide Zeus with his weapons, thunder and lightning. It is these weapons which decide the battle against the Titans, and if the poet does not in v. 506 immediately proceed to the description of that battle, the correct explanation is not

¹⁷² Vv. 886ff. I do not believe in Hesiod's authorship of the Typhoeus episode (vv. 820-880). The stylistic arguments adduced by Jacoby (*Praef.* 20f.; cf. also Mazon, *op. cit.* 15) seem to me to have a good deal of weight. Furthermore, the episode is ignored in vv. 881ff. Gaea who is normally on the side of Zeus would in this episode be opposed to him. It is unlikely that she should give the gods friendly advice and help Zeus to supremacy (v. 882) if he has just crushed her son. Tartarus (v. 822) is not a god in Hesiod.

¹⁷³ The references to Olympus in vv. 391, 396, and 632 should not be construed as indications that even before the ten years' war the Titans had been stripped of their power. Hesiod always thinks of Zeus as being on Olympus but never puts Cronus and his group there.

¹⁷⁴ Vv. 617ff. The part of the *Theogony* which includes the Titanomachia and the description of Tartarus opens with the names of Briareus and his brothers. It is correct to say that the poet is still guided by his genealogical scheme in which the 'Hundred-arms' would come in for discussion after the Titans (see their first introduction at v. 147).

¹⁷⁵ See below, pp. 73ff.

that for external reasons he could not do so but that for reasons of climactic structure he would not do so.

The real difficulties with which an attempt to understand the role of Zeus in the *Theogony* has to contend are of a very different kind. They lie in the fact that in the present state of research it is frequently impossible to decide whether a section of the *Theogony* is Hesiod's own work or whether it is an 'expansion' for which a later rhapsode has to be held responsible.¹⁷⁶ Such expansions there are, and at times suspicion is legitimate, even if interpolation cannot actually be proved. With some confidence, and yet with due respect for the last impressive attempt to determine the extent of these expansions, I should say that if the attempt leads to the condemnation of the Hecate episode and of the account of Zeus' own part in the Titanomachia as un-Hesiodic, such results can hardly be considered as a recommendation of the critic's procedure; for these sections are essential to Hesiod's plan, and both contribute something important to the growth of our belief in the supremacy of Zeus. On the other hand, it must be conceded that if Hesiod himself is the author of the description of Tartarus, this description does not contribute to and is not functionally related to what we have now come to regard as the principal subject of the *Theogony* and as the Alpha and Omega of Hesiod's creed; for it adds nothing to the emergence of the all-powerful personality of Zeus or to the unfolding of his empire. Conversely, while it is very tempting to regard the episode of Zeus' struggle with Typhoeus and his destruction of this last monster as the crowning episode in his rise to supreme power, the reasons which tell against the Hesiodic origin of this section are too weighty to be set aside.¹⁷⁷ Fortunately the sections which are fundamental for our exposition of the poet's design are genuine beyond doubt. They are, to state it once more, the story of Styx, of the birth and rescue of Zeus (worked into the account of Cronus and his progeny), of his assertion of his power against Prometheus and the other rebels among the children of Iapetus, and of the victory over the Titans, which is the result of Zeus' own exertions. The lines which mark the end of these four sections, vv. 403, 506, 613-616, 881-885, tell a good part of the story.¹⁷⁸

One more point should be made to complete this phase of our investi-

¹⁷⁶ See above, notes 164, 165, 169, and 171.

¹⁷⁷ See note 172.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Mazon who (*op. cit.*, note 19, 19 n.1) actually quotes the same lines in support of a view fundamentally identical with mine. I have reached my conclusions independently and am pleased to find myself in complete agreement with the French scholar.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

the husband of Asteria,¹⁹¹ daughter of Coeus, and of her begets Hecate. Whoever likes may believe that an earlier poet, a Hesiod before Hesiod, knew two divine representatives of the starry heaven and identified the one as daughter of the Titan Coeus, the other as son of the Titan Crius.

Finally, in view of the family likeness which modern scholars have noticed between Hecate and the children of Leto (Wilamowitz regards Hecate as a sister of Apollo Hekatos, or Hekatoergos), one wonders if it is entirely by accident that in Hesiod Hecate becomes not their sister, for the two children of Leto were fixed, but their cousin; for Asteria and Leto are both daughters of the Titan Coeus.

COSMOLOGY AND THEOGONY

The role of Zeus in the *Theogony* and the characteristics of his rule will perhaps be even more clearly perceived against the background of certain other features in the poem to which we have hitherto given little attention. While it is wrong to call the *Theogony* a cosmogonic poem and while it is difficult to believe that Hesiod should have defined it as his purpose in the Proem to tell 'how at first gods and the earth came to be, and rivers, and the boundless sea, with its raging swell, and the gleaming stars, and the wide heaven above,'¹⁹² a certain cosmological strand is yet present in his speculations. There seems to be general agreement among the students of the *Theogony* that when Hesiod speaks of Gaea's giving birth to Uranus¹⁹³ he is actually thinking of earth and heaven; in some lines of that section his language is so clearly physical and cosmological that it would be quite futile to dispute this strand of his thought. In particular, Gaea is both the earth and the goddess who represents the earth. When Uranus 'tries to hide' his and Gaea's children, the Titans, and 'does not let them come forth to the light,' one has to think of a woman prevented from giving birth to her children ('vast Earth groaned within, being straightened'); but the children are kept in a *κειθμών* ('hiding place') of Gaea,¹⁹⁴ and the connotations of the word

¹⁹¹ V. 409; cf. v. 377.

¹⁹² Vv. 108-110. Cf. E. Schwartz, *Sitz. Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1915.123 n.1; Wilamowitz, *Ilias und Homer* 464. Mazon (*op. cit.*, note 19, 9), who regards these lines as genuine, makes some good points on the 'cosmogonical' trend of the *Theogony*.

¹⁹³ Vv. 126f. (no matter which of the alternative readings is accepted for the end of v. 127); cf. also v. 133 (see above p. 15); see also vv. 176-178.

¹⁹⁴ Vv. 157 *πάντας ἀποκρύπτασκε*. . . *Γαίης ἐν κειθμῶνι*. *Οὐρανός* is *μέγας*, *Γαῖα* is *πελώρη* (vv. 159, 173, 175).



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

fundamentally the same as a *χάος*) which contains the roots of earth and sea, or, as another passage has it, the *πηγαί* and *πείρατα*, the wells and borders (or does the poet mean the beginning and end?) of Earth and Tartarus, Heaven and Sea.²⁰² Have we not earlier in the poem learned that Earth and Erebus sprang from Chaos and that Earth, all by herself, gave birth to Heaven and Sea?²⁰³ Night too arose from Chaos and now hovers around the place where these roots and well-springs are located.²⁰⁴ To be sure, if we tried to translate this cosmological account, so to speak, literally into the genealogical language of the earlier sections, we should expect to find Heaven and Sea arise from Chaos without any intermediate agent. In other words, complete correspondence between the two accounts, the genealogical and the cosmological, cannot be asserted. We have observed contradictions before, though they too were between passages of which either one or both have been rejected by those for whom consistency is an unbreakable law of poetry.²⁰⁵ Even those who may tolerate a certain type of inconsistencies will balk at others which seem more fundamental. We are dealing with problems which rational arguments cannot settle. It is a metarational, almost a metaphysical, question how serious contradictions a critic should allow.

It can, however, be asserted that the cosmological trend is clearly present in Hesiod's construction of the first stages of his divine history. For it is there that Earth, besides producing out of herself Uranus, 'so that he might cover her on every side,' also gives birth to the mountains (*οὐρεα μακρά*) and to Pontus.²⁰⁶ The mountains have neither personality nor progeny; in the genealogical scheme of the *Theogony*

²⁰² Vv. 727ff., 736-739; for the *πείρατα* cf. Friedländer, *loc. cit.*, note 55, 244. The *χάσμα* v. 740. *Χάος* personified and affected by what happens (or might happen, v. 702; cf. Heyne's and Hermann's notes) to Heaven and Earth: vv. 700ff.

²⁰³ Vv. 126f., 131f.

²⁰⁴ See esp. vv. 725f., 744f. The presence of *Νύξ* in and near Tartarus (see also vv. 746ff.) seems of more fundamental importance than the presence of any other entity. In fact, "Ερεβος and *Νύξ* were born together of Chaos (v. 123) and are complementary; where Tartarus is is Night. Night is also where Chaos is (but Chaos at the same time has the *πηγαί* of the elements, Earth, Heaven, etc.; vv. 736ff). Again where Night is some of her children will be—Day, Sleep, and Death. The remainder of her progeny (vv. 211-225 or 232) may be less in need of localization though it is easy to understand that later poets also placed the Furies or *Luctus*, *Curae*, *Morbi*, *Senectus*, *Metus*, *Fames*, *Egestas* in Tartarus (see, e.g., Vergil, *Aen.* 6.274; cf. Cicero, *De nat. deor.* 3.44; see Ed. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* [Leipzig and Berlin, 1926].213). Highbarger, *op. cit.*, note 198, 73, discusses the passages in Vergil without reference to Hesiod).

²⁰⁵ See above, pp. 36f.

²⁰⁶ Vv. 127, 129, 131f. Cf. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion* 74, 148, 185.

they have no function. But from the cosmological point of view we can understand the thought that Earth created out of herself both Sea and Mountains, which cover a good part of her surface. In contrast to the Mountains, Pontus has a very important place in Hesiod's theological system, for although Pontus is merely the sea and has no personality either in Hesiod or probably anywhere else in Greek religion,²⁰⁷ here he is made the father of Nereus, Phorkys, Thaumas, Keto (?), and Eurybie,²⁰⁸ and thus is the ancestor of everything divine and mythical that is associated with the sea and water, except the rivers and wells, who form the progeny of Oceanus. One of Pontus' children, Nereus, represents, along with his daughters, every pleasant aspect and mood of the sea that a sailor may experience. Another, Thaumas, begets Iris and the Harpies (Wind-goddesses). A third and a fourth, Phorkys and Keto, head a line of monsters whom Keto, by her name, and Phorkys, perhaps by his character, are ideally qualified to represent.²⁰⁹ The monsters themselves have no connection with the sea or with water, nor is it possible to argue that the Harpies²¹⁰ were to Hesiod's mind very closely related to this element. On the other hand, it is well to note that the rivers and wells are kept outside the sphere and progeny of Pontus, for they belong to Oceanus (we have reason to suspect that the Boeotian poet deliberately restricted the province of Oceanus, but he has left to him these two important groups).²¹¹ Despite these exceptions the progeny of Pontus, as set forth by Hesiod, may be considered an attempt at a *diaeresis* of this element into its various phases and aspects. I use deliberately a word that is familiar to us as a philosophical term for logical divisions, though the resemblance between Hesiod's genealogical differentiations and Plato's logical splittings must not be pressed; for quite apart from the fact that Hesiod allows at least one heterogeneous point of view—his conception of the realm of monsters—to influence his selection of Pontus' descendants and that the experiences of gale and shipwreck are not represented in his stemma of Pontus, his imaginative separation of the various qualities and aspects of the sea is as different from the logical division of a genus into its species or of a Form into other Forms as poetry is from rational thought. Plato has no common denominator for Eunomie, Dike, and Eirene, yet he has one

²⁰⁷ ἡ δὲ καὶ ἀτρυγέτον πέλαγος τέκεν, οἰδματι θῦον, Πόντον . . . (v. 131f).

²⁰⁸ Vv. 233-239.

²⁰⁹ Vv. 240-264, 265-269, 270-336 (see above, p. note 61).

²¹⁰ Ἄρπυιες v. 267; cf. I. Sellschopp, *op. cit.*, note 3, 92.

²¹¹ See above, pp. 14f.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.



You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

This book, out of print for many years, has long been recognized as the standard work on Hesiod's influence on other Athenian poets, particularly Aeschylus.

"The debt of Aeschylus to Hesiod, as well as to Homer and Solon and other poets, has always been realized, though never thoroughly explored; yet only a just appreciation of the debt can enable us to measure the originality of Aeschylus. Solmsen's study is therefore most welcome."

—*American Journal of Philology*

"The book is rich in ideas and its suggestions give a valuable contribution towards a real understanding of the Greek archaic period."

—*Classical Philology*

"Solmsen has attempted . . . to answer two questions: what was original in Hesiod's poems (as distinct from the mass of traditional myth and religious beliefs incorporated in them) and what Solon and Aeschylus derived from him. The author examines the *Prometheia* and the *Eumenides* at length, and he devotes a chapter to Solon. It is an important book."

—*Greece and Rome*

"A wealth of acute observation and insight. . . . There is much of value here for the philologist as well as for the student of religious development. . . . Hesiod emerges from these pages as a religious thinker of impressive stature."

—*Journal of Religion*

The late FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN taught at Cornell University and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Cornell Studies in Classical Philology

CORNELL PAPERBACKS
CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS

ISBN 0-8014-8274-7



9 780801 482748

