

The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*

Robert Mondi

THE DISTINCTION between the synchronic and diachronic analysis of a work of literature is nowhere more relevant than in the explication of Hesiod's *Theogony*. To regard the poem that Hesiod created purely as a synchronic composition—giving no consideration to the separate traditional origins of its various parts and therefore expecting unity and consistency among them—is to invite a difficult choice between unpalatable alternatives when dealing with the text that has come down to us: the commentator must either explain away, often at the expense of great effort and ingenuity, the glaring discrepancies and obscurities in that text in his attempt to preserve its integrity, or delete enough of it so that what remains is synchronically consistent, the work of the 'original Hesiod'. The only other recourse would be to suppose that Hesiod's sense of clarity and narrative logic was either very weak or disturbingly different from our own.

The necessity of making this choice inevitably resulted in a schism between analytic and unitarian schools of Hesiodic criticism, a gulf which has not been narrowed so much as its counterpart in Homeric scholarship by our increased appreciation for the workings of an oral poetic tradition. For the difficulties in the text of the *Theogony*, in both content and expression, are far greater than those in the epics, and the battle over the authenticity of various passages is still being joined.¹

But if we begin by assuming that the *Theogony* we have is substantially the one that Hesiod composed and attempt to analyze its contents diachronically, we can stake out a middle ground in such debate and grant a certain validity to each side: by considering the in-

¹ The degree to which the integrity of the text is still subject to debate can be seen in a recent discussion by F. Solmsen, "The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text," *HSCP* 86 (1982) 1–31: he defends the deletion of the Typhonomachy (820–80), the account of Zeus' swallowing of Metis and the subsequent birth of Athena (886–900), the reference to the freeing of Prometheus by Heracles (526–34), and the essay on marriage with which the Prometheia concludes (602–12); he further expresses grave reservations about the authenticity of most of the catalogue of Leto's progeny and the description of Tartaros.

dependent traditional origins of the poem's several constituent parts, we can retain the unitarians' single monumental author, yet concede at the same time that in its composition the poem is nevertheless essentially the 'Stückwerk' that the analysts supposed. That is, the key to understanding the *Theogony* is to view Hesiod himself as both composer and redactor.² I shall explore here this approach to the poem and then illustrate its value by applying it to the problem of the relationship between Zeus' overthrow of Kronos and the conflict between the Titan and Olympian gods.

I

To understand how and why the *Theogony* was put together as it was, we must first dispel the specter of the 'theogonic tradition' which inevitably arises in any discussion of Hesiod's poem. There is in fact no compelling reason to suppose that some pre-Hesiodic *Theogony* stands behind our poem—not, at least, in the sense of a single Panhellenic scheme uniting the wide range of material that Hesiod has organized and amalgamated.³ On the contrary, the poem poses too many logical dilemmas and the transitions between its separate parts are too clumsy for us to believe that the *Theogony* as it stands is the end result of a long tradition of so systematizing all cosmogony and theogony into a single encyclopedic narrative. We would expect the product of such a tradition to be a narrative that is free from the internal discrepancies and the thematic doubling that characterize the non-traditional reworking and conflating of traditional material.⁴ In

² For a statement of the principles underlying this 'neoanalytic' approach and a bibliography of its application to the Homeric epics, see A. Heubeck, *Die homerische Frage* (Darmstadt 1974) 40–48; Heubeck and G. S. Kirk in *Homer: Tradition and Innovation*, ed. B. C. Fenik (Leiden 1978); and W. Kullmann, *GRBS* 25 (1984) 307–23.

³ For various expressions of Hesiod's innovativeness in creating this theogonic system, see F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca 1949) 11f; P. Mazon, *Hésiode* (Paris 1928) 29; U. von Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I (Berlin 1931) 341–43; G. S. Kirk, "The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*," in *Hésiode et son influence* (Entretiens Hardt 7 [1962]) 70. On Panhellenism as a force in the creation of the monumental epic see G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979) 7–9, and "Hesiod," in *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome* I (New York 1982) 43f.

⁴ The repeated use of the same or similar themes is of course a characteristic feature of oral poetry as well as most other forms of popular literature, and does not in general constitute proof of non-traditional conflation. But it is necessary to distinguish between the episodic multiplication of a theme (e.g., the combat scenes in the *Iliad* or the sea adventures in the *Odyssey*) and the juxtaposing of clearly *alternative* themes. It is this latter type of thematic duplication which I would construe as a sign of the conflation of traditionally independent material. J. T. Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* (Lund 1971) 43, simi-

the *Theogony* we encounter this simplicity and logical consistency on the level of the individual episodes (with one or two exceptions) but not in the overall composite narrative. It therefore seems reasonable to suppose that the tradition behind Hesiod's poem consisted rather of a body of simpler songs, some celebrating the births and characteristics of individual gods (such as those in the corpus of Homeric hymns, or Hesiod's 'hymns' to Hecate, Aphrodite, and Styx) and others narrating specific divine or cosmogonic events, such as the Prometheia, the Titanomachy, and the Typhonomachy.⁵

Hesiod's place in the poetic tradition represented for us by the hymns in the Homeric corpus is beyond doubt. It has been demonstrated repeatedly that the paean to the Muses with which the *Theogony* begins (1–115) is composed of the formal elements characteristic of these hymns.⁶ Moreover, Hesiodic poetry and the hymns share a particular item of poetic vocabulary which likewise suggests a common traditional background: the use of ὕμνος/ὕμνῆν by the composer to refer to his own poetic activity (or to that of his Muses,

larly distinguishes between mutually exclusive "parallel themes" and "progressive intensification." G. S. Kirk (*Presocratic Philosophers* [Cambridge 1957] 25) also sees parts of the *Theogony* as a Hesiodic conflation of older material because of the poem's "occasional irrationality and reduplication of stages." On the "formalizing and simplifying effect" which a long oral tradition would subsequently exert on such a narrative, see Kirk (*supra* n.3) 90, and W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley 1979) 17. Cf. also V. Propp's discussion of the "single axis" in the narrative structure of the Russian fairy tale: *Morphology of the Folktale*² (Austin 1968) 21–23.

⁵ At Xenophanes 21B1.21–22 D.-K. a list of typical songs (although unsuited, according to the poet, to a festive banquet) includes a Titanomachy, a Gigantomachy, and a Centauromachy. On the idea that the *Theogony* is based on a tradition of 'Göttersage', just as the Homeric epics are the final product of a tradition of 'Heroensage', see H. Usener, "Eine Hesiodische Dichtung," *RhM* N.S. 56 (1901) 174–86, esp. 183. K. Ziegler, *Roscher Lex.* 5.1551f s.v. "Theogonien," likewise spoke of "älteren Götterepik, die die Vorstufe der eigentlichen theogonischen Epik darstellt"; for him, however, Hesiod's poem is merely the final product of a long tradition which gradually ("etappenweise") combined these shorter songs in a continually growing complex. The Phaeacian bard Demodokos regales the guests at Alkinoos' board with a burlesque of just such a 'Götterepik' (*Od.* 8.266–366). On the incorporation of abbreviated hymns in the *Theogony* see P. Walcot, "Hesiod's Hymns to the Muses, Aphrodite, Styx, and Hecate," *SymbOslo* 34 (1958) 5–14.

⁶ P. Friedländer, "Das Proömium von Hesiods Theogonie," *Hermes* 49 (1914) 1–16 (reprinted E. Heitsch, *Hesiod* [Darmstadt 1966] 277–94); H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Würzburg 1933) 36–38; R. Böhme, *Das Proömion: Eine Form sakraler Dichtung der Griechen* (Bühl Baden 1937) 8–10, 44–51; W. Minton, "The Proem-Hymn of Hesiod's *Theogony*," *TAPA* 101 (1970) 357–77; and R. Janko, "The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre," *Hermes* 109 (1981) 20–22. On the *Theogony* itself as an expanded hymn see C. Robert, "Zu Hesiods Theogonie," *Mélanges Nicole* (Geneva 1905) 468–70 (Heitsch 158–60); H. Koller, "Das kitharodische Proömion," *Philologus* 100 (1956) 179–82, 198–200; Nagy, "Hesiod" (*supra* n.3) 53–55.

which amounts to the same thing). The exact connotation of these terms in the archaic period and the degree to which they differ, if at all, from the unmarked *ᾠοιδή/ᾠείδειν* is open to debate, but their contextual distribution is suggestive: with the single exception of an obscure instance in the *Odyssey* (8.429), *ῥῦμος/ῥυμνεῖν* is restricted to Hesiod and the hymns; and in fourteen of the sixteen instances of *ῥυμνεῖν* with an expressed direct object, that object is a divine entity—either a specific god or all the gods collectively.⁷ It does not seem unreasonable to conclude that the comparatively late dates at which the particular hymns in our corpus may have been composed are not representative of the antiquity of the genre itself, and that both this corpus and Hesiod's *Theogony* are products of the same tradition of sacral narrative and attributive poetry.⁸

Such songs might well represent the oldest Greek poetic form; they at least appear to be an Indo-European legacy. The earliest Indic poetry consists of a similar body of short songs (customarily called hymns, although the modern connotations of this term are not suggestive of the wide range of tone and subject matter in these texts) including prayers, narratives of divine birth and conflict, aetiology, and speculation on questions ranging from cosmogony to eschatology. The similarities in formal structure and the cognate diction occasionally found in these Greek and Indic poems suggest that they are reflexes of common Indo-European prototypes.⁹ The Indic material was eventually compiled in the collection we know as the *Rig Veda*, a compendium of more than one thousand separate poems arranged in ten books according to putative family of authorship, subject, or date of composition. But the *Theogony* represents a quite different type of composite based on such poems, one that was alien to the early Indic

⁷ The exceptional occurrences of *ῥυμνεῖν* in connection with human topics are *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 190, where the object of the verb is *θεῶν δᾶρ' ἄμβροτα ἦδ' ἀνθρώπων τλημοσύνας* (cf. also 158–61), and *Theog.* 50f, where the verb governs the phrase *ἀνθρώπων τε γένος κρατερῶν τε Γιγάντων*. In both passages the focus is on human-kind in reference to its place in the cosmological scheme.

⁸ H. N. Porter's diachronic analysis of the hexameter had in fact led him to the observation, which he advanced with some reluctance, that the hymns to Apollo and Aphrodite seemed to represent a form of the hexameter more archaic than that of the Homeric epics: "The Early Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 12 (1951) 33–35. See also C. A. Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago 1984) 11f. On Hesiod and the hymnic tradition see W. Minton, "Invocation and Catalogue in Hesiod and Homer," *TAPA* 93 (1962) 188–202; F. Pfister, "Die Hekate-Episode in Hesiods *Theogonie*," *Philologus* 84 (1929) 1–9; Friedländer (*supra* n.6) 5; Mazon (*supra* n.3) 29.

⁹ On Indo-European 'Götterdichtung' see R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1967) 142–94; F. Schröder, "Eine indogermanische Liedform," *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 35 (1954) 183–85 (reprinted R. Schmitt, *Indogermanische Dichtersprache* [Darmstadt 1968] 183–86).

literary tradition, and, I would argue, an innovation in the Greek: Hesiod has arranged this disparate material into a single cosmogonic and theogonic narrative—a divine universal history extending from the origin of the cosmos to the enthroning of the current celestial régime and the establishment of the contemporary social order.

Herein lies not only Hesiod's originality, but also, as more than one commentator has observed, the source of many of the infelicities in his text: "le poète se trouve en présence de traditions contradictoires qu'il s'efforce de concilier: d'où des gaucheries et des obscurités dans son récit."¹⁰ But to say that Hesiod is combining traditions is to say that he is combining traditional songs, for this is the medium in which the ἀοιδός learned, retained, and transmitted traditional material. By 'song' I am not referring to an actuality, the fixed and specific text that the singer composes on any given occasion, but rather to that intangible and undefinable complex of events, themes, and phrases which exists in the singer's mind for each 'piece' in his repertoire, what Nagler has termed the "pre-verbal Gestalt."¹¹ The degree to which such a 'song' was memorized, prepared beforehand, or recomposed during performance obviously must have varied greatly from singer to singer, song to song. To avoid confusion, I shall refer to any one specific composition (oral or written) of such a traditional song as a realization of it.

It seems likely that over the years a singer in this tradition would gradually develop a relatively stable version of his own for many of his songs, a version that might vary little in repeated performances. It is true that this does not appear to be the case in the Serbo-Croatian songs collected by Parry and Lord; but there are two reasons why that particular oral tradition does not provide a useful model for the one I imagine Hesiod to have been working in. The first distinction that needs to be drawn was recognized by Lord himself: the "clearness of outline" of a song depends not only on how often it is performed, but also on its length; a short song "will naturally tend to become more stable the more it is sung."¹² The second distinction, which did not play a significant rôle in the original formulation of the oral theory, is that of function, and its relationship to the fluidity or

¹⁰ Mazon (*supra* n.3) 20; see also H. Schwabl, *RE* Suppl. 12 (1971) 454f s.v. "Hesiodos"; and H. Buse, *Quaestiones Hesiodeae et Orphicae* (Halle 1937) 26, 58f.

¹¹ *Spontaneity and Tradition* (Berkeley 1974) 13–26. B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958) 30f, describes the bard's repertoire as "un arsenal de poèmes, de morceaux, de passages tout faits." Cf. also E. A. Havelock, "The Alphabetization of Homer," in *Communication Arts in the Ancient World*, edd. E. A. Havelock and J. P. Hershbell (New York 1978) 11–14.

¹² A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1960) 100.

fixity of a song. The Finnish *Kalevala* is a narrative compendium based, somewhat as I am supposing the *Theogony* to have been, on one man's amalgamation of a traditional corpus of orally transmitted songs.¹³ Discussing this underlying tradition, P. Kiparsky has concluded that "each individual singer works out his own arrangement of a song, which perhaps at first is relatively fluid, but then crystallizes into a stable form, which changes only gradually over the years as new elements are incorporated here and there and others are dropped"; he attributes this relative stability to the fact that these songs have "strong elements of myth and ritual," rather than being primarily intended for entertainment.¹⁴ Since a body of short songs dealing with myth and/or ritual is precisely what I am supposing to constitute at least part of Hesiod's repertoire prior to his composition of the *Theogony*, I take this to be a much better contemporary model of the tradition behind the *Theogony* than the larger and predominantly secular epic narratives of the south-Slavic tradition.¹⁵

If the episodes of the *Theogony* were in fact pre-existing and self-contained songs to some degree already 'crystalized' in Hesiod's repertoire, then the origin and nature of the poem's 'gaucheries' are understandable. Hesiod, it would seem, did not sufficiently alter (to our literary way of thinking) the content of the songs as he knew and sang them separately to integrate them smoothly into the new and more complex structure of the *Theogony*, a structure for which they were not traditionally intended. As a result, each episode of the *Theogony* generally has an integrity and logic of its own, but lacks these qualities when taken together with other parts of the poem.¹⁶

¹³ Cf. F. P. Magoun, *The Kalevala or Poems of the Kaleva District* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1963) xiii: "It is essentially a conflation and concatenation of a considerable number and variety of traditional songs, narrative, lyric, and magic, sung by unlettered singers . . ." The crucial difference of course between the *Kalevala* and the *Theogony* is that its composer Elias Lönnrot was not, like Hesiod, himself a singer trained in that oral tradition and combining songs from his own repertoire, but a literate and academic collector.

¹⁴ "Oral Poetry: Some Linguistic and Typological Considerations," *Oral Literature and the Formula*, edd. B. A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon (Ann Arbor 1976) 95–104. As C. Watkins points out in his response to Kiparsky's paper (107f), the great virtue of this approach is that it allows the Vedic hymns to be brought into the realm of discourse on oral poetry. On fluidity versus fixity in an oral tradition see also D. G. Miller, *Improvisation, Typology, Culture, and 'The New Orthodoxy'* (Washington 1982) 1–15, and on the larger question of the individual singer's 'prepared version' of a song see R. Finnegan, *Oral Poetry* (Cambridge 1977) 73–87.

¹⁵ I do not necessarily mean to imply that Hesiod did not or could not also sing heroic epic; whether or not such songs also constituted part of his poetic repertoire is not relevant here.

¹⁶ In fact, one strong indication that Hesiod is combining pre-existing individual songs rather than simply composing the narrative of the *Theogony* out of whole cloth is

It might seem reasonable at this point to ask why Hesiod was not more conscientious in harmonizing this material into a fluid and consistent narrative, as was for instance the author of the Apollodoran *Bibliotheca* seven centuries later. Stated in this way, the question suggests its own answer. Hesiod occupies a unique chronological position at the threshold of Greek literacy and lettered composition. His design in creating a unified and systematic theogony may have been original and forward-looking, and he may even have composed with the aid of writing; but his poetic technique is that of the oral tradition in which he was trained. In particular, the episodes of the poem are joined together by the naïve compositional device of simple juxtaposition, a characteristic of which is that the composer's attention is focused solely on the episode or digression with which he is currently involved, with apparently little concern for the harsh and uneven transitions produced by the juxtaposition of these episodes. As Auerbach said of the author of the *Odyssey*, "what he narrates is for the time being the only present, and fills both the stage and the reader's mind completely."¹⁷

Hesiod did adapt his traditional material to suit its new context in one significant way. Like all songs in an oral tradition, the episodes that he wove into the fabric of the *Theogony* were individually capable of being expanded or condensed to any length that fit his needs.¹⁸ The brief narrative of the birth of Aphrodite (188–206), for example, could have been spun out to a much greater length; and among the sons of Iapetos, the stories of Epimetheus, Atlas, and Menoitios—merely alluded to in our text—perhaps could have been the ones elaborated rather than (or in addition to) that of Prometheus, if this had suited Hesiod's thematic plan better.¹⁹ In the *Works*

the occasional retention in his text of a line or passage from the traditional version of a song which is completely at odds with the new thematic purpose to which he is putting it in his *Theogony*. There are compelling examples of this in Hesiod's use (one could almost say abuse) of the Prometheia: see, e.g., F. Wehrli, "Hesiods Prometheus," in *Navicula Chiloniensis* (Leiden 1956) 30–36 (Heitsch [*supra* n.6]) 411–18; Solmsen (*supra* n.3) 48f.

¹⁷ *Mimesis*, tr. W. Trask (Princeton 1953) 4–5. Cf. van Groningen (*supra* n.11) 33; J. A. Notopoulos, "Parataxis in Homer: A New Approach to Homeric Literary Criticism," *TAPA* 80 (1949) 14–16; and C. R. Beye's similar comments on the composition of the *Works and Days*, "The Rhythm of Hesiod's *Works and Days*," *HSCP* 76 (1972) 23–36.

¹⁸ Cf. Lord (*supra* n.12) 102–23.

¹⁹ See F. C. Phillips, "Narrative Compression and the Myths of Prometheus in Hesiod," *CJ* 68 (1973) 289–305, esp. 297f. A comparison of the two Hesiodic versions of the Prometheia provides a good illustration of the extent to which different sections of a song could be condensed or expanded, depending on the immediate purpose to which the song is being put. This process of condensation and juxtaposition is very like that

and *Days*, a poem even more obviously composed by the compression and juxtaposition of a wide variety of disparate traditional material, Hesiod explicitly describes this process (106–08):

εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις, ἕτερόν τοι ἐγὼ λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω,
 εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν,
 ὡς ὁμόθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ' ἄνθρωποι.

The implication of ἐκκορυφώσω is that the *logos* of the Five Ages which takes up the next 92 lines is being told more briefly than it could have been, and presumably would have been, if Hesiod were presenting it as a self-contained composition rather than as a small part of a larger complex.²⁰

Had Hesiod's composite narrative subsequently enjoyed an extended period of oral transmission and development, as had the individual episodes before he combined them, later generations of singers surely would have smoothed over these rough joints and tattered edges, and a more seamless and coherent narrative would have resulted. But the *Theogony* marks the end of an oral tradition rather than a beginning; what happened instead was that the poem became frozen in the form in which Hesiod composed it. This fixing of Hesiod's song need not have entailed writing at first, although it seems less problematic to suppose that it did; in any case, the important point is that, even though the content of the *Theogony* may be largely traditional, we can justifiably employ the literary concepts of 'author' and 'text' when referring to Hesiod and his

employed in *Odyssey* 9, 10, and 12: each book contains three independent sequential episodes, one related at length and two in abbreviated form. There is no reason to doubt that the shortened episodes could likewise have been told at greater length. This paratactic composition has resulted in many of the same sorts of inconsistencies in these books of the *Odyssey* as are found in the *Theogony*, a similarity which led Wilamowitz to categorize both poems as products of sixth-century editorial activity (*Hesiodos Erga* [Berlin 1928] 131). More recent critics have saved the integrity of the *Odyssey* by means of precisely the kind of diachronic analysis of constituent episodes that I am suggesting for the *Theogony*; see especially W. J. Woodhouse, *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford 1930); D. L. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford 1955) and *Folktales in Homer's Odyssey* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1973).

²⁰ In his discussion of this section of the poem, G. S. Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions* (Berkeley 1970) 229, attempts to give a synchronic unity to the two juxtaposed narratives of the Five Ages and the creation of Pandora, with results that he himself admits are infelicitous: "In one respect, however, even Hesiod's arrangement is puzzling: for if Pandora is the first woman . . . and she was created on Zeus's orders as punishment for the theft of fire, then men had no women during the golden age." But the necessity of drawing this absurd conclusion disappears if these two narratives are analyzed as the Hesiodic juxtaposition of diachronically separate myths, as had been done by K. von Fritz, "Pandora, Prometheus, and the Myth of the Ages," *RevRel* 11 (1947) 227–60.

poem, as we cannot when dealing with the anonymous bards who preceded him.²¹

Many of the most frequently discussed incongruities in the *Theogony* appear in a new light once the episodes are analyzed in this way as originally separate songs, rather than solely in the synchronic context of the entire poem. I offer two examples in brief illustration before turning to our main concern, the two narratives of Zeus' rise to the celestial throne. The events related in the Prometheia take place at a time when Zeus is firmly in power and the earth is already inhabited by men. In placing this song within the framework of the *Theogony*, Hesiod was forced to choose between chronological and genealogical priorities. If he followed his customary practice of presenting mythological narratives about the various gods at or near the place in which these gods are first mentioned in the unfolding genealogy, then the Prometheia would appear too early in the history of Zeus' career. On the other hand, if the episode were inserted in its proper chronological place after Zeus' victory over the Titans, it would be far removed from Prometheus' place in the poem's genealogical skeleton. As it turned out, Hesiod made only a minor concession to overall chronological consistency: the birth of Iapetos' children is placed last of all the Titan offspring, so that at least Zeus is already born when Hesiod narrates the Prometheia (although the births of Athena and Hephaistos, who also appear in the Prometheia, have not yet been related); otherwise he surely would have narrated the birth of Kronos' children last, they being the most important. The price paid for thus preserving the genealogical plan is the illogicality of the Prometheia placed before the battle with the Titans; for lines 881–85 leave no doubt that in the traditional Titanomachy it is the victory over the Titan generation which *first* establishes Zeus in power. But this chronological difficulty arises only as the result of the juxtaposition of the Prometheia and the Titanomachy; there would of course be no such problem in separate realizations of the two songs.²²

²¹ Cf. Havelock (*supra* n.11) 18–20. P. Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore 1977) 138–42, argues from a comparison of the Prometheus and Eris passages in the two Hesiodic poems that, with or without writing, Hesiod had created in his *Theogony* what was for him an “unalterable” text. For a hypothetical process by which an orally-composed text might first be ‘fixed’ without writing and only later ‘frozen’ in a written text, see G. Nagy, “An Evolutionary Model for the Text Fixation of Homeric Epos,” in *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. J. M. Foley (Columbus 1981) 390–93. G. S. Kirk, *Homer and the Oral Tradition* (Cambridge 1976) 135f, argues for a direct relationship between monumental composition and “the concept of a fixed text.”

²² Cf. Robert (*supra* n.6) 477f on this “Dilemma zwischen Stemma und Erzählung.” The circumstances surrounding the abbreviated hymn to Styx at *Theog.* 383–403 are

Similarly, it is useless to try to make synchronic sense out of the shifting allegiance of Gaia in the various episodes of the *Theogony*.²³ She is instrumental in the overthrow of Kronos as it is related in the narrative of Zeus' birth (494), and proffers timely advice to Zeus in the Titanomachy (626); yet it is she also who begets the monstrous challenger to Zeus' sovereignty in the Typhonomachy (821). The *Theogony* provides no motivation for this last action, but the version of this event in the *Bibliotheca* makes it an intentional act of vengeance for the slain Giants.²⁴ So her behavior is perfectly consistent and logical within the separate narratives of the overthrow of Kronos, the Titanomachy, and the Typhonomachy so long as these songs are considered independently; it is only when her actions are viewed synchronically in the non-traditional complex of the *Theogony* that those inconsistencies emerge which are so disturbing to the literary critic.

II

The particular problem I wish to address using this approach to Hesiod's text is that of the relationship between the overthrow of Kronos and the Titanomachy. The battle between the Olympians and Titans is explicitly referred to four times in the course of the *Theogony*: in the Titanomachy proper (617–720), in the hymn to Styx (390–92), at the beginning of the Typhonomachy (820), and in a brief epilogue to the Titanomachy which is deferred until after the fall

very similar. The aetiological function of this song was to explain why the gods swear oaths on the Styx. This explanation of necessity involves the narration of the events surrounding the Titanomachy—Zeus' call for assistance, Styx's volunteering of her children, and the granting to Styx of her *τιμῆ* after the Olympian victory. Chronology again yields to genealogy, and the epitome of this song is inserted in the *Theogony* at the point where the children of Styx should appear, despite the fact that in the larger narrative of the overall poem Zeus is in fact not yet even born. Cf. Walcot (*supra* n.5) 12f.

²³ See M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 24, 381. He unnecessarily looks as far as the Mesopotamian Tiamat to illuminate Gaia's behavior. On the other hand, her inconsistent actions have frequently been cited as an argument against the Hesiodic authorship of the Typhonomachy, most recently by Solmsen (*supra* n.1) 12.

²⁴ *Bibl.* 1.6.3. The b scholion to *Il.* 2.783 gives a highly eclectic version in which it is an angry and vengeful Gaia who provokes Hera to conspire with Kronos in producing Typhoeus as a challenger to Zeus. This he does by impregnating two eggs and instructing Hera to bury them in the earth. This is a patent conflation of the tradition of Typhoeus born from a spiteful Gaia with the narrative attested in the hymn to Apollo (332–54) in which Hera herself, in a jealous rage over the birth of Athena, gives birth to the monster through parthenogenesis.

of Typhoeus (881–85). It is remarkable that not only do we never hear of Kronos in any way taking part in this Titanomachy, but once the narrative of his deception by Zeus is broken off so abruptly at line 500, we in fact never hear of him again.²⁵ If Hesiod imagined him to be a combatant in the Titanomachy, why is his rôle never mentioned? Admittedly none of the Titans is mentioned specifically by name in the Titanomachy itself (and traditionally they may not even have had individual names); but Kronos has after all been portrayed as the *θεῶν προτέρω βασιλῆ* (486), and we might expect that at least the leader of the enemy forces would be singled out for mention in the narrative of this conflict, especially since it would be the very conflict in which he was forced from the throne. If, on the other hand, we are to assume that Kronos had somehow already been eliminated by Zeus as a result of the events in lines 453–500 and therefore was not one of the participants in the subsequent theomachy, why was this earlier elimination not made more explicit? In either case the sudden disappearance of Kronos from the narrative is puzzling in the extreme: the elevation of Zeus to the throne previously held by his father is by every critic's reckoning the climactic moment in Hesiod's vision of divine history; yet in the text of his poem it is not at all clear at what point this climactic moment actually occurs.

Previous attempts to resolve the problem posed by this double narrative of Zeus' rise to power illustrate the kinds of arguments employed by the critic who wishes to see the *Theogony* as a synchronic unity and at the same time cast the most favorable light on Hesiod's narrative ability. According to Solmsen, for instance, Hesiod "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."²⁶ An alternative means of forcing synchronic logic on the text is to suppose

²⁵ Kirk (*supra* n.3) 88f is sufficiently disturbed by this to suggest that part of Hesiod's original text has been lost after line 500, a section which would have dealt more explicitly with "the rule of Kronos, the details of his deposition, and the transition to the Titanomachy." Similarly, F. A. Paley, *The Epics of Hesiod* (London 1861) 206f, thought that lines 501–06 were an interpolation designed to fill a lacuna created by the loss of a passage relating the imprisonment of Kronos. There is in fact one more reference to Kronos in the *Theogony*: in the Typhonomachy (851) he is mentioned as dwelling in Tartaros; but this line is merely part of a general and formalized description of the cataclysmic effects of the divine combat on the underworld (*cf. Theog.* 682, 841, *Il.* 15.225, 20.61–65).

²⁶ Solmsen (*supra* n.3) 53. For a similar explanation of this and other such incongruities in the poem as the result of an intentional "Prolepsis" on the part of the poet, see Robert (*supra* n.6) 473–79.

that the Titans are actually rebels against a Zeus already in power: so Paley spoke of the “acts of Zeus in punishing rebels against his authority.”²⁷ But neither Hesiod’s text nor the subsequent Greek literary tradition will support this notion: the Titans are the “former gods” who are now in Tartaros, and the Olympian hierarchy is not in place until after they are deposed as a result of the Titanomachy. If anything, it is Zeus and his allies who are the rebels against established authority.²⁸

This twice-told tale of Zeus’ acquisition of the kingship is just the sort of narrative doubling that we would expect when diachronically independent traditional material is combined in a non-traditional complex. I suggest that we have here the Hesiodic juxtaposition of two previously independent songs representing mutually exclusive traditions. Each presents a different mythological narrative of Zeus’ rise to power, in one case through the patrilinear succession Ouranos→Kronos→Zeus, with never any question about who the leader of the new generation would be (453–500), and in the other case as the result of a general theomachy in which the new gods as a group oust their predecessors and establish Zeus on the celestial throne (617–720).

The first of these two songs, the story of Zeus’ birth and overthrow of Kronos, has the narrative structure and aetiological function of a traditional hymn. As in the hymns to Apollo and Hermes, a preliminary statement of the recognized titles and attributes of Zeus (457f) is followed by the story of his birth and childhood. The details of his transient infancy are clearly designed to provide an aetiological charter for what must have been two sites of cultic importance, Lyktois and Mt Aigaion;²⁹ this is thematically and functionally similar

²⁷ Paley (*supra* n.25) 207; so also Preller/Robert, *GriechMythol* 1.43. The same rationalization was current in later antiquity: cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 150, schol. b *Il.* 15.229.

²⁸ Cf. *Theog.* 424, 486; West (*supra* n.23) 200f, 301. In composing the version of the Titanomachy in 617–720 Hesiod has omitted the beginning of hostilities entirely. But from the abbreviated account of the onset of the war in the hymn to Styx we can infer that it was Zeus who mounted the challenge against an established régime (389–94):

ὡς γὰρ ἐβούλευσε Στύξ ἄφθιτος Ὀκεανίη
 ἤματι τῷ, ὅτε πάντας Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητῆς
 ἀθανάτους ἐκάλεσσε θεοὺς ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον,
 εἶπε δ', ὃς ἂν μετὰ εἰὼ θεῶν Τιτῆσι μάχοιτο,
 μὴ τιν' ἀπορραΐσειν γεράων, τιμὴν δὲ ἕκαστον
 ἐξέμεν ἢν τὸ πάρος γε μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

This is also the implication in Aesch. *PV* 199–213. See West 273.

²⁹ Cf. M. P. Nilsson, *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*² (Lund 1950) 459–69; Solmsen (*supra* n.3) 21f; U. Hölscher, “Anaximander und die Anfänge der Philosophie (II),”

to the explanation offered in the Homeric hymn to Apollo of that god's connection with Delos and Delphi, and the mythological linking of Aphrodite with both Cyprus and Cythera in the Hesiodic hymn to Aphrodite (188–206). Similarly, the concluding lines (498–500) provide an aetiological basis for the cultic significance of a sacred stone at Delphi, an object still believed in Pausanias' day to be the very stone swaddled and substituted for the infant Zeus (Paus. 10.24.6).

I suggest that lines 453–500 constitute the substance of a traditional hymn to Zeus, a song that Hesiod knew and incorporated into the *Theogony* at the genealogically appropriate place, as he did earlier with the hymns to Aphrodite, Hecate, and Styx. That Hesiod was conversant with this hymnic tradition has already been noted; given his awe of Zeus, we should certainly expect him to have had at least one such hymn to this god in his repertoire. Lines 47–49 of the proem suggest that the Muses sing just such a song, in addition to a general theogony (44–46) and a heroic genealogy (50).³⁰ The opening lines of the *Works and Days* are essentially the beginning of a hymn to Zeus in which the preliminary aretalogy has been expanded at the expense of the rest of the hymn (*i.e.*, the narrative portion), in a manner similar to that of the Hecate passage in the *Theogony*.³¹ To cite a parallel instance of this compositional phenomenon, a previously independent hymn to Zeus, “a passage of separate provenance,” was also incorporated into the so-called “rhapsodic” theogony circulated under the name of Orpheus.³²

Hermes 81 (1953) 407. The Callimachean hymn to Zeus (4–53) employs a similar device to account for rival claims to Zeus' birthplace in Arcadia and Crete.

³⁰ Lines 44–50 are essentially a summary of the poem that Hesiod himself is about to sing. This being the case, the fact that lines 47–49 summarize a section of the poem dealing separately with the birth and pre-eminence of Zeus, apart from that of all the other gods (44–46), might be construed as further evidence that Hesiod himself in putting the *Theogony* together appended a separate song about Zeus' birth to his narration of the births of the other gods. It is in all likelihood only accidental that our corpus of Homeric hymns contains only the briefest summary of such a hymn (23). The often-quoted Pindaric scholia at *Nem.* 2.1 attest to Homeridae ἐκ Διὸς προοιμαζόμενοι.

³¹ Cf. M. L. West, *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 136: “He might have made it [the opening of *Op.*] a long hymn by telling of the god's birth (the commonest narrative theme in such hymns), or of how he established his rule in heaven; but that would have meant repeating material from the *Theogony*.” See also W. Nicolai, *Hesiods Erga: Beobachtungen zum Aufbau* (Heidelberg 1964) 13–16; Meyer (*supra* n.6) 38f; Minton (*supra* n.8) 197–200; Janko (*supra* n.6) 22. On the similar expansion of the aretalogy in the hymn to Hecate at the expense of the narrative portion, see Walcot (*supra* n.5) 12f. On the function of this aretalogy in the thematic structure of the *Theogony* see J. S. Clay, “The Hecate of the *Theogony*,” *GRBS* 25 (1984) 27–38.

³² So M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford 1983) 240f. Cf. the ‘hymns’ to Athena, Artemis, and Hestia embedded in lines 7–33 of the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite, on

In its most complete form (which many of the surviving examples do not attain) such a song celebrating the birth and ascension of a specific divinity would contain six structural elements:³³

- (1) Announcement of the subject of the hymn, usually as the direct object of ἀείδειν, ὑμῆιν, or μνάσθαι, and most often the first word of the song.
- (2) Titles and attributes of the god, and/or important cult sites.
- (3) Birth and childhood.
- (4) Ascent to Olympus.
- (5) Assignment of special sphere of influence (τιμή).
- (6) The singer's farewell and request for beneficence, often coupled with a transition to the next part of the performance.

To adapt such a hymn to its new context as part of the larger narrative of the *Theogony*, Hesiod has perforce departed from this traditional form in a number of ways.

First, he obviously had to recast the beginning of the song to effect a transition from the preceding passage, which catalogues the other five children of Kronos and Rhea (453–58):³⁴

Ῥεΐη δὲ δμηθεῖσα Κρόνω τέκε φαίδιμα τέκνα,
Ἰστίην Δήμητρα καὶ Ἥρην χρυσοπέδιλον,
ἴφθιμόν τ' Αἴδην, ὃς ὑπὸ χθονὶ δώματα ναίει
νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, καὶ ἐρίκτυπον Ἐννοσίγαιον,
Ζῆνά τε μητιόεντα, θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
τοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ βροντῆς πελεμίζεται εὐρεῖα χθῶν.

The formal announcement of the god has been suppressed, but otherwise lines 457f differ very little from the characteristic formular opening: a series of titles and epithets of the god in the accusative case, followed by a relative clause further describing some attribute, prerogative, or biographical detail (elements 1 and 2 above).³⁵ The opening lines of the brief Homeric hymn to Zeus (23) provide a characteristic example:

which see H. N. Porter, "Repetition in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite," *AJP* 70 (1949) 252f, and Janko (*supra* n.6) 19.

³³ For various presentations of this scheme, see e.g. Meyer (*supra* n.6) 19–24; Koller (*supra* n.6) 175f; Nagy, "Hesiod" (*supra* n.3) 53f; Janko (*supra* n.6) 9; and L. Lenz, *Der homerische Aphroditehymnus und die Aristie des Aineias in der Ilias* (Bonn 1975) 9–21.

³⁴ Perhaps πρῶτον in 497 indicates that in a more traditional form of this song the 'birth' of the other five gods from Kronos was narrated at this point, and that Hesiod simply omitted it here, to avoid repeating what he had already narrated in 453–56.

³⁵ See Friedländer (*supra* n.6) 5–7, Janko (*supra* n.6) 9–11. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig/Berlin 1923) 168–76, discusses the sacral use of this "Relativstil der Prädikation" in a larger historical context.

Ζῆνα θεῶν τὸν ἄριστον ἀείσομαι ἠδὲ μέγιστον
 εὐρύοπα κρείοντα τελεσφόρον, ὅς τε Θέμιστι
 ἐγκλιδὸν ἔζομένη πυκινούς ὀάρους ὀαρίζει.

Secondly, in adapting the narrative section of the hymn (elements 3–5) to this immediate context, Hesiod has focused attention on just one portion of that narrative through the techniques of expansion and compression described in part I above. The tale of Zeus’ birth and infancy is related in considerable detail (459–91), while the narrative of his ascent to Olympus and assumption of his *τιμή*, which in this case means his defeat of Kronos and succession to the kingship, is told much more briefly in the space of just eight lines: a drastically compressed account of the deception of Kronos and consequent liberation of Zeus’ older siblings (492–97), preceded by an even briefer proleptic reference to the violent transfer of royal *τιμή* from father to son (490f). Hesiod had good reason, which I hope to clarify below, for passing so lightly over what would seem to be the most important part of the hymn’s narrative; but reasonable or not, an unfortunate result of this brevity for the modern reader is that the ruse by which Kronos is tricked into disgorging his children and subsequently deposed has thereby been condensed to the point of hopeless obscurity, although it must have been well known to audiences of Hesiod’s day.³⁶ Finally, for obvious reasons, the standard transitional conclusion (element 6) was not composed for the version of this hymn required by this particular narrative context.³⁷

³⁶ According to Apol. *Bibl.* 1.2.1 Metis gave Kronos a *φάρμακον*; in the Orphic fragments Kronos was made drunk on honey (154 K.), consumed a *δολόεσσαν ἐδωδήν* (148), or reacted to the stone itself as an emetic (80); for Nonnos (41.68–71) it is Rhea who supplies the stone which likewise has an emetic effect. It seems likely that this wide variation in the subsequent mythological sources on the means by which the vomiting was induced can be attributed precisely to Hesiod’s failure to provide any additional details here.

³⁷ As reconstructed, the content of this song would be very similar to that of the Callimachean hymn to Zeus: announcement of the hymn’s subject (1–3), birth and infancy (4–53), rise to the throne (54–66), choice of the patronage of kingship as his *τιμή* (67–89), singer’s farewell and request for blessing (90–95). On the numerous reminiscences of Hesiod in this hymn see H. Reinsch-Werner, *Callimachus Hesiodicus: Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene* (Berlin 1976) 24–73. It is interesting to note that Wilamowitz, though for different reasons, posited the existence of just such a poem describing in detail the overthrow of Kronos and the enthroning of Zeus, “ein vorhomerisches höchst einflussreiches Gedicht, das auch dem Hesiodos in irgendeiner Bearbeitung bekannt gewesen ist”: “Kronos und die Titanen,” *SitzBerl* 1929, 42 (*Kleine Schriften* V.2 157–83); and cf. *Glaube* (*supra* n.3) 338f. I am of course substituting a traditional song in Hesiod’s repertoire for Wilamowitz’s “Bearbeitung.” Under the rubric “The Young God Consolidates his Power,” Sowa (*supra* n.8) 146–53, 283, discusses the very similar agglomeration of themes in the narrative structure of Hesiod’s account of the birth and ascension of Zeus and the narratives

There are some indications of the kind of additional narrative detail that would have been presented in elements 4–5 in a more complete and balanced rendering of this song. In our abbreviated version Zeus is said to have overcome his father by means of both *τέχνη* and *βίη* (495f):

ὄν γόνον ἄψ ἀνέηκε μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης,
νικηθεὶς τέχνησι βίηφι τε παιδὸς ἐοῖο.

Line 496 clearly summarizes a sequence of events which would have been more satisfyingly related in a more extensive realization of this song; in this brief version it is Hesiod's only reference to Zeus' part in the overthrow of Kronos, and for that reason alone we should not join with Heyne, Rzach, and Solmsen in deleting it.³⁸ The *τέχνησι* must refer to the means by which Kronos was tricked into vomiting up his children.³⁹ It seems equally clear that, in the context of line 496, *βίηφι* does not refer to the Titanomachy, but rather to some individual physical encounter between father and son. One form taken by this *βίη* in the popular tradition is attested by Pausanias (5.7.10, 8.2.2): Zeus wrestled Kronos for the throne. There is perhaps a proleptic allusion to an event of this sort a few lines earlier (490f):

ὁ μιν τάχ' ἔμελλε βίη καὶ χερσὶ δαμάσσας
τιμῆς ἐξελάαν, ὁ δ' ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάξειν.

In the one reference in the *Iliad* to the overthrow of Kronos (14.202–04), the transition of power is described similarly as brought about by an individual action on Zeus' part, with no hint of any generational theomachy:

contained in the hymns to Apollo and Hermes. Among the themes she includes are conception and birth in secret to escape the wrath of older gods, prodigious childhood and rapid growth, the performance of a great deed “which confirms his essential nature,” and the assuming of the new god's own prerogatives and his bestowing of others on other gods.

³⁸ See Robert (*supra* n.6) 484–86. The inconsistency between lines 494 and 496 may in any case be only apparent. The statement that Kronos was tricked by the eloquent urging of Gaia (*ἐννεσίησι πολυφραδέεσσι δολωθεὶς*, 494) is much too vague for us to say that it is definitely irreconcilable with the statement that Kronos was overcome by Zeus' cunning and strength (*νικηθεὶς τέχνησι βίηφι τε*, 496). The two lines occur so awkwardly close together because this section of the song is so drastically abbreviated, and Hesiod's main concern at this point is to tell us who was responsible for the fall of Kronos rather than how exactly it came about.

³⁹ Cf. *Hymn. Hom. Ven.* 22f: Ἰστίη, ἣν πρώτην τέκετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης, αὐτὶς δ' ὀπλοτάτην, βουλῇ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο. The statement at *Apol. Bibl.* 1.2.1 that Zeus enlisted the aid of a personified Metis in this enterprise really amounts to the same thing.

οἷ μὲ σφοῖσι δόμοισιν εὐὲ τρέφον ἠδ' ἀτίταλλον,
 δεξάμενοι Ῥείας, ὅτε τε Κρόνον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
 γαίης νέρθε καθεῖσε καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης.

We can get an idea of how the fall of Kronos might have been traditionally described from *Iliad* 8.10–16, where Zeus threatens similar treatment of any god who defies his authority by interfering in the Trojan conflict:

ὄν δ' ἂν ἐγὼν ἀπάνευθε θεῶν ἐθέλοντα νοήσω
 ἐλθόντ' ἢ Τρώεσσιν ἀρηγέμεν ἢ Δαναοῖσι,
 πληγεῖς οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἐλεύσεται Οὐλύμπόνδε·
 ἢ μιν ἐλὼν ρίψω ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα,
 τῆλε μάλ', ἠὲ βάθιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον,
 ἔνθα σιδήρειαί τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδός,
 τόσσον ἔνερθ' Ἀΐδεω ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης.

Zeus' single-handed deposition of his father is mentioned with more detail among the preserved fragments of the Orphic theogonies: he tricks him into an intoxicated sleep induced by honey (fr.148–49, 154 K.), ties him up (58, 154), castrates him (137, 154), and sends him to Tartaros (58). Only then does he turn to confront the Titans *περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς*.⁴⁰

One other passage in the *Theogony* can help us in reconstructing the traditional content of this song. Lines 71–74 of the proem present a brief outline of Zeus' career and manifestation—a further summary, I would argue, of the narrative, summarized in lines 453–500 (if an invocation and farewell were added to 71–74, the result would be very similar to one of the shorter Homeric hymns):

ὁ δ' οὐρανῶ ἐμβασιλεύει,
 αὐτὸς ἔχων βροντὴν ἠδ' αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,
 κάρτει νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον· εὐὲ δὲ ἕκαστα
 ἀθανάτοισι διέταξε νόμους καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμᾶς.

Again, the phrase *κάρτει νικήσας* implies some physical encounter between Kronos and Zeus in addition to the deception, an encounter

⁴⁰ In the Callimachean hymn Zeus likewise comes to power through *ἔργα χειρῶν* (65). The binding of Kronos in Tartaros is mentioned in Aesch. *Eum.* 641 and Eur. *HF* 1317f, 1342. In identical fashion, in Pind. *Pyth.* 2.39–41 Zeus dispatches Ixion by first defeating him with a combination of *δόλος* and *παλάμαι* and then binding him in Tartaros. For a thematic discussion of these two manifestations of *μητις*—the ambush and pinioning of an unsuspecting adversary and the serving of a baneful food or drink, see J.-P. Vernant, “L'union avec Mêtis et la royauté du ciel,” *Mélanges H. Ch. Puech* (Paris 1974) 101–16 (revised in M. Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, *Les ruses de l'intelligence* [Paris 1974] 104–25).

which resulted ultimately in the transfer of power from Kronos to Zeus. But this very brief summary also contains one detail not mentioned in the longer version at 453–500, a reference to what must have been the final event in the traditional hymn: Zeus' assumption of power and distribution of *τιμαί* to the other gods. These events would take the place of element 5 in the standard hymnic form: Zeus' delegation of *τιμαί* is in fact an acknowledgement of his own *τιμή* as the new *θεῶν βασιλεύς*. As we shall see, Hesiod had good reasons for omitting these events also from the longer realization of the hymn at 453–500.

Just as there was no mention of Kronos in the four Hesiodic references to the Titanomachy listed above, so too there is no mention of the Titans in any of these passages relating the passage of power from Kronos to Zeus, nor any mention of Zeus being aided by his siblings in some general theomachy.⁴¹ The implication is that this hypothetical hymn to Zeus preserved in *Theogony* 453–500 and 71–74 reflects a mythological tradition in which Zeus' rise to power came solely as a result of his deception and single-handed deposition of his father.

Our gradually increasing knowledge of early Near Eastern myth and its relationship to the Greek permits us to speak with some confidence about the historical evolution of this particular tradition. Even without the benefit of such knowledge, Wilamowitz had argued persuasively that the only original significance of the god Kronos lay in his mythological relationship to Zeus: Kronos answered a need for the chief god of the Hellenic pantheon to have a father, just as the characterless Rhea furnished him with a mother.⁴² That Kronos subsequently achieved more mythological prominence than Rhea ever did is due to something that Wilamowitz could not suspect, but is now generally accepted—that the three-stage mythological succession Ouranos→Kronos→Zeus owes its essential outline to the assimilation

⁴¹ The language of Gaia's prophecy points also in this direction (463–65):

πέυθετο γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος
οὐνεκά οἱ πέπρωτο ἔῳ ὑπὸ παιδὶ δαμήναι,
καὶ κρατερῶ περ ἔονται, Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὰς.

The fact that the epithets *Kronides* and *Kronion* are applied to Zeus alone in early epic has been taken to indicate that Zeus' siblings are a later development than the pater-
nity of Kronos. See F. G. Welcker, *Griechische Götterlehre* I (Göttingen 1857) 141f; Wilamowitz (*supra* n.37) 48f; West (*supra* n.23) 36.

⁴² Wilamowitz (*supra* n.37) 47. M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* I³ (Munich 1967) 511, characterized Kronos as “mythologisch, nicht kultisch.” See also West (*supra* n.23) 30, Hölscher (*supra* n.29) 406, and Preller/Robert 1.52. The opposing position, that Kronos was a pre-Hellenic divinity of primary importance who was replaced by the Zeus of the invading Indo-Europeans, had been argued by M. Pohlenz, “Kronos und die Titanen,” *NJbb* 37 (1916) 556–63, 590f.

of an element of Hurro-Hittite theogony into the Greek mythological tradition long before Hesiod's time.⁴³ Kronos' most important and distinctive mythological actions, the castration of his father and the swallowing of his children, are due to his early identification with the oriental Kumarbi, whose oral emasculation of his father and consequent gastric pregnancy seem to have provided the inspiration for the grisly and un-Hellenic actions attributed to Kronos.

In sum, the Titanomachy and the hymn to Zeus, as they appear in the *Theogony*, present diachronically independent mythological narratives, and as late as Hesiod's time there was not yet any established tradition for combining them. Perhaps the coexistence of such alternative myths has a regional explanation; in any case, in creating his Panhellenic theogony Hesiod himself has simply placed these two songs in sequential juxtaposition, according to the compositional principles outlined in part I.⁴⁴ Consequently, it is pointless to try to understand or reconcile them synchronically. Hesiod does not mention Kronos in the Titanomachy because traditionally Kronos did not play any outstanding rôle there, just as the Titans did not figure in the alternative tradition, based on the Hellenized Hittite myth, of Zeus' birth and single-handed expulsion of his father. That Hesiod's combination of the two songs is a non-traditional one is indicated not only by the fact that the contents of the two songs are simply juxtaposed in the *Theogony* rather than conflated (as we might expect to have happened during transmission over a longer period of time), but also because when such a conflation does inevitably occur in post-Hesiodic sources, both possibilities inherent in Hesiod's ambiguous narrative are realized: in some cases Zeus first disposes of Kronos separately and then goes on to fight the Titans, in others the outwitted Kronos joins with the Titans in battling Zeus and his newly-liberated siblings.⁴⁵

We may now answer the question raised at the outset about the sudden disappearance of Kronos from the main narrative thread of the *Theogony*. Any self-contained realization of the hymn to Zeus surely would have concluded with an explicit statement of the trans-

⁴³ See West (*supra* n.23) 20f, 28–30; Burkert (*supra* n.4) 18–22; Hölscher (*supra* n.29) 391–93, 404–10; P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff 1966) 1–26.

⁴⁴ C. J. Rowe, "'Archaic Thought' in Hesiod," *JHS* 103 (1983) 124–35, discusses other instances of this uncritical juxtaposition of "multiple approaches" to a subject as a characteristic of Hesiodic thought: "far from looking for 'the best explanation' or 'the most adequate theory', he can leave apparently rival accounts jostling side by side, without registering the slightest embarrassment" (133).

⁴⁵ For the former cf. *Orph. frag.* 58 K.; for the latter, Aesch. *PV* 201–03, *Apol. Bibl.* 1.2.1.

fer of celestial authority after Kronos released his children and was overcome by Zeus. But Hesiod is here faced with the same dilemma as earlier when he inserted the abbreviated narrative about the children of Styx. Any explicit depiction of the transfer of power at this point in the *Theogony* would render a subsequent narrative of an alternative tale of Zeus' rise to power—the Titanomachy—nonsensical. So Hesiod made at least a rudimentary attempt to preserve a degree of narrative flow in his composite *Theogony* by suppressing the end of the first of these two juxtaposed narratives. The outcome of the deception of Kronos—the enthroning of Zeus and the distribution of *τιμαί*—is simply passed over in silence, and Zeus does not explicitly assume the reins of power and redistribute the divine prerogatives until lines 881–85—that is, not until after the second of these two narratives describing how he attained them.

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE
December, 1984