

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 7 (1962)

Artikel: The structure and aim of the theogony
Autor: Kirk, G.S.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660747>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 04.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

II

G. S. KIRK

The Structure and Aim of the Theogony

THE STRUCTURE AND AIM OF THE THEOGONY

Clearly the first need is to determine as accurately as possible the extent and structure of the poem; only when that has been done can its original purposes be conjectured. This plunges one at once into the problem of the text, a problem which cannot be avoided and is central to any discussion of the Theogony.

Not even the most conservative of critics now takes the Theogony as we have it, and as it has survived from the first centuries after Christ, to be a unified work. It has obviously suffered major expansions and omissions as well as many minor interpolations. Most of these, and all the large-scale elaborations, probably occurred during the period of rhapsodic transmission, down to the time when written texts of the poem were produced in some numbers between the late 7th or early 6th and the 5th century B.C. Even after that time there was some fluctuation, as can be seen from the ancient quotations, from the papyri, and probably from the 19-line variant on the birth of Athene known to Chrysippus. But there is no reason to suppose that this fluctuation was serious or that it seriously affects the shape of the work as a whole. In many ways the situation resembles that of the Homeric poems, except that the composition of the Theogony was presumably later than that of most parts of the Iliad and probably of the Odyssey too; and that the making of anything like a standard version was also later than with Homer, whose exceptional popularity soon produced the need for an un mutilated Panathenaic text. In the meantime, during the period of predominantly oral transmission which might be approximately and hesitantly defined as from ca. 650 to ca. 525, fluctuations in the text may have been, and probably were, serious. I place the composition of the Theogony not earlier than around 675, on the grounds

that the Iliad cannot safely be brought below the end of the 8th century, with the exception of a few rhapsodic elaborations, and that the Hesiodic poem shows a degree of linguistic development beyond the latest integral stage of the monumental Iliad. Parts of the Theogony, in addition, and most notably the prologue to the Muses, are linguistically akin to the Homeric Hymns, the earliest of which there are reasons for placing around the middle of the 7th century. As for a lower limit for the activity of Hesiod, the Greeks of the classical period, Herodotus for example, took him to be roughly contemporary with Homer. If his work had been substantially later than that of Archilochus, even allowing for the differences between a primarily oral and a primarily literate poet, this reputation would surely have been unthinkable.

It may be doubted, moreover, whether an oral poet who was also an innovator is likely to have flourished much later than the rise of written literature. This anticipates an important question which will also have a bearing on the qualities of the "original" Theogony: *Was* Hesiod a true oral poet? Some critics have recently been inclined to challenge the idea that even Homer was completely oral; they cannot stomach the thought that so long a poem as the Iliad, or so complex a one as the Odyssey, can have been put together in the head, and preserved by memory, entirely without the aid of writing. If these critics are right then *a fortiori* Hesiod, who was probably younger and certainly less spontaneous and less strict with the traditional phraseology than the composers of the Homeric poems, cannot have been a true oral poet either.

None of the arguments for Homer having used the aid of writing in some form seem to have much force. That he might have made a list of headings and themes, as a sort of aide-mémoire, is conceivable though there is nothing particular to suggest it. That he wrote out his verses in the

process of composition is certainly impossible, since all comparative experience shows that this immediately and seriously reduces the strict economy of the oral formular system, an economy which is very marked in the Homeric poems. As for the theory that Homer dictated his poetry to a literate accomplice, this seems to me to be founded largely on a misleading analogy with modern oral poets and also on some not quite accurate generalisations made by Sir Maurice Bowra, A. B. Lord and others on the degree of variation to be expected in oral transmission. If there was an oral dictated text of Homer then that text must have been immediately lost, since the received text strongly suggests that the Homeric poems were open to rhapsodic elaboration over some considerable period. Essentially, as I have already remarked, the desire to associate the composers of the Iliad and Odyssey with writing in some shape or form emanates from incredulity that such long and complex poems can be composed and recited from memory. This incredulity has been strengthened by the much more limited capacities of the South-Slavic *guslars*, who are also capable of *dictating* their songs without too much distortion. But the feelings of habitual literates on the capacities of oral poets are almost entirely valueless by themselves, and the Yugoslav analogy is extremely precarious for three main reasons: that these modern singers are vastly inferior in ability to the Homeric poets, that they are handicapped by an imprecise metrical scheme, and that those who can be studied in detail so far (namely the singers of the Novi Pazar region who feature in the first volume of Parry-Lord, *Serbo-Croatian Heroic Songs*) are not fully creative oral poets like the Homeric *aoidoi* with whom we are concerned, but primarily reproductive oral reciters or rhapsodes.

Even if the Homeric singers were not helped by writing, this does not mean that Hesiod was not so helped. The language of the Theogony, like that of the fragmentary

Catalogue of Women, is Homeric in essence; its vocabulary and phraseology can more often than not be paralleled in the Iliad or Odyssey. The Works and Days, on the other hand, has long been recognized as far less Homeric in diction. Yet even the mythical and genealogical poetry, though closely associated in its linguistic elements with the Ionian epic tradition, clearly belongs to a secondary stage of development. There are few passages of Hesiod which, even apart from their subject-matter, could for long be mistaken for the work of Homer. Many of the Homeric formulas undergo minor variation in Hesiod, sometimes unnecessarily and for the mere sake of variety. New words and formulas are introduced, and the old formulas derived from the Ionian tradition, even when they are not varied, are combined with each other in a clumsy, redundant or colourless manner. There are many stylistic variations in the Theogony, but both as a whole and in its parts the work is vastly inferior in style and language to most of the Iliad and Odyssey. This does not necessarily mean that the oral technique has been adulterated by the aid of writing. The awkwardness, repetitiveness and flaccidity and the futile striving after effect that are to be seen, for instance, in the Typhoeus episode, can be closely paralleled in those parts of the Homeric poems which are most affected by rhapsodic elaboration or supplementation—notably the Doloneia in the Iliad and the Nekyia and the ending of the Odyssey. No good arguments have been produced to show that these parts are written poetry as opposed to oral poetry. Rather they possess the qualities that one expects to find when an oral tradition is moribund, when the “poets” are reciters of other men’s songs rather than singers of their own, when they seek for a specious glitter of originality through exaggerated and affected elaboration of the poetry they have committed to memory. In these circumstances a poet, or rather a rhapsode, will frequently misunderstand the true use and real meaning

of the traditional phraseology, simply because he has learned this by rote rather than assimilated it as a natural poetical language.

The probable conclusion that the Theogony is an oral poem, produced at a time when oral creativeness was on the wane and when the heroic epic was falling into the hands of rhapsodes, is an important if not a surprising one. It immediately suggests that the "original" text of the Theogony has to be understood in a special way. A poem like the Theogony differs in this respect from one like the Iliad. The composer of the monumental Iliad probably made small unconscious changes, improvements perhaps, each time that he recited his work or a part of it. Yet these would be kept to a minimum, and need not in my view have been important in scope or have entailed any alteration in the order of themes. Now the Iliad or the Odyssey are much more formal poems than ever the Theogony was, at least to the extent that their progressive narrative structure exercised a high degree of control over any possible variations. There are many occasions, admittedly, where a description of battle in the Iliad could be expanded or contracted at will without affecting the plot or disturbing the narrative thread; and similes could be left out or reduplicated at the desire of the singer, and no doubt were, according to the exigencies of time and place and the restiveness or absorption of the audience. With a poem like the Theogony, though, the variation could be much greater, since, although it must always have had a definite over-all plan and even some element of progressive action, its narrative content is much more tenuous and could in any case be arranged in a number of possible ways. Catalogues could be added or omitted, shortened or sometimes lengthened; minor figures could be mentioned or not, offspring could be recorded *en passant* without seriously affecting the shape or purpose of the poem. In short the opportunities for digression, variation and elaboration were greater in the

Theogony than in the Iliad. That these opportunities were taken from the beginning is possible even if it is not certain; and this means that there need never have been precisely an "original" Theogony, in the sense of a fixed and ideal exemplar all departures from which were in some sense spurious. Hesiod could have varied the poem very considerably each time that he recited it, and perhaps he did so. Now in relation to poems possessing the particular properties of the Iliad and Odyssey I am growing tired of the dictum that the oral poet never gives the same poem twice; not because it is not literally true, in the unimportant sense that inevitable and unnoticed minor changes of diction will occur, and a line or two will be omitted here or added there, but because it is invariably construed to mean that you will find the same degree of variation in a Homer as you will in a Salih Ugljanin or an Avdo Mededovich. But with a poem like the Theogony the variation from recital to recital may well have been considerable, and there may never have been a moment at which *the* Theogony came into being.

About the status of the singer of this possibly fluctuating Theogony remarkably little is known. He was born and brought up in Ascra, son of a small farmer, and a shepherd until his call by the Muses. Then he became a singer, and later incorporated a quarrel with his brother into one of his songs. Apart from the few oar-strokes to Chalcis he had never left the mainland up to this time. In spite of occasional ancient doubts, based in part upon the apparent inconsistencies between the two main poems and to some extent, perhaps, upon rivalry between the cults of the Heliconian and the Pierian Muses, there is little reason to deny his substantial authorship of the Theogony, Works and Days, and Catalogue of Women. These poems show a great variation in diction and style. The Theogony and Catalogue contained a considerable number of non-Homeric phrases and words, especially abstract nouns, but the proportion is

much higher in *Works and Days*, which also has many Aeolisms and resorts to gnomic sayings and fables quite different in spirit from the Ionian epic. The change in diction and style is largely conditioned by a change in subject. When Hesiod sang of the generations of gods and heroes his language was closely based on the Homeric. When he sang of gift-devouring kings, of Pandora, of homely fables and moralisms, of the economics of the small-holding and the life of the farmer, his language inevitably changed. Where possible the epic *lingua franca* was made to serve; but in many situations in which the traditional poetical vocabulary resisted adaptation it was replaced by new, sparse and often ungainly phrases that were the contribution of Hesiod himself and perhaps of other contemporary poets.

For the Hesiod of the *Theogony*, at least, is unlikely to have been unique of his kind. One can admittedly be too glib with phrases like "the Boeotian school of catalogue-poetry", but the facts remain that the *Catalogue of Ships* in the *Iliad* gave exceptional prominence to the Boeotians and their northern neighbours and may well have originated in the region of Aulis, and that the *Catalogue of Heroines* in the 11th book of the *Odyssey* is substantially a list of Boeotian heroines. The *Catalogue of Ships*, at least, must have been incorporated in its monumental surroundings before the time of Hesiod, and this indicates that Boeotian catalogue-poetry was not his invention. Some other Homeric lists, like those of Nereids and of rivers, might have Boeotian affiliations, but can hardly be used as evidence because of the possibility that they were derived from Hesiod; though personally I am inclined to minimize the direct infiltrations from Hesiod into the text of Homer.

The internal evidence of the Hesiodic poetry itself confirms the suggestion that Hesiod learned from other singers — from a local tradition, perhaps, which may have grown up only a generation or so before his time. So much is

suggested by the range of the subject-matter of the Catalogue combined with its Homeric language. The variety of legends, heroes and heroines certainly exceeds that which a single poet, inventing freely and unaided by earlier poetry on the same subject, could cover. On the other hand the special tradition on which he relied could not have been very old or very firmly established in Boeotia, since it developed no individuality of diction but simply lived on the formular system of the Ionian singers. There is no sign in the fragments of the Catalogue of Women—and I wish that room could have been found in our conversations for a special treatment of this important topic—of a native formular system, let alone of much native dialectal influence, which would be the inevitable result of a strong pre-Homeric local tradition. The possibility cannot be dismissed that Ionian singers had visited the mainland for generations before the creation of the two monumental epics; but in the light of the argument from the Catalogue poetry I should be inclined to conjecture that Hesiod came near the beginning of a Boeotian poetical renaissance, in which the Iliad and Odyssey acted as a tremendous stimulus on a weak native legendary tradition with a genealogical bias. On the other hand there is nothing to suggest that Hesiod was anything but unique in his two most notable achievements—the attempt at a relatively comprehensive codification of divine legends on the one hand, and the application of epic technique to the actualities of daily life on the other.

Hesiod's originality must not blind his critics to his undoubted poetical limitations. These affect not only his use of language but also, it may be conjectured, his powers of construction within a semi-monumental framework. So much may be inferred from a consideration of the present shape of the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. Even when probable accretions have been removed, and due allowance made for possible omissions during transmission, the residue

suggests that the structural plan of each poem was loose and rather undisciplined, being often based on the exploitation of casual associations rather than on a principle of strictly logical development. Such looseness of arrangement may be inferred also from the distortions which the poems later suffered. Their very subjects expose them to the risk of elaboration, as I have already pointed out—much more so than a simple heroic narrative. Yet the amount of disruption and elaboration which the two main Hesiodic poems have undergone, to reduce them to the rather amorphous aggregations which confront us in our texts, presupposes not merely a certain kind of subject but also some original lack of precision in its handling. In addition, as has been seen, there was perhaps a considerable fluctuation in the text from one performance to the next even by Hesiod himself, not to speak of the rhapsodes who rapidly took the poems into their *répertoire*.

Thus even if there was a strictly determinable original version of the *Theogony* it could never be theoretically reconstructed, since the probable structural looseness and discursiveness of the poem make inferences about the detailed shape of its original particularly hazardous. This forms one overwhelming argument against the kind of endeavour undertaken by Jacoby in his edition: for the line between what is so anomalous that it must be due to post-Hesiodic interference, and what might be considered legitimate for a singer like Hesiod working on subjects like Hesiod's, is so tenuous and irregular that in many cases it simply cannot be accurately drawn on the evidence available. The proper course, then, is to isolate what is certainly posterior on the one hand and what is certainly indispensable on the other, and to remain uncommitted about the rest. With this in mind I proceed to consider the different elements of the poem.

A brief initial synopsis of the extant *Theogony* may be useful. First is the prologue to the Muses, describing among

other things Hesiod's first poetical inspiration and announcing the general theme of the poem (lines 1-115). Then comes a cosmogony and the early stages of theogony, beginning with the formation of Gaia, earth, and passing rapidly to the offspring of Gaia and Ouranos, the so-called Titans and the Cyclopes and hundred-handed giants (116-53). There follows the story of the mutilation of Ouranos by Kronos to allow the Titans to be born from Gaia, and the consequent birth of Aphrodite (154-210). The offspring of Night are next described, an allegorical bunch, and then that of Pontos or Sea; Pontos's children's offspring are duly listed, first the names of fifty Nereids, then Iris and the storms as children of Thaumias (211-69), then a long section on the descendants of Phorkys, who with his sister Keto produces the Graiai, the Gorgons (of whom Medusa leads on to a brief digression), and the unpleasant Echidna, who in turn produces other monsters (270-336). After the line of Pontos comes the line of Okeanos, with catalogues of rivers and Oceanids (337-70); next various other Titanic marriages and children and grandchildren are briefly listed, with longer digressions first on Styx and then on Hecate (371-452). There follows the important union of Kronos and Rheia, and the story of how Kronos swallowed his offspring, all except for Zeus who saved the others (453-506). The last Titanic marriage is of Iapetos with the Oceanid Klymene, who bears Atlas, Menoitios, Prometheus and Epimetheus; Prometheus is the subject of a long digression (507-616). The hundred-handed giants, earlier imprisoned by Ouranos or Kronos, are released by Zeus on Gaia's advice, for the children of Kronos are now at war with Kronos and the other Titans. A battle is grandiloquently described, with a digression on Zeus's part in it, but it is the giants who settle the matter and despatch the Titans beneath the earth (617-735). Eighty lines are taken up with a series of supplementary descriptions of Tartaros, including

a second description of Styx; and a further sixty lines with the growth of the monstrous Typhoeus and his suppression by Zeus (736-880). Zeus briefly distributes their prerogatives to the victorious Olympians (881-5). The rest of the poem is rather chaotic: first a list of Zeus's divine consorts (Metis, Themis, Eurynome, Demeter, Mnemosyne, Leto, Hera) with a brief account of the birth of Athene (886-929), then the marriages of two other gods, then some human wives of Zeus, then the marriages of Hephaestus and Dionysus and a bit on Heracles and the race of Circe and Aietes; a sudden couplet bids farewell to the Olympians, to lands, islands and sea (929-64). The Muses are called on to give a list of goddesses with mortal lovers; this lasts from 965 to 1018, and the poem ends abruptly in the middle of a transition to a list of mortal women who had divine lovers (1019-22).

From this extant text of the Theogony three major interpolations may be immediately subtracted on the ground that they break a necessary sequence (necessary, that is, even by the fairly loose standards that have been tentatively ascribed to Hesiod) or are totally inconsistent with their context. They are the variant descriptions of Tartarus in lines 736 to 819, the Typhoeus episode which immediately follows, and the list of goddesses with mortal lovers from 965 to the end.

The descriptions of Tartarus in fact began as early as 720 ff., the statement that the Titans were as far below earth as sky is above it, and 726 ff., the somewhat bizarre additional information that night in three ranks is poured round the neck of Tartarus, and above are the roots of earth and sea. Yet there is nothing necessarily impossible or contradictory in these passages, apart from one or two added verses in the former, and they are immediately followed by a further reference to the general situation of the hundred-handed giants guarding the Titans. We cannot with confidence

abrogate them from Hesiod. Very different is the series of alternative and conflicting descriptions which follows, a series which clearly suggests the exercise of rhapsodic virtuosity on a subject which seems to have been found particularly fascinating during the Greek archaic period. First comes an extension of the roots of sea and earth mentioned at 728 into those of earth, sea, Tartarus and sky, a singularly strange expansion which includes the notion that the roots of Tartarus are above Tartarus. The depths of Tartarus are then envisaged as filled by storms—a much better idea. There too are the halls of Night; but it is perturbing to discover in the lines that follow (746 ff.) that in front of them Atlas takes his stand. The scene has changed without warning from the underworld to the far west. The halls of Night provoke further expansions, on Sleep, Death and Cerberus, leading on to the Styx digression—although Styx's functions have already been described earlier in the poem—and some curious underworld geography. Finally a repetition of 736-9 and the fourfold roots leads back to the Titans, a praiseworthy though somewhat obvious attempt to re-connect this list of expansions and optional doublets with its original starting-point.

Little time need be spent on these Tartarus-expansions, since they are generally agreed to be rhapsodic additions—though I expect to be taken up on this by Professor Solmsen. If there was a line or two among them by Hesiod himself, that does not really affect the issue. General agreement can also be invoked for the Typhoeus episode. It is a strained elaboration of the general theme of the Titanomachy, in which Zeus is given complete prominence on the side of the angels—a prominence which an interpolator, perhaps the same as the Typhoeus-poet, probably tried to restore to the Titanomachy itself at 687 ff. The last eleven lines of the episode are an excursus on the Typhoean origin of stormwinds, which contradicts earlier passages in the poem and

in which Jacoby is probably right in recognizing a secondary stage of elaboration. After this there is a sudden reversion to the subjection of the Titans, as though nothing had intervened. In fact Typhoeus has already been dealt with earlier in the poem, under his alternative form of Typhaon, who is mentioned at 306 as mating with Echidna. Echidna is there described as εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν, a reference to the line in the Iliad (II 783) in which this description is applied to Typhoeus. But this repetition-argument is not inviolable, since linguistic reasons make it possible to suspect the authenticity of parts of the Echidna passage in Hesiod.

Before the expansions on Tartarus and Typhoeus Zeus was left assigning prerogatives and rewards to his helpers. It is conceivable that a list of his divine wives might have been related to this activity by Hesiod himself, though in any event a considerable lacuna must be envisaged. The mortal wives of 938 ff. are much less relevant, and seem to be appended by free association; so are the verses which follow, and which veer from god to hero to god with vertiginous and inconsequent speed. The farewell couplet to gods and islands, 963-4, is a curiosity which at least pays lip-service to the theme indicated in the prologue. The list of goddesses with mortal lovers that follows is absolutely irrelevant to that theme, and Pausanias (I 3) evidently found lines 984-91 in a text not of the Theogony but of the Catalogue of Women. This presents certain difficulties; but the list of women with divine lovers to which the end of the poem turns must come, as antiquity judged, from that source. Thus 965 to the end are almost certainly added, perhaps to a large extent from other Hesiodic poetry, and much of 886 to 964 falls under suspicion too.

These major elaborations have been distinguished by their structural inadequacy, but they are also sometimes recognizable by their language and style. If one adopts the practice of going through the poem and underlining Homeric

formulas, or minor adaptations of them, with one sort of mark, phrases found not in Homer but in the Homeric Hymns with another, and words and phrases strange to the whole Homeric tradition and unparalleled elsewhere in Hesiod with a third, remarkably interesting results will follow. The prologue, as one would expect, is seen to have an unusually high proportion of expressions found in the Hymns as well as many phrases from the Iliad and Odyssey. The parts of the poem that can with the greatest probability be assigned to Hesiod, like the cosmogony and the earliest part of the genealogy of gods, including the story of the castration of Ouranos, contain a high proportion of Homeric phraseology and a low proportion of non-Homeric; but with the Tartarus and Typhoeus passages the proportions are more equal. The list of Zeus's divine wives, at least down to 923, is fairly traditional, but the language deteriorates both in formular quality and in fluidity in the muddle that follows. Differences in subject naturally have their effect; the Iliad and Odyssey do not, except in isolated and untypical cases, deal with Tartarus or with giants, and it is natural that the language used to describe these things in the Theogony should differ at some points from that used for more traditional subjects. The traditional language simply will not cover some aspects of the new subject, though on reflexion these aspects will appear fewer than one might at first think. Yet the difference of subject does not by any means account for all the untraditional qualities of the great expansions; and in particular it does not account at all for the unperceptive *distortions* of established Homeric formulas. The gross misuse or misunderstanding of well-known traditional phrases immediately points, for me, to later elaboration and to a period when the creative oral tradition had passed or was passing away, when the true use of the oral poet's main tools, the treasury of available phrase-units, was no longer understood, and when the itch

for elaboration and the sterile passion for going one better than the familiar phrase were submerging the conservative virtues of the true oral singer. This kind of distortion may be termed not so much untraditional as anti-traditional, and wherever it occurs in the Theogony in unusual density we should consider the probability of post-Hesiodic expansion. Certainly it is typical of palpable elaborations of Homer. The critical value of this kind of phenomenon is admittedly less clearly defined in Hesiod, since he himself belonged in all probability to a later stage of the epic tradition than the Homeric singers. He was therefore liable not only to use some untraditional language, particularly in the description of newly-developed subjects, but also on occasion to carry the permissible re-adaptation of traditional phrases too far, to the point of absurdity and active incompatibility with the tradition. Yet it has been argued earlier that Hesiod was still an oral poet; and unlike most rhapsodes he was certainly a creative one—that is, he was continually making fresh verses and developing new themes, though normally on the basis of the inherited oral equipment. This being so I do not believe it likely that he would have overthrown the tradition so readily as a professional reciter. Certainly there are large tracts of the Theogony where the language is straightforward if not fluent, and where the rhapsodic kind of exaggeration and straining for effect is entirely absent.

Let me now give some examples, which will be stated, to save time, rather dogmatically. Untraditional language of a harmless sort can be simply illustrated from the prologue. The Muses are described at line 55 as *λησμοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων*. None of these abstracts occurs in Homer, the Hymns or elsewhere in Hesiod, and the line is untraditional. A more revealing case is the phrase *γελᾷ δέ τε δώματα πατρός* in 40: the two final words are a Homeric formula, but the metaphor *γελᾷ*, constructed with a dative in the form of the Homeric phrase *ὀπι λειριοέσση* in the

next line, is a new elaboration. It is clearly based on Iliad XIX 362, γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθῶν, from a passage which itself belongs relatively late in the oral tradition; the innovation, bold enough when one reflects on it, was the addition of the dative: the halls of father Zeus laugh with the voice of the Muses.

As *anti-traditional* one might instance the unpleasant and unique distension ἔεις in a palpable double recension explaining the name Cyclopes at 145, or the disastrous line which immediately follows it: ἰσχύς δ' ἦδὲ βίη καὶ μηχαναὶ ἦσαν ἐπ' ἔργοις. This represents more than a mere extension of established oral practice. As well as a weak list of nouns, of which the post-Homeric ἰσχύς is to be found only in two equally unsatisfactory and doubtful lines of the Theogony, 823 in the Typhoeus-expansion and 153 discussed below, the verse includes a piece of syntax in ἦσαν ἐπ' ἔργοις which could hardly have been tolerated in Homer or by a true oral poet. Yet the verse is not quite nonsensical. Non-sense is the surest sign of the anti-traditional, so long as there is no probability of textual corruption, and is exemplified a few lines later in the statement at 151-2 that "heads had grown from shoulders *on heavy limbs*", where ἐπέφυκον is an untraditional oddity and ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσιν is an inappropriate elaboration pointlessly based on the Homeric phrase ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσιν.

This example comes in the last part of the introductory description of the hundred-handed giants, and is immediately followed by another abortion, ἰσχύς δ' ἄπλητος κρατέρη μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἶδει. The last words are based none too happily on ἐπὶ εἶδει, twice in the seventeenth book of the Odyssey meaning 'in addition to good looks'; and the structure of the whole line, together with the use of ἰσχύς and the loose ἐπί construction, relate it closely with 146 considered above. Before one concludes that 151-3, and consequently also 672-3, are certainly added, one must recall that 152 recurs as line 149 of

Works and Days, while 148 there is closely related to Theogony 151. The description of the men of the age of bronze presents certain difficulties, however, and I cannot accept this recurrence in Works and Days as a guarantee of Hesiodic authorship for this kind of language. Which passage has been more heavily adapted is hard to say; certainly the *μεγάλη δὲ βίη καὶ χεῖρες ἄαπτοι* of Erga 148, for the fifty heads of Theogony 151, produces an additional clumsiness which may suggest rhapsodic composition.

Turning briefly to the language of the large-scale expansions recognized on structural grounds, for possible confirmation of the inference that inept and contorted diction tends to be post-Hesiodic, we observe in the Tartarus-expansion 733 *περοίχεται*, which is possibly a Dorism, 744 *τοῦτο τέρας*, extremely curious in its present position, 755 the weak and untraditional *φάος πολυδερκὲς ἔχουσα*, 770 the un-Homeric form *νηλειῆς* and the feeble and untraditional phrase *τέχνην δὲ κακὴν ἔχει*, followed in the next line by the bold expression about Cerberus fawning with both ears. Other innovations follow, but for real distortions of the established poetical language one must turn on to the Typhoeus elaboration, in which 823 *οὗ χεῖρες μὲν ἔασιν ἐπ' ἰσχύι ἔργματ' ἔχουσαι*, which is of course incurable by emendation, sinks to the lowest level. In addition the repetition of *κεφαλήσι* with different epithets in 827 and 829 is jejune and ineffective, and there is a higher than usual proportion of untraditional words like 832 *ἀγάρου*, 839 *σκληρόν*, 853 *κόρθυεν* and 860 *αἰδνῆς*. At 861 the phrase *πολλὴ δὲ πελώρη καίετο γαῖα* is an odd extension of *Γαῖα πελώρη* in 159 and 173.

Some of these words and phrases are no more than permissible if sometimes rather unhappy innovations of the kind that occurs from time to time even in those parts of the poem that are most likely to be Hesiodic. In the large-scale elaborations they are more frequent than usual and are sometimes associated with the much more significant *anti-traditional*

features. It must be admitted, though, that the large elaborations are not so obviously tainted by probably post-Hesiodic language as one might expect. Certain other sections of the poem show more marked tendencies of that kind, and to them we may now turn.

The offspring of Night at 211 ff. have surprised some critics, though not all, by their concentration of allegorical qualities (among which the Hesperidai are clearly interpolated), and untraditional words abound, for example ἀλγινόεσσαν, νηλεοποιίνους, Ἀμφιλογίας, συνήθεας. The use in 220 of ἐφέπουσιν = 'punish' is not merely untraditional but anti-traditional, while 222 δώωσι κακὴν ὄπιν, 'give the evil eye', is a drastic elaboration of the θεῶν ὄπιν that can be observed or disregarded according to rare passages in Homer and other poems of Hesiod. The offspring of Pontos, on the other hand, are not so prodigious in language as they are in shape. Only the excursus on Echidna is anomalous, with its tasteless accumulating of epithets (for example 320 δεινὴν τε μεγάλην τε ποδώκεά τε κρατερὴν τε, also 300, 305, 307, 312 and the sterile redundancy of 296 and 302), its untraditional οὐ τι φατειόν (310) and ἄπλητον (315), and finally the wonderfully anti-traditional line 332, ἀλλὰ ἐῖς ἐδάμασσε βίης Ἡρακλείης, in which the primarily Iliadic periphrasis βίη Ἡρακλείη is senselessly conflated with the Odyssean periphrasis ἱερὴ ἔς Τηλεμάχοιο. The Hecate-excursus, 411 ff., is as bizarre in expression as it is surprising in content: witness not so much μάλιστα at the end of the sentence in 415, since this is paralleled at Works and Days 642, or the new use of νόμος = 'custom' in 417, since this recurs in fragment 119 of the Catalogue of Women, but μέγਾਲως παραγίγνεται in 429, transitive μεταπρέπει in the next line, 440 γλαυκὴν ... ἐργάζονται meaning 'work the sea', excessively bold in construction and ambiguous in result, ἄγρην = 'commercial gain' in 442, and the purely decorative variation of ἐθέλουσά γε θυμῷ and θυμῷ γ' ἐθέλουσα in 443 and 446. The episode of the birth of Zeus which

follows is much more Homeric in diction; then at 506 ff. comes the long digression on Prometheus. This has not been generally considered as un-Hesiodic, but close attention to the language nevertheless suggests that much of it is added. Signs of remoteness from the living oral tradition multiply from 521 onwards: ἀλυκτοπέδησι is a totally un-Homeric compound, while ποικιλόβουλον instead of traditional ποικιλομήτην breaks the oral rule of economy. μέσσον διὰ κίον' ἐλάσσας in 522 is a meaningless hotch-potch; 530 contains Θηβαγενέος; at 534 ἐρίζετο βουλάς is distinctly odd even apart from the perhaps Doric quantity of βουλάς; ἐκρίνοντο in the next line meaning 'were resolving a dispute', is new, so are 540 δολίγη ἐπὶ τέχνῃ, 541 εὐθετίσας, 544 ἑτεροζήλως, and the use of ἄναξ in πάντων ἀριδείκετ' ἀνάκτων in the previous line. From 545 anomalies sharply decrease. In the first-woman story, part of which recurs in Works and Days, 584 φωνήεσσιν and 589 δόλον αἰπὺν are harmless novelties; more surprising are 585 καλὸν κακὸν and 593 συμφόρος with the genitive, but in general the unusual features are fewer here despite the *sermo obscurissimus* (Jacoby) of 603 ff. and the anti-traditional addition of ἔμμεναι to ἀντιφερίζει in 609-10. The first-woman section may or may not be Hesiodic; but the description of Prometheus bound, his release by Heracles, and the first part of the dispute over sacrifices, all of which last from 521 to 544, are highly dubious, and I feel confident in conjecturing that the Prometheus excursus has suffered considerable rhapsodic elaboration.

The next section is the Titanomachy, of which the first half contains no more than a probable Hesiodic average of untraditional diction. Indeed the parley with the hundred-handed giants at 644 ff. is exceptionally fluent; the difficulties do not begin until 671-3, which is a repetition of the earlier and objectionable description at 150-2 of heads growing from shoulders on heavy limbs. In the next line κατέσταθεν with the dative meaning 'took their stand against' is absolu-

tely unique; 678 *περίαχε*, perhaps a Dorism, and 682 *αίπεια ἰωή* are untraditional and somewhat odd, while the expression *χειρῶν τε βίης θ' ἅμα ἔργον ἔφαινον* in 677 has the true rhapsodic quality or rather lack of quality. There follows the passage in which Zeus takes the leading part in the battle and indeed submerges the Titans in fire; this whole piece is inconsistent with the main idea that the hundred-handed giants are the Olympians' trump-card, and that even Zeus could make no progress before the giants brought their multiple artillery to bear. Odd language, however, is not so noticeable here as might be expected. There are a few new words like 690 *συνωχιδόν*, 691 *ἴκταρ*, 709 *ῥτοβος*, and the conception of *χάος* meaning something like 'air' in 700 is original. Yet there are two strongly anti-traditional phenomena: first *ἔγεντο* in 705 as a new and very curious by-form of *ἐγένετο*, paralleled by *γέντο* in a palpable double recension at 199 and by *γένθ'* in the Perseus and Chrysaor digression at 283, and absolutely opposed to the Homeric tradition in which *γέντο* means 'grasped'; and secondly 710 *κάρτος δ' ἀνεφαίνετο ἔργων*, an unappealing phrase resembling 677 *χειρῶν τε βίης θ' ἅμα ἔργον ἔφαινον*, to which exception was taken above. It is worth noticing how often the words *φαίνειν*, *ἔργον*, *βίη*, *κάρτος*, *κρατερός*, *τέλος* and *χεῖρες* are involved in these new locutions of suspected rhapsodic type. Finally the Titans are despatched below ground; this leads on to the Tartarus expansions, the language of which, like that of the succeeding Typhoeus episode, has already been briefly considered. The language of the miscellaneous remainder does not contain an exceptionally high proportion of anti-traditional elements.

No use has been made in this paper of dialect-forms as a criterion of authorship or date, for the simple reasons that the Theogony is almost entirely Homeric in dialect and that the occasional oddities can hardly ever be assigned to a particular dialect or period with any security whatever. The poem contains no certain non-Homeric Aeolisms and only

a few possible Dorisms, of which virtually the only one which cannot be reduced by easy emendation is the use of short $-\alpha\zeta$ in the accusative plural of first-declension nouns. This occurs in lines 60, 267, 401, 534 and 653, of which only 534 (the release of Prometheus) comes in an otherwise suspected context. The use of dialect, syntax and morphology as effective criteria within the Theogony flourished in the first half of the last century, the most prolific era of Hesiodic studies, and produced little that is particularly cogent. I prefer to rely on the detection of gross departures from the traditional language of epic as a guide to post-Hesiodic composition, especially when such distortions are associated with an unusual concentration of non-Homeric language not found elsewhere in Hesiod and with a context not itself un-Homeric in subject.

This sort of linguistic test is admittedly imprecise for individual phrases, and depends on the accumulation of probabilities. It is nevertheless better than no test at all, provided always that the conclusions reached by it are regarded as probable and not as certain. Consequent inferences about the structure of the poem as a whole are as follows. Apart from the three large-scale elaborations, which leave only the list of Zeus's divine wives as possibly Hesiodic after the end of the Titanomachy, there has probably been post-Hesiodic expansion in the following episodes: the descendants of Night, 211-32; the birth of Echidna and her offspring, 295-332, and possibly the Perseus and Chrysaor passage which immediately precedes; the description of Hecate, a brief mention of whom was probably expanded by the addition of 414-52; the Prometheus excursus, particularly 521-44; some part of the description of the hundred-handed giants in the Titanomachy, from 670; and the inconsistent part played by Zeus in lines 687-712 of the same episode. In addition there has clearly been considerable expansion and reduplication of the Prologue. Opinions have differed about which parts of this are

prior and which posterior, and linguistic criteria are of little or no use here; but Jacoby is probably right in thinking that at least 38-52 and the extraordinary passage in which the Muses are claimed as helpers alike of singers and of kings, 80-103, are rhapsodic expansions. Apart from all these cases there are, of course, a number of one- or two-line interpolations, for example etymological glosses and doublets, most of which are obvious—and are bracketed even by a conservative editor like Mazon—and do not affect the structure and disposition of the poem as a whole.

Assuming that these judgements are correct, what sort of poem remains? There remains a shorter prologue of perhaps seventy lines; a cosmogony and theogony which puts far less emphasis than before on Night, on the offspring of Pontos (especially on the series of monsters), on Hecate and Prometheus; a somewhat abbreviated battle against the Titans, ending with Zeus distributing privileges and powers to his helpers; and then perhaps a list of Zeus's divine consorts. Within the main theogonical section the two matching episodes of the mutilation of Ouranos by Kronos and the tricking of Kronos by Zeus become relatively much more important with the diminution of some of the subsidiary themes and digressions; and the poem that remains is concentrated more markedly than before round the theme of Zeus's gradual emergence to supreme power. The Titans are the last foes to be overcome, in a decisive battle between an old divine order and a new, and their defeat marks the full establishment of Zeus as supreme god.

The next question to ask is how such a nucleus would correspond with the programme announced in the prologue. An initial difficulty is that the prologue itself has suffered expansion, and that it contains not a single version of a programme for the poem that follows but three or four versions, not all of which are likely to be 'original' and give a clue to the Hesiodic extent of the poem. The content of these

versions is as follows: first of all the subject of the Muses' song, as they sing by night around Helicon, might be taken as indicating the subject of the poem (9 ff.)—they sing of Zeus, Hera, Athene, Apollo and Artemis, Poseidon, Themis, Aphrodite, Hebe, Dione, Leto, Iapetos, Kronos, Eos, Helios, Gaia, Okeanos, Nyx and the sacred race of other immortal gods. Ouranos is a notable absentee from this list, and the Dione envisaged here is not the mere Oceanid of the subsequent poem but the mother of Aphrodite as in the fifth book of the *Iliad*; otherwise the subjects range roughly in reverse order from the end of the hypothetical nucleus, assuming that this contains the list of divine wives, to its beginning, though Echidna, Hecate, Styx, Typhoeus and even Prometheus find no mention. Secondly at 33 ff. the Muses bid Hesiod ever to sing of 'the race of eternal blessed ones, but of the Muses themselves first and last.' This at least is more specifically programmatic, and it has been taken to imply, if it belongs to the early form of the poem, that Hesiod's version normally ended with a farewell addressed to the Muses, corresponding with the initial invocation. This farewell does not survive, which may help to confirm that the ending of the received poem is curtailed or mutilated. Thirdly at 44-50, in a probably identifiable expansion-passage, the Muses are said to sing of the race of gods from the beginning, of the children of Gaia and Ouranos, and of the next generation, the Olympians; also of Zeus, and how he is the best and strongest of gods, and again of men and mighty giants. Only men, here, seem irrelevant to the poem that follows, except insofar as they are mentioned in the Prometheus story and a few other minor digressions. Fourthly at 71-7 the Muses are described as singing of Zeus's reign in the sky, of his possession of thunder and the thunderbolt, of his conquest of Kronos and assignment of possessions and honours to the gods. Finally at 104 ff. the Muses are asked to give the power of song to the singer and to glorify (to make him glorify, that

implies) the holy race of gods who come from Ge and Ouranos, and Night, and those whom Pontos reared; and to tell how gods and earth came into being, and rivers and sea and stars and sky; and how there descended from these the gods who are givers of good things—the regular periphrasis in the *Theogony* for Zeus and his coevals—and how they divided up wealth and received their honours and first possessed Olympus. There is no explicit mention of Zeus here, but he is strongly implied as author of the division of divine wealth and honours. Now all these possible forecasts of the poetry that Hesiod learns from the Muses bear a fairly close relation to the subject of the extant poem; but I think it can be said that they have a much more accurate correspondence with the nucleus that remains when identifiable accretions have been removed. The quality they all share in common is their emphasis on the emergence of Zeus as chief god for ever, and on his assignment of privileges and possessions to the other Olympians. There is a marked absence of reference to figures like Hecate and Styx, who form the subjects of digressions in the extant version of the poem; and only the first forecast of all, and then not explicitly, suggests that the plot continued after Zeus's establishment. There are of course many brief incidental references, even in the apparent Hesiodic nucleus, to events which logically follow his assignment of prerogatives, but these are a different matter from the formal list of goddesses whom he fertilized after his power was secure. That list is itself the point of attachment for other lists of divine and heroic marriages, which ultimately lead into a part of the Hesiodic Catalogue; but these are without doubt secondary additions, and only the list of divine consorts has any claim to be part of the *Theogony*. An indication in its favour is that Themis and Mnemosyne, alone of the Titans listed in the presumed nucleus-poem at 133 ff., were omitted in the subsequent list of Titanic marriages at 337 onwards, apparently because they were being reserved

as wives of Zeus. On the other hand it is odd that they should be both Titans and wives of Zeus, since they were a generation older than him and formerly his implacable enemies.

The Hesiodic ending is lost: that is relatively certain. The list of divine wives can be accepted as Hesiodic and as belonging to the Theogony only if it is assumed that a *considerable portion* of the ending disappeared; otherwise there is no way in which they could either be relevant or avoid anti-climax. One considerable element that seems to be missing, or to have been drastically condensed, is the whole description of the assignment by Zeus of divine rights and prerogatives—a *διάταξις* which is repeatedly foreshadowed in the course of the poem but which never explicitly takes place apart from six words in 885. That is not even so much as can be found in the Iliad, where at XV 187 ff. (still part of the Beguilement of Zeus, with its markedly cosmogonical and theogonical emphasis) Poseidon recalls how his share was the sea, Hades's the underworld and Zeus's the sky, with earth and Olympus held in common. This division places less emphasis on Zeus's supremacy than the casual Hesiodic references, either because a different version of the story is being followed or perhaps because Poseidon is deliberately distorting the truth; but at least the division was obviously a crucial stage in the development of Olympian rule, and one which would have formed part of a suitable and expected climax to Hesiod's poem. Once this stage had been described other details of the Olympian system could be filled in. An obvious means to this end would have been the listing of the first sexual unions of Zeus, who now fulfils a sort of secondary Ouranos-rôle by producing such important gods as Apollo, Artemis and Athene, while Hera retaliates by bearing Hephaestus 'without love' (cf. 131).

Little more can be usefully conjectured about the content of the lost ending. In short it probably described the primary division of powers and also accommodated the extant list of

Zeus's divine wives—the triadic form of which, incidentally, accords with an evidently Hesiodic tendency exemplified in the Titanic marriages of 371 ff. But what other parts of the poem have disappeared, if any? The argument of the earlier part of this paper still applies: that the Hesiodic Theogony may always have been patchy, volatile and incomplete. Much indeed is omitted that would have been relevant even to the limited period in the history of the gods that is covered in our poem. More could profitably have been said about the underworld, about Okeanos and Night, about other important cosmological factors like sun and stars (for it is only meteorological phenomena, especially winds, that receive more than the most cursory treatment), or even about famous giants like Otos and Ephialtes, who are entirely omitted though known to the Iliad, or Typhaon. Yet these omissions could be due to accident or personal choice. Quite different is the fragmentary quality of the description of Kronos. Why are we told nothing whatever of his reign, known in the Works and Days as a golden age? And why so pitifully little about his deposition by Zeus? Only the story of Kronos swallowing his children is told in full, and that because it is relevant to the birth of Zeus; the episode fades out with the description of Zeus's release of the Ouranides at 501 ff., as though Kronos were already deposed. If he was we have heard nothing about it, and it seems to be the Titanomachy episode of over a hundred lines later that really describes this deposition. Admittedly the interruption of sequence is very likely caused by the displacement of the whole expanded Prometheus excursus, and Iapetos and his offspring should really come earlier, before the marriage and offspring of Kronos and close to the marriages of Koios, Krios and Hyperion, with whom Iapetos is associated in the original Titan-list at 134. Yet even so there is something missing in the transition from the birth of Zeus to the Titanomachy episode, and in addition the gaining by Zeus of thunder, lightning and

the thunderbolt at the end of the former episode is incompatible with his notable lack of pre-potency in the Hesiodic part of the latter. It might be argued that an analogous incompleteness is seen in the deposition of Ouranos, and certainly we do not know why Ouranos re-imprisoned the Ouranides of 502, if he is signified, rather than Kronos, by the word *πατήρ* here; for there are difficulties in either interpretation. Yet the act of castration, so much more damaging than mere stone-swallowing, by itself accounted for Ouranos's decline, and the un-manning of this essentially un-anthropomorphic figure was presumably followed by a rapid return to his original cosmological essence. Kronos was more completely anthropomorphic and had to be put somewhere when no longer needed. In short, the one notable and easily-detectable omission *within* the poem is concerned with the rule of Kronos, the details of his deposition, and the transition to the Titanomachy.

The basic structure of the Hesiodic poem has now been hypothetically reconstituted as far as this is possible. What are the most conspicuous and characteristic features of this hypothetical original? It is chiefly remarkable, as I think, for its cosmogony, for its preoccupation with the Titans on the one hand and a whole host of monsters on the other, and for its central emphasis on the progressive overthrow of the old gods of nature and the emergence of the fully-anthropomorphic Olympians under their supreme master Zeus.

Among references to gods in Homer one of the few good parallels with the cosmogonical material in Hesiod is the isolated mention of the priority of Okeanos in the *Διὸς ἀπάτη*. Yet Hesiod did not *invent* his cosmogonical subject-matter, not only because it is inherently improbable that he should have done so but also because his account shows the kind of inconsistency and reduplication which results from the conflation of earlier and variant sources. This is especially apparent in the erratic use of Eros and sexual union for the

production of new divine figures, in the uncertain relationship of Tartarus, Erebus and Night, and in the three different accounts, on three distinct mythopoeic levels, of the separation of earth and sky. In fact this separation is a cosmogonical myth widely known in Egypt and the Near East in the second millennium B.C., and there is little doubt that Hesiod's various accounts of it were affected by indirect contact, perhaps through the Mycenaean minority in Ugarit, with these earlier non-Hellenic sources. Not only the story of the mutilation of the sky-god Ouranos by his son Kronos, so as to force the separation of the primeval parents Sky and Earth, but also that of the supplanting of Kronos in his turn by the thunder-and-lightning god Zeus had an eastern origin, and both are too closely related for coincidence to the second-millennium legend known to us through the Hurrian-Hittite Kumarbi-tablet. Thus there is no doubt that even where Hesiod seems most original by comparison with Homer and other Greek sources he was relying in many cases on stories long known and already transposed into a Hellenic form. Whether these had been transmitted by prose story-telling, or whether they had already been taken up by other poets before Hesiod, we cannot say; but the degree of inconsistency in the cosmogonical section of Hesiod, compared with the relative consistency of much of the divine generation later in the poem, may suggest that the formalizing and simplifying effect of oral poetry had not long been at work. It may be noted that the post-Hesiodic Typhoeus-expansion is likewise founded on a story of probably Near-Eastern origin, and shows that Hesiod did not exhaust the material that was to be found in pre-existing legends or try to work them all into a universal synthesis. Nor, it may be assumed, did he leave those that he did use entirely unaltered. So much is strongly suggested by his setting of cosmogony before theogony. In the eastern versions the creation and disposition of the world, notably by the splitting of earth and sea, is achieved by the

gods after the settlement of their own dynastic problems, as for example in the Babylonian Creation-hymn. In the Theogony the situation is reversed: the cosmos is formed before the gods begin their anthropomorphic quarrels, as a necessary setting for them. This is an important and deliberate adjustment, in a rationalistic sense, of the tradition, and one which both foreshadows and facilitates the rational and abstract character of Greek physical thought.

The first truly anthropomorphic gods are the Titans, though even these have certain cosmological associations. Hesiod's twelve Titans are a motley collection, however, who show signs of having been forced into an uneasy symmetry and an unnatural contemporaneity. Themis and Mnemosyne marry into a generation younger than themselves; Okeanos and Tethys are prior to the Titans in the account adumbrated in book fourteen of the *Iliad* and elaborated in an Orphic version mentioned in Plato's *Timaeus* (40 d-e); Atlas is known by Hesiod to hold up the sky, a task which he must presumably have taken on shortly after its separation from earth—he should belong therefore in the generation of his father Iapetos. Here too, then, as in the cosmogony, there seems to have been considerable synthesis and re-arrangement, and some at least of Herodotus's evaluation of Hesiod at II 53 seems to be deserved. How far Hesiod depended on earlier systematization is impossible to say. It may be conjectured, though, that he may well have been responsible for widening the old conflict between the storm god and Kumarbi/Kronos into one between all the older Olympians, together with their chthonian allies, and the whole generation of Titans. Probably it was Hesiod's own choice to make this Titanomachy the final and decisive episode in Zeus's rise to supremacy. At least this does not seem to have been the standard account; for the Typhoeus-interpolator followed the second-millennium myth more closely in making a fast-growing giant the final challenge, whereas in the first book of

the *Iliad* (401 ff.) it is a subsequent mutiny by the Olympians themselves that causes the hundred-handed Briareos to be summoned.

That there was a degree of novelty in the rôle assigned in Hesiod to the hundred-handed giants can be seen from the distinct signs of re-adjustment of the rôle assigned to the Cyclopes. In the majority of the earlier versions the decisive factor in Zeus's acquisition of power must have been his possession of thunder, lightning and the thunderbolt, and not his kindly or cunning persuasion of monstrous allies. In the *Theogony* these weapons are closely associated with the Cyclopes, who bear their names at 139 ff., a passage which describes the birth of the Cyclopes from Gaia in parallel fashion to the birth of the hundred-handed giants a few lines later. Then at 501 ff., after Kronos had vomited up the stone substituted for the infant Zeus, we learn that Zeus released the children of Ouranos whom his (or their) father had bound, and that they in gratitude gave Zeus thunder, lightning and the thunderbolt. Obviously it is the Cyclopes who are meant, and it is they who give to Zeus the weapons symbolized in their own names, weapons with which he is said at 506 to rule over mortals and immortals. Yet in the great crisis of the nucleus-poem, that Titanomachy which probably followed almost directly upon the gift of these weapons, it is the hundred-handed giants who gain the day, and Zeus's weapons seem to have been quite ineffective. They are prominently used only in the Zeus-insertion of 687-712 and the rather similar Typhoeus-addition of 810 ff. The elaborators who inserted these passages were conservative in that they were relying on the standard version of the story, one of which Hesiod shows himself at times to be aware but which he suppressed in favour of a variant of his own choice. One of Hesiod's motives for the adoption of this variant was probably his preoccupation with monsters in general, as demonstrated by the space and prominence devoted even in the

nucleus-poem, so far as we can judge, to the various prodigious offspring of Pontos. There are also signs, however, that he wished to place greater emphasis at this point on the more humane qualities of Zeus and his coevals, rather than on the brute force of rule by thunderbolt. Brute force there has to be, of course, in order to suppress the Titans, representatives here of a coarser age; but this force is exerted not by Zeus himself but by agents who are made to say to him, through Kottos, 'We know that you excel in mind and understanding . . . by your wisdom we came up from darkness' (656 ff.). At least there must have been some specific motive for abandoning, in this crucial part of the poem, the traditional appurtenance of the sky-god, by the violence of which he had always been envisaged as maintaining his power.

Why did Hesiod make his Theogony? This is a question to which some answers have already been implicitly given in the reconstruction of the Hesiodic poem. What can or must be added is necessarily brief. Hesiod clearly had many different aims, some of them perhaps conflicting ones. First and foremost, though, he must have decided to use the stories of the gods, some of them already in poetical form, to construct a brief history of the earlier generations from the very moment when sky and earth first separated down to the firm establishment of Zeus. In this he had some idea of a gradual progress, not only from more abstract cosmogonical figures to more concrete and anthropomorphic ones, but also from cruder and more violent gods to cleverer and more orderly ones. There is almost nothing in the hypothetical Hesiodic original about divine justice, a theme which is fully developed in the Works and Days. Whatever the Hesiodic element in the Prometheus-excursus, its content shows Zeus not as moral but as clever and all-powerful. It is prudence again, rather than justice, that is emphasized in Zeus's dealings with the hundred-handed giants, though there is a certain emphasis on the concept of *quid pro quo*. This episode

seems to have been given a new prominence by Hesiod, who in playing down the probably traditional picture of the thunder-and-lightning god burning up his opponents—a picture duly restored by the rhapsodes—was probably trying to depict a figure who, all-powerful as he was, was also capable of properly ordering the cosmos. The assignment of divine prerogatives and the stabilization of the world of nature were the real climax of Hesiod's poem. These were also the ultimate functions of the storm- or sky-god in the old stories shared by Hellas with her Near-Eastern neighbours. In this respect, then, Hesiod may have been deliberately restoring to Zeus an element of skill and intelligence that had been distorted in the sophisticated Ionian treatment of the gods and may have suffered even in the cruder mainland tradition.

Subsidiary aims may be inferred from the formal battle-piece of the Titanomachy, in a relatively new poetical genre of which the Ionian equivalent is seen in the Theomachy of the Iliad; from the preoccupation with giants and monsters, which perhaps arises from native poetical tastes; and from the use of catalogues—some of which, it should be remembered, could have been greatly expanded by rhapsodes. Finally Hesiod's emphasis on the Muses, his pride in the poet's craft and his reference to his own poetical vocation show that he had a new awareness of himself as a person, as a poet, and as a Boeotian poet. He had too a new conception of the oral singer, one which could not have arisen if the old poetical tradition had not seriously but not totally declined in power and public appeal. That conception found its full expression in a subsequent poem which departed much more completely than the Theogony from the exemplar of the heroic epic. The Works and Days allows many inferences to be made about Hesiod's personality; the Theogony, almost none. Needless to say this has not prevented a great deal of scholarly conjecture. But this is mainly because the Theogony,

although not a great or even a good poem, whatever original shape we may give it, is yet a highly fascinating one. It is a kind of fascinating swamp in which its critics are imperceptibly and relentlessly engulfed—which is why, before I lose all contact with solid ground, I bring my survey to a close.

DISCUSSION

M. von Fritz: It seems to me that one must not start with asking Hesiod for a plan, or with assuming that there are different plans, which then, of course, are found to contradict one another, but I think one must see in what context these things appear. In 11 ff. we must not expect a complete enumeration; it is quite sufficient for the poet to indicate by some examples what in general the Muses were singing. In 36 ff. we do not have a second plan, but the execution of an order given by the Muses, namely to sing about themselves. As to 80 ff., why should a rhapsode who had nothing whatsoever to do with « kings » have added this passage, whereas Hesiod had every reason to talk about « kings »? If these lines are a little clumsy, we can only conclude that Hesiod found the subject difficult.

M. Kirk: I would agree that the inconsistencies between the different parts of the Prologue are not particularly serious. The thing that impressed me is that even if we may believe that a few parts of the Prologue are due to expansion, yet its general programmatic content strongly suggests that in the poem that follows there must be a dramatic concentration on the emergence of Zeus and on his distribution of powers and honours. And I drew the conclusion that this programmatic content does in fact coincide with the kind of nucleus which I have tried to establish by detecting certain probable additions to the latter part of the poem.

M. Verdenius: I would emphasize the fact that the Muses sing two different songs. There is one song they sing on their way from Helicon to Olympus, and there is another song they sing when they are on Olympus. The central subject of the first song is Zeus and everything connected with him. This song is resumed in 68, and the reign of Zeus is mentioned again (71). The subject of the other song is the Theogony in general. If we make this

distinction between the two songs, we get two different subjects and we can dispense with different plans.

M. Kirk: I would entirely agree with this. I feel that this prologue, whether we abstract from it a couple of passages or not, is a fairly loose structure, and so I do not find the local progression of the Muses very significant. What impresses me is that all these possible programmes, as I have called them, do have this common emphasis on Zeus.

M. Waszink: It is curious that the Muses are already singing before they meet Hesiod. Should we not regard this first song as a kind of prelude meant by Hesiod to express the general background of his theme and to be followed by a number of specifications?

M. Verdenius: The fact that they are going from Helicon to Olympus may be explained as an attempt to reconcile the Muses of Helicon and the Muses of Olympus. Their locomotion seems to be the graphic expression of some kind of logical connection. As such it may be compared with the fact that Aphrodite goes to the gods (202). When in 68 the first song is resumed, this is, as you said, a specification, a concentration on the main idea, which was already suggested in the beginning, namely the central position of Zeus in the Olympic family. We could say, then, that after the Muses have inspired him, Hesiod feels able to express more clearly what is his ultimate aim, namely to write a theogony resulting in the reign of Zeus.

M. von Fritz: I am sorry I do not at all agree with this interpretation. The Muses were born, not on Olympus, but a little bit away from it (62). Being real goddesses, they were at once grown up, and went to Olympus (68). So I do not think that there is any march of the Muses from Helicon to Olympus.

M. Verdenius: But what is, in your interpretation, the meaning of τότε?

M. von Fritz: It is the time of their birth. It seems to me more natural that τότε should refer to something immediately preceding than to something many lines back.

M. Verdenius: But the passage describing their birth is followed by a description of the place where they are dwelling (63-67), so that τóτε cannot refer to the immediately preceding words.

M. Solmsen: The parallel of the birth of Aphrodite (202) is, I think, very important and stands in favour of the view of Professor von Fritz. In general, I would hardly use the word «programme» at all for any of the passages here discussed. As far as Hesiod says anything about the contents of his poem, he does it in the most extrinsic terms, just saying that he is dealing with several generations of gods. The only place where he does tell us something more substantial and intrinsic is curiously the one which has not at all the character of a programme, namely the one we have just discussed, 71 ff. This passage gives us the real essence of the poem: Zeus, having overcome his father, reigns and distributes prerogatives among the other gods. An explicit description of these prerogatives was not necessary, except in those cases where Hesiod introduced new deities, such as the Horae (901-3). The τιμαί of most of the deities were familiar.

M. Verdenius: I have been thinking about a possibility of reconciling the parts played by Zeus and by the Hekatoncheires in the battle against the Titans. The fact that Zeus calls the Hekatoncheires for help does not imply that their help will be decisive. When the battle is going on in 686, there is not as yet any decision at all. Then Zeus comes into action, and it is he who makes the battle turn (711). This is the decisive point, but it does not mean that now the battle is over. The Hekatoncheires resume their activity, and it is they who give the finishing stroke.

M. Kirk: I still do find a great difficulty in the fact that 689 ff. is a description of somebody who produces a master-stroke. After this smashing attack we expect the battle to be finished absolutely and instantly. To me this passage has all the signs of an insertion by somebody who could not support the conception that Zeus did not himself play the decisive physical part in the

action. After all, even the most conservative of editors and critics would now agree that there are detectable expansions in the *Theogony*.

M. Verdenius: On the other hand, we should try to keep the number of interpolations as small as possible. If something can be saved, let us save it.

M. Kirk: Certainly, I agree.

M. Solmsen: Wilamowitz said that if you cut out Zeus from the Titanomachy, much of the substance of Hesiod's belief in Zeus and of the whole meaning of the *Theogony* is gone. On the other hand, we should in my opinion not make it a principle to keep as much in the *Theogony* as is possible, but should examine, how much we can keep in it. My personal view is that there has been a good deal of what I should call overpainting here. Zeus played a role in this passage, but we do not read that role in the authentic version of Hesiod. My suspicions arise from the fact that the style and language of the passage are open to objections. For instance, objections have been raised against 697 $\chi\thetaονίους$. Who is the subject in 700 $\epsilonἶσατο$? In 703 $\piίλνατο$ is very suspect. In 705 $\thetaεῶν \acute{\epsilon}ριδι \xiυνιόντων$ is awkward, for the commotion arises from Zeus' own exertions. As for the fact that the roles of Zeus and of the Hekatoncheires are not very well integrated with one another, this seems to me very characteristic of Hesiod. There is a similar lack of integration in the Prometheus section. Here the poet explains (1) a sacrificial custom, (2) the existence of women, (3) the omnipotence and omniscience of Zeus (613-4). To my mind it is a very characteristic feature of Hesiod's technique that different interests and different emphases have not been properly coordinated with one another.

M. von Fritz: At this point the question of the way in which the poem was transmitted might be brought in. I cannot imagine Hesiod to have written down or dictated his work. It must have been taken over by somebody else or perhaps two or three persons in succession until it was written down. Now in contradistinction to Homer, Hesiod has an extremely individual style,

which to other people was not something familiar but something to be learned. This may explain the increasing number of alterations and additions. The beginning was remembered fairly well, but then memory failed more and more. In the proem I think nothing really can be dropped except very minor things. But as the poem proceeds there is an increase of anomalies, repetitions and variants. The passage with which we have been dealing is so far advanced in the poem that it may have suffered from a number of such more or less unconscious and spontaneous alterations. On the other hand, the fact that after 711 the battle goes on may be paralleled by a story in the *Rosengarten*, where the battle is going on for some time, even after Dietrich von Bern has turned the tide.

M. Kirk: I do not think the number of additions and alterations increases so very as markedly the poem goes on. I am also sceptical about the influence of any difficulties of memory. For an ancient rhapsode a poem of the length of the *Theogony* can hardly have been difficult to learn by heart.

M. von Fritz: I still have the impression that in the *Theogony* the text constantly deteriorates, till at the end it just dissolves.

M. Verdenius: There is perhaps some kind of parallel between the *Theogony* and the text of Theognis, where deteriorations and interpolations increase as the poem proceeds. I would not explain that from the point of view of memory, but from the fact that the poem of Theognis, as it proceeds, becomes more and more «catalogic». This is also the case with the *Theogony*: in the beginning the composition is rather close, but gradually it becomes looser and gets the character of a catalogue. This growing dissolution involves a corresponding increase of the possibility and the temptation to insert interpolations.

M. von Fritz: The analogy between Hesiod and Theognis does not seem to me quite conclusive, because the latter's composition is much looser from the very beginning. Hesiod is a very conscientious poet, and therefore the fact that his work is not completed but becomes loose toward its end seems to me

to indicate that for some reason the beginning was better transmitted than what followed.

M. Grimal: Je me demande si l'explication de ce phénomène ne peut pas se trouver dans ce fait que le début de la *Théogonie* traite d'événements qui sont beaucoup plus rares, beaucoup moins connus que la suite qui se rapproche de plus en plus des *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*, des mythes communément admis. Par conséquent, au fur et à mesure que se déroulait la *Théogonie*, la possibilité des interpolations augmentait.

M. Kirk: I suggested in my paper that 687-712 was inserted for the very reason that Hesiod's version of the story conflicted with the common conception of Zeus. Hesiod wished to emphasize, at this stage of Zeus' rise to power, not so much his physical strength and his brute force as symbolized by the thunderbolt, but his intelligence. Zeus actually wins the battle by *reconciling* to himself former enemies who were symbolic themselves of another kind of brute force. If we assume that this was Hesiod's intention, we can also imagine that a transmitter, a rhapsode perhaps, should have felt that this was at odds with the traditional version, and tried to reconcile both versions by inserting a passage in which Zeus uses his traditional weapons.

M. Waszink: But in 71-74, which I am inclined to regard as a kind of programme, there is no reference to Zeus' intelligence.

M. Kirk: His intelligence is emphasized in 656. As to the Prologue, I am very agnostic about it. I think it extremely difficult to say that any one particular part of the Prologue is especially programmatic at the expense of others. But I fully admit that there is nothing in the Prologue to suggest that the intelligence of Zeus was a theme which Hesiod intended to stress.

M. Verdenius: Does the compliment paid to Zeus by Kottos in 656 refer to the fact that he now calls the Hekatoncheires to help, or—as I would explain it—to the fact that formerly he liberated them?

M. Kirk: Are not the two things connected very closely? Is

not this former liberation bound up with the fact that they are now prepared to come to his aid?

M. Verdenius: But I do not think the idea of calling them to help is represented as a sign of his intelligence. The *πραπίδες* of 656 seem to be identical with the *βουλαί* of 653 and the *ἐπιφροσύνη* of 658.

M. Kirk: The fact remain that Hesiod at this point is putting a rather unexpected emphasis on Zeus' wisdom and cleverness.

M. Verdenius: On the other hand, Zeus needed ten years to get the idea of calling the Hekatoncheires to help.

M. von Fritz: This may be simply a means of giving a kind of climax to the battle story. I quite agree with Mr. Kirk that Hesiod made a point of emphasizing Zeus' intelligence, but I do not think this is incompatible with 687 ff. Hesiod did not wish to neglect altogether the other aspect of Zeus. He may have felt that Zeus after all must also do something himself.

M. Grimal: L'idée que la victoire doit être acquise d'une part par des moyens accessoires et d'autre part par une action personnelle, est fréquente. On la trouve notamment dans le cycle troyen, où la victoire dépend des armes d'Héraclès en même temps que l'intervention de Néoptolème. Et je me demande si l'accent qui est mis sur la sagesse de Zeus n'est pas précisément destiné à montrer que cette sagesse consiste dans le fait d'avoir obéi à l'oracle de Gaia, c'est-à-dire de s'être conformé aux destinées. Mais il doit être aussi violent en même temps. C'est pour cela que je serais moins enclin que M. Kirk à voir une contradiction dans ce qui n'est peut-être que le double développement d'une même action.

M. Kirk: I do not want to insist on whether this intervention of Zeus is an interpolation or not, but I still think the important thing is the emphasis laid on Zeus' intelligence in using other aids, which may very well not have been part of the traditional picture.

M. Solmsen: I would also accept both sides of the picture of Zeus as Hesiodic, his intelligence as well as his violence. The

latter aspect is never absent from the *Theogony*. It is significant, for instance, that when the birth of Zeus is related, the poet adds the words τοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ βροντῆς πελεμίζεται εὐρεῖα χθών (458). We should also remember that in the epic a great battle is usually bound up with the ἀριστεία of a great hero. In the Titanomachia Zeus is the obvious person to play that role.

M. Grimal: Je me rappelle que dans la *Bibliothèque* du Pseudo-Apollodore le récit de la guerre des géants présente un caractère assez voisin. C'est que chaque géant doit être tué deux fois, par la force d'Héraclès et par la sagesse du dieu.

M. La Penna: Pour moi, la difficulté principale c'est de lier les v. 711-2 au v. 713. Les mots μάχην δριμεῖαν ἔγειραν ne donnent pas l'impression qu'on a déjà gagné la bataille.

M. Verdenius: L'expression ἐκλίνθη μάχη n'implique pas la victoire, mais seulement le fait que la bataille prend une tournure favorable à Zeus.

M. La Penna: Tout de même, le fait qu'on allume la lutte (ἔγειραν) se conçoit plutôt de la part de ceux qui fuient que de la part de ceux qui sont en train de prendre le dessus. L'interpolateur semble avoir senti que les v. 713-4 présupposent une lutte acharnée, non pas une lutte qui va se résoudre dans peu de temps. Alors il a essayé de remédier à cette anomalie par l'addition de la remarque qu'auparavant le combat était encore dur (711-2), mais la maladresse de cette adjonction saute aux yeux. De plus, le v. 713 ne peut pas suivre immédiatement le v. 686. Par conséquent, il faut penser que toute cette partie remplace une version où, probablement, la position des dieux était beaucoup plus précaire.

M. Kirk: Yes, it is a little strange that immediately after the battle has turned decisively in favour of Zeus' party the hundred-handed giants should start up a particularly savage fight.

M. Verdenius: But the phrase πρὶν ἐμμενέως ἐμάχοντο need not imply that after the ἐκλίνθη the battle did not remain very fierce.

M. Solmsen: It seems to me that Hesiod in 713 takes up the description of the hundred-armed giants just at the point where he left it in 675. In the intervening passage he has described the general commotion, in which due prominence is given to the activity of Zeus.

M. von Fritz: After all, there is not much important action after 712. The Hekatoncheires merely finish them off.

M. La Penna: Mais le poète dit: « ils allumaient la bataille, une bataille acharnée », ce qui est bien autre chose que « ils mettaient fin à la bataille ».

M. Verdenius: Il n'est pas nécessaire de traduire: « ils allumaient la bataille »; on peut aussi traduire: « ils allumaient une bataille ».

M. La Penna: Mais c'est toujours la même bataille.

M. von Fritz: When they see that the enemy does not yet give in, that gives them a new impetus which puts an end to the battle.

M. Waszink: In that case we should not leave a space between 712 and 713, as is done by Rzach.

M. La Penna: Mais les mots πρὶν ἐμμενέως ἐμάχοντο impliquent que la bataille a cessé d'être dure.

M. Verdenius: No, the main point of the sentence, as so often in Greek, is the participle. The ἐμμενέως ἐμάχοντο continues, the only thing which does not continue is the ἀλλήλοις ἐπέχοντες, the equal push from both directions. I think we may conclude that even if the passage represents an attempt to reconcile two different aspects of Zeus, it could be the work of Hesiod himself.

M. Kirk: For the sake of argument I am prepared to accept this conclusion, but I feel by no means certain about it.

M. Verdenius: I should like to pass on to a more general question. You remarked in your lecture that in those passages which are generally admitted to be expansions or interpolations, odd language is not particularly frequent. This is in perfect accord with what we would expect in advance, namely that interpolators would generally avoid unusual expressions and

stick as much as possible to the traditional epic idiom. If this assumption is correct, must not we conclude that odd language is rather an argument *pro* Hesiod than *contra*?

M. Kirk: I think one has to recognise that the rhapsodes varied greatly in ability. The major expansions in Hesiod were added by particularly able rhapsodes. On the other hand the end of the *Odyssey* contains a concentration of very odd language, and it seems generally agreed that this part of the poem is a later expansion. In the period of decline of the oral tradition some poets will have been conservative, and have repeated as far as possible the old language, whereas others were trying to compete against the new types of literature by producing something more exciting, more literary, more rhetorical. They, therefore, were more prepared to innovate, but just because they were not fully familiar with all the oral equipment of fixed phrases the results were often deplorable.

M. Solmsen: The author of the *Aspis* seems to belong to the first class: his work does not show any great peculiarities of language, but also no great originality.

M. von Fritz: I think the first question we have to ask is whether an expression can be Hesiodic, and this can only be decided by an analysis of the text. We cannot start from the character of the transmission, because we do not know anything of the rhapsodes between Hesiod and the writing down of the text.

M. Verdenius: Let us, then, turn to the discussion of some details, for instance the difficulties in the Prometheus passage. The phrase μέσον διὰ κίων' ἐλάσσας (522) was called by Mr. Kirk «a meaningless hotch-potch». Could not we from δεσμοῖς understand δεσμούςς as the object of ἐλάσσας: «putting them through the middle of a column», namely to fasten them? The translation of μέσον by «half-way» (Mazon: «à mi-hauteur») seems to me meaningless in this connection. We should rather assume that Zeus made a hole (in a horizontal direction) through the column.

M. Kirk: It was quite a difficult thing to make holes in columns.

M. Verdenius: For Zeus everything is easy.

M. Waszink: And it was still the time of wooden columns.

M. Solmsen: Aeschylus must have misunderstood the phrase (*Prom.* 65 στέρνων διαμπάξ πασσάλευε).

The phrase δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοισι may be an explanation by a later rhapsode of ἀλυκτοπέδησι. Similarly 564 seems to have been added as an explanation of μελίγησι which was understood as an epithet of human beings. The passage 523-533 is under suspicion, because it is contradicted by 616 δεσμός ἐρύκει. Just as the liberation of Kronos and the Titans was interpolated into the *Erga*, so the liberation of Prometheus got into the *Theogony*. The only difference is that the latter interpolation was incorporated into the archetypus of our mss., whereas the former was rejected and has been preserved only in the papyrus.

M. Verdenius: The use of ἀναξ in 543 reminds me of a line in the *Erga*, where Hesiod addresses his brother as δῖον γένος (299). In both places we have the same kind of sarcastic irony. We might also compare the use of «my dear Sir» addressed to a naughty boy.

M. Kirk: This is an attractive explanation, but the addition of πάντων makes the phrase rather clumsy, and I am not so sure that the clumsiness is part of the irony.

M. La Penna: Il me semble qu'on peut garder le vers 146. En effet, les vers 140-1 et 504-5 suggèrent qu'Hésiode connaissait la tradition selon laquelle les Cyclopes ont travaillé les métaux. En outre, après la description de l'apparence des Cyclopes, on s'attend à ce que soit indiquée leur fonction.

M. Kirk: The thing I find most extraordinary about this line is the language.

M. von Fritz: Could one not understand the verse by just adding in mind αὐτοῖς: «they had strength and skill in their works»?

M. Kirk: Of course, yes, but it still remains a thoroughly

clumsy line. Again, I fail to see any strong suggestion in other passages that the idea of the Cyclopes as metal-workers was known to Hesiod. It is not present in Homer and it seems to appear for the first time in 5th century authors. There is a striking similarity in structure between 146 and 153. This line, just like 152, may also be regarded as a later addition. The couplet 144-5 seems to be another expansion, for it is absolutely superfluous after 143.

M. von Fritz: Wenn man daran denkt, dass für diese Hundertarme eben die Glieder das Wichtigste sind, so scheint mir der Ausdruck ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσιν (152) an dieser Stelle nicht unpassend. Auch die Betonung ihrer Körperkraft in 153 ist eine gute Vorbereitung auf ihre spätere Rolle in der Titanomachie. Dass diese Verse, ebenso wie 146, in der Form weniger schön ausgefallen sind, ist zuzugeben, aber wichtiger scheint mir, dass der Geist, der aus ihnen spricht, ganz hesiodisch ist.

M. La Penna: Que pensez-vous des rapports entre la *Théogonie* et le *Catalogue des femmes*? Si, comme on l'admet généralement, la fin de la *Théogonie* n'est pas authentique, et si, d'autre part, le prélude du *Catalogue des femmes* se rattache étroitement à cette dernière partie de la *Théogonie*, il semble s'ensuivre que nous devons rejeter soit tout le *Catalogue des femmes*, soit le prélude seul. Personnellement, j'inclinerais vers cette seconde hypothèse.

M. Kirk: I find it difficult to use the first words of a proem, or the last words of a poem, as the basis of certain arguments. One has to remember that the beginnings and endings of these epic poems were adapted to make possible various rhapsodic combinations. It is perfectly possible that the *Catalogue of Women* could be given another proem which could be attached to other poems of the Hesiodic type. The proem such as we have it—but I doubt whether it really was the only one—presupposes some kind of a list of Zeus' divine wives, and I think one can make quite a good case that these were an authentic part of the Hesiodic *Theogony*. But this does not mean that we must accept the whole of what comes between 965 and 1021 as Hesiodic.

