

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



The Text of Hesiod's Theogony and the Hittite Epic of Kumarbi

Author(s): P. Walcot

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 6, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1956), pp. 198-206

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [The Classical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/636913>

Accessed: 25/05/2012 18:30

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE TEXT OF HESIOD'S *THEOGONY* AND THE HITTITE *EPIC OF KUMARBI*¹

HESIOD is among the most difficult Greek poets for problems of text. This is especially true in the case of the *Theogony*. Today we consider an over-scrupulous analysis of the logical consistency of a text a characteristic of nineteenth-century pedantry. Yet such latitude is not always allowed the *Theogony*. It was only twenty-five years ago that there appeared the most ruthless survey of its contents. This was Jacoby's edition of 1930, when only a mutilated remnant of the surviving text was left the original poet; the rest was added by a whole series of subsequent rhapsodes. Hesiod received very much the same treatment four years later from Schwenn. Recently, however, two developments have gone a long way towards the defence of passages excluded by scholars from what they think the authentic text of Hesiod's *Theogony*. Many single lines or groups of verses have been bracketed by the editors of Hesiod, since they reproduce some other part of the poem in a similar or even identical form. The researches of the Dutch scholar Otterlo have now revealed that the fault is rather that of these editors. When they stigmatize the passages with the description of aimless repetition, they fail to appreciate what Otterlo claims as an inherent principle of oral recitation, or literature derived from an oral prototype. Otterlo's term for what would be an essential feature of this literature is ring-composition.² A rhapsode provides a loose unity for his poem by repeating at the conclusion to the sections of the poem the verses which also introduced them. These repetitive verses announce the beginning and then the end of each section. We are wrong if we think that they have only been transferred from their original place in the poem to some later passage because there has been a lack of proper care in the process of transmission. Certainly this repetition is no adequate reason for us to suppose their occurrence a second time in our text spurious.

It has not only been verses repeated in our text which critics would deny Hesiod. They have also rejected complete episodes from the *Theogony*. The battle between Zeus and Typhoeus, for example, represents the most suspect part of a poem, where critics allow little to escape at least some mild censure. The list of scholars who have expelled this passage because they believe it interpolated in the original text is an impressive one. It includes Aly, Mazon, Wilamowitz, Jacoby, Schwenn, Solmsen, and Worms.³ Many of the arguments they have used to buttress this theory are trivial. An initial difficulty has been the presence of Gaea at verse 821 as the mother of Typhoeus. They claim that elsewhere in the poem the goddess is made the ally of Zeus

¹ The author would like to express his sincere thanks for much valuable criticism to Professor T. B. L. Webster of University College, London, who read the article in typescript.

² W. A. A. Otterlo, *De Ringcompositie als Opbouwprincipe in de epische Gedichten van Homerus*.

³ W. Aly, *Hesiods Theogonie*, pp. xvii and

52; P. Mazon, *Hésiode*, pp. 15-16; U. von Wilamowitz, *Hesiodos Erga*, pp. 112 and 131; F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Carmina, Pars 1, Theogonia*, pp. 19-21; F. Schwenn, *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos*, pp. 41-45; F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus*, p. 53 n. 172; and F. Worms, *Hermes*, lxxxii (1953), 29 ff. Cf. M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk, *Mnemosyne*, iv, vi (1953), 279-82.

(thus verses 626 and 884). Yet there is absolutely no evidence why we must assume that she was an enemy of Zeus anywhere in this episode. The choice of this particular goddess as the parent of Typhoeus is obviously conditioned by the pattern already set for her in the poem as the mother of the Cyclopes and Centomani (verses 139 and 147 ff.).

This final triumph of Zeus recalls examples of battles known from the literature of the ancient Near East, where the struggle between a god and a kind of dragon symbolizes the defeat of the old year by the new.¹ In the light of these analogies it does not seem unlikely that an ultimate origin for the battle in the *Theogony* should be sought in ritual combat performed at a new year festival.² This suggests that our episode is really very old. A recognition of its great antiquity is a first step towards the belief that this part of the *Theogony* was in fact composed by Hesiod. The conjecture seemed brilliantly confirmed by a second discovery, which we shall find relevant to our study of the text of Hesiod. This was the identification of a close coincidence between the contents of the *Theogony* and the Hittite *Epic of Kumarbi* and *Song of Ullikummi*.³ The correspondence need hardly surprise us. Parallels can be profitably developed between the epic poetry of the Near East and Homer.⁴ A use of analogy with eastern literature for Hesiod should not be restricted to the *Theogony*. It is probable that a pattern for the basic situation in the *Works and Days* must be located in didactic literature which circulated in the countries of the Near East.⁵ There, however, advice is addressed by a father to his recalcitrant son. The actual existence of a brother, Perses, explains Hesiod's variation on a standard pattern. The degree of coincidence between the *Theogony* and its two related Hittite myths was so marked as to imply a strong possibility of imitation. It seemed reasonable to conclude that they had supplied Hesiod with the idea for the scheme of his poem. Of course it is quite impossible for us to say in what form Hesiod may have known them. The scheme in Hesiod would be represented by his dynasties of the gods, war between Zeus and the Titans, and the last struggle against Typhoeus. This final battle parallels the Storm-god's fight with the stone monster Ullikummi. The Greek poet did not adhere slavishly to his eastern source. The Hittite legend of Kumarbi has four generations of the gods, but Hesiod only the three, Uranus, Cronus, and Zeus. Hesiod, then, was obliged to modify this material in whatever form it was available to him. In this case presumably it would be a concession to beliefs about the Greek gods already popularized by epic poetry.⁶

¹ A list is given by T. H. Gaster, *Thespis*, pp. 140 ff.

² F. Dornseiff, *L'Antiquité Classique*, vi (1937), 254 ff.; F. M. Cornford, *The Unwritten Philosophy*, pp. 104 ff., and *Principium Sapientiae*, pp. 218-20; G. Thomson, *J.H.S.* lxxiii (1953), 77-78; and G. Murray, *J.H.S.* lxxiv (1954), 52-53.

³ Both are translated into English by A. Goetze in J. B. Pritchard's *Ancient Near-Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, pp. 120 ff. The latest edition of the Kumarbi epic is that by P. Meriggi, *Athenaeum*, xxxi (1953), 101 ff., while H. G. Gueterbock treats the other exhaustively in *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, v (1951), 135 ff., and vi (1952), 8 ff. Their relation to Hesiod is dis-

cussed by Dornseiff, op. cit., pp. 246 ff.; R. D. Barnett, *J.H.S.* lxxv (1945), 100-1; Gueterbock, *A.J.A.* lii (1948), 123 ff.; and A. Lesky, *Saeculum*, vi. i. 38 ff.

⁴ C. H. Gordon, *Introduction to Old Testament Times*, pp. 89-99, and *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, xxix (1954), 161-9; F. Dirlmeier, *Rh. Mus.* xcvi (1955), 18-37.

⁵ Dornseiff, *Philologus*, lxxxix (1934), 397 ff. A selection of texts of this type is included in the collection by Pritchard, op. cit., pp. 412 ff.

⁶ Wilamowitz, op. cit., p. 155; W. Schade-walt, *Iliasstudien*, p. 118; and P. Philippson, *Thessalische Mythologie*, pp. 107 ff. Cf. Solmsen, op. cit., pp. 20 ff.

Attempts to justify the Hesiodic composition of the story of Typhoeus by a comparison with the *Song of Ullikummi* have been too optimistic.¹ Gueterbock has identified two essential similarities between the Greek and Hittite stories. Both versions occupy the same general position in the narrative. They represent a last effort to regain a lost throne. In both traditions the decisive battle is fought at Mount Hazzi. This second point of contact has been recovered, however, not from Hesiod, but from the account of the battle preserved for us by Apollodorus, who makes the first clash between Zeus and Typhon occur at that place, the classical Mons Casius. All we learn from Hesiod is that Typhoeus consorted with Echidna, who lived beneath the ground 'among the Arimi' (verse 304). Otherwise there are no similarities between the *Song of Ullikummi* and Hesiod's story of Typhoeus.

Ullikummi was able to defeat the first attack of the Storm-god, Ea, however, using the saw with which Heaven had been originally severed from Earth, 'cut off under the feet of the monster so as to destroy its great power'. The end of the Hittite story is lost, but presumably showed the Storm-god victorious. None of this can be paralleled in Hesiod. The version of the story preserved by Apollodorus is very similar.² According to this account the weapons used by Zeus were thunderbolts at a distance, but a sickle for work at close range. Typhon was pursued by Zeus as far as Mount Casius. The story does not close at this point. The monster was able to get the sickle away from Zeus, and used it to cut through the sinews of the god's hands and feet. These had to be retrieved by Hermes and Aegipan before Zeus could complete the destruction of Typhon. Even then Typhon was also deceived by the Fates, who persuaded him to eat what Apollodorus mysteriously refers to as 'the ephemeral fruits' in the mistaken belief that they would be the source of fresh strength.

Nothing survives from the *Song of Ullikummi* to compare with the end given the story by Apollodorus. Before the discovery of this myth, the loss of his sinews by Zeus in Apollodorus had been compared to an identical situation in another Hittite story, that of the fight between the Storm-god and the dragon Illuyankas.³ In this legend Illuyankas beats the Storm-god, and takes away his heart and eyes. They were only recovered when the Storm-god had produced a son by a mortal woman, who could demand the organs as a dowry for his marriage to the daughter of Illuyankas. We have a second version of the story preserved on the same tablet. Here once again the Storm-god is at first defeated. The dragon and his children were trapped, however, by the goddess Inaras and Hupasiyas. These two gave the god's enemies so much to eat and drink that they were incapable of returning to their lair. It is perhaps not impossible to compare this alternative version of the story of Illuyankas with Apollodorus' enigmatic reference to the ephemeral fruits presented to Typhon by the Fates.

Two parallels to the story of Typhon in Apollodorus have been noted. Neither unfortunately clarifies the issue. In Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* Cadmus tells Typhon that the strings of his lyre were destroyed by Zeus after he had competed in a musical contest against Apollo, and had had the presumption to win (I, verses 486 ff.). He then obtains the sinews of Zeus from the monster as a

¹ Lesky, *Anz. Öst. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1950, pp. 146-7. Cf. U. Hölscher, *Hermes*, lxxxii (1953), 392, n. 2.

² Apollodorus, I. 6. 3.

³ W. Porzig, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, 1930, pp. 379 ff. The myth is translated by Goetze in Pritchard, op. cit., pp. 125-6, and by Gaster, *Thespis*, pp. 325 ff.

replacement. Our second parallel is from Plutarch, who simply states that there was a statue of Horus at Coptus, where the god holds in one hand the genitals of Typhon. Apparently there was also a story current that Hermes had taken away the sinews, this time of Typhon, and used them for strings (*de Is.* 55).

The story of Typhon known to Apollodorus would seem to be a conflation of details otherwise present in the Hittite *Song of Ullikummi* and the two versions of the battle between the Storm-god and the dragon Illuyankas. The idea of a loss of sinews also appears to be present in Plutarch, and then considerably later in Nonnus. Our major difficulty in trying to relate these scattered sources is the great time gap between them. In the case of the Hittite myths and Nonnus this would be as much as 2,000 years. We shall start nevertheless with Nonnus in the fifth century A.D.

What do we know about the sources for Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, which may have some bearing upon our problem of the relation between Hesiod and these Hittite myths? Eissfeldt has argued for Phoenician legend as the basis of books 40-43 of the *Dionysiaca*.¹ In these books Dionysus reaches Tyre, and clashes with Poseidon over their mutual passion for Beroe. The whole of the forty-third book is taken up with the resulting battle between the two gods. According to Eissfeldt this battle belongs to a standard type of contest between heaven and the sea, which he can otherwise illustrate with a text found at Ras Shamra.² This type of contest is known again from the extract of the Phoenician history by Philo of Byblus, quoted by Eusebius.³ In this we are told that Uranus and his ally Demarus attacked Pontus. The assault by Demarus was defeated, while Uranus ended up by being castrated by Cronus. Although Philo himself dates from the first century after Christ, his source was apparently very much older. His authority was a history by a certain Sanchuniathon. This historian would seem to have had access to temple archives. Eusebius also quotes Porphyrius on Sanchuniathon and Philo. From this we learn that Sanchuniathon was a native of Beirut, used a priest named Hierombalus for his information, and submitted his history to the examination of Abibalus, king of Beirut, and his experts. It was possible for Porphyrius to calculate from the Phoenician king-list that all this had taken place before the time of the Trojan war.

The source for Philo's history is undoubtedly very old. Names, similar to those preserved by Philo, occur on the tablets which the French have excavated at Ras Shamra. Critics were then prepared to admit the reality of Sanchuniathon's existence, though few would press for a date before the Trojan war, near the time of Moses, or during the reign of Queen Semiramis, all of which would presumably give Sanchuniathon a *floruit* before the twelfth century. Albright has based his arguments upon the form of the name Sanchuniathon. The American has been consistently lowering his date for Sanchuniathon over the past eighteen years, and his latest published opinion is that he should be placed between 700 and 500 B.C.⁴ On the other hand, Eissfeldt has always felt

¹ O. Eißfeldt, 'Ras Schamra und Sanchuniaton (*Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums IV*), pp. 64, 112 ff., and 128 ff.

² Pritchard, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-1.

³ The best edition of Philo is still C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, iii. 563 ff. There is also a new version with a German translation of the fragments by C. Clemen,

'Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos' (*Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft*, xlii. 3), pp. 16 ff.

⁴ W. F. Albright, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, lxx (1938), 24; *From Stone Age to Christianity*, pp. 240 ff.; *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 69-71.

a considerable sympathy for the early date of Sanchuniathon.¹ He has been hard pressed until recently, however, to support the statements made by Porphyrius about Philo's source, which after all we only know through the third-hand report of Eusebius. Now the matter seems to have been finally settled in favour of an early Sanchuniathon. We have preserved a colophon attached to a poem from Ras Shamra about Baal, where there appears to be indicated exactly the same relation between author, teacher, and patron that Porphyrius claims for Sanchuniathon, Hierombalus, and Abibalus.² Porphyrius knows what is an undoubtedly old colophon. Why then should we not admit that Philo translated into Greek some text very much like those preserved for us at Ras Shamra? Sanchuniathon could very easily then have been alive before the date of the Trojan war.

Only a little of Philo's *History* has been kept for us by Eusebius. In it we find first a short cosmogony, a zoogony, a suggested origin for certain gods, and finally the story of the dynasties in heaven, Eißfeldt's *Uraniden-Geschichte*. Hypsistus and Beruth in the first generation had as their children Uranus and Ge. They in turn gave birth to El-Cronus, Baetylus, Dagon, and Atlas. Ge quarrelled with Uranus over the god's excessive offspring by other marriages. Uranus then attempted to kill their children. He was resisted by Ge, and next Cronus and his scribe Hermes took up arms against Uranus. The preparation of a sickle and spear from iron provided Cronus with a weapon. His allies, aroused by Hermes, were able to drive Uranus from his throne. Cronus gave his father's already pregnant concubine to Dagon as his wife. She bore a child named Demarus. At last, in the thirty-second year of his reign, Cronus ambushed and emasculated Uranus, the blood from whose wound flowed away into the neighbouring springs and streams.

There are obvious parallels between this version by Philo and the Kumarbi myth.³ Philo has four generations of the gods like the Hittite story. Hesiod of course is restricted to three. Cronus is equated with El, a god whom we know from another text at Ras Shamra was identified with Kumarbi. Demarus was conceived by Uranus, but born to Dagon. His birth is not unlike that of the Hittite Storm-god, who was reproduced from the genitals of Anu, but qualifies as a son of Kumarbi. The drops of blood, which fell from the severed organs of Uranus, suggest Hesiod's description in the *Theogony* of the birth of Aphrodite (verses 188 ff.). A ceremony was performed, probably in spring, at the sanctuary of Astarte in Philo's home town of Byblus. The red earth washed down from the mountains into the River Adonis at that season gave its waters the colour of blood. There was a popular belief that this was the blood of Adonis, slain each year by the boar on Mount Lebanon.⁴ Perhaps this was partially the source for the corresponding event in Philo. Other comparisons between Philo and the *Theogony* include the idea of Ge as the ally of Cronus against Uranus, the *harpe* motive, and castration of Uranus.

Our problem with Apollodorus was to explain exactly how versions of the Hittite myths, to which he is clearly indebted for the details of his fight between Zeus and Typhon, were transmitted over such a space of time. The answer

¹ Eissfeld, op. cit., pp. 67-71. Cf. Clemen, op. cit., p. 77.

² Pritchard, op. cit., p. 141. See Eißfeldt, 'Sanchuniaton von Berut und Ilumilku von Ugarit' (*Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des*

Altertums v), pp. 47 ff., 58-59, and 68-69.

³ Gueterbock, *A.J.A.* lii (1948), 133; Hölscher, *Hermes*, lxxxii (1953), 391 ff.

⁴ J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, i. 225.

seems supplied by Philo, who in the first century A.D. translated into Greek a very much older work by a scribe at Beirut. Presumably this is not an isolated example. At the same time Philo also knows his *Theogony*.

So far we have been content with the elucidation of Apollodorus from our Hittite sources. The reverse process should be equally valid. If we have no analogy in Greek tradition for some detail in Apollodorus, it is reasonable to suspect a Hittite source. Apollodorus tells us that after Zeus had been safely reared he took Metis as his accomplice. The goddess gave Cronus a drug, which forced him to throw up first the stone substituted for Zeus, and then the children he had swallowed. Hesiod knows nothing about the part played by Metis. In the *Theogony* Cronus is made to deliver up his children through the guile of Gaea (verse 494). Kumarbi replaced Anu as king of the gods according to Hittite legend. He bit off and swallowed his father's genitals. The result was to impregnate Kumarbi with the River Tigris, Tasmisu, and his own eventual successor, the Storm-god. Anu mocked Kumarbi, who then vomited. It appears, however, that he was left with the Storm-god still very much inside him. The text here is too fragmentary to permit any reliable reconstruction of the Hittite story. Later Anu gives instructions to the Storm-god for his safe birth from inside Kumarbi, who a little afterwards receives something to eat. What this actually was our torn text does not allow us to say. However, in the end the Storm-god appears to have been safely delivered.

The gods produced from the genitals of Anu have been compared to the Erinyes, Giants, and Melian Nymphs in the corresponding story of Uranus told by Hesiod. The mysterious object, presented to Kumarbi for the god to eat, is referred to the stone which Gaea substituted for the infant Zeus. This is the weakest of the parallels which have been suggested between the Greek and Hittite stories.¹ The situations in the two stories are entirely different. At no time is Zeus inside Cronus. The stone is expressly given to Cronus by Gaea to prevent any possibility of this ever taking place. On the other hand, the Storm-god is certainly inside Kumarbi, and the problem here is rather how to get him out. What the sense of the plot requires is something like an abortion, which can release the Storm-god and get him out of Kumarbi. This is exactly what we have related by Apollodorus in the case of Metis. She gives Cronus a drug which removes the stone and the rest of his children. The situation is the same as in the Hittite story. The difficulty for Metis is not to stop Cronus from swallowing more of his children, but to release something already inside his stomach. The source for this incident in Apollodorus has been previously unknown. We have discussed earlier the evidence for a knowledge of the *Song of Ullikummi* by Apollodorus. We now have adequate reason for supposing that he was not unacquainted with its related Kumarbi myth.

The comparison, which has been made between Cronus and the stone, and what is given to Kumarbi to eat, is based upon insufficient evidence. It also gives a wrong sense for the interpretation of the story of Kumarbi. We want Kumarbi to swallow something, and next to bring it up again. We must turn back to the castration of Anu. Then Kumarbi certainly swallows his father's genitals, and spits them out later. Cronus castrates Uranus in the *Theogony*, but merely throws the genitals away (verses 180 ff.). An act of swallowing and then spitting out is told about different generations of the gods in the two stories. The episode is transferred from the generation of Anu and Kumarbi in the

¹ Lesky, *Saeculum*, vi. i. 42.

Hittite myth to the later one of Zeus in the *Theogony*.¹ This suggests the degree of modification which could occur in the details of the stories during the centuries they were transmitted. It also stresses what is of much greater importance for our problem of the text of the *Theogony*. This is the fundamental similarity between the two stories of usurpation in Hesiod. The stories are actually parallel, and their details coincide.² We may revert to the commencement of our study of the text of Hesiod, and revive the terminology of Otterlo. We could then say that these two parallel stories form one large compositional ring, which frames the whole of the first half of the poem after the introduction. In both stories the new king is the youngest son of the monarch who is displaced (verses 137 and 478). Uranus tried to conceal his children in the bowels of the earth (verses 156 ff.). There is a comparable act of suppression in the second story. Cronus, however, preferred his stomach as the place of concealment (verses 459 ff.). Two balanced speeches stand at the climax of the narration of both stories (verses 162-7 and 168-73, and 463-5 and 469 ff.). The two speeches of Uranus and Gaea in the second story are reported indirectly, but retain some of the careful antithesis characteristic of the speeches which formed the basis for the conspiracy against the power of Uranus (cf. verses 463 and 469-70, and 464-5 and 475-6). Both gods, who are in possession of sovereignty, are overthrown when Gaea prompts another act of concealment (verses 174 ff. and 477 ff.). A general epilogue supplies a conclusion to both stories (verses 207-10 and 501-6).

The epilogue to the story of Uranus and Cronus foreshadows the revenge which is to come to Cronus at the hands of Zeus. The second epilogue anticipates the description of the release of the Centomani by Zeus for his fight against the Titans. This battle is followed by the story of Typhoeus. We have seen that many critics reject this episode from the original *Theogony*. It has been more favourably received recently because of its general resemblance to the Hittite *Song of Ullikummi*. Mazon finds the closest parallel to Hesiod's story of Typhoeus in the passage from the *Titanomachia* which begins at verse 687. He believes that this is an interpolation in the *Titanomachia*. Schwenn thinks the greater number of these verses authentic. He restricts his comparisons to the two passages he believes added to the *Titanomachia*, verses 681-6 and 705-10. Jacoby acknowledges the extensive imitation of the *Titanomachia* made by the interpolator of the story of Typhoeus. All these critics invariably conclude that this apparent imitation is proof of the interpolation of the second battle. We have just seen that the two stories in the first half of the *Theogony* are really parallel. Can we now say that the same is true of the two battles which Zeus has to fight in order to consolidate his realm?

The *Titanomachia* opens with the release of Briareus, Cottus, and Gyes by Zeus (verses 617 ff.). Until then the war seems to have proved a very qualified success for both parties over the course of ten years. Once Zeus had won this new support the whole situation changed. The Titans were finally overpowered by the Centomani, who compelled them to take their own place in chains beneath the earth. The end of the compositional ring is marked by the complete reversal in the fortune of the Centomani, who become guardians where they had formerly been the prisoners (cf. verses 620 and 717, 618 and 718, and 619 and 719). Our other extract comprises a description of Typhoeus (verses 820-35), the details of his battle with Zeus (verses 836-68), and an

¹ O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites*, p. 191.

² Solmsen, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

account of the origin of winds from the body of the monster, which includes verbal reminiscences of the description of Typhoeus' appearance (verses 869-80).

One feature of the stories of succession was the assistance given in both cases to the young god by Gaea. In the *Titanomachia* Zeus still had need of the help of the Centomani to defeat the Titans. At the same time he makes a significant contribution to the victory himself (verses 687 ff.). In spite of the protests of Mazon there is no inconsistency between the former inability of Zeus to defeat his enemies and his eventual triumph.¹ When the Centomani were released, Zeus was rewarded by the grant of thunder and lightning, which had previously been concealed in the earth (verses 504-5). It was these new weapons which the god used against the Titans. By the end of the *Theogony* Zeus can defeat Typhoeus without any outside support. He has now attained his full powers as king of the gods. Now that there is no longer any need for Zeus to turn to either Gaea or the Centomani for help, the structure of the episode has been modified. In the first story Gaea addresses Cronus, who pledges his support against his father (verses 164 ff.). Both Cronus and Rhea depend upon the advice of their parents at the time of the birth of Zeus (verses 463 ff.). In the *Titanomachia* we have the interchange between Zeus and Cottus (verses 644 ff.). There is no passage of direct or indirect speech in the story of Typhoeus. This suppression of any passage of dialogue destroys for the *Titanomachia* and the battle against Typhoeus the close parallelism which exists between the stories of the dynasties of the gods. Yet it still remains true that the two battles are in fact parallel, though the parallelism is mainly present on a verbal level. Before Typhoeus can effectively menace Zeus, the god can bring his thunderbolt into action, and the result, as in the *Titanomachia*, was to cause widespread devastation by fire (cf. verses 678-83 and 839-43, 850-2 and 858; 681 and 693-700, and 844-52). In both battles Zeus descends from Olympus against his opponent (cf. verses 687-93 and 707, and 853-5). Similes are used to express the noise of the one battle and the effect of the fire upon the earth in the other (verses 702-4 and 862-6). Finally Typhoeus suffers the same fate as the conquered Titans (cf. verses 717-18 and 868).

The parallelism, which we identified in the two stories of succession, also exists in the case of the *Titanomachia* and the story of Typhoeus. It is mainly, however, a verbal parallelism. The stories of succession were defined as the outer limits of a single large ring of composition. There now appears to be a correspondence in structure between the first and the second half of the *Theogony*. Each contains two dramatic episodes set round a less dynamic passage of description.

It is with Otterlo's principle of ring-composition that we are in possession of a new method for a valuation of the text of Hesiod. This need not confine itself to the defence of an occasional line, but can also be applied to the major divisions, which dictate the structure of a poem. The coincidence in structure we have just described for the *Theogony* demands the retention of the story of Typhoeus. It repeats the theme of battle in its own half of the poem, and forms a companion piece to the story of the birth of Zeus in the first part of the *Theogony*. The scheme of the structure of the *Theogony* has now become plain. At the climax of the poem stands the story of the clash between Zeus and Prometheus. We would expect Hesiod to have included some details about the

¹ Mazon, *Hésiode*, pp. 13-14. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, lxiii (1928), pp. 369-71.

origin of mankind in the poem. It is illustrated by this preparation of the first woman. The story of Prometheus is preceded by the two stories of the struggle for the leadership among the gods. It is followed by the two battles in which Zeus defeats the Titans and Typhoeus. Our pattern comprises (1) introduction (verses 1-115), (2) struggle for succession (verses 116-506), (3) story of the sons of Iapetus (verses 507-616), (4) struggle for consolidation (verses 617-880), and (5) conclusion (verses 881 ff.). If we allow our text to stand as we possess it, the *Theogony* has a structure which can be clearly defined. When scholars stress the verbal parallels between the different parts of the poem, this is not evidence for the method of a stupid interpolator, but a use of repetition, which is characteristic of ring-composition. We can come to no other conclusion than that the *Theogony* comprises a self-contained unity. This was the opinion of Carl Robert fifty years ago,¹ and I can see no adequate reason why we should care to dispute his verdict today. We then have a poem whose structure we are able to appreciate. Jacoby gives us a shambles and a series of inferior rhapsodes. There is no doubt in my mind which alternative is the better.

University College, London

P. WALCOT

¹ C. Robert, *Mélanges Nicole*, pp. 461 ff.

THE Editors regret the occurrence of two errors in *C.Q.* VI (1956), p. 41, in Professor Guthrie's article on Anaximenes, for which the author is in no way responsible. The beginning of the second paragraph should read:

We are equally unfortunate in having no actual fragment of Empedocles' poem dealing with this point, but according to Aëtius again he believed . . .

The end of footnote one should be: Dreyer, *Planetary Systems* (Cambridge, 1906), 289.