The Power Dynamics of the Family of the Gods in Archaic Verse.

Classics PhD

Department of Classics

Rebecca Claire Symonds

February 2021

Acknowledgements

A PhD is often compared to a marathon. Enthusiastically entered into blissfully unprepared for the reality of long hours of training, the gruelling effect on mind and body, and, of course, with an overly ambitious completion time in mind.

Perhaps the way in which it most resembles a marathon, to my mind, is how much impact the support of others has throughout the entire process. This impact is often unseen, just as the focus on race day will be on the runner, but it is crucial to success. Throughout this project I have been fortunate enough to enjoy the support of colleagues, friends and family. Without their support, guidance, and patience I would not have made it to this point, and I would like to take a moment to thank these individuals.

Firstly, I would like to thank my grandmother, Elizabeth Staples, without whose generosity I would not have been able to begin. As a staunch believer in the value of education, she refused to let something 'as trivial as money' stand in the way of my goal to return to study. It is difficult to articulate how deep an impression someone has made in your life when they play such a formative role from the beginning. Granny's love of learning and her determination to accomplish what she set her mind to are two qualities which stand out in my memory. Her kindness is the reason I am here now, and the one regret I have regarding the whole thesis is that she passed away before I could complete it.

Secondly, I owe a remarkable debt of gratitude to my supervisors: Dr Emma Aston and Professor Ian Rutherford. My primary supervisor, Emma, has been brilliant since we first began corresponding about the project before I began at Reading. Whenever I have been asked who my supervisor was people have always responded by telling me how fortunate I am to be working with Emma. This is true, and a measure of how well respected an academic she is. Throughout the project she has lived up to that reputation; the support and guidance I have received has been helpful, considered, and insightful. This project simply would not be the same without her input, and I have benefitted from her wisdom both academically and personally. The knowledge and breadth of understanding which my secondary supervisor, Ian, has brought to the project cannot be overstated. Ian's influence will be felt most directly in the discussion of Near Eastern influences, and his insight has been invaluable throughout. I would especially like to thank my supervisors for their continued and steady feedback during this last, very turbulent year.

The department of Classics at Reading has been a wonderful community to be part of. The staff have all been extremely helpful and eager to discuss research. Professor Timothy Duff and Professor Barbara Goff both critiqued my work during the annual review and Confirmation of Registration processes, and I am grateful for their advice and feedback. I would also like to thank Barbara for setting aside time to talk with me about approaches to the family, both ancient and modern. Amongst the students, I would particularly like to mention Becca Grose and Dania Kamini, my cohort amongst the PhD students, and with whom I co-organised the 'Keeping it in the Family' conference in 2019. The value of conversations over a cup of tea is easily overlooked but they help to crystalise ideas, and challenge your thought processes. I wish them every success with their projects, current and future.

I would also like to thank my examiners, Professor Jenny Strauss Clay and Professor Katherine Harloe for their thorough and considered feedback. I am very grateful to them for taking the time to examine the thesis and for their suggestions for improvements to this project. This project has benefitted immeasurably from their guidance.

Outside of academic circles, I would like to thank my employer CAFCASS for allowing me to reduce my working hours and relocate for my studies. My manager, Stephanie Watson, has gone above and beyond to facilitate my studies. She has been flexible with my working hours, allowed me to book time off for conferences, and generally been the most supportive manager she could possibly be.

I would also like to thank the friends and family who have been there for me throughout this project. Special mention must go to my mother and father, who have encouraged and supported my interest in the Classical world for my whole life, and who have never faltered in their confidence in me to get to this point. Alongside them, my friends: Emily McGann, whose offer of a sofa and a cup of tea frequently restored my sanity, Millie Farquhar, my spin class rival and climbing buddy, and Joshua Wells, for his optimism and good humour. Final mention must go to my fiancé Ian, who has been patient and supportive throughout. Ian has kept me grounded, and provided much needed perspective on many issues throughout my course.

Declaration:

I confirm that this is my own work and the use of all material from other sources has been properly and fully acknowledged.

Rebecca Claire Rusk

Abstract:

This thesis seeks to explore the power dynamics within the Greek pantheon as it is represented in Archaic Greek verse. The poets depict the gods as members of an elite ruling family, and this presentation allows them to explore complex relationships between the gods. The poets' own understanding of interfamilial and political relationships within their communities would have shaped their presentation of the gods, who the poets describe using the same terms as their mortal counterparts. Studies of the *basileus* in the archaic period have shown that Zeus has more in common with that of the 'Chief' or 'Big-man' than with 'king'. This thesis will demonstrate that the immortals are subject to the same social pressures as their mortal counterparts and highlight the connections between family and political roles in the power struggles amongst the gods. Particular attention is given to the role of goddesses in relation to their consorts and sons. Zeus' position is far from secure, and he must manage his allies and rivals carefully to avoid displacement. While he punishes his enemies, but he also creates alliances through distribution of gifts and honours and through marriages which bind together the various branches of the divine family. Zeus actively polices the boundaries of mortal and immortal, by punishing those who attempt to transgress those boundaries. In an appendix, the thesis explores similarities and differences between Near Eastern theogonic accounts, especially in the means of succession and models of monarchy. The presentation of the gods as members of a powerful dynasty offers a powerful insight into how the Archaic Greeks conceived of their deities.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 2
Declaration: 4
Abstract: 4
Table of Contents 5
1) Introduction 8
1.1) Approaching myth 8
My Approach 11
1.2) Approaching Epic 12
Introducing the Texts 12
Orality and Dating Issues 13
Key Scholarship 15
My Approach to the Texts 17
1.3) Key Aspects of Context 18
Gods 19
Authority 20
1.4) The Structure of the Thesis 21
2) Commanding Loyalty: Power and Control on Olympos 24
2.1) Introduction: 'Father of Gods and Men' 24
2.2) Anthropological Approaches to the Family 24
2.3) Fatherhood in Archaic Greece 27
2.4) 'Basileus of Gods and Men' 34
Big-Men, Chiefs and Kings 35
The Origins of the term *Basileus* 41
The Mortal *Basileus* and *Anax* in the *Works and Days* 42
The Mortal *Basileus* and *Anax* in the *Odyssey* 45
The Mortal *Basileus* and *Anax* of the *Iliad* 49
2.5) Zeus in the *Theogony* 53
Zeus as *basileus* 53
Zeus as *anax* 60
Kronos as *anax* 62
Father-son relationship 66
Hekate 72
Zeus as *aigis*-bearing 76

2.6) Conclusions 78
3) Conflicting Loyalty: The Goddesses and their Allegiances 80
3.1) Introduction 80
3.2) Mortal Women in Epic 83
Marriage in Epic Verse 85
Marriage in the *Iliad* 87
Marriage in the *Odyssey* 90
Dependents 94
Fears Around Fidelity 100
The Treatment of Male Infidelity 102
Motherhood 104
3.3) Divine Women 107
Pandora 113
The Loyalty of the Goddesses 116
The Need for a Guardian 117
Matrilineal Descent and its Difficulties 120
The Fears of the Father 124
Zeus and Persephone 128
The Absent Mother 131
Fluidity of Form 133
Conclusions 135
4) Maintaining Loyalty: Dealing with Dissenters 137
4.1) Introduction 137
4.2) Mortal 'Punishments' 139
Written Law in the Archaic *Polis* 141
Competition and Authority 146
Representations of Justice in Epic 151
Hesiod and Discontent with the *Basileus* 153
Conclusion 157
4.3) Prometheus and the Gift of Pandora 160
Prometheus' Challenge 161
The Politics of Giving 165
Zeus' Choice 167
Pandora and Appetite 170
Conclusion 172
4.4) Policing the Boundaries: Mortals who Overreach themselves 172

Introduction 172
Hades and Tartaros 174
Tityos, Tantalos and Sisyphos 179
Dynastic Control 186
4.5) Returning to Olympos 188
Tartaros as a prison 189
Imprisonment within Gaia 190
The Imprisonment of Ares 193
Conclusion 195
5) Conclusion 197
6) Appendix - Near East Connections 201
6.1) The Texts 204
Hesiodic Succession Narrative 204
The Kingship in Heaven Plot 206
The *Enuma Elish* 210
6.2) Comparing the Texts 211
Progression through Generations 212
Emasculation and Ascendance 215
Unnatural Parenthood 217
The Swallowed Stone 220
The Final Challenger 223
6.3) Conclusion - The Importance of the Near Eastern Parallels 226
7) Bibliography 230

1) Introduction

1.1) Approaching myth

For many of us, our introduction to the Ancient Greeks came through their mythology. Stories about the minotaur or the adventures of Herakles, usually in a heavily sanitised form, captured our imagination and inspired us to learn more. At the heart of these myths are the gods, whose actions shape the narrative as they interact directly and indirectly with the mortal protagonists. These portrayals of the gods often focus on the familial relationships between members. It is possible for plots to hang on concepts such as the jealousy of Hera because it is understood that Zeus and Hera are married and a wife would not take kindly to an extramarital affair. By connecting the gods using terms that have resonance to the society sharing the stories, the narrator is able to shape their expectations of how they would react in specific situations. These expectations may be fulfilled or they may be subverted but they must be engaged with. When Zeus is described as 'father of gods and men', what exactly does the poet mean?[1] He is not literally father to all gods, nor is he the creator of mankind. The term is used deliberately and repeatedly so there must be significance to it, but we must attempt to unpick the social understanding behind it to fully comprehend the poet's meaning.

The ubiquity of social roles to their contemporary audience presents a further challenge to any examination of these relationships. The poet does not need to outline the expectations of parents of their children, and vice versa, directly, as his audience would have understood. Distanced by time and culture, the modern scholar must attempt to discern what would have constituted normal behaviours and what would have been considered exceptional or even deviant. This is one area which Archaic verse is an extremely useful tool. Whilst the poet had creative licence with details such as armour, the way in which people related to each other had to resonate with the understanding of his audience. This is not to say that the society presented in the Homeric poems is an accurate representation of the nuances of Archaic Greek society; rather that characters who attract praise for their behaviour within the poem would most likely have seen as exemplifying particular social virtues by the audience,[2] and vice versa for those who are chastised within the

[1] This will be discussed more fully in the next chapter.

[2] It is important to note that these virtues would not necessarily have made a hero a constructive member of Archaic Greek society. Van Wees emphasises that the Homeric heroes resort to violence extremely quickly but as this is done in times of conflict this is perceived as a show of individual prowess rather than a threat to the stability of the *polis*. Van Wees 1992, 62-7.

poem. It is probably safe to say, for example, that an Archaic man would rather be married to a Penelope than a Clytemnestra.

To this, already complicated, discussion, one further difficulty must be added. I am interested in the portrayal of the gods rather than mortals. It is clear that the Archaic Greeks viewed their gods as distinct from mortals. The gods are not bound to one form, they do not age or die. But it is important that despite disagreeing on the precise details, the Archaic poets consistently represent the gods as a family. The gods have parents and children, aunts and uncles and cousins, all of whom come together into one divine unit. The implications of this are important as they shape the conceptions of the immortals. There are moments of mortal existence which a deity might be expected to bypass entirely. One of the most bizarre inclusions is birth; Leto endures a painful and prolonged labour to deliver Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, an element which the poet stresses numerous times.[3] Given that childbirth was an extremely dangerous moment in a woman's life, and was considered polluting,[4] it is strange that a goddess would be expected to experience it.

The hierarchy within the family is entwined with the political hierarchy of Olympos, and this combination is interesting as it suggests that the two concepts may have been connected in the minds of the poets. For the gods, the creation of the next generation brings with it powerful rivals each with a claim to authority. The fragility of power, and the eagerness of the next generation to establish their own position within the world, suggests that the Archaic Greeks saw their own world as highly competitive. This has important implications both for scholars working with the texts, and for those who are interested in Ancient Greek religion. The later Greeks credited Homer and Hesiod with the organisation of the pantheon, if not its creation.[5] The conceptualisation of the gods is heavily influenced by these early authors and the effects of their poetry have been felt down the generations.

Before beginning, it is important to acknowledge that there are two inherent dangers when working with Greek myth; both are related to a sense of familiarity. The first is viewing the stories of myth as static and fixed. Early exposure to some of the key stories often gives a deceptive impression of a coherent and consistent network of narratives which remained throughout the entirety of Greek history. This apparent consistency is owed more to Renaissance scholarship than it is to the surviving Greek material itself.[6] A quick comparison of Homer and Hesiod, described by Herodotos as the ones

[3] *Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo*, 89-120.
[4] For a discussion of this see Parker 1983, 48-55.
[5] This will be discussed in more detail in the following section.
[6] Trigger 2003, 444.

who established the gods for the Greeks,[7] reveals inconsistencies in areas as significant as the origins of the universe. There is no definitive version of a single narrative, and the stories are retold and reshaped for the audience they are presented to. With that being said there are key details which remain fixed. A good example of this Agamemnon's slight of Artemis; as Buxton highlights, there are numerous versions of what exactly he did to offend the goddess, but in every version, Agamemnon provokes Artemis with disastrous consequences.[8] This means that the variations between versions are as important as the texts themselves.

The second danger is to view myth as a clearly defined genre that has retained a distinct position in culture throughout human history. In his discussion of the contexts of mythology, Buxton stresses that there can be 'no automatic equation' between Greek myths and similar stories in other cultures, nor can mythology be 'regarded as constituting an autonomous, hermetically sealed territory.'[9] Though the term is used quite freely, there is very little consensus on what actually defines a myth. Entire works have been written attempting to narrow down the form and function of myth and, despite significant and sustained interest, there is still little consensus on a clear and concise definition of myth.[10] The modern term has been debated since Heyne (1782-1812) and the discussion continues.[11]

Fowler highlights that there is no distinction between *mythoi* and *logoi* in the surviving material until the 5th Century BC, significantly later than the poems under discussion in this thesis, and stresses that the division of history and 'mythical' history is problematic when considering a culture that considers its myths to be history.[12] Fowler suggests that the overriding association of *mythos* in Plato's work is not with fictions but with the poets: 'myths are what poets tell.'[13] If the relationship between poets and society changes over time, then the reception of the poems they recite will also adjust. The stories of Homer may be bursting with fantastic details that a modern reader cannot, for good reason, accept as accurate, but for figures such as Herodotos these stories were historical.[14] The idea of myth as what the poets tell is more important to this thesis as the myths of Archaic

[7] Herodotos *Histories* 2.53.
[8] Buxton 1994, 74.
[9] Buxton 1994, 14.
[10] Whilst there are a great number of works dedicated to the subject of myth, the key works used for this thesis are: Bremmer 1987; Burkert 1979; Buxton 2013; Caldwell 1989; Graf 1996; Kirk 1970, 1972, 1990; Lévi-Strauss 1978; Nilsson 1932; Vernant 2006; Woodard 2007.
[11] Graf 1996, 1 and 9-10. See also López-Ruiz 2014, xvii.
[12] Fowler 2011, 48-9.
[13] Fowler 2011, 49.
[14] Fowler 2011, 61. See also Neville 1977 for a detailed discussion of Herodotos' critical evaluation of the Trojan War.

Greece survive to us through the work of the poets.[15] This means it is impossible to consider myth completely independently from poetry it survives in as the two are inextricably linked.

My Approach

My own approach to myth can be summarised as follows: myth is a narrative told by a community to explore their position within the universe.[16] As such, each telling of the myth must build on the social constructs familiar to its own audience to ground that exploration in their reality. The combination of lived experience and the elements which transcend day-to-day life allows the poet to engage with complex issues which resonate within their community within the defined space of the mythic narrative. This interpretation means that each retelling of the myth requires the scholar to examine the society which produced that version to fully understand what is being communicated. The myths recorded by Hesiod and Homer offer their view, as shaped by their community, and both highlight areas of contention and reinforce the social norms that were significant to their society. The myths that the poets record almost certainly existed prior to being fixed in writing, and continued to resonate with audiences far beyond Archaic Greece. The focus of this thesis will be on examining how these myths were shaped by their context.

My approach draws on both the psychological[17] approach and the ideological.[18] The poets present the gods as agents who act based on motivations that the audience would comprehend. Whilst the poets preserve the distinction between gods and mortals, there are fundamental similarities in behaviour which shape their actions within the poem. The gods presented within the poems are presented as members of complex social networks who respond to the expectations of their family and others as individuals. The gods experience emotions and these often provide the motivation for their actions; Aphrodite runs to her mother for comfort,[19] and Hera stings at the insult of Athena's birth.[20] Whilst they are not human, the gods are depicted as relating to each other in very human ways. However, it would be a mistake to consider these emotions as somehow timeless, and attempting to psychoanalyse Zeus using modern standards offers more information on our own world view than that of the Archaic Greeks. By combining the psychological approach with the

[15] This will be discussed further in the section on oral transmission below.
[16] The myths that survive to us are preserved in literature, but the importance of performance should not be overlooked. For a discussion of the significance of oral poetry see: Chadwick 1939; Finkelberg 1990; Nagy 2015; Notopoulis 1960 and 1964.
[17] An outline of the theory and its influences can be found in Csapo 2005, 80-131.
[18] See discussion in Kirk 1970, 48. Versnel 1998.
[19] Homer *Iliad*, 5.416-417.
[20] *Homeric Hymn to Pythian Apollo,* 305-330.

ideological it is possible to understand the context behind these actions and emotions. The importance of situating the myths within the culture that created them cannot be overstated.

1.2) Approaching Epic

Introducing the Texts

Of all the material available, Hesiod's *Theogony* is the poem that has been most pertinent to this project. This is due in part to its obvious focus on the gods rather than mortals, and also due to its comparative neglect when contrasted with the Homeric poems. The *Theogony*, as it survives, is around a thousand lines long, a fraction of the length of the Homeric Epics, but closer in length to the longer of the *Homeric Hymns*. Both Nelson and Clay comment that Hesiod has traditionally been viewed as the less interesting when contrasted with Homer.[21] Nelson considers this to be the result of the timeless nature of Homer's narrative of war, whereas Clay highlights Hesiod's love of detailed lists as falling out of fashion with later readers.[22] Whilst it is impossible to deny the drama of Homer's poems, what is of interest to me is Hesiod's construction of the pantheon.

The *Theogony* details the birth of the gods and the intergenerational power struggle that culminates with Zeus taking his place as *basileus* of gods and men.[23] Beginning with Chaos, Hesiod details the family tree of the gods and the transitions of power between them, pausing only to elaborate on particularly significant moments or actions taken by the gods. This mapping out of the family of gods demonstrates not only that the Greeks conceived of their deities as one interconnected family, but provides a detailed list of exactly how those branches of the family connect. The *Theogony* is not a religious text in the same way that the Bible might be considered a religious text, but the ancient Greeks do not have holy books; instead, they have the poets.[24]

It is implausible to suggest that either Homer or Hesiod created the pantheon as both were probably working within an existing tradition.[25] However, it is important to note the discrepancies between the two. An obvious example of this is that whilst Hesiod details the birth of Aphrodite from the

[21] Clay 2003,2; and Nelson 1998, 42. This is demonstrated by Kirk's description of the *Theogony* as 'not a very good poem by comparison with anything in Homer, but it contains a certain rough charm.' Kirk 1974, 98-99.
[22] West observes that 'even Homeric poetry, however, readily admits genealogies.' West 1985, 5.
[23] There is a detailed outline of the plot of the *Theogony* in the appendix comparing the *Theogony* to Near Eastern creation myths.
[24] Clay 2003, 1. It is important to note that Homer and Hesiod were seen as authorities on the gods by later Greek writers and this is not something which is being projected back by modern scholarship. Herodotos *Histories* 2.53.
[25] Clay 2003, 4.

severed genitals of Ouranos, Homer instead gives her Dione for a mother and Zeus himself as her father.[26] As has been shown, both Homer and Hesiod are regarded as authorities on the Greek gods and here there is a blatant contradiction between the two. Versnel, in particular, has stressed that conflicting versions of myth posed less difficulty to the Archaic Greeks than they do to modern scholarship which often seeks to discern the 'true' version of the myth.[27] Versnel's work has been extremely useful in highlighting that these contradictions are something to be explored rather than defects to be ironed out.

Orality and Dating Issues

The poems that survive for us to enjoy and examine have survived because they were preserved in written form, but they would have been known to their earliest audiences in oral form.[28] There are distinct differences between composing for oral poetry and written poetry, with the most significant being the flexible nature of delivery. When a poem is written down that version of the poem can be referred to time and time again; when a poem is delivered orally that exact version only exists for the duration of that recital.[29] The performer may choose to stress certain aspects and minimise others, they may have vocalisations or variations in speed and style which are not available to a reader.[30] It had been thought that poetry as long as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* was beyond the scope of oral poets. However, Milman Parry's work demonstrated that with the use of stock formulas this was possible.[31] There is not space in this project to cover the transition between oral and written in detail but it is important to recognise that the written texts that survive were not the first form that these poems existed in, nor would it be the last form that these myths would manifest in.[32]

The transition from oral to written poetry is important to this project for one particular reason, and that is the idea that the poems that survive to us capture a particular telling of that myth in the myth's history. The poems of Homer and Hesiod are revealing about the world that the poets

[26] This will be explored in more detail in the appendix on the *Theogony* and the Near Eastern influences.
[27] Versnel 1998, *passim*.
[28] Jensen suggests that all approaches to epic performance should begin with Lord 1960, but studies of Homeric performance have progressed since the 1960s. Jensen 2005, 54. Notable works include: Finkelberg 1990; Nagy 2015; Notopoulis 1960 and 1964; and Scodel 2002. The importance of oral poetry was first brought home to Classicists by the work of Anthropologists. The work of the Chadwicks in the early part of the 20th Century demonstrated that oral poetry is a distinct art form from written poetry and emphasised the importance of poetry over prose in oral performance. Chadwick 1939, 77-80.
[29] Notopoulis 1964, 4.
[30] Nelson refers to this variation as comparable to a jazz performance. Nelson 1998, 42.
[31] Pope 1963, 1-2.
[32] Scodel 2002, 1-8.

inhabited. This is distinct from the question of whether the world portrayed by the poet reflects the Bronze Age or the world of the poet, or some combination of the two; instead, this is about the values that the poet presents as important within his work. Whilst Herodotos may rely on Homer, for a modern scholar to embrace a mythical account for a 'reliable reservoir of actual history' is a 'not uncommon error of judgement.'[33] The texts that survive show a society that may never have existed outside of the mind of the poet, but they must match enough of the understanding of the audience to be interesting in order to survive.

There is fierce argument over the composition date of the works of Homer and Hesiod, with many scholars opting out of committing to a firm date for either. Part of the difficulty is determining when a poem is considered to be complete.[34] The difficulty in dating the poems led Snodgrass to label Homer as a 'moving target' in terms of dating.[35] Clay describes Hesiod as close to or perhaps contemporaneous to Homer, and Scully too avoids engaging with the question directly by suggesting that Hesiod and Homer were roughly contemporary. [36] The most obvious reason for this is the discomfort around the admission that we cannot be entirely sure when the *Theogony* was composed. In the *Works and Days*, Hesiod's narrator alludes to a poetic victory at the funeral games of Amphidamos which has offered scholars a potential clue to the dates of the poet, however this is still far from certain.[37] Osborne notes that as Hesiod describes no archaeologically datable material a workable estimate of c.700 BC is as precise as realistically possible and, as the social evidence it provides is likely to reflect changes which occur over an extended period of time, there is no need to try and force the evidence further than it can take us.[38]

The exact dating of the poems is not something which is attainable or pertinent to this project. What is perhaps of more significance is the relationship between the texts.[39] Notopoulis describes the need to establish the antecedence of Homer or Hesiod as a modern phenomenon, driven by the presence of 'Homeric' phrases in Hesiod and a general preference for Homer's narratives.[40] For Notopoulis the similarity in turns of phrase can be explained by the beginnings of both narratives in

[33] Bamberger 1974, 266.
[34] From the 1960's- 1980's scholars considered Homer to have been composing no later than the 8th Century BC. Snodgrass 2016, 1.
[35] Snodgrass 2016, 1-9.
[36] Clay 2003, 4; Scully 2013, 9-11.
[37] Kõiv 2011, 355. Hesiod *Works and Days*, 654-7. In an article dedicated to discussing the dates of Hesiod's poem, Kõiv begins by describing the conventional dating of Hesiod to between the end of the C8th BC and the beginning of the C7th before deconstructing the reasoning behind this dating and concluding that the dating cannot be securely established more precisely than between the C8th and C6th BC. Kõiv 2011, 376-7.
[38] Osborne 1996, 159.
[39] West challenged the idea of Homer's precedence in his 1966 commentary. This has been influential in modern scholarship, but is not universally accepted. West, 1966; Snodgrass 2016, 2.
[40] Notopoulis 1960, 178.

the oral tradition with its heavy reliance on set, repeated phrases and formulaic construction rather than the direct debt of one poet on another.[41] It is important to remember the debt owed by both poets to the oral tradition. The transient nature of oral poetry leaves open the possibility that both Homer and Hesiod could have been influenced heavily by poems which have simply not survived to us. I am inclined towards the view that nothing develops in complete isolation and that both poets would have been responding to a variety of influences that we cannot possibly reconstruct accurately using the current evidence. As retelling is an important element of oral poetry the stories that Homer and Hesiod are famous for would most likely have been told many times by many different poets before they were set down in writing. What is most interesting to me is which facets of the stories the poets choose to home in on and what values they praise or censure.

Key Scholarship

The scholarship on Archaic verse is extensive and varied. One name which has dominated discussion of early Archaic verse is West. When discussing the transition from oral to written poetry, or the dating of the major compositions, it is impossible to avoid the influence of West whose 1966 commentary on the *Theogony* is still invaluable to anyone approaching the text. The influence of West's work will be found throughout this thesis, from his linguistic analysis of the text to his important work on the Near Eastern and Indo-European influences on early Greek poetry. West's interest in the texts is more intensely philological than my own, as demonstrated by his extremely detailed commentary, and his work has enabled many scholars, myself included, to appreciate the nuances and intertextual details of the poems and then to build our own work from the foundations of West's linguistic and historical analysis.

Another scholar who is inextricably linked with the *Theogony* and the *Homeric Hymns* is Clay. Clay describes her approach as 'an examination of early Greek theology' and is interested in the interpersonal relationships between gods and men explored through Greek mythology.[42] Clay's influence on the study of Archaic Greek verse is such that scholars can often find her ideas bleeding into their own work without their notice.[43] Clay views the *Theogony* as a movement through genealogical descent from the formation of an unstable cosmos to its resting point as a stable and fixed order under the rule of Zeus.[44] She highlights the neglect of non-Homeric verse and pushes for

[41] Notopoulis 1960, 179.
[42] Clay 2003, 1.
[43] Myers 2011, 123.
[44] Clay 2003, 13.

the re-examination of this material.[45] Clay's work has been very influential on my own approach, especially with her interest in the boundaries between mortals and immortals. Whilst there are many points of agreement, there is a very significant point of deviation between her argument and mine. Clay views Zeus' rule as 'permanent and unchanging' once it is established.[46] I do not view Zeus' position as ruler as any more stable than any of his predecessors. This view is based on the methods Zeus employs to gain power and those that he uses to keep power once he has attained it which will be explored in more details in the first chapter. The significance of this may seem minor but it is integral to understanding the Archaic Greek understanding of the world they exist in, highlighting an underlying sense of insecurity and concern about vulnerability to change.

Scholarship on Archaic Greek verse is far from limited to the Clay; and it would be impossible to do justice to the wide and varied material available in this limited space but there are a few further scholars who warrant particular attention. I have already mentioned West and Vernant, as well as Versnel, whose work on contradictions within Greek myth challenges scholars to rethink our approach to myth and embrace the divergent myths. His 2011 work *Coping with the Gods* was especially interesting in highlighting the dichotomies in the representation of the gods. Versnel's work on the portrayal of Hermes and Kronos provides strong examples of the contradictory ways in which the same gods could be depicted. More broadly, Versnel's approach to Greek religion as an 'expression of culture that mirrors the social mentality of its times albeit in a way that is never very plain' is also one which resonates with this thesis.[47] It is fundamental to this project that the way in which the gods interact is shaped by the social norms of the culture that is depicting them.

There is an increased interest in the transmission of material between cultures and the Near Eastern influences on Archaic Greek cosmogonies has been an active area of study. Both Scully's *Hesiod's Theogony: from Near Eastern Creation Myths to* Paradise Lost,[48] and López-Ruiz's *When the Gods were Born. Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East*,[49] have both sought to place Greek mythology, in particular Hesiod, within the broader historical context. These two scholars, as well as Rutherford,[50] have built on work by previous scholarship to expand our understanding of how Greek myth is influenced by the surviving mythologies of other cultures, particularly Near Eastern mythology, and how it has influenced other narratives. There will be a more comprehensive examination of the scholarship around this theme at the beginning of the appendix dedicated to it. It is significant that

[45] Clay 2003, 2-3.
[46] Clay 2003, 8.
[47] Versnel 1998, 37.
[48] Scully 2016.
[49] López-Ruis 2010.
[50] Rutherford 2009, 2010.

so much work has been done to confirm the connections, and this in turn allows for an examination of the differences. For all of their similarities, not one of the myths moves seamlessly between cultures; there are always differences and these differences reveal the elements that the culture embraced or rejected. I aim to use the foundation established by these scholars to explore some of those differences.

Scully's interest in situating the *Theogony* within the poetic traditions of the Mediterranean and his detailed examination of the power struggles within the *Theogony* appear superficially similar to my own. Scully presents the *Theogony* as a hymn to Zeus and highlights the importance of the division of honours, something which I also explore. However, Scully's understanding of Olympos is markedly different from my own. Whilst I see the combination of the political and family roles to be integral to the poem, Scully distinguishes the *polis* of Olympos as a 'space apart' free from the influences of the 'violent and discordant forces' already present when Zeus assumes his authority.[51] Scully suggests that the model of the *oikos* is entirely unsuited to the gods, removed as they are from the human model of labour and describes Olympos as 'Hesiod's proto-πόλις' less the temples, fields and commercial centre.[52] The firm division between *polis* and *oikos* which Scully advocates for seems to neglect the centrality of the family model to the *Theogony* itself.[53] Scully has to acknowledge the significance of Hera's wrath at the birth of Athena but suggests that 'marriage and Olympian polity' have neutralised that fury.[54] Marriage is a key element of Zeus' management of the family, but the tension within the family is never fully resolved, even if it ceases to occupy the main narrative. It is integral that the family relationships are not neglected within the poem. To follow Scully's line and remove the concept of the *oikos* from Olympos entirely is to fundamentally underestimate the importance of the family to the poets and to the Archaic Greeks.

This brief summary of key scholarship is far from exhaustive but aims to help the reader understand the works which have had a substantial influence on the main arguments of the thesis. Each chapter will contain its own more detailed evaluation of the key texts relevant to its dominant themes.

My Approach to the Texts

[51] Scully 2016, 31.
[52] Scully 2016, 33.
[53] Patterson discusses the role of the *oikos* in establishing early *polis* society and even law, if this is the case then separating the two concepts is detrimental to our understanding of both. Patterson 1998, 3.
[54] Scully 2016, 42.

My approach to the texts has been heavily shaped by the scholarship above, in particular Clay. I am interested in the ways in which the poets present their gods using social positions and interpersonal relationships. These elements would have been familiar enough to their audience that a word such as *basileus*, or even mother, would have conveyed a broad range of information. This familiarity is perilous for a modern reader who lacks the contextual information to interpret the implications as the poet originally intended, and who may instinctively use their own frame of reference when reading the texts. This is a particularly true of concepts such as family which transcend Archaic Greek culture. Throughout this thesis I have sought to explore these terms by comparing the representations within the poems to the surrounding historical context where possible. This has meant close reading of the texts, as well as utilising the work of Classicists, Ancient Historians, and Archaeologists.

The focus on the very human aspects of the gods is not intended to diminish the difference between gods and mortals. The fact that Hesiod repeatedly refers to these two groups as distinct throughout the *Theogony* demonstrates that they ought to be viewed as two separate communities. It is, however, extremely interesting to see which aspects of mortal life the gods experience to some degree. There are moments which both groups experience but the undying nature of the gods can shape for better or worse. In these moments the poets are able to explore the human condition through its opposition to the *athanatoi*. Identity is more easily explored through opposition; it is often easier to say what you are not rather than what you are. By showing how the gods behave in these circumstances the poet can, through contrast, draw parallels between mortals and immortals which provides an insight into the ways in which the Archaic Greeks viewed their world.

1.3) Key Aspects of Context

If I am to argue that the context of the poems is key to understanding them then it is, of course, necessary to establish that context. As with the exploration of approaches to mythology, the space to do that here is limited but it is important to offer some background into the key concepts which will be discussed. There are three key concepts within this thesis: family, divinity and authority. These concepts are connected by their association with the movement of power between individuals and the policing of the social divisions between differing social groups. Some of these divisions and power hierarchies are clearly delineated whilst others are more implicit, but they all shape the poet's world view and their presentation in myth highlights the preoccupations which were present in Archaic Greek society.

Gods

Though the gods of ancient Greece are extremely familiar to us, the question of 'what is a Greek god' is one which even Parker recognises as a difficult one to answer.[55] When discussing gods and mortals, the gods are frequently distinguished from their mortal counterparts by their undying nature. They are the *athanatoi*, the undying. As mentioned above the gods do share aspects of the human experience, but there are limits on how much of the human experience the gods are prepared to endure, as Apollo's omission of childhood shows.[56] Throughout the *Theogony*, deities are suppressed at the earliest stage possible, with Ouranos confining his unborn children, Kronos swallowing them as soon as they are born, and even Zeus tricking a pregnant Metis into his belly. The pre-emptive attack on the next generation suggests both a vulnerability of the infant deities and a desire from the previous generation to confine them. One very good reason for this is highlighted by Golden: the gods have an inheritance issue.[57]

In a mortal family the production of the next generation is a cause for celebration as it ensures that the continuation of the family after the death of the current members. Though there may be tensions over inheritance as sons and fathers age, there is the certainty that eventually the father will have to hand authority over to his sons either through infirmity or death. This is simply not possible amongst the gods who neither age nor die. The only way for a younger god to gain power is to be given it voluntarily or to take it by force. This creates a tension between the generations as they vie for power. It is often suggested that Zeus is able to break this cycle, either through swallowing Metis or securing the virginity of Athena, but there is no reason that his strategy should be any more secure than that of his father or grandfather. In fact, there are several attempts to overthrow Zeus' authority in the surviving mythology, they are just less successful.[58]

By structuring the pantheon as one extended family unit, and expressing the relationships between gods using the same terms as a mortal family, the poet invites comparison between the two. To describe Zeus as a father is to attribute all the characteristics that an audience would associate with a father to Zeus. Whilst the ability to bear a child through his own skull may be beyond the remit of a mortal father, the relationships between fathers and their children would have been part of their

[55] Parker 2011, 97.
[56] This is particularly interesting when compared with his half-brother Hermes, who remains an infant throughout the *Hymn to Hermes* as it allows him to play innocent when he is accused of theft. *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, 260-298.
[57] Golden 2012, 183.
[58] This is dealt with extensively in Yasumura 2013.

lived experience and something they were able to relate to. The important element here is remembering that whilst the parent-child bond exists in our own culture the Archaic Greek understanding of those relationships does not always match our own.

Authority

When approaching this project my interest was primarily in the family aspect of the pantheon but what rapidly became apparent was that it was impossible to dissociate the family connections from the political ones. Zeus' combined presentation as '*basileus* of gods and men', and 'father of gods and men' is an apt example of this. The Olympians are not merely a family, they are a ruling dynasty and as such their behaviour is influenced by the high stakes of rulership of the cosmos. The theme of tension between deities, in particular successive generations, is not unique to the Greek pantheon; the Near Eastern theogonies too demonstrate this pattern.[59] What is unique about the Greek myths here though is the absence of kings, as a modern reader may understand the term, in the historical record on which to base these dynastic struggles.[60] The evidence for kings in Archaic Greece, and even in Mycenaean Greece, has been challenged by scholars such as Morris, whose examination of the evidence has led them to the conclusion that the only secure images of kingship for these periods are the Olympians themselves.[61] It is notable that the division between the lives of mortal rulers and the heroes presented in Homer is an important one which has been explored by Archaeologists, Ancient Historians and Classicists, but the critique rarely extends to the gods.[62]

One aspect of the mortal leaders portrayed by Homer is the fragility of their status. Van Wees in particular highlights the intense competition between the elites to maintain and expand their influence which often comes at a direct cost to another.[63] The competition is not open to all to participate in and some degree of hereditary power is always required to enter into the fray, but the potential to lose everything is always present.[64] The flexible hierarchy of the system, in contrast with the fixed order of a monarchy, places the leaders in an extremely vulnerable position, where the higher up the social order a figure is the more his rivals stand to gain by toppling him. If this world view is transposed onto the Olympians, then Zeus becomes the Iliadic Agamemnon, both leaders

[59] López-Ruiz 2014, 3.
[60] This will be elaborated on in more detail in the first chapter.
[61] Morris 2003, 2.
[62] The connection between mythological and historical leadership is highlighted by Trigger who suggests that the social elite were able to capitalise on the religious model to secure their own position within society. Trigger 2003, 410.
[63] Van Wees 1992, 63.
[64] Van Wees 1992, 72.

holding together a loose alliance of extremely powerful figures, many of whom would stand to directly gain from deposing him. This difficult position is further exaggerated by the undying nature of the gods. Unable to simply wait patiently for time and age to overcome a ruler, the gods must act against them if they wish to challenge. This changes the perception of Zeus as a secure and absolute ruler, to one who must always be on guard against attack and carefully manage his subordinates to mitigate threats. Unlike his Near Eastern counterparts, Zeus lacks the security of an established monarchy.[65]

This increase in vulnerability is important because it changes the way in which we should understand Zeus' behaviour within Archaic verse, and through that within the Archaic Greek mind. The boundaries which otherwise seem set in stone are shown to be permeable and in need of strict policing. The jealousy of prestigious mortals becomes less about an innate vanity of the immortals, and more about safeguarding their own superiority. The gods are powerful but far from invulnerable and this vulnerability is at the heart of this thesis.

1.4) The Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is divided into three main sections. Chapter one examines Zeus' role within the pantheon, where his role as *father* of gods and men intersects with his title of *basileus* of gods and men. The concepts of ruler and father both emphasise masculine authority with the poets blurring the lines between a political leader and the head of a household. There exact nature of the term *basileus* is examined in detail, with the traditional translation of 'king' proving as insupportable in the divine sphere as scholars have shown it to be in the mortal. The nature of Zeus' power is of importance to this discussion as the transition of authority from father to son has given the impression of a hereditary model. The concept of hereditary rule is undermined by two important details: firstly, the father is made aware of the threat of their son through prophecy rather than an innate threat. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, any system which relies on an older generation passing away will encounter difficulties when the older generation is both ageless and deathless.

The second chapter addresses the behaviour of the goddesses. The expectations and role of women in Archaic Greece is a subject which has occupied many scholars.[66] Building on their work, I examine the portrayal of women in Homer, and using the limited historical evidence available on marriage

[65] The details of the power structures and hierarchy will be more thoroughly explored in chapter 1.
[66] Scholarship in this area is extensive. Notable works consulted include: Arthur 1973; Cohen 1995; Dean-Jones 1996; Fantham 1994; Gould 1980; Hawley 1995; Katz 2003; Lardinois 2001; Lefkowitz 1987, 2007; Ormand 2004; Pomeroy 1995; Walcott 1984; Zeitlin 1996.

and motherhood. The surviving evidence, outside of the verse, is primarily later Athenian material but by comparing this to the Homeric texts there are clear themes which recur. No woman in Homer can truly be described as ordinary, but in order to establish as close to a baseline as possible, mortal women are evaluated using these themes. With this in place it is then possible to compare the behaviour of the goddesses to the behaviour of the mortal women within the same genre. This reveals some interesting information. The goddesses are subject to the same social pressures as their mortal counterparts; however, they are protected from the consequences of non-compliance. The most powerful driving social pressure applied to women, mortal and immortal, is to defend their child.

Having established that Zeus must build relationships in order to support his power base, it is possible to examine the unions that he makes with goddesses. Zeus is unusually prolific in his acquisition of sexual partners and children, and whilst that strategy enables him to incorporate disparate elements of the family it also creates the problem of more children. Like mortal mothers, the goddesses seek to advance their own children's interests, however, the children cannot simply wait for their inheritance to come to them naturally as their father will never age or die. This places Zeus, as their father and ruler, as a direct obstacle to the child achieving their full potential. Zeus is ultimately able to negotiate this by incorporating his children into his regime rather than attempting to suppress them, but the threat of figures such as Apollo is never entirely absent. This chapter concludes with an in-depth discussion of Apollo's prospective assault of Olympos in the *Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo* and the decisive moment where he is disarmed by his mother.

The first two chapters have provided a discussion of Zeus' ascent to power, and his maintenance of his position through careful family management. The concepts of power, authority and family are inseparable throughout. The final chapter examines how Zeus manages threats and challengers to his regime. Zeus is not successfully deposed within epic verse, though this is not for lack of attempts. Some of these threats are violent and obvious, whilst others are more subversive and subtle. These challengers are often related to Zeus, Prometheus is a cousin, and there is a real need to produce a suitable deterrent to would-be usurpers. When gods are immortal, ageless and difficult to damage permanently, the punishment must be able to cause even them to reconsider attempting insurrection.

This section looks at the methods used by Zeus to keep his family, and others, in line. It begins with an examination of Prometheus' attempted deception at Mekone and the creation of Pandora, before moving onto a discussion of the role of Hades. In this section there is a discussion of the boundaries between mortality and immortality, as well as how they are enforced. The traditional

approach has been to see this boundary as rigid and impermeable however there are numerous myths of those who successfully transgress this boundary, often at a terrible cost. I suggest that the boundary is less clear and that this is the reason that it must be so brutally policed. If the boundary was completely clear cut and no change of station were possible, there would be no need to make public examples of those who attempted to cross it. There is a subtle but important distinction in mindset between a situation which is fixed, and a situation which endures because the cost of challenging it would be too high. The potential for change is ever present, perpetually threatening the security of Zeus as a ruler and the order of the universe he presides over, as such Zeus must always act to protect and reinforce his own position. Zeus may never be overthrown, but the threat of a usurper is constant.

Finally, an appendix builds on the succession myth of the *Theogony*, which is at the heart of this poem and shows marked similarities with the Hurro-Hittite *KiHC* as well as the Babylonian *Enuma Elish*. As both of these cultures have well established monarchies, they will have had a different relationship with the concept compared with the Greeks whose relationship with autocracy was more problematic. This section will explore the relationship between the texts and discuss the points of divergence that might demonstrate the poet's attempt to make the narrative more palatable to his audience. The comparison of the texts further highlights that the power that Zeus obtains is limited and fragile; reliant on an underlying threat of force and alliances with other powerful figures rather than an accepted status quo.

The ultimate aim of this project is to demonstrate that the Archaic poets portray their gods as engaging in the same power struggles as mortals but on a grander scale. Like his mortal counterparts, to survive Zeus must successfully manage the ambitions of his peers, his duties to his family, and ensure that no challenger is left unpunished.

2) Commanding Loyalty: Power and Control on Olympos

2.1) Introduction: 'Father of Gods and Men'

Zeus is referred to as the 'father of gods and men' at several points within the *Theogony*.[67] Initially this statement appears innocuous but with further consideration it is deeply problematic. Zeus appears relatively late in the family tree, with several key members of the pantheon being his siblings rather than his children, and there is no other allusion in the *Theogony* to Zeus as a father, or creator, of mankind.[68] As the statement cannot be explained by Zeus' position within the family alone, there must be a reason that Hesiod chooses to repeatedly associate Zeus with the role of father. To understand the implications of this phrase it will be necessary to explore the expectations that the archaic Greeks would have had for a father. Through examining these expectations, I aim to explain Hesiod's use of the term, and to further the understanding of Zeus role within the pantheon.

When considering a concept like the fatherhood, which seems almost universal to the human condition, it is important to remember that the family is a social construction.[69] It is important then to distinguish the exact understanding behind any familial title such as 'father' as they may mean different things in different cultures. The study of the family unit extends far beyond Classics and Anthropologists have had a profound influence on our understanding of the family; figures such as Lévi-Strauss have reshaped the academic discourse around family across disciplines.[70] When approaching fatherhood in the ancient world it is important to look at how the family is constructed by that society. The social aspects of the relationship are termed a 'role-relationship' by Bott, and are constructed by the expectations of family members upon each other, often centred around reciprocal behaviours.[71] To understand the role of the father in ancient Greece we must understand the expectations placed on the father figure by other family members.

2.2) Anthropological Approaches to the Family

[67] Hesiod *Theogony*, 47, 457, 468.
[68] Zeus can be said to be a father of gods and men, as he has both divinities and mortals amongst his children, but the same claim could also be made of figures like Poseidon or Apollo. The phrase is repeatedly used of Zeus.
[69] Rawson comments that neither the Greeks nor the Romans had a term which encapsulated the concept of the family as a modern English speaker would understand the word. 2011, 3.
[70] Key anthropological texts consulted: Casey 1989; Lévi-Strauss 1949; Morgan, 1996.
[71] Bott 1957, 3.

The concept of the family seems ubiquitous, however, there is no universal agreement amongst Anthropologists as to what a family actually consists of. Despite the absence of a definitive understanding of the family,[72] there are certain connections between individuals which are broadly accepted as family connections. At its most basic, Stone defines 'kinship' as encompassing the relationships between individuals linked by blood (consanguineal) or through marriage (affinal).[73] These relationships can never exist in isolation as they are built around that society's understanding of the place of humanity within the world and the resulting meaning of the connections between family members.[74] Some of these connections are very obvious, such as the connection between a mother and child, and some, like the connection with the family of the father, are more abstract and require a significant level of social organisation.[75] Whilst the role of the father may initially appear straightforward, the position of the father within the family unit is therefore heavily dependent on the social expectations of fatherhood.

The focus of family relationships is often the successful production of the next generation as the continuation of a society is dependent upon children who will carry on the values and traditions.[76] Morgan observes that 'family practices are, to a very large extent, bodily practices' and revolve around the significant moments such as birth, marriage, and death.[77] At its most basic, the biological role of the father is to provide the necessary genetic material to create a child. Whilst the complexities of genetics were not known to the archaic Greeks, they were certainly aware that procreation required male input as well as female. In spite of lacking the knowledge of the biological nuances, the archaic Greeks also understood the inheritance of physical characteristics, as Helen's swift recognition of Telemachos demonstrates.[78] Though her perception is useful to the poet to drive forward the narrative, it relies on the general understanding that children often physically resemble their parents.

The connection between the mother and the father is often formalised through a marriage. Marriage is an institution common to almost all societies, albeit in various forms, and is heavily associated with the production of legitimate children.[79] The difference between a child and a legitimate child relies on the social recognition of the union of the parents, and the conditions of the child's birth. The need to establish fatherhood is important in societies which place value on

[72] Creed 2000, 330.
[73] Stone 2000, 5.
[74] Stone 2000, 6.
[75] Casey 1989, 4.
[76] Stone 2000, 2.
[77] Morgan, 1996, 113-4.
[78] Homer *Odyssey* 4.140-146.
[79] Stone 2000, 18.

patrilineal descent. Though both parties are needed to create a child, there is a disparity between the parents' evidence of their role. The foetus develops inside the mother, her gestation and the process of birth means there can be no question over the maternity of her baby. However, the father lacks any similar physical connection to the child, and his role in the process is potentially vulnerable to usurpation. Before the advent of the DNA test, the father could have no certainty and had to either take on faith that the child was his, or pre-emptively take steps to ensure that his partner could not come into sexual contact with another man. The father may have no reason, or indeed cause, to doubt the fidelity of his spouse but will lack the certainty of the mother. The decision to accept a child as their own is therefore a public statement, that is assuming they take any interest in the child.[80] The social realities of the situation are far more complex than this, but it is worth remembering that anything beyond this is beyond the bare minimum necessary to father a child.

The gods of the *Theogony* are not entirely removed from this biological understanding, as most are born to a divine father and mother with a few notable exceptions such as Aphrodite, or Ouranos and Pontos whom Gaia produces through parthenogenesis.[81] It is interesting to consider that the gods themselves are bound by the processes of conception and birth which are considered impure and polluting by the Greeks.[82] Parker writes that the sacred and the sexual are incompatible, and that the gods must be distanced from the profanity of the human process;[83] yet the gods themselves take sexual partners and give birth to children. It is possible that, as the risk of death associated with childbirth for a mortal mother is infinitely higher than for an immortal goddess, there is a greater risk of pollution through contact with death for the parties involved. Though Hesiod does not elaborate on the details of delivery, the description of Leto's labour in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* demonstrates that even for a goddess birth was not always straightforward. Due to Hera's opposition, Leto endures labour pains for nine days and nights before Eileithyia is fetched and Leto is able to deliver her son.[84]

Once the biology is accounted for then cultural elements can be considered. These are far more nuanced and should be handled with caution.[85] In the introduction to her book, Stone comments that kinship involves more than relatives and forms an 'ideology of human relationships; it involves

[80] The importance of controlling female sexuality will be discussed in more detail in section three of the thesis.
[81] Hesiod *Theogony*, 188-193, 126-132.
[82] Parker 1983, 32-33.
[83] Parker 1983, 74.
[84] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 89-125.
[85] Casey cautions against the tendency of historians to work backwards from the current family model, seeking explanation. 1989,1.

ideas about how humans are created and the nature and meaning of their biological and moral connections with others.'[86] Casey also highlights the integrated nature of family structures saying that they 'are not self-contained institutions; rather they are imperfect, ramshackle adaptations of the human psyche to the culture and ecology of a particular area.'[87] The role of the father in Archaic Greece does indeed extend beyond the realm of the biological and into the social. Like most societies,[88] the Greeks practised marriage and the production of legitimate children was a key aspect of that union.

2.3) Fatherhood in Archaic Greece

The brief discussion of fatherhood above may appear to muddy the water more than to clarify the nature of fatherhood; but it does demonstrate that it is impossible to understand fatherhood without locating it within the specific culture under examination. Once again, the difficulty with this lies in the nature of the sources available; the bulk of evidence comes from the poets, or from Classical Athens. This difficulty has been addressed in previous work, but bears mentioning due to the significant impact this has on any attempt to explore life in Archaic Greece.[89] The changing nature of fatherhood has not always been a focus for those interested in the gods. In an article titled *Zeus the Father*, Calhoun wrote that '[w]hen a reader of Homer thinks of Zeus, it will likely be of Zeus the father and the ever-recurring formula': father of gods and men.[90] Calhoun then goes on to discuss the political titles of *anax* and *basileus* in Homer, with one brief mention of the father as the ruler his children have no say in. Even in an article titled *Zeus the Father*, there is no discussion of what it means to be a father in Archaic Greece or what the poet might be communicating by describing Zeus as a father. Hesiod's use of the phase is rather more limited than Homer's, it is only used three times within the *Theogony*. It is, however, a title which only Zeus is associated with, and this warrants some exploration.

The Absent Father

[86] Stone 2000, 6.
[87] Casey 1989, 10.
[88] Stone 2000, 17.
[89] Herodotos *Histories* 1.155.1-2 and 2.89.3.
[90] Calhoun 1935, 1.

It might seem counterintuitive to begin by an examination of absent fathers but the difficulties created within a family who is missing this figure demonstrate the key elements of the role. There are different reasons why a father might be absent, either temporarily or permanently. Though a child in this situation could be considered 'fatherless', the term is avoided here. 'Fatherlessness' implies that the situation is unnatural; implying that there is a standard family unit and damage to the children.[91] The most obvious reason that a father might be absent is death. The practical realities of life in the ancient world meant that life expectancy was significantly shorter than it would be now; it is suggested that up to a third of all children in the ancient Mediterranean may have lost their fathers before the age of 25.[92] This figure may have been higher in Athens, where due to the marriage age of thirty, as many as four in ten Athenians may have lost their father before going through the *ephēbeia*.[93] These statistics are important because they demonstrate that it would not have been uncommon for a father to die whilst his children were still relatively young; and most people would be affected either directly or indirectly.[94]

The death of the father was a serious moment for the family and one which the poets engaged with frequently. Pratt highlights the significance of fatherhood as a theme within the *Iliad*, and I think it would be safe to broaden that to Greek mythology.[95] From Laios and Oidipous to Orestes and Agamemnon, and Telemachos and Odysseus, there are constant questions around what it means to be a father, and what it means for families, especially sons, when that father is taken away. This need for exploration suggests that this was a significant area of concern to the Archaic Greeks and the high mortality rate may provide some explanation for this.

The response to the loss of a father was not uniform even within the work of the same poet; with Astyanax, Neoptolemos and Telemachos all reacting very differently to the loss, or suspected loss of their fathers.[96] This may be due to their time of life at the crucial moment. In the *Iliad* Astyanax is still a babe in arms when Andromache appeals to Hektor to refrain from the fighting for their child's sake. The image created by Homer is a particularly unhappy one as Andromache describes their son with a tear-stained face begging his father's friends for food, his land snatched by others.[97] Though the scene is striking enough at first glance there are a number of features that make this passage

[91] Hübner and Ratzan 2009, 5.
[92] Hübner and Ratzan 2009, 8-9.
[93] Scheidel 2009, 32-33. Scheidel gives a very interesting breakdown of the demographics, 2009, 31-41.
[94] There was a special title, *amphithales*, for those children whose parents were still alive which suggests that this was notable. These children had a special role in religious rites to Athena. The most recent discussion of this is in Lafargue 2017.
[95] Pratt 2009, 142.
[96] Golden 2009, 43.
[97] Homer *Iliad,* 22.490-500.

particularly jarring. Firstly, there is the use of the phrase 'the day of orphanhood'.[98] This is the second time that Andromache has used this adjective, with the first being in Book 6 when speaking to Hektor about their son's future.[99] The other character to use this adjective within the *Iliad* is Diomedes; when he abuses Paris for the use of a bow, and asserts the superiority of the spear in making wives weep and making warriors' sons orphans.[100] It is interesting that in both cases the child's mother is still alive, and there is no specific reference to her being impeded from supporting her child in any way. In Andromache's speech the child runs back to his mother after being driven away from the feast by the child whose father is still alive.[101] This is not then to be orphaned as the term would be understood now, with the death of both parents, but specifically the death of the father. The use of the adjective by Diomedes suggests that Andromache's use of the term is more than simple hyperbole designed to heighten her appeal, and would have been understood as leaving the child without a suitable guardian and vulnerable.

The second feature of Andromache's appeal which is striking is that this cruel treatment of her child is not the result of being taken prisoner by hostile forces, but is still within his own community. This is stressed by the description of the men Astyanax will have to appeal to as the friends of his father.[102] This seems particularly callous, as you would expect the friends of the father to act with some kindness towards any child or partner of their deceased friend. It is possible that Andromache's comments may be exaggerated due to her grief, however, her fear must reflect something of the attitude towards children with no father in order to resonate with Homer's audience. Astyanax would be a grandchild of Priam and it might be expected that his privileged position within the community would offer some protection from the maltreatment of his peers but this does not appear to be the case. By Andromache's account, neither his grandfather nor his mother can offer any protection to Astyanax now that his father has been killed. This does fit with competitive aspects of the heroes within the *Iliad*. The status of a hero is dependent not only on his ability to gain prowess within his community, but also to retain it.[103] With Hektor dead, Priam an elderly man, and Astyanax an infant, that household no longer has a defender and as such is vulnerable to the ambitions of others.

[98] ἦμαρ δ' ὀρφανικὸν… Homer *Iliad,* 22.490. All translations given are my own.
[99] Homer *Iliad,* 6.432.
[100] Homer *Iliad,* 11. 385-395. Despite his posturing Diomedes does flee the scene after removing the arrow from his foot, rather undermining his argument.
[101] Homer *Iliad,* 22.499.
[102] Homer *Iliad,* 22.492.
[103] This is explored in more depth in the section on dissenters.

The need for a strong male defender is not restricted to Hektor's household, and this is a concept that is also explored in the *Odyssey*. Odysseus' extended absence from his household, and rampant speculation regarding his death, leaves his household vulnerable to the Suitors. The Suitors occupy the house of Odysseus, ostensibly seeking to court his wife and consuming the estate. When Athena arrives, Telemachos is sitting watching and waiting for his father's return in the hope that Odysseus would be able to evict the Suitors and win back the rule of his house.[104] Telemachos' wait for his father is not born out of deep affections for him as an individual, as he would have been a baby when Odysseus left for Troy so would not have been able to build a relationship. Telemachos' ambiguity toward Odysseus is further underlined as when questioned about his father Telemachos quips that his mother tells him he is his father's son, but that no man truly knows his parentage.[105] Telemachos is indifferent to Odysseus, but in dire need of a father who can step in and take action against the Suitors. Interestingly, just like Priam, the aged Laertes is unable to step back into the role as father of the household and offer Penelope and Telemachos his protection.

Whilst the two figures share the loss of their father; Telemachos is in a very different position to Astyanax as he is much older. Unlike Astyanax, Telemachos is on the brink of manhood and is almost in a position where he can assert his own authority; this is demonstrated in Book 1, when Telemachos instructs Penelope to return to her rooms.[106] However, when Telemachos calls an assembly, he is unable to take control of the meeting and the Suitors. The encounter culminates in Telemachos' declaration that he will sail to Pylos and Sparta to seek news of his father, and the Suitors suspecting that he is going to raise an army or return with poison to rid himself of them.[107] The suspicion of violence that undercuts this exchange is perhaps a product of the Suitors' own thought processes as they plan to kill Telemachos themselves on his return journey.[108] The move towards violence is triggered by Telemachos' increased boldness, and the desire to avoid splitting the contents of the household between Penelope's future husband and her son.[109] Whilst Telemachos was a boy he posed no threat to the Suitors or their ambitions, but now he is approaching manhood and almost ready to take a wife of his own. At this point he becomes more than an irritant to the Suitors, and represents a real threat to their endeavours.

Astyanax and Telemachos represent two examples of sons who have lost their fathers within the Homeric poems. Both are sons of formidable warriors who hold high social positions and are well

[104] Homer *Odyssey,* 1.113-117.
[105] Homer *Odyssey,* 1.215-216.
[106] Homer *Odyssey,* 1.345-360.
[107] Homer *Odyssey,* 2.309-336.
[108] Homer *Odyssey,* 4.842-847.
[109] Homer *Odyssey,* 2.334-336.

liked within their home community. Yet, once the father is not there to defend their interests, they are both vulnerable to the ambitions of other stronger figures around them. Both Priam and Laertes are older, and therefore would struggle to assert their authority over the community in defence of their grandchild or daughter-in-law. It is significant that this treatment is not the result of being left at the mercy of an enemy, or being isolated from their extended family or mother, but purely as a result of losing their father. This emphasises the importance of the father as a protector of the family unit and highlights the reliance of the entire family on the patriarch for status and survival. Death is an inevitability for mortals, but the death of the father could have a devastating impact on the entire family.

Fathers and Sons in Conflict

Possibly the most famous father-son conflict of the ancient world is the clash between Oidipous and Laios later made infamous by the work of Freud.[110] Freud's Oidipous complex, where the son kills his father out of a desire to bed his own mother, represents the complete breakdown of the relationship between father and son. Whilst the Oidipous complex has facilitated the development of modern psychology it has been noted by Sheleff that the succession myth in the *Theogony* would have served Freud's argument far better.[111] When Oidipous kills Laios on the road, he has no idea that the old man is his father; whereas Kronos knowingly emasculates his father Ouranos and Zeus goes to war with Kronos. Freud's lack of understanding of the myth of Oidipous is perhaps excusable as there are variants of the myth scattered through various sources. It can be demonstrated that Oidipous was known to the Archaic poets as Odysseus encounters Jokasta, or rather Epikaste, the mother and wife of Oidipous in Book 11 of the *Odyssey*.[112] In Homer's version of events, Oidipous remained as ruler in Thebes after the suicide of his mother/wife, albeit tormented by the gods and the Erinyes. There is no further information available in Homer, and the exposure of Oidipous as a baby does is not explicitly mentioned, though it is difficult to see how else he could have married his mother unknowingly.

The story of Oidipous begins not with a murder and marriage but with a prophecy and a birth. The exact nature of the prophecy varies between poets with Sophocles suggesting that Laios would be killed by his son, and Aiskhylos that Thebes would fall if Laios fathered children.[113] The consequences

[110] Csapo 2005, 103.
[111] Sheleff 1976, 22.
[112] Homer *Odyssey,* 11.271-280.
[113] Sophokles *Oidipous Tyrannos,* 710-725; Aiskhylos *Seven against Thebes,* 742-757.

for both prophecies are severe enough to cause even the most determined of prospective parents to seriously consider their options. The logical response to either of these prophecies would be to avoid becoming a father but the prophesied child is, of course, born. In this, Laios provides a mortal parallel to Zeus who is warned that Metis' son will grow up to overthrow him.[114] The key difference between the two figures is that Laios is mortal, and without a son to continue his family line it will die with him, whereas Zeus is immortal and has no practical need for an heir either to continue his line. To Zeus an heir is a danger, to Laios an heir would usually be his future. Oidipous should have become both heir and protector to Laios as he grew older, repaying the care and support that he was given as a child.[115]

Once Oidipous has been born, Laios and Jokasta are faced with the prospect of what to do with their son. Weineck draws attention to the recurring motif of failed filicide in Western Patriarchies, drawing on Abraham and Isaac, and Jesus, as a key parallels.[116] The driving force behind these failed attempted murders is the filicidal impulses of the father which Weineck considers to be universal to fathers based on the work of the psychoanalyst Munder Ross.[117] The other consistent feature that these narratives have is that they all ultimately fail; Abraham does not succeed in sacrificing Isaac, and Laios is unable to kill his son himself.[118] It is also worth considering the grandfathers of heroes such as Perseus, who expel their daughter and grandchild with the intention of killing them. The paternal figure may wish for the death of the infant; however, they are often unable or unwilling to get their own hands dirty in the process.[119] Laios' decision to have Oidipous killed by another allows for the shepherd to take mercy on the child and for the sequence of events to continue.

The Father and the State

The conflict of Laios and Oidipous, in their roles as father and son, have fascinated Classicists, Anthropologists and psychoanalysts for years.[120] But it is not this which is of particular interest to Weineck, who argues that the primary conflict for Laios is between his duties as a father and his duties as a ruler of a *polis*.[121] Laios can produce an heir and lose his city, or he can protect his *polis* at great cost to his family line. The dichotomy faced by Laios here plays off the role of father, and the

[114] Hesiod *Theogony,* 886-900.
[115] Stevenson 1992, 427-8.
[116] Weineck 2010, 137.
[117] Weineck 2010, 134.
[118] Weineck 2010, 137.
[119] With Tantalus being an obvious exception to this pattern, which is perhaps what earns him his unique punishment.
[120] Panourgiá 2008, 98.
[121] Weineck 2010, 140-141.

father-like role of the leader of a *polis*.[122] Stevenson emphasises the frequent use of the father figure in Greek conceptions of leaders and suggests that, as the family is the 'fundamental unit of society' it is a logical extension to consider the head of state as a father figure.[123] The connection between the father and the ruler is broadly a positive one, with the emphasis on mutual obligation. The evidence Stevenson employs mostly comes from later sources, and as such it is important to be cautious when applying their conclusions to earlier texts, but they are still worth consideration.

Brock highlights the importance of the association of fatherhood and political leadership but suggests that this is only seen from the late 6th Century BC, and is not firmly established until the second half of the 5th Century BC.[124] Brock cites Plato and Xenophon and shows the connections that they draw between dominion over a household and rule over a community, utilising the family model of managing the *oikos* to discuss the ideal model for the state.[125] The good Athenian politician should exercise his authority like a good father, administrating as a steward of a household, and the idealised guardian appears to have been prominent. What is very interesting is that Brock presents this as distinct from the imagery of gods and kings which he views as the primary imagery used in the Archaic poems.[126] This is perhaps because, as Brock observes, many of the references to kings as fathers are associated with Near Eastern figures.[127] Aiskhylos has his chorus refer to Dareios as 'father' in the *Persae*,[128] and Herodotos repeatedly uses the image of the father when discussing rulers in the Near East.[129]

The issues of this imagery in a *polis* such as Athens, which prided itself on its democracy, are potentially greater than they would be in the Archaic period where aristocratic families appear to have played a key role in the community.[130] Zeus is described as both *basileus* of gods and men, and father of gods and men, despite his late arrival in the chronological sequence. Zeus is connected with both rule and fatherhood in a way that no other deity is within the *Theogony*, and his association with both concepts extends into the Homeric poems and beyond as well. For all his concern with the

[122] There is a detailed exploration of the use of the image of the family, particularly in Athens, in Brock 2013, 21-43.
[123] Stevenson 1992, *passim*.
[124] Brock 2013, 25.
[125] Brock 2013, 25.
[126] Brock 2013, 1-14.
[127] Brock 2013, 31.
[128] Aiskhylos *Persians*, 664 and 671.
[129] Herodotos *Histories,* 1.155.1-2 and 2.89.3.
[130] Building on this thesis, I would be very interested to explore how the change in attitudes through time towards ruling elite figures is reflected in the presentation of the gods as an aristocratic family. An obvious example of a difference can immediately be seen in the portrayal of Zeus in *Prometheus Bound* where he is described as a violent authoritarian figure from the moment Hephaistos first refers to him. Aiskhylos *Prometheus Bound*, 12-17.

genealogy of the gods, Hesiod only refers to five gods as a father, using either *pater* or *tokeus.*[131] These gods are Ouranos, Kronos, Nereus, Poseidon and Zeus. Nereus and Poseidon are both only referred to as fathers once, with one of Nereus' daughters having her father's disposition, and Triton dwelling with his father, Poseidon. This means that 20 of the 22 times that fatherhood is mentioned it is related to one of the ruling deities, and that Zeus is referred to as father 9 out of the total of 22 times, almost half of the times that a word for father is used.[132] Zeus' authority as *basileus* and *anax* is entwined with his position as father of gods and men. It is impossible to completely separate the two ideas.

Zeus: The Divine Father and Ruler

When looking at the Olympians, there is considerable overlap between the familial and political roles; Zeus is not only 'father of gods and men' but *'basileus* of gods and men'. This has traditionally been understood as a monarchic system where the son seizes the position of *basileus* from their father becoming head of the household and ruler of the cosmos simultaneously.[133] This view risks simplifying our understanding of Zeus' authority by constraining it within a model that does not fully encapsulate the integral elements of the power structure of Olympos. In order to better understand the nature of power and authority on Olympos it is important to understand the context of the poems and the poets who composed them. The poem which provides the most detail of Zeus' ascent to power is Hesiod's *Theogony.* With its central focus on the family of the gods and representation of the intergenerational conflicts that arise, the *Theogony* offers an insight into how the Archaic Greeks conceived of their pantheon.

2.4) 'Basileus of Gods and Men'

After the defeat of Kronos and the Titans, Zeus takes his place as *basileus* of gods and men:

[131] *Pater* occurs twenty times and *tokeus twice*, highlighted in bold below.
[132] Hesiod *Theogony,* 36, 40-1, 47, 53, 71, 73, **138**, **155**, 164, 171, 180, 207, 262, 457, 472, 501, 502, 542, 580, 617, 838, 932.
[133] Burkert 1985, 127; Drews 1983, 25; Kirk 1974, 119; Luraghi 2013, 166; Park 2014, 262; and Podlecki 1984, 8.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσσαν, / Τιτήνεσσι δὲ τιμάων κρίναντο βίηφι, δή ῥα τότ᾽ ὤτρυνον βασιλευέμεν ἠδὲ ἀνάσσειν / Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν /ἀθανάτων, ὃ δὲ τοῖσιν ἐὰς διεδάσσατο τιμάς. [134]

At this moment Zeus takes his role as the ruler of the cosmos.[135] The word *basileus* is often simply translated as 'king'[136] but the understanding the word as 'king' is highly problematic.[137] It is important to recognise that the political environment of Archaic Greece was very different from our own and that the use of a modern political term may hinder rather than further our comprehension of rulers within the period. If we describe Zeus as a 'king' we shape the impressions of the reader.[138] Whilst 'king' is a short and neat translation, the impressions that are conveyed by the translation of *basileus* as 'king' may not accurately represent what the Archaic Greeks understood by the word *basileus*.[139] It is important to look to the texts

Big-Men, Chiefs and Kings

The variety of terms for a modern person in authority within our own language demonstrates the complexity of conveying a specific power model through a single word. It might seem excessively pedantic to quibble over the semantics; however, it is important in this instance. There are other terms of power and authority that could be applied to a leadership role. These terms differ from 'king' in subtle but important ways and each conveys an impression of the nature of the leader. The differences between our understanding of a prime minister, an emperor, a tsar, or a president can be extreme. Despite the fact that they ultimately all reflect a single leader of a state each title carries a very specific meaning and this shapes the impression of the society that they lead. The two

[134] 'When the blessed gods had brought to an end their work and through force reached a settlement with the Titans regarding honours, by the cunning of Gaia they urged wide-eyed Olympian Zeus to become *basileus* and *anax*, and he divided the honours for them.' Hesiod *Theogony,* 881-885.
[135] The idea of a kingship of heaven is not unique to Greek culture. For a discussion of the conceptions of divine rulers see Littleton 1969, 73.
[136] Burkert 1985, 127; Podlecki 1984, 8; Drews 1983, 25; Kirk 1974, 119; Luraghi 2013, 166; Park 2014, 262.
[137] The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a king as 'The male ruler of an independent state, especially one who inherits the position by right of birth.'
[138] Wright defines kingship as 'an inherited, superior, political authority vested in a single person, the king, who holds his position for life and who maintains his power through a manipulation of economic, military, and ideological forces that reinforce relationships determined by value and belief systems in society.' Wright 1995, 65.
[139] Calhoun recognised, as far back as 1935, that we cannot simply project our ideas of kingship onto Archaic Greek society. Calhoun 1935, 10-11. Sheer suggests that the translation is not important as long as it conveys political leadership. However, there are differences in how different types of leaders establish and maintain their authority. A king and an elected official have very different approaches by necessity. Sheer 2004, 7-8

alternative terms for a leader which appear in the discussion of early Greece are 'chief' and 'Big-Man'.[140] Carlier's comment that alternative terms for the role are often clumsy and inadequate is a fair one but using alternative models when considering the role is helpful.[141]

Some exploration of terms is necessary at this point. Wright's definition of a king, given in full earlier, highlights the importance of inheritance, the sustained authority of a single man, and the significance of oversight of the driving societal forces. To this Carlier would add the bearing of royal regalia and the protection of the gods.[142] The establishment of the role of the king is important. Unlike other leadership roles the position of the king retains its power through the position rather than through the individual holding it. In order for there to be a king, the community must accept that the role of a king exists. Once this role has been established the power of the occupant is both supported and limited by the increased structure and formal legislation which accompany the role of king.[143]

It has been argued that this infrastructure can be demonstrated in the archaeology of the Mycenaean palaces. Scholars such as Sheer suggest that the presence of a megaron and a throne are evidence of the existence of kingship.[144] Morris' challenges to these suggestions, which will be discussed in the next section, are pertinent. In defence of kingship, two points must be acknowledged. Firstly, that there was a named position of leadership which is used consistently where we have evidence available and that term is used consistently in the surviving records.[145] Secondly, that there was a leadership strong enough to orchestrate the large-scale building programs of the palaces. The commitment to building in stone and at scale suggests that there was a sense of permanence and stability to the community that vanishes with the collapse of the palace societies. As will be discussed in more detail later, the building of these palaces ceases with the fall of the *wa-na-ka*, and though there is some attempt at resettlement of the citadels following the collapse there is nothing on the same scale and the megaron is left untouched at Mycenae and

[140] Hall 2006, 127-133; and Hammer 1998, 332-349.
[141] Carlier 2006, 104. Carlier here highlights the frustration of translating a neat Greek term with a cumbersome phrase which whilst more accurate is often less accessible to the reader. There is an interesting dichotomy between the need to translate fluidly and the need to convey the exact meaning of a phrase.
[142] Carlier 2006, 104.
[143] The increase in rules and social structures is key to the difference between a king and a chief. Wright suggests that as chiefs begin to introduce legislation to protect themselves from challengers they gradually phase the position of chief out of existence and create the role of king. Wright 1995, 65 and 73-4.
[144] Sheer 2004, 34.
[145] It is important to remember that the Linear B tablets are only found in a limited number of sites. The absence of written material from outside of these sites coupled with the diversity of material culture throughout the period highlights the dangers of trying to portray a unified culture throughout Greece during this period. Dickinson 2006, 115.

Tiryns.[146] There is clearly a significant amount of power vested in the position at the top of society but the criteria of kingship relies on more than just a powerful individual.

There are other theoretical models in which social power is invested in powerful individuals. One of those is that of the chief. Wright describes the power of the chief as similar to that of a king and suggests that the key difference between the two roles is the lack of supporting infrastructure to support the chief in his role.[147] In the absence of the infrastructure, the chief's role is closely tied to their individual authority. This means that the chief cannot be entirely secure in his position and must constantly be aware of threats from within his own community. These threats are likely to develop if the chief is not perceived to fulfil his duties to the community and to manage the expectations of the elite. These expectations are focussed around the redistribution of resources, decision making and the ability to protect his community. In the absence of a supporting infrastructure the chief is comparatively vulnerable to the conditions of the society around them. The power is vested in him as an individual and if he cannot protect the community and the interests of its people then he is extremely vulnerable to deposition. However, Wright suggests that, like a king, a chief's power is hereditary and his sons are therefore expected to inherit.[148] From a practical perspective it makes sense for a chief to promote his son's interests. As the chief grows older, he will be physically less able to defend his position and will need to rely on younger men to maintain his position and protect against challengers. There is a dangerous point however when the son grows up and is eager to further his own interests, but the father is not yet ready to hand power over. At this point factions can split from the main group unless the chief is able to manage their expectations and restrain their ambition. The ambition of the son can be checked by the knowledge that his father will one day hand over power, either due to incapacity or death and at that point the son can assume the role. The key difference between the power of the king and the power of the chief is that the power of the chief is far more vulnerable to attack than the power of a king which is protected by the institutional nature of the position.

Wright theorises that in trying to protect their power chiefs create an increasing amount of legislation which gradually enshrines their rule into that of a king rather than a chief.[149] This transition is difficult to prove due to the lack of documentation and physical evidence to support such a claim but the concept bears consideration. The idea is certainly tempting when we consider that Ouranos is never described as a king, but both Kronos and Zeus are.[150] It must be acknowledged

[146] Shelmerdine 1997, 582.
[147] Wright 1995, 66.
[148] Wright 1995, 66. Van Wees 1998, 43.
[149] Wright 1995, 63-80.
[150] Bremner 2008, 9; Detienne and Vernant 1991, 61.

that Wright is writing about a transition of power which he thinks occurred within the Mycenaean period, which is several centuries before Hesiod is writing. Wright seeks to explain how the kings came about through a gradual imposition of infrastructure to protect individual chiefs which cumulatively shift the power away from the chief as an individual and towards the role of 'king' where the position holds the authority.[151] As will be discussed, the assertion that the Mycenaean palaces were ruled over by 'kings' remains highly contentious but the model of the chief is an important one. The position of a 'chief', though lacking in infrastructure, still gives authority to the figure who occupies the role. There is a socially agreed contract that whoever occupies that role holds power.[152] This means that the role can be taken by an individual from the current occupant without disrupting the model of society.

The third model of power which has been used to explore the leadership structures of ancient Greece is that of the 'Big-Man'. This model is frequently cited by scholars working on Dark Age and Archaic Greek models of leadership.[153] The term 'Big-Man' comes from an article written in 1963 by anthropologist M Sahlins: *Poor Man, Rich Man, Big-Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia.* This article has been extremely influential on scholarship, and rather than cite others citing Sahlins I intend to largely refer to the original article directly for the explanation of the position before exploring the ways in which the model has been applied to the roles of *anax* and *basileus*. The 'Big-Man' as defined by Sahlins is distinct from the 'chief' and the 'king' in that his power is directly tied to his own person. The model of the 'Big-Man' is based solely around the social influence that one man is able to exert on his community. The authority rests exclusively with an individual and once that individual is no longer able to sustain their power, either through death or displacement, the entire social group dissipates.[154] The Melanesians themselves might refer to the Big-Man as a 'man of importance', a 'man of renown', 'generous rich-man', 'centre-man' or 'Big-Man' recognising their elevated position within the group but again this is a comment on the power of the individual and is not the title of a formal position.[155] The problem with this model being applied to a titled role such as *basileus* is that the 'Big-Man' does not step into an existing role or office, they have no hereditary claim to leadership or influence.[156] This is more problematic for the

[151] Wight 1995 65.
[152] Sahlins 1963, 295.
[153] There is a discussion of 'big-men' in Hall 2006, 129-130. Qviller 1981, 180. Thomas and Conant 1990, 52-53. Van Wees 1998, 43. Whitley 1991 (a), 185. Whitley 1991 (b), 349.
[154] Sahlins 1963, 289.
[155] Sahlins 1963, 289.
[156] Sahlins 1963, 289.

strictly hierarchical society detailed in the Linear B tablets, where the power structures are rigidly defined,[157] than it is for the Archaic period where there is potentially more fluidity.

The ways in which a 'Big-Man' cultivates his own authority and reinforces his power are interesting given the fragile nature of his position. A 'Big-Man' gains his power is by exerting his influence over gradually broadening social spheres. Initially this begins with his family and household who he has immediate economic control over.[158] To further his sphere of influence the 'Big-Man' builds the number of his followers. Sahlins highlights the importance of acquiring what could be considered 'strays' amongst that number.[159] The incorporation of widows and orphans is a way of adding extra productivity to the household, as well as increasing the number of followers in the 'Big-Man's' retinue.[160] This economic control is an important element and the 'Big-Man' gains power through giving gifts rather than withholding assets.[161] There is a sense of imbalance created when someone gives a gift which the recipient is unable to match or surpass in return; this sense of imbalance leads the recipient to feel indebted to the gift giver. The debt cannot be repaid in a material way meaning that the giver remains in a position of superiority over the recipient and the recipient is placed under their authority. The more people that can be brought into his sphere of influence this way the more standing the 'Big-Man' is able to attain.

The gifts exchanged are not limited to material possessions; sometimes favours which create a sense of gratitude function in the same manner.[162] The motivation of the 'Big-Man' is not to appear compassionate, rather it is to appear generous. This overt generosity keeps the community indebted to him whilst allowing him to draw on their surplus productivity to enhance his own position.[163] The stakes of this generosity can be extremely high, as one 'Big-Man' can be defeated by another if they are unable to surpass the gifts given to them by a rival.[164] The demands of keeping up with the generous patterns of giving can also put increased pressure on the community as they work to produce enough surplus to satisfy the demands of the 'Big-Man'. The position of the 'Big-Man' is equally reinforced and undermined by his distribution of assets. Mitchell draws attention to the importance of gift giving culture in Classical Greece in her 1997 work.[165] She also notes that the concept of gift-giving to create a sense of debt between members of a community can be found in

[157] Shelmerdine 1997, 557.
[158] Sahlins 1963, 290-1. See also Hall 2006, 129-30.
[159] Sahlins 1963, 291.
[160] Sahlins 1963, 291.
[161] Sahlins 1963, 291.
[162] Sahlins 1963, 292.
[163] Sahlins 1963, 291.
[164] Qviller 1981, 180.
[165] Mitchell 1997, *passim*.

Hesiod when he suggests overpaying a debt to a neighbour to ensure that they are then indebted to you in the future.[166] It is also worth highlighting that there are elements of competitive gift exchange between heroes of Greek epic, and their insecurity around being publicly humiliated by other heroes or losing out on status suggests a vulnerability to public opinion that figures with a set office may feel less keenly.[167]

The ideas set out by Sahlins are not universally accepted. In particular, criticism has been made of both the narrow range of society surveyed within the article and its use in Neolithic and Bronze Age archaeology.[168] Lilley highlights the implied assumption that leadership systems reliant on an individual's attaining status fall earlier in a social evolution, when the development of societies is complex and open to variables that make this assumption perilous. Allen also highlights that the division that Sahlins portrays between the chiefs and 'Big-Men' is perhaps not as concrete as Sahlins article would suggest as communities led by 'Big-Men' may include ascriptive elements and chiefdoms with a hereditary structure are sometimes challenged by powerful individuals.[169] Whilst it is important to acknowledge the danger of this model this does not rule out its value as a comparable form of leadership model. The volatile nature of rule based on an individual's charisma and authority, unsupported by a social infrastructure is ruled out by the evidence of Mycenaean Greece with the elaborate building program and named leadership roles; but the archaeology demonstrates that Greek Dark Age settlements like Lefkandi and Kavousi lasted for no more than one or two generations.[170] This shorter settlement lifespan is more in keeping with the 'Big-Man' model. The model of power acquisition and retention is an important parallel to consider.

The three models listed above are by no means exhaustive. They each describe a style of leadership which has specific features associated with it. All three relate to sole, male power but all three also have their nuances. Both the role of king and chief carry implications of an established power hierarchy which is accepted broadly by the community. The archaeology of a 'king' even in the time of the palaces has been challenged but the existence of a clear leader within the Linear B tablets is compelling. The chief is the weakest defined of the three terms. Wright views it almost as a transitional state of leadership as the man in charge gradually secures his leadership using infrastructure until he becomes, in effect, a 'king'. The hereditary expectation on a chief means that the role already has some authority within society. Finally, the 'Big-Man' is entirely dependent on his own authority to support his power. There is no expectation of inheritance and, like the 'chief', the

[166] Hesiod *Works and Days,* 349-351.
[167] Hall 2006, 132.
[168] Lilley 1985, 60 and 63.
[169] Allen 1984, 20.
[170] Whitley 1991(b), 349.

big man is vulnerable to threats that a 'king' is protected from. As soon as a figure is placed using one of these existing terms it becomes very difficult to disassociate them from the specifics of that role. Establishing the outline of these commonly discussed models allows a more detailed examination of the texts. Is it fair to translate *basileus* as a 'king' or does one of the other leadership terms suit the nature of the role more?

The Origins of the term *Basileus*

It is not my intention to enter into a detailed linguistic analysis of the Linear B derivation of the word *basileus*; however, some exploration of the origin of the term is necessary to provide a context for the later usage. The word *basileus* is thought to derive from the *qa-si-re-u* in the Linear B tablets and refers to a 'local chieftain' associated with palace authority but not tied directly into the palace.[171] This distinguishes the position from that of the *anax* (*wa-na-ka*) which is fixed to the power of the palace more intrinsically. Morpurgo Davies suggests that the *qa-si-re-u* was a minor officer who did not necessarily live within the capital but who operated with the authority of the palace.[172] With the collapse of the palaces the *qa-si-re-u* would be well placed to step into the power vacuum.[173] They had already established authority within their community and the distance from the palace structure would have provided a buffer from the collapse of the existing system.

The evidence for the power dynamics in prehistoric Greece is extremely limited. On the one hand there are extravagant burials of individuals who clearly possess wealth and status such as the burial mounds at Mycenae, and on the other, as Morris observes, there is an absence of 'ruler' iconography in the material evidence that would allow for a conventional monarchy to be posited.[174] There are clearly people in positions of relative authority, but authority takes many forms. The titles of leaders are given on clay tablets but the titles do not reveal much about the nature of the role that they occupy, particularly where there is so much ambiguity around the origin of the words used. There is a real danger when looking at the Mycenaean material that in the absence of clear data the

[171] Palaima 2006, 68. Hall 2006, 128. Carlier 1984, 4.
[172] Morpurgo Davies 1975, 98.
[173] Morpurgo Davies 1975, 98.
[174] She highlights that the reconstruction of the throne at Pylos is based on the model at Crete based on a square stone base, and 'minimal evidence for images of rulers on thrones'. Morris 2003, 7. She also draws attention to the absence of ruler ideology outside of anonymous hunt leaders and generals. Morris 2003, 9. For further information on Mycenaean rulers see Antonaccio 2006, 381-393; Calhoun 1935, 1-17; Dickenson 2006, 115-122; Dickinson 1977, 53-57; Luraghi 2013, 166; Morgan 2003, 3-21; Nilsson 1932, 241- 244. Palaima 2006, 53-58; Sheer 2004, 2-99; Starr 1961, 129-136; Tartaron 2008, 101; Thomas and Conart 1990, 51-53.

existing information is manipulated to fit the picture that the later sources paint. The tholos tombs at Pylos are a striking example of this.[175]

Hesiod's use of the term *basileus* demonstrates that the term retains authority and denotes a position of leadership to an Archaic audience, and also a panhellenic audience more widely dispersed than the palaces and citadels who adopted the terms. It conveys an impression of established authority, predating the current situation and with broad reaching power. To press this further is perilous, as Dickinson observed in his discussion on the burials at Mycenae, it is a rather large step from a collection of high status burials to a fully fleshed out hereditary monarchy.[176] Thomas, writing in 1966, states that it is a 'matter of record that kings were a reality for both the palace scribe of the Mycenaean age and the bard of the Homeric period',[177] less than fifty years later Morris suggests that kingship in the age of the palaces is far from certain.[178] I disagree, however, with Morris' assertion that the hierarchy of Olympus offers a more stable picture of monarchy. If the idea of kingship is in dispute in the mortal realm then the use of mortal terms for a leader in heaven make that dispute equally valid for the immortals, and this instability is central to this thesis. It is important then to situate these terms within the poems and understand how the poets use these terms.

The Mortal *Basileus* and *Anax* in the *Works and Days*

It is notable that whilst the term *basileus* is used to refer to both divine and mortal rulers in the *Works and Days*, the word *anax* is only used once describe Zeus, *anax*, son of Kronos.[179] However, the term *basileus* is used for both mortal and immortal rulers within both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*.[180] the use of *basileus* to describe rulers in the mortal world offers some insight into the presentation of Zeus as a *basileus*. Whilst the *Theogony* focuses heavily on the gods, the *Works and Days* offers more information on the mortal world. The *basileus* is mentioned eight times within the *Works and Days*.[181] Two of these instances relate to the gods, as the Golden Race of men are described as living at the time when Kronos was *basileus* in heaven,[182] and Zeus is described as

[175] Schepartz, Miller and Murphy 2009, 160.
[176] Dickinson 1977, 57.
[177] Thomas 1966, 387.
[178] Morris 2003, 2.
[179] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 69.
[180] See table 1 on page 54 for a full list of the uses of *basileus* in the *Theogony*, and table 2 on 60 for a full list of the uses of *anax* in the *Theogony*.
[181] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 38, 111, 126, 202, 248, 261, 263, and 668.
[182] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 111.

basileus of the deathless gods.[183] The references to a divine *basileus* or *anax* will be set aside here to focus on the representation of mortal rulers.

The first mention of the *basileus* in *Works and Days* is on line 38 when Hesiod's narrator discusses the division of inheritance with his brother and the role that the *basileis* have had in that division. The characterisation of these figures is not positive. Perses, the narrator's brother, is described as lurking round the courthouse observing the goings on when he should be working on the farm to store up provisions for the coming year;[184] and the *basileis* themselves are described as 'gift-swallowing.[185] The narrator is not presented as a neutral observer of events as it is explicitly stated that he and Perses are engaged in a dispute over inheritance. The narrator openly accuses Perses of taking more than his fair share through manipulation of the court system and the 'gift-swallowing' *basileis*. The allegations of corruption could not be stated any more bluntly by the narrator. The narrator also directly contrasts the judgement of the courts with the justice of Zeus, which is described as the best.[186] The contrast between mortal injustice and the just rule of Zeus is a recurring theme within the *Works and Days*, and Zeus is consistently associated with dealing retribution to figures of authority who overstep their bounds within the poem.[187]

Whether for good or ill, the *basileis* clearly hold authority within the community and are able to pass judgement on cases which are placed before them. From the narrator's description, the inheritance had already been divided but then Perses challenged this division and the dispute was decided by the *basileis*. It is worth noting that the *basileis* of the *Works and Days* are described in the plural. This suggests that it is not one individual authority figure who has passed judgement in this inheritance dispute. The existence of multiple *basileis* within a community stands in stark contrast with the singular use of the term throughout the *Theogony* where only one deity at a time is described as having the power of the *basileus*, however, the idea of many *basileis* also appears in the *Odyssey* as will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

The final point of distinction between the mortal *basileis* of this passage and Zeus is the contrast between Zeus as a distributor of gifts and these figures who devour gifts. Throughout the *Theogony*, Zeus is associated with giving *time* and *moira* to deities who are prepared to aid him. This is seen most clearly in Zeus' recruitment of deities to fight against his father when he offers to preserve the honours that the gods hold, and give honours to the gods who were without, should they aid him.[188]

[183] Hesiod *Works and Days,* 668.
[184] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 27-32.
[185] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 39.
[186] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 36.
[187] This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.2 *Hesiod and the Discontent with the Mortal Basileus*.
[188] Hesiod *Theogony*, 389-396. This is discussed in more detail in 2.5 *Zeus as* Basileus.

The distinction between Zeus, the just and *basileus* who uses gifts to recruit, and the corrupt mortal *basileis* who accept 'gifts' in return for delivering specific judgements could not be more marked.

The greed of the *basileis* is not presented as typical of the role of the *basileus* within the *Works and Days*, rather it is indicative of the decline of man. When the narrator describes the creation of man, he begins by discussing the Golden Race who existed when Kronos was *basileus* in the sky.[189] The men of the Golden Race live a blessed existence, neither troubled by old age nor burdened by the toil of working the land. The idyllic characterisation of their lives is continued in their behaviour towards each other, and even in death. After this race have passed away, by the counsels of Zeus, the Golden Race are established as *daimons* who watch over mortals.[190] The Golden Race are given the honour of the *basileus*, which positions them, according to Hesiod, as invisible guardians of mortals. The characterisation of this role has more in comment with Zeus than with the *basileis* Perses engages with; the Golden Race are protective figures who watch over judgements and give wealth. Again, these figures are plural, however, the role of the *basileus* is centred around giving rather than taking gifts, presiding over judgements, and protecting communities.

The community of the narrator of the *Works and Days* does not exist within the blessed past, but within the Race of Iron. The narrator highlights the role that corruption and injustice takes within this race, lamenting that he was born into that Race.[191] It is to the *basileis* of this community that he relates the fable of the hawk and the nightingale. The narrator specifically mentions that this *ainos* is for the *basileis*, 'who have understanding.'[192] The meaning of this tale is fiercely debated; Nelson draws attention to the ambiguity of the identity of the hawk and the possible implications of understanding the hawk as Zeus with his talons in the *basileis*, rather than the *basileis* as the hawk with their talons in their communities.[193] Whichever of the two is intended to be in the role of the hawk, the presentation of the hawk as a powerful and violent figure of authority over the restrained nightingale reiterates the underlying association between physical prowess and the ability to exercise control over others. The ability of the *basileus* to physically excel is perhaps more obvious in the context of the *Iliad*, however the inherent physical superiority of the *basileus* is also so stressed

[189] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 109-126. The chronology of the Races is extremely difficult to map onto events in the *Theogony* as there is very little information given to connect the two beyond of this moment. The contradictions of Kronos reign during the time of the Golden Race have been discussed in Versnel 1987, 125. West too picks up on the conflict in presentations of Kronos' reign. West 1966, 205.
[190] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 121-126,
[191] Hesiod *Works and Days,* 174-176.
[192] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 202.
[193] Nelson 1997, 235. Nelson also provides a useful summary of scholarship on both sides of this debate in footnote 1 and 2, 235.

in the *Odyssey*, as shall be discussed in more detail below, and in the *Theogony* where Zeus must overcome both Kronos and Typhoëos in battle to establish and preserve his power.[194]

The last three mentions of the mortal *basileis* within the *Works and Days* occur within fifteen lines of each other and highlight the connections between the just, or unjust, *basileus* and the fate of their community. The *basileis* are urged to consider the impact that their judgements have on their communities. The narrator explains that the immortals are constantly vigilant for those who deal in crooked judgements.[195] Hesiod's narrator describes Dike, the daughter of Zeus, who alerts her father to those who have harmed her so that he might take vengeance against them.[196] Hesiod's narrator highlights the peril of communities ruled over by a crooked *basileus* as the execution of this vengeance is not restricted to the errant *basileus* but to their whole community. Zeus acts against *demos* not just the individual.[197] The narrator again highlights the responsibility of the *basileus* to make straight judgements, and to avoid 'gift-swallowing'.

The presentation of the *basileus* in the *Works and Days* consistently highlights the *basileus'* role as an arbiter of disputes, whether for good or for ill. The success of entire communities may rest on the integrity of the *basileis*, as the gods will punish the whole community should the *basileis* prove corrupt. The narrator's fixation on this aspect may come from a feeling of being wronged by a crooked judgement which neither Perses nor the *basileis* are given the opportunity of responding to directly. It is also important to note that the *basileis* are frequently referred to in the plural, suggesting that this is a role which could be occupied by more than one individual at a time. This stands in stark contrast to the discussion of the *basileus* in the *Theogony* where the title is not associated with more than one god at any given point, as will be demonstrated.

The Mortal *Basileus* and *Anax* in the *Odyssey*

Discussion of the *basileus* is not restricted to Hesiod, and the role and its occupants are topics of discussion throughout the Homeric poems. The political situation in the *Iliad* is exceptional, with the Greek army headed by a collection of powerful leaders gathered together to fight a war far from their respective homes. Whilst this makes it very useful for examining the power play and competitive aspects between leaders,[198] it does make it more challenging to gain a clear image of the role of the *basileus* within their own community. This makes the *Odyssey* better placed to offer a

[194] Hesiod *Theogony*, 687-710.
[195] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 248-251.
[196] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 256-264.
[197] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 261.
[198] The competition between leaders will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.2 *Competition and Authority*.

Homeric perspective on the role and duties of a *basileus* within their own community. The political situation in Ithaka is also atypical to an extent. Odysseus' prolonged absence leaves both the island and his household in a state of limbo. The situation is further complicated by the spectre of Laertes' continued presence, Telemachos' impending adulthood, and Penelope's position as wife of an absent man. However, the use of the term and the discussions between characters are helpful in clarifying the Homeric understanding of the term.

The word *basileus* occurs over fifty times within the *Odyssey*. Some of these uses are simply used alongside names; figures such as Minos and Echetos are referred to as a *basileus* but no elaboration is given as to their role or duties within in the community.[199] Focus here will be given to the passages which provide more detail surrounding the role. Perhaps the most enlightening discussion of the term comes fairly early in the *Odyssey*. The term is first used by Antinoos in Book 1 when he expresses his hope that Telemachos may never be *basileus* of Ithaka.[200] Albeit brief, these two lines offer a great deal of information: Antinoos acknowledges that this role is Telemachos' right by birth, highlights the connection with Zeus by evoking the 'son of Kronos', and demonstrates that Odysseus' absence is not enough to grant Telemachos the role of *basileus* by default. Antinoos' comments come after Telemachos has challenged the presence of the Suitors within the halls and declared he will hold an assembly to publicly expel them from his home. The timing of this incident comes just after Telemachos has instructed Penelope to return to her chambers and, in doing so, openly claimed authority over the household.[201] If Telemachos would automatically assume the position of *basileus* of Ithaka upon coming of age due to his position as Odysseus' son, Antinoos' comment cannot read as anything other than a thinly veiled threat as it indicates Antinoos' desire for something to befall Telemachos before he can take his rightful place.

The response that Telemachos gives indicates that this is not the case as Telemachos comments that, whilst it is not a bad thing to be a *basileus*, there are others on Ithaka who claim the title of *basileus* and he would be content to be *anax* over his own household and the slaves his father won for him.[202] Instead of treating Antinoos comments are a threat, Telemachos acknowledges that there are advantages in becoming *basileus*, both in terms of material gain and *time*, but that he would cede these to another *basileus* along with the palace itself. Telemachos' comments suggest that *basileus* is not an uncommon title, even among those who dwell on the island of Ithaka itself. It should be acknowledged that Telemachos may have his own reasons to downplay his ambition in

[199] Homer *Odyssey*, 19.179. 18.85 and 116; 21.308
[200] μὴ σέ γ᾽ ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ Ἰθάκῃ βασιλῆα Κρονίων / ποιήσειεν, ὅ τοι γενεῇ πατρώιόν ἐστιν. Homer *Odyssey*, 1.386-387.
[201] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.345-359. This episode is discussed in more detail in section 3.3 *Dependents*.
[202] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.388-398.

the company of the Suitors. Telemachos also contrasts the roles of *basileus* and *anax* which implies that there is distinction between the two.[203] In the context of this passage the distinction appears to be a division between a political role and a familial role, as Telemachos states that he would be *anax* over his own household.[204] This delineation may be a rhetorical device intended to deflect from Antinoos comments, or on the part of the poet to reduce any excessive repetition of the word *basileus*, but by placing the two titles in proximity and specifically relating one to the household and one to political office, the poet here implies that there is some distinction between the two positions.

Yamagata suggests that the most prominent use of the word *anax* in the *Odyssey* relates to the 'master of the house' and highlights that Odysseus is frequently described as an *anax* to members of his household, including subjects as far ranging as Penelope, the island of Ithaka and his arrows.[205] The inclusion of inanimate objects is unique to the *anax*, as Yamagata notes that there are no comparable examples with the *basileus* governing over objects or animals, only people.[206] The connection between the *anax* and the patriarchal head of household implies a duty of care over a community which might not be expected from a more distanced leader. The idea of the *anax* as a protective figure is underlined by the description of Polyphemos as the *anax* of his flock both by Odysseus in his role as narrator, and by Polyphemos himself when he addresses the ram.[207] Whilst it would be very strange to consider Polyphemos as a lord of the flock in a political sense, the concept of a protective authority figure seems well suited to a shepherd or a steward. Yamagata goes on to suggests that these paternalistic characteristics are why Zeus is connected with both *pater* and *anax* in the Homeric poems.

The gap between the *basilieus* and the *anax* cannot be as straightforward as simply the difference between household and community authority, however, as the link between a paternal head of household and a *basileus* is one which recurs within the *Odyssey*, particularly with regard to Odysseus himself. Telemachos is the first to raise this when he addresses the assembly on Ithaka. He describes the two evils that have befallen his household: the loss of his father, who was a *basileus* and gentle as a father to his people, and the arrival of the Suitors.[208] The description of Odysseus as a ruler who was as 'gentle as a father' is then echoed by Mentor who also praises Odysseus'

[203] Yamagata states that the association of *anax* with a 'master of the house' is well established whilst the *basileus* has not been shown to have this context. Yamagata 1997, 1.
[204] This distinction is perhaps more easily made amongst the mortals, as the gods are portrayed as one extended family so the division between *oikos* and *polis* is less pronounced.
[205] Yamagata 1997, 3.
[206] Yamagata 1997, 3.
[207] Homer *Odyssey*, 9.440 and 9.452.
[208] Homer *Odyssey,* 1.45-50.

kindness and righteousness.[209] Mentor's appeal that no sceptred *basileus* should be kind and gentle, but instead be harsh and work wickedly, as Odysseus seems to have been forgotten by his people on account of his mild nature, is later repeated almost word for word by Athena in Book 5 when she beseeches Zeus to intervene and rescue Odysseus from Calypso' island.[210] There is a connection drawn in these three passages between fatherhood and benevolent leadership. The implication is that Odysseus was a kind and fatherly *basileus* but that as the population have forgotten him, they now deserve a less benevolent leader. There is an irony in Telemachos referring to Odysseus as like a father to his people given that Telemachos has no memory of him, and his people now accused of having forgotten Odysseus in his absence as well. However, the connection between a positive paternal figure and a successful community leader is echoed by Athena and Mentor.[211]

In this passage Telemachos also highlights the connection between Zeus and *basileis*. This is a concept which is repeated throughout the *Odyssey*. The *basileis* are directly referred to as 'Zeus-fostered' at several points within the poem[212] and affiliated with the divinity more generally as well.[213] The elevated status of the *basileus* is evidently tied in with their heritage as Menelaos greets Telemachos by saying that he and his comrade are clearly of the 'race of Zeus fostered *basileis*' as they could not have been sired by lesser men.[214] Menelaos' greeting specifically refers to a *genos* of men who are *basileis*. The implication of this is that those in authority are a particular breed of men. This is perhaps not surprising in the Homeric poems where many high-profile figures can trace their family history to the gods themselves; Menelaos himself is married to a daughter of Zeus and Thetis' bond with her son Achilles is central to the plot of the *Iliad*. Andolfi suggests that the main focus of the Ancient Greek mythographers was on the genealogical aspects of myth and highlights the centrality of genealogies to poems such as the *Theogony*.[215] The association between patronymics and status is well established.[216] It is notable that the tales of Odysseus' travels that he gives himself noble heritage, for example as a descendent of Minos, *basileus* of Crete.[217] A noble heritage is clearly important to the heroes of the Epics and one of the key markers of the *basileus*.

[209] Homer *Odyssey,* 2.230-235.
[210] Homer *Odyssey*, 5. 7-12.
[211] This is perhaps significant within the *Theogony* when Kronos and Ouranos both act against the interests of their children, in contrast with Zeus who incorporates them into his regime.
[212] Homer *Odyssey*, 3.480, 4.44, 4.63, and 7.49.
[213] Homer *Odyssey*, 4.621, and 4.691.
[214] Homer *Odyssey*, 4.63.
[215] Andolfi 2017, 187.
[216] This is discussed in more detail in section 4.2 *Competition and Authority*. See also Scott 1912 for an early discussion of the importance of patronymics.
[217] Homer *Odyssey*, 19.179.

Within the Hesiodic examples examined above, the use of *basileus* has been restricted to male figures. The same is not true of the *Odyssey*. Both Penelope and Arete are referred to using the feminine form: *basileia*. Arete is directly addressed with the title in Book 7, and subsequently in Book 11 and 13,[218] but it is Penelope who is most frequently associated with the term. The Suitors are described as 'wooers of the glorious *basileia*' on four separate occasions[219] and Penelope is described as a *basileia* at various points within the poem.[220] Both women are exceptional in their status, as noted by Doherty,[221] and the use of this term further emphasises their relative power within their communities.[222] There are two other women connected with this term in the *Odyssey* are Nausikaä and Tyro, both of whom are given the title only once.[223] Arete is a woman with inherited status as the only surviving daughter of a powerful ruler and Athena speaks at length about her heritage and descent from Poseidon.[224] The focus on Arete's genealogy is even more significant given that we are told that she is of the same line as Alkinoos in line 55 and yet the focus remains on Arete rather than her husband. The elevated status of Arete, both within her marriage and within her community, is made clear when she is described as being honoured like as no other woman on earth, and even looked upon by the people as a goddess.[225] Arete is an exceptional figure and the use of *basileia* reflects this.

The Mortal *Basileus* and *Anax* of the *Iliad*

As stated at the beginning of the previous section, the role of the *basileus* in the *Iliad* is made complex by the nature of the poem. The Greek army is encamped on the plains of Troy and the leaders are not operating within their own communities or overseeing day to day life. However, there are several points within the poem where the nature of leadership is discussed. Some of these, such as the power struggle between Achilles and Agamemnon, and the position of Thersites, will be dealt with more fully later in the thesis.[226] There are some key details which are worth exploring in a little more detail here. Some of these, as shall be seen below, are the consistent references to more than one *basileus*, the close association between the *basileus* and Zeus, and the duties of a *basileus* to their community. As might be expected in a poem centred around war, there is also more

[218] Homer *Odyssey*, 7.241, 11.345, and 13.59.
[219] Homer *Odyssey*, 17.370, 17.468, 18.351, and 21.275.
[220] Homer *Odyssey*, 4.770, 16.332, 17.513, 17.583, 18.314, 23.144.
[221] Doherty 1992, 166.
[222] Penelope's position in Ithaka is discussed in more detail in section 3.2) *Dependents*.
[223] Homer *Odyssey*, 6.115 and 11.258.
[224] Homer *Odyssey*, 7.48-77.
[225] Homer *Odyssey*, 7.66-72.
[226] Section 4.2 *Competition and Authority*.

attention given to the duties of a *basileus* in times of conflict, and the different pressures that this places on a leader.

Hesiod's account of multiple *basileis* is echoed within the *Iliad* where there are frequent references to the *basileis*.[227] This could be explained by the presence of many leaders joined together in one war effort, but the presence of multiple *basileis* is also clear in the *Odyssey*, as discussed above. The impression from the *Odyssey* is perhaps more amiable than the *Iliad* where the presence of multiple *basileis* is presented as a source of contention. Despite the references to multiple *basileis* in all three texts examined, the plethora of potential commanders in the *Iliad* is a portrayed as a source of difficulty. Odysseus' address to the Greeks in Book 2 highlights the need for an overall leader who can make decisions on behalf of the people and the tensions between leading figures drives a substantial part of the narrative.[228]

Of all the *basileis* in the *Iliad*, the figure who is most frequently associated with the term is Agamemnon.[229] The prominence of Agamemnon as a leader within the group is stressed from the beginning of the poem. When Nestor attempts to diffuse the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon, he reminds Achilles that even though he is the son of a goddess and a mighty warrior, Agamemnon is the greater since Agamemnon has command over more men.[230] Nestor's comment highlights that even amongst *basileis* there is still a clear hierarchy and attributes Agamemnon's overarching authority to his command over more men. Agamemnon's authority is broadly acknowledged within the Greek army even amongst so many other *basileis*.

The other notable detail in Nestor's appeal to Achilles is his reference to a sceptre-bearing *basileus*, given honour by Zeus. Agamemnon's sceptre is a unique object with a heritage of its own. The sceptre was crafted by Hephaistos and given to Zeus before being passed to Hermes, Pelops, Atreus and Thyestes before being left to Agamemnon, that he might become *anax* of 'many isles and all of Argos'.[231] The transition of the object through the generations is evident, especially when the object enters the mortal chain of inheritance. The connection with inheritance is not linked to the role of the *basileus* but to the *anax*. It is possible again that this is a purely aesthetic decision made by the poet, but it is significant that Zeus is given the title of *anax* when Hephaistos presents him the with sceptre and then Agamemnon too will be an *anax*.[232] This stands in contrast to the multiple sceptre-bearing *basileis* who are described a few lines earlier which might suggest that, whilst a *basileus*

[227] Some clear examples where multiple *basileis* are referred to are: Homer *Iliad*, 2.86, 7.344, and 19.309.
[228] Homer *Iliad*, 2.203-206.
[229] Yamagata 1997, 11.
[230] Homer *Iliad*, 1. 275-281.
[231] Homer *Iliad*, 2.100-118.
[232] Homer *Iliad*, 2.102.

might possess a sceptre, this particular sceptre conferred additional authority.[233] This additional authority vested in Agamemnon by this sceptre is echoed by Odysseus' address to the Greek commanders when he entreats them to defer to the authority of the one *basileus* who had been given the sceptre and the authority to pass judgements by Zeus.[234] Sceptre-bearing is linked with the *basileis* but the sceptre of Agamemnon and the power it confers are linked with a line of descent and the inheritance of an object through the generations.

When Hesiod's narrator discusses the impact of the *basileus*, he highlights the perils of a wicked *basileus* who brings judgement on his whole community. This idea is also demonstrated in the *Iliad* from the outset of the poem, when the refusal of Agamemnon to return Chryseis brings down Apollo's wrath on the Greek army. The decision of Agamemnon to reject the ransom payment has serious repercussions for the army, whilst he himself remains unscathed by Apollo directly. In this episode Agamemnon acts as a corrupt *basileus*, seeking to advantage himself through the distribution of assets and the army suffer as a result of his judgement. The actions of Agamemnon are at odds with the general wishes of the community; the narrator stresses that the Greek army shouted their approval for ransom to be accepted, and yet it is still the Greek army who suffer as a result of Agamemnon's decision making. The conflict which arises from Agamemnon's refusal to accept ransom is not only damaging to the army, but also to his credibility to lead them. As Gish comments, the quarrel lays bare the tenuous nature of Agamemnon's command here, and threatens to destabilise the delicate balance of power amongst the Greeks.[235]

The Homeric poems are composed as entertainment for an audience rather than a political treatise and often the discussion of key terms is based on what can be inferred from the interactions between characters. There is, however, one key moment in Book 12 of the *Iliad* where Sarpedon discusses the role of the *basileus* with Glaukos.[236] Again, the term *basileis* is used in the plural rather than the singular, echoing what has been seen in both poets already. Sarpedon highlights the privileged position of a *basileus* within their community with access to fat sheep and honey sweet wine, and even says that other men look on them like gods.[237] The idea that the *basileis* are in some way markedly physically superior to the average person is one which can be seen in the *Odyssey* when Menelaos greets Telemachos, as discussed above. Sarpedon, as a son of Zeus, does have a

[233] Homer *Iliad*, 2.86.
[234] Homer *Iliad*, 2.203-206.
[235] Gish 2010, 6-7. The conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon is discussed in more detail in Section 4.2 *Competition and Authority*.
[236] Homer *Iliad*, 12.310-328.
[237] Homer *Iliad*, 12.312.

substantial claim to divine lineage, but not all *basileis* have such a direct link to divinity.[238] The position of the *basileis* within the community is evidently an elevated one, giving access to some of the finest resources and commanding a level of respect from the population.

Sarpedon's discussion of the rewards of the role also includes some of the duties of the *basileus*, most notably the military aspects. Yamagata suggests that the military leadership of the *basileus* may be the most important aspect of the role because the survival of the community depended upon the ability of the *basileus* to protect it.[239] Sarpedon's comments draw attention to the expectation that the *basileis* not only join the fray, but that they fight amongst the foremost of their men.[240] This expectation for the *basileis* to lead his men from the front allows for many of the high profile duels to occur between the heroes of both armies, but also suggests that the *basileis* have duties which they are expected to perform in return for their celebrated status. The *basileis* provide figureheads for their men, rallying them to greater valour through their own acts of bravery.[241] Many of the leaders, such as Achilles and Sarpedon, will never return home from the plains of Troy, and they go into the skirmishes knowing this. The poignancy of these moments is stressed by the poet. Sarpedon, who is destined to be killed by Patroklos,[242] tells Glaukos that as they are mortal, and therefore will perish regardless, it is better to join the fighting where they might win glory or give it to another.[243]

Conclusions

Within the Epic poems, it is clear that discussion of leadership in mortal communities ought to be around the role of a *basileus*, one amongst many other *basileis*, rather than the *basileus* as a singular monarchic figure ruling over a community. Both Hesiod and Homer refer to multiple *basileis* within a *polis*, and discuss their role in leadership within their community. Hesiod stresses the importance of the *basileis* in resolving disputes, and associates a crooked *basileus* with disaster for the entire *polis*. Hesiod's account does not give details on how one might attain the role, but emphasises the significance of distribution of goods and assets as a key element and also implies that there is an element of coercion through his connection of raw power and authority. The corrupt basileis of Hesiod are contrasted against the justice of Zeus, giver of gifts, who is closely associated with *dike* and the idealised Golden Race, who endure as *basileis* watching over mortals.

[238] The *basileis* of the *Iliad* are referred to as 'Zeus- fostered' in the same way as in the *Odyssey.* Homer *Iliad*, 1. 176, 2.196, and 14.27. See footnote 211 for some exampled from the *Odyssey*.
[239] Yamagata 1997, 11.
[240] Homer *Iliad*, 12.320-321.
[241] Homer *Iliad*, 12.409-414.
[242] Homer *Iliad*, 16.433-434.
[243] Homer *Iliad*, 12.326-328.

In contrast, Homer focusses more heavily on the dynastic elements. The discussion between Telemachos and Antinoos highlights the importance of a bloodline but also allows for flexibility in the distribution of authority. Telemachos will not automatically become ruler of Ithaka in the continued absence of Odysseus, and there are others on the island who could legitimately take the role. The *genos* of the *basileus* reflects a social hierarchy which one must belong to in order to compete for authority, but suggests a level of fluidity within that hierarchy. The distinction between a *basileus* who has authority within the community and the *anax* who has authority over the household is notable.

Whilst Hesiod does not describe any of his mortal rulers as an *anax*, Homer does not apply the term *basileus* to any deities, which strengthens the idea that the two terms carry a particular meaning. The inclusion of the *basileia* within the *Odyssey* is also notable, and this is not a role that Hesiod mentions within either the *Theogony* or the *Works and Days*. The final significant aspect is the comparison between the role of father and the role of *basileus*, which will be discussed further with reference to Zeus below.

2.5) Zeus in the *Theogony*

The questionable role of the *basileus* in the historical record increases the ambiguity surrounding Hesiod's use of *basileus* to describe Zeus. Having looked at the historical context of the term, I shall now examine them in the context of Hesiod's *Theogony*. The *Theogony* is the text which is primarily concerned with the establishment of the family tree of the gods and the hierarchy.[244] Hesiod's position as an authority on the gods is supported by Herodotos who credits Homer and Hesiod with the foundations of the Greek understanding of their deities in his own time.[245] The acknowledgement by Herodotos demonstrates that Hesiod's writing forms an influential part of the conceptions of the gods by the Classical period.

Zeus as *basileus*

Whilst the exact nuances of a term may be elusive, it is possible to build a picture of the term by looking at the contexts in which it is used within the texts. The table below gives a list of all the times that *basileus* is used and which figures are associated with the term.[246]

[244] See also Dowden 2007, 42.
[245] Herodotos *Histories,* 2.53.2.
[246] The discussion below will primarily focus on the uses which are connected to Zeus.

Form of *Basileus*	Line Reference	Verbal or Nominal	Figure Referred to
ἐμβασιλεύει	71	Verbal	Zeus
βασιλεῦσιν	80	Nominal	Mortal rulers
βασιλήων	82	Nominal	Mortal rulers
βασιλῆες	88	Nominal	Mortal rulers
βασιλῆες	96	Nominal	Mortal rulers
βασιλεῦσι	434	Nominal	Mortal rulers
βασιληίδα	462	Nominal	Kronos' honours
βασιλῆι	476	Nominal	Kronos
βασιλῆι	486	Nominal	Kronos
βασιλευέμεν	883	Verbal	Zeus
βασιλεὺς	886	Nominal	Zeus
βασιληίδα	892	Nominal	Zeus' honours
βασιλῆι	923	Nominal	Zeus
βασιλῆα	897	Nominal	Metis' unborn son
βασιλῆα	957	Nominal	Aeetes
βασιλῆα	985	Nominal	Memnon
βασιλῆος	992	Nominal	Aeetes
βασιλεὺς	995	Nominal	Pelias

Table 1 – The use of *basileus* in the *Theogony*.

Zeus is first described as being *basileus* in line 71 of the *Theogony*:

> ὃ δ᾽ οὐρανῷ **ἐμβασιλεύει**, /αὐτὸς ἔχων βροντὴν ἠδ᾽ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν, /κάρτει νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον. εὖ δὲ ἕκαστα /ἀθανάτοις διέταξεν ὁμῶς καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμάς.[247]

As this is the first instance which *basileus* is connected with Zeus it is key for shaping the concepts behind the term. It is worth considering the context of the passage. Hesiod's narrator is describing the song the Muses sing as they move towards Olympus. The song travels up to their father who is described as 'ἐμβασιλεύει', which can be rendered as *he is basileus*, and Hesiod then adds more detail to the description of Zeus. Zeus is described as ruler of a set dominion, Olympus,[248] and he is bearing the thunder and lightning bolt which are decisive in his victory over the Titans and later over Typhoëos.[249] Within the passage Zeus is also credited with defeating his father and dividing up the *timai* of the undying.[250] This picture created by the Muses in their song is of a ruler who has power

[247] 'He is *basileus* in the heavens, bearing the thunder and smoking lightning bolt; conquering his father Kronos by might, he appointed everything in equal parts to the undying and declared the honours.' Hesiod *Theogony,* 71-74. The word in bold is my selection.

[248] Scully suggests that Zeus creates Olympos as an idealised *polis* free from strife and distances this from the view that the family of the gods is an *oikos*. I disagree as both aspects are presented side by side and as such neither should be discounted. Scully 2016, 30-32.

[249] Hesiod *Theogony,* 687-69.

[250] West suggests that the κάρτει refers to Zeus compelling Kronos to regurgitate his siblings rather than the result of the Titanomachy. West 1966, 180.

through might rather than administrative methods. Zeus is shown in a position of authority with his most powerful weapons in hand and credited with the violent overthrow of his father and the division of the spoils from the Titanomachy. The idea of a hereditary leadership position is minimised slightly by setting the father in conflict with the son; in this description of events Zeus did not inherit power, he seized it.[251] The idea of a military coup rather than a natural succession is emphasised from very early within the text when the idea of the *basileus* is first introduced.

The portrayal of Zeus as a figure who rules primarily through force rather than affection is supported by other sources. In Book 1 of the *Iliad*, Achilles reminds Thetis that she thwarted a plan to overthrow Zeus and bind him, and Zeus reminds Hera of the time when he hung her with golden chains.[252] The characterisation of Zeus in these passages is not one of a benevolent leader but of a strong one. Blickman highlights that Zeus may be 'the best of a bad lot, the last strong man to rule in heaven'.[253] Scully takes this a step further suggesting that Zeus is 'an abusive ruler' who is reliant on his position as strongest to maintain his power.[254] The importance of power in maintaining the position of the *basileus* is emphasised within this passage.[255] However, despite the implications of potential violence this passage is not a portrait of a despot. Zeus is a distributor who shares out the *timai* amongst the undying and divides them well. When the Muses sing at the beginning of the *Theogony,* the audience is told that the Muses sing their song of what is, what will be and what was before.[256] Their song is taken up by the narrator of the *Theogony* who then relates it to his audience.[257] The Muses' song of the origins of the gods delights their father and gives him pleasure which suggests that their characterisation of his regime is a positive one, or at least one which he can take pleasure in.[258] The position of the description of Zeus as *basileus* is at an early point in the text; which ensures that Zeus is established as *basileus* from almost the outset of the poem. Before the main narrative has even begun within the poem Zeus is shown to be established in his power.

The close link between the use of force and of the manipulation of distribution is further underlined by the next use of *basileus*:

[251] The idea of natural succession when the father is undying is an interesting one. This will be addressed further when talking about Zeus' role as a father and as a son.
[252] Homer *Iliad,* 1.396-404 and 15.13-24.
[253] Blickman 1987, 342.
[254] Scully 2016, 13.
[255] This is also supported by the imagery in the Hawk and the Nightingale episode in *Works and Days.* Hesiod *Works and Days,* 202-212. Hall 2007, 46.
[256] Hesiod *Theogony,* 38-9.
[257]Hesiod *Theogony,* 114-115.
[258] Lopez-Ruiz 2004, 1.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσσαν, / Τιτήνεσσι δὲ τιμάων κρίναντο βίηφι, / δή ῥα τότ᾽ ὦτρυνον βασιλευέμεν ἠδὲ ἀνάσσειν / Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν / ἀθανάτων· δὲ τοῖσιν ἐὰς διεδάσσατο τιμάς.[259]

In contrast to the positioning of the first use, this passage is placed just after Zeus has defeated Typhoëos. The defeat of Typhoëos marks the culmination of the succession myth where Zeus finally secures his power.[260] Zeus' final victory over Typhoëos marks both Zeus' ability to defeat a challenger in combat and his control over the dynastic order.

Once Typhoëos has been defeated, Zeus is appointed by 'universal consent'[261] and by the counsels of Gaia to *basileus*. The idea that Zeus can be urged to take on the roles of *basileus* and *anax* implies both that the role does not go to Zeus automatically and that the two roles retain a distinction between them.[262] West refers to the use of the two titles as a 'simple pleonasm' and highlights that Hesiod uses both terms to describe 'kingship in heaven'.[263] It seems strange to dismiss the lexical choice of a poet who chooses his words with deliberate care as a pleonasm. West acknowledges that the terms are used of specific groups of people within Homer, but denies that this dual allocation in Hesiod carries a deeper meaning. The decision to use both terms is an interesting as it suggests that that there is meaning in giving both titles to Zeus. The term *anax* is used throughout the *Theogony*, as is *basileus*, but the two are used in conjunction at the specific moment when the gods appoint Zeus to be their leader. In giving Zeus both titles Hesiod cements Zeus as the ultimate authority. There is no ambiguity about Zeus being overshadowed by the occupant of the other role. The use of *anax*,will be discussed in more detail in the section below, but the importance of giving both terms to Zeus cannot be dismissed without consideration.

The positioning of the passage is interesting. Having gained a military victory over Typhoëos, and over his father and the Titans, Zeus is set into the leadership role. As in the previous section, Zeus is in the position of a triumphant military leader and dividing up the *timai* amongst the undying. The militaristic connection is strengthened be deliberately referring back to the conflict with the Titans, despite the conflict with the Titans ending on line 819 over fifty lines previously. The passage makes no mention of Typhoëos by name, perhaps including him as one of the Titans by extension of his

[259] 'When the blessed gods brought to an end their work and through force reached a settlement with the Titans regarding honours, by the cunning of Gaia they urged broad-eyed Olympian Zeus to become *basileus* and *anax*, and he divided the honours for them.' Hesiod *Theogony*, 881-885.
[260] West 1966, 18-19.
[261] West 1966, 397.
[262] Zeus as *anax* will be discussed in the next section.
[263] West 1966, 399.

parentage or distance from the Olympians. There is clearly an importance to leading a successful military campaign for inspiring confidence amongst the followers. However, this in isolation is not enough. Zeus cannot rely exclusively on his military prowess or brute force to ensure his position; he must also have the support of his grandmother Gaia. The text is unambiguous regarding Gaia's role in ensuring Zeus' power; Zeus owes his establishment in his position to the cunning of Gaia.[264]

As West highlights, the exact phrase is used of Gaia both at his point and earlier in the text when Kronos is forced to regurgitate the children that he had swallowed.[265] The re-emergence of Zeus' siblings is the result of Gaia's scheming against Kronos at the request of Rhea. Kronos swallows the children of Rhea out of fear, having been by Gaia told that that one of them will over power him and replace him as the *basileus*:

ἵνα μή τις ἀγαυῶν Οὐρανιώνων / ἄλλος ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔχοι βασιληίδα τιμήν.[266]

In the manner of ancient Greek prophecies, attempting to escape the prophecy brings the undesirable event to pass. In seeking to evade the threat of the child Kronos alienates his wife causing her to plot his downfall. The prophecies and cunning of Gaia ultimately usher in the rule of Zeus and it is her machinations which ensure the gods elect him to the positions of *basileus* and *anax*. Despite the fact that Kronos and Zeus occupy the position of power, both Rhea and Gaia are influential in placing them into that position.

The next point at which Zeus is referred to specifically as a *basileus* follows swiftly on from the last example when he is described as '*basileus* of the gods' in line 886.[267] The use of *basileus* has been fairly infrequent throughout the poem until Zeus takes power then it is used four times within fifteen lines.[268] Upon becoming *basileus* of the gods, Zeus first action is to find a partner and to father a child. This follows the model of his father whose first independent action following the castration of Ouranos is to overpower Rhea and produce children of his own.[269] Whilst the need to take a partner and to produce children appears consistent the methods used by Zeus and Kronos are quite different. Kronos 'overpowers' Rhea, whereas Zeus makes Metis his wife: Ῥείη δὲ δμηθεῖσα Κρόνῳ τέκε φαίδιμα τέκνα.[270] That Zeus is the first of the gods to marry the mother of his children suggests a level of increased social order where the relationship is ratified by more than the

[264] Hesiod *Theogony*, 884.
[265] West 1966, 399. Hesiod *Theogony*, 626.
[266] 'Lest another of glorious Ouranos' children [literally 'the heavenly ones'] should have the honour of the *basileus* among the undying.' Hesiod *Theogony,* 461-2. Davidson 1995, 364-369.
[267]Hesiod *Theogony,* 886-7
[268] Hesiod *Theogony,* 883, 886, 892, and 897.
[269] Hesiod *Theogony,* 453.
[270]'Rhea, overpowered by Kronos bore him splendid children'; Hesiod *Theogony,* 453.

production of children.[271] The increasing imposition of social order is part of the broad theme of the *Theogony*; and Scully also credits Zeus with both the creation of the institution of marriage and the polity of Olympos.[272] The increase in social infrastructure is associated with Zeus' ascension to power, as the first mention of matrimony is Zeus' first wife.

However, with the marriage comes the insecurity of a son who will challenge for authority. Zeus, like his father before him, is concerned about the potential of a child to take the honour of the basileus from him.[273] In contrast to his father Zeus has the support of Gaia and Ouranos, and as well as being told of the prophecy Zeus is told what he must do to mitigate the threat. Kronos is ignorant of the counsels of Gaia and Ouranos when they conspire with Rhea against him, but Zeus is aware of the potential danger and informed enough to act to preserve his reign.[274] The potential threat of the son is underlined a few lines later when it is revealed that Metis is destined to give birth to a son, and that son is destined to be a *basileus* of gods and men.[275] The prophecy of the son is fascinating. Firstly, it demonstrates that Zeus is not entirely secure in his position. Zeus's overthrow is foretold by Gaia and Ouranos, and he knows that it is one of his own children that will displace him. Secondly it asks the question of whether Zeus himself is above fate. If Gaia prophecies that Zeus' son will be the '*basileus* of gods and men' then Zeus either escapes his fate and the prophecy or is able to delay the inevitable arrival of his son beyond the confines of the *Theogony*. Lastly naming a son as the significant threat to his father strengthens the impression that there is a significance to the line of descent. Ouranos was neutralised by the youngest of his sons,[276] Kronos was deposed by the youngest of his sons, and Zeus is made aware of a threat posed by his own.

The impression given by these passages is not one of a secure and established kingship. In the passages where Zeus is referred to as a *basileus* he is portrayed as a powerful individual, often the victor of a recent battle. The focus of military success and the depiction of him wielding of the lightning bolt stresses the personal strength of Zeus as an individual warrior and leader. This does not negate the possibility of Zeus becoming a 'king' but does move power away from the institution and towards the individual which suggests a chief or 'Big-Man' model. The reliance on individual standing is further underlined by the fact that the other gods urge Zeus to become *basileus* and to rule over them. The implication is that there is a titled role, however, this is not a role that Zeus can claim without the support of his peers. Hesiod makes no mention of a birth right to the role, nor

[271] Scully 2016, 41.
[272] Scully 2016, 42.
[273] Hesiod *Theogony,* 892-3.
[274] See also Ready 2007, 131.
[275] Hesiod *Theogony,* 897-8.
[276] Hesiod *Theogony,* 137.

does he stress the familial connection between Zeus and Kronos in the instances where Zeus is described as a *basileus.* Rather Hesiod focuses attention on the strengths and merits of Zeus as an individual. If the power rests with the ruler himself rather than the position that he is born into it is difficult to assert that the ruler is a 'king' based on the understandings of kingship outlined by Carlier and Wright.[277]

What is most notable about Zeus' position as a *basilieus*, in comparison to the mortal examples discussed previously, is the singular nature of his position. Hesiod uses *basileis* to describe mortal rulers but Zeus and Kronos are the only two deities to hold the power of the *basileus* and they do not hold the position at the same time. The reason for this is not entirely clear, it is possible that as Hesiod is engaging with the Near Eastern model of the succession myth[278] there is an inherent difficulty with having multiple *basileis* amongst the gods, or it could be that Hesiod is deliberately emphasising the sole authority of the '*basileus* of gods and men' and through that Zeus' singular authority over the cosmos whilst he occupies the role.

Within the sections above, it appears that Zeus' ascension to the role of *basileus* is not an automatic product of his birth. This seems counterintuitive given the pattern of father-son discord demonstrated within the *Theogony*. When sons take over the rule from the father it is logical to assume that there is patrilinear descent.[279] The idea of inherited rule is a key feature of a king and the movement of authority from Ouranos to Kronos and then to Zeus would imply that there is a hereditary nature to the role of *basileus*. There is certainly a concern from Kronos that one of his children will become *basileus* of the undying. The difficulty with ascribing this to an idea of fixed inheritance is that the fear of the son comes from a specific source. In both instances Gaia and Ouranos foretell the arrival of a challenger, and inform the current holder of power that their child will be a danger to their rule. Whilst it would be unwise to neglect the fact that the prophesied successor is always a child to the current ruler rather than another figure within the family, it is also problematic to assume that the child is a threat purely by virtue of their existence. Both Zeus and Kronos have other children, and other sons, who do not go on to seize power. It is too much of a coincidence to dismiss that Kronos and Ouranos are deposed by their youngest son, and that Gaia prophesies that Zeus will be overthrown by his son by Metis.

Unlike Kronos, Zeus takes multiple wives and the first wife he takes is not one of his sisters. He instead marries Metis who is a daughter of Okeanos and Tethys.[280] Okeanos and Tethys are siblings

[277] Carlier 2006, 104. Wright 1995, 65.
[278] This is discussed in detail in the appendix.
[279] Harrison 1963, xxi.
[280] Hesiod *Theogony,* 358.

of Kronos and Rhea, which places them in the generation above Zeus.[281] Next Zeus marries Themis, a sister of Kronos and Rhea,[282] before marrying Eurynome another of Okeanos' daughters.[283] Zeus also has children with Leto, who is herself a child of Phoebe and Koios,[284] two more of his father's siblings. Mnemosyne is another daughter of Gaia and Ouranos,[285] and he then goes on to father children with the two of his sisters who have not sworn chastity: Demeter and Hera.[286] This means that Zeus marries all of his aunts who are without a partner, his sisters who have not abstained from marriage and two of the daughters of his married aunt and uncles. There appears to be a concern to take control of the female line of the family and to ensure that the children that they produce are all descended from Zeus himself. The need to control the fathering of children with the female members of the family implies that there is a dynastic element to the position of *basileus*. In marrying the women who are within that line, and ensuring that they bear his children, Zeus is able to prevent any other god from producing children with them who may go on to threaten his rule. This would suggest that there was a need to prevent alternative gods from marrying into the line of descent. The need to protect the line of descent suggests that hereditary descent does have some bearing on the succession of the position of *basileus*.

Zeus as *anax*

Whilst Zeus is only referred to as a *basileus* once he has defeated his father and the Titans, he is referred to as an *anax* before he has been able to take a position of power. Again, Zeus is not the only deity who is associated with the term *anax*, as can be seen from the table below:

Forms of *Anax*	Line Reference	Verbal or Nominal	Figure Referred to
ἄνακτι	347	Nominal	Apollo
ἄνακτι	486	Nominal	Kronos
ἀνάξειν	491	Verbal	Zeus
ἄνακτος	493	Nominal	Zeus
ἀνάκτων	543	Nominal	Prometheus

[281] Hesiod *Theogony,* 132-136.
[282] Hesiod *Theogony,* 132-136.
[283] Hesiod *Theogony,* 358.
[284] Hesiod *Theogony,* 405-6.
[285] Hesiod *Theogony,* 135.
[286] Hesiod *Theogony,* 912-914 and 921-924.

ἄναξ	660	Nominal	Zeus
ἄναξεν	837	Verbal	Typhoëos
ἄνακτος	843	Nominal	Zeus
ἄνακτος	859	Nominal	Typhoëos
ἄνακτι	932	Nominal	Poseidon
ἄνακτα	985	Nominal	Emathion

Table 2 – The use of *anax* within the *Theogony*.

Once Rhea and Gaia have contrived for Kronos to swallow the stone in place of Zeus, Zeus is concealed from his father to allow him to reach maturity. Zeus is referred to as an *anax* twice within quick succession as the plan to take retribution on Kronos nears its conclusion. Firstly, there is a reminder of the prophecy which Kronos is fruitlessly trying to evade. As Kronos seizes the rock and swallows it in place of his son the narrator reminds the audience that Zeus will drive him from his honour and will be *anax* amongst the immortals.[287] This is immediately followed by the description of Zeus growing, and Zeus is again described as an *anax*.[288] The description of Zeus as an *anax* within the prophecy is a foretelling of the role he will take on after the defeat of his father and could potentially be left at that. However, the description of the limbs and might of the *anax* growing is more immediate. Zeus is not the one who will be an *anax*, he is described in this instance as the *anax* a year before he is able to challenge his father, let alone defeat him.

This idea that Zeus is an *anax* before the defeat of his father is strengthened in his address to Kottos.[289] Zeus offers Kottos, Gyges and Briareos ambrosia and nectar and frees them from the confinement under which Kronos placed them. Once he has done this, Zeus then attempts to persuade them to join the Olympians in overthrowing Kronos and the Titans. Kottos responds to Zeus' address; he tells Zeus that Zeus has proved himself to be superior in mind, and a protector of the gods. Kottos attributes his release to Zeus and tells the '*anax*, Kronos' son' that he and his brothers will fight alongside the Olympians against Kronos.[290] Once again Zeus is being referred to as an *anax* when he has yet to take his place as leader. It is possible that the use indicates a role Zeus will take on, rather than one which he already occupies, but the context seems to suggest that Kottos already regards Zeus as occupying this position. If the position of *anax* is open to Zeus before the overthrow of his father this could suggest that *anax* here means something closer to leader than king. The Hundred-Handers acknowledge the authority of Zeus as their liberator and agree to aid them in the Titanomachy but Zeus has not yet defeated his father. In providing Zeus with the

[287] Hesiod *Theogony,* 492.
[288] Hesiod *Theogony,* 493-4.
[289] Hesiod *Theogony,* 654-663.
[290] Κρόνου υἱὲ ἄναξ. '*anax*, son of Kronos.' Hesiod *Theogony,* 660.

thunderbolts and lightening the Hundred Handers not only grant victory in the Titanomachy but ensure Zeus' reign over gods and mortals.[291] Once again the link between a position of authority and military supremacy is drawn.

Kronos as *anax*

Although Hesiod's text focusses on the ascent of Zeus to ruler of the heavens he is not the only figure described as a ruler within the *Theogony*. As Vernant observes Kronos is the first *anax* in the *Theogony*.[292] Ouranos, despite being the first father to be supplanted by his son, is never described as a *basileus* or an *anax* within the text. The way in which the poet uses *basilieus* and *anax* when describing Kronos is notable. The first time that Kronos is associated with the term *basileus* is when he is afraid that another amongst the descendants of Ouranos should have the honour of being *basileus* amongst the immortals.[293] In this moment Kronos is not explicitly named as either an *anax* or a *basileus*. At this point in the narrative, it is an inference that in fearing another would become a *basileus* Kronos feared that he would be directly replaced. Though Kronos is later described by Gaia and Ouranos as a *basileus* this is in the passage in which they describe how Zeus is destined to overthrow Kronos and to take the role of *basileus* from him.[294] The description of Kronos as a *basileus* at this point only serves to illustrate the power Kronos will lose to Zeus rather than the power that he holds in his own right. The same approach is used when Kronos swallows the stone in place of his son. Rather than emphasise Kronos' position as leader, Hesiod underlines the loss of authority that Kronos will suffer at the hand of his son.[295] Once again Kronos is not described as an *anax* himself; rather he is the one who will be driven from his honour by a child who will be *anax* to the immortals. Again, by implication Kronos is the current occupier of the role of the *anax* but the role is given in a backhanded manner. By requiring the audience to work backwards from Zeus as the *anax* displacing his father, Hesiod is able to retain the focus on Zeus' reign. Kronos is referred to as an *anax* directly only in the prophecy of Gaia and Ouranos when they foretell his defeat, and only as a *basileus* by implication that he will have this taken from him by another. That Kronos is never directly referred to as a *basileus* also means it is possible that he occupies the position of *anax* but

[291] Hesiod *Theogony* 506. See also Heath 1985, 256-7.
[292] Vernant 1971, 36.
[293] Hesiod *Theogony* 461-462. West observes that Kronos is not directly called a 'king' until line 462. He suggests that Hesiod must have taken for granted that his audience would understand Kronos' position without needing it to be stated. West 1966, 295.
[294] Hesiod *Theogony,* 474-476.
[295] Hesoid *Theogony,* 485-491.

not *basileus*, and he will be overthrown by his son who is destined to be the *basileus* making Kronos superfluous not by replacing him in the role, but by replacing his role entirely. This might be pushing the idea a little further than the text comfortably allows but the absence of power terms directly applied to Kronos does appear to be deliberate.

The opposition between Zeus and his father is alluded to in the epithets given when they are named as children of their parents. Of the children of Ouranos and Gaia only three are given epithets: golden-crowned Phoebe, lovely Tethys and crooked-counselled Kronos.[296] The fact that not all of the children are given epithets suggests that there is some significance to the ones that are given. Whilst the attributes of Phoebe and Tethys are mild and positive in outlook, by comparison ankulometes is negative. It cannot be a coincidence that the only son of Ouranos who is given an epithet is Kronos. Nor is the description of Kronos as ankulometes at this point a lone occurrence. Kronos is referred to as ankulometes from his first mention in line 18, and is repeated a further four times.[297] The repetition of the epithet marks significant moments in Kronos' life: his first mention within the text, his birth, his agreement to castrate his father, the swallowing of his own children, and his regurgitation of those children. As each of these events are narrated, the repetition of ankulometes reminds the audience of Kronos' wickedness and his crooked-counsel. By connecting Kronos moments of agency with the epithet ankulometes, the narrator implies that Kronos' actions are driven by his crooked nature.

This characterisation is in contrast with Zeus, who is described as 'counsellor' and goes on to marry Metis herself. Zeus described as *metioeis* from his birth.[298] The placement of this adjective, as the first descriptor of Zeus at his birth, is significant as it is directly comparable to the use of ankulometes to describe his father Kronos at his birth. The positioning of the term highlights a disparity between the two figures, by placing them into opposition. It has to be acknowledged that the lines are over 300 lines apart, and if the poem was delivered orally the audience would not be able to flick back to an earlier section to check the exact details, but there is still a significance to the placement. The moment that the god is born is the moment that the poet introduces them to the audience, at this point the poet chooses which features of the deity to highlight. For example, Hesiod's narrator choses to draw attention to the 'pitiless heart' of Hades,[299] or the soothing nature of Leto.[300] Not all of the gods get this character development, so the additional information is chosen

[296] Hesiod *Theogony,* 136-138.
[297] Hesiod *Theogony,* 18, 137, 168, 473, 495. The same word is also used to describe Prometheus in line 546 of the *Theogony* and line 48 of *Works and Days.*
[298] Hesiod *Theogony,* 457.
[299] Hesiod *Theogony,* 455-456.
[300] Hesiod *Theogony,* 406.

for a specific purpose and that there is a purpose to the information that is provided. At the moment of his birth Zeus is first described as μητιόεις, just as his father is described at his own birth as ankulometes. Their natures are described as in direct opposition, which provides a reason for them to come into conflict. By associating Zeus with counsel and wisdom it ensures that Zeus' characterisation is more positive than his father's and that there is no doubt about which has the moral upper hand when the two do come into conflict.

Zeus' connection with legitimate rule is also in stark contrast with his father. As discussed above, he is referred to as 'counsellor' Zeus, and stands in direct opposition to both the crooked rule of his father and the challenger Prometheus. His association with strong and just leadership is outlined in the Muses' connection with the mortal rulers. Kalliope, the greatest of the Muses,[301] attends upon the favoured mortal rulers, pouring sweet dew onto their tongues and imbuing their speech with gracious words.[302] The 'Zeus-cherished *basileus*'[303] is capable of turning around a wayward assembly and can return the people to a correct course of action using gentle words.[304] The connection between Zeus and these mortal rulers, who are regarded as almost god-like by their peers, establishes the connection between Zeus and beloved leaders.[305] In placing these wise and well regarded leaders under Zeus' blessing and protection Hesiod connects Zeus with the model of tempered and reasoned leadership supported by those who are ruled over. Zeus' own daughters nourish those who receive his blessing and it is this nourishment which allows them to provide straight judgements and to dispel quarrels. The image is presented before the genealogy is even begun, and allows Hesiod to shape the impression of Zeus' leadership from the outset.

Hesiod's narrator does not need to criticise Kronos' regime directly to justify Zeus' actions in supplanting his father; the actions that Kronos takes and the association with crooked thinking cement the impression of an unfair and despotic regime. There is enough information which can be picked up through implication to shape Kronos' rule. Hesiod's presentation of actions that Kronos takes within the narrative highlights the negative aspects of his character. This is consistent throughout the text. Aside from his epithet of ankulometes, discussed above, Kronos is described as the 'most terrible' of the children of Gaia and Ouranos.[306] This is a reputation that Kronos seems keen to live up to, not only does Kronos carry out the castration of his father, creating the avenging

[301] Hesiod *Theogony,* 79.
[302] Hesiod *Theogony,* 83-84.
[303] … διοτρεφέων βασιλήων… Hesiod *Theogony,* 82.
[304] Hesiod *Theogony,* 90.
[305] Hesiod *Theogony,* 91.
[306] Hesiod *Theogony,* 138.

Erinyes, but he volunteers for the task and carries out the deed 'eagerly'.[307] His violent streak manifests again in his union with Rhea who is 'overpowered' by him:

Ῥείη δὲ δμηθεῖσα Κρόνῳ τέκε φαίδιμα τέκνα.[308]

The use of the term 'overpowered' is significant. Whilst there is no rigid definition of a sexual assault within ancient Greek culture there is an understanding that violence or force can be used to overpower a woman and that this is not a positive use of strength.[309] The only other male figures who overpower their wives within the *Theogony* are Hyperion, Orthos and Peleus.[310] Whilst it cannot be ignored that different cultures have different attitudes regarding issues of consent, the context of these situations demonstrates that the use of overpowering force is not viewed positively. The union of Peleus and Thetis is an infamously unhappy one, as the goddess, resenting her marriage to a mortal and the grief it will cause her, resides in the ocean away from her husband. Orthos is described as the dog child of Echidna and Typhon who mates with his equally monstrous sister Chimaira to produce both the Sphynx and the Nemean Lion.[311] The offspring of this union are devastating to humanity until they are eventually defeated by heroes. The one exemption to this would seem to be Hyperion who overpowers Theia in love, which could imply a less violent nature to his advances. This small but important distinction is missing in Kronos' advances on Rhea.

The male figures who are associated with 'overpowering' their partners are few in number and the instances that they describe can be predominantly characterised as negative. The limited number of figures suggests that this is a term being used in a specific context and carries a meaning deeper than simply an alternative linguistic choice. The use of the same key term in select cases encourages comparison between those situations. The comparison created by using that participle with only these figures suggests that there is an unnatural or unpleasant element to the union. Orthos and Chimaira are non-anthropomorphic figures, Peleus and Thetis cross the boundary between mortal and immortal, and perhaps Hyperion as a Titan carries an implicit sense of aggression.[312] Collectively

[307] Hesiod *Theogony,* 181.

[308] 'Rhea, overpowered by Kronos, bore him radiant children.' Hesiod *Theogony,* 453.

[309] For information on ideas of rape and sexual consent see Cole 1984, 98; Laiou 1993, 17-38; Omitowoju 2002, 16-27; Rabinowitz 2010, 1-21. As is often the case, the source material detailing the laws and litigation around these issues dates to classical Athens. This is problematic in that it is impossible to be entirely sure that these attitudes would have been present in other periods or geographic areas. This is an area which must be treated with caution.

[310] Πηλέι δὲ **δμηθεῖσα**… 'overpowered by Peleus…' Hesiod *Theogony,* 1006-7.
… **ὑποδμηθεῖσ'** Ὑπερίονος ἐν φιλότητι. '[Theia] overpowered in love by Hyperion.' Hesiod *Theogony* 374.
ἡ δ' ἄρα Φῖκ' ὀλοὴν τέκε Καδμείοισιν ὄλεθρον, /Ὄρθῳ **ὑποδμηθεῖσα**… 'She [Chimera], overpowered by Orthos, bore the deadly Sphinx, the ruin of the Kadmeans.' Hesiod *Theogony* 326-7. Selection in bold is mine.

[311] Hesiod *Theogony* 309.

[312] Thetis is also associated with changing her shape in later literature. Apollodorus, *Lib.* 3.13.5.

this would suggest that there is a negative characterisation to gods who 'overpower'. Certainly, the union between Kronos and Rhea is an unhappy one as she conspires with their parents to avenge the wrongs which he has done to her and her kin. The implication that Kronos has forced Rhea into a union against her will suggests that even as an authority figure he lacks the personal qualities to make an appealing partner.

In contrast with his father, Zeus takes multiple wives, none of which are compelled into a union. As mentioned earlier Zeus is the first to marry within the *Theogony*, legitimising the partnership and any offspring that are born to that union. It is also worth noting that Demeter and Maia are both described as coming to Zeus' bed which could imply not only that they were not averse to the union but that they sought it.[313] Even with the consumption of Metis there is no suggestion of violence against her. Metis is treated much in the same way that Kronos treats his children; the contrast however is in the presentation. Metis is placed into Zeus' stomach rather than swallowed down.[314] This is an interesting change of emphasis. To all intents and purposes, the action is the same, a deity who poses a potential challenge is confined to the stomach of the current ruler to avoid or postpone the completion of a succession prophecy. Zeus' forethought in swallowing the mother rather than the child is cunning, in that it negates the threat of the enraged mother attempting to exact vengeance on behalf of her children. The forethought could be said to extend even further as swallowing Metis whilst she is pregnant with her first child means that it is impossible for her to become pregnant with the second child whilst she is inside Zeus. The birth of Athena demonstrates that Zeus would not necessarily be able to confine the prophesied son within his own body, so by swallowing the pregnant Metis he removes any shadow of a doubt that she can produce a second child, either by him or by another god. The implication in the text is perhaps that it would be a son of Zeus who would prove to be a challenger, but the text says that Metis is destined to produce a son who will be a king of gods and men.[315] Throughout the *Theogony* the goddesses produce children with a single partner with the notable exception of Gaia, and those who produce children through parthenogenesis. The fidelity of these partners would suggest that Metis would only bear children as a result of her relationship with Zeus, but as Gaia demonstrates that the capacity for an alternative father is present.

Father-son relationship

[313] Hesiod, *Theogony,* 912, 938-939.
[314] Hesiod *Theogony,* 889.
[315] Hesiod *Theogony,* 897-8.

For all the conflicts that exist between Zeus and Kronos, the relationship between two is not minimised within the text. Zeus is repeatedly described as the 'son of Kronos' or 'Kronos' son' throughout the *Theogony.*[316] The repeated emphasis of the relationship between father and son is perhaps an indication of the importance that the Archaic Greeks placed on to patrilinear descent. The significance of a genealogy lies in the ability to place oneself in the world by connecting the lines of descent until a discernible pattern emerges which allows you to place yourself within that world.[317] The form of the *Theogony* suggests that this interest in genealogical thinking extended beyond the mortal and into the divine sphere, perhaps due to the muddying of the waters between the two zones where mortals could trace their descent through to the gods themselves. The need to find and maintain that sense of connection is echoed in the *Theogony* when Zeus is called 'son of Kronos'. The very first time that Zeus is mentioned within the *Theogony* he is referred to as the 'Son of Kronos' and no further description is given, not even his own name.[318] It is not uncommon for figures to be referred to by a patronymic in Greek epic; and the use of the formula may not reflect any meaning in particular but it is striking that the first time Zeus is mentioned in the *Theogony* it is not by his own name but rather his father's. The relationships between fathers and sons in the descent from Ouranos to Zeus are all extremely fraught. Ouranos loathes his children and is loathed by them in return, and Kronos is a devourer of his own children whose children declare open war against him. The relationship on a personal level is poor, and yet Zeus is still defined in terms of his relationship to his father. The implication is that the connection between father and son is still perceived as integral to identity even when the figures are in direct opposition to each other.

It is difficult to comment as to whether this is due to a line of inheritance. Zeus takes power from his father because Kronos is destined to be overthrown by a child of his.[319] This is quite different to saying that Zeus is expected to inherit as a son of a ruler. Whilst Kerényi bases Zeus' sovereignty on his position as Kronos' son and heir, Finkelberg has demonstrated that the mode of transition of rulership in epic poetry cannot be assumed to progress automatically from father to son; and that often the marriage of a daughter to an external hero governs the line of descent.[320] Interestingly, the limit placed on the role of the son, in Finkelberg's model, is the idea that if the line of decent runs through the daughter, then the inheritance of the son would require an incestuous relationship.[321] Given that in the *Theogony* brothers and sisters often intermarry with scant regard for the

[316] Hesiod *Theogony*, 73, 412, 450, 534, 572, 624, 660, and 949.
[317] Fowler 1998, 1.
[318] Hesiod *Theogony,* 4.
[319] Hesiod *Theogony,* 463-465.
[320] Kerényi 1976, 45. Finkelberg 1991, 303, 306.
[321] Finkelberg 1991, 307.

implications of incest, it becomes impossible to determine whether the line of descent runs through the father or the mother of the child, if indeed it runs at all. The implication of using a patronymic is that the connection between the father and the son is the important one. If the mother was the key to the inheritance of power and authority surely it would be the mother's name which was tied to the authority of the daughter, rather than the son drawing his name from his father. However, as Finkelberg observes there is no evidence of a broad interest in matrilineal descent the Greek writings.[322] An examination of the contexts in which Zeus is described as the 'son of Kronos' may prove more revealing about the relationship between father and son.

The next time that the paternal relationship is stressed is when the Muses sing of Zeus' rulership of the heavens after 'defeating his father Kronos.'[323] Hesiod could have minimised the connection at this point by omitting to refer to Kronos openly as Zeus father. The decision to emphasise that relationship at this point is interesting. It ties the story of Zeus' ascent to power into the broader theme of family connections, but also associates Zeus' role as ruler with the military defeat of his own father. The overthrow of Kronos in the *Theogony* is not presented in a negative manner however there is an interesting conflict in presentation. As Versnel observes, Kronos is the first titled ruler; he presides over the Golden Age of man, yet he is also the monstrous ruler who devours his own children and mutilates his own father.[324] The delicate relationship between Zeus and his father is a product of the conflict between succession and immortality. Whilst Kronos will not die a natural death his son cannot live in hope of inheriting the role of either *anax* or *basileus*. In order to assume that role Zeus must overthrow his father and seize power. To justify the seizure of power from his father, his father's rule must be characterised as negative. This allows Zeus to claim that he seized power not only for his own benefit but for the benefit of others.

The characterisation of Zeus as a rescuer from the regime of Kronos is best exemplified in the freeing of Kottos, Briareos, and Gyges. What is perhaps strange about this is that the three Hundred-Handers had been bound by Ouranos beneath the earth rather than by Kronos himself.[325] As another example of a father fearing the might of their own child, Ouranos confines his sons beneath the earth, in confinement within their mother like the rest of Ouranos' children. However, they have been left in their captivity under the rule of Kronos. The fearsome nature of the Hundred-Handers, who will go on to play a decisive role within the Titanomachy, perhaps explains their continued confinement. This might also suggest that Kronos feared a challenger from amongst his siblings as

[322] Finkelberg 1991, 308.
[323] Hesiod *Theogony,* 73.
[324] Versnel 1987, 125. Hesiod *Works and Days,* 111. West too picks up on the conflict in presentations of Kronos' reign. West 1966, 205.
[325] Hesiod *Theogony,* 617-620.

much as from his own children. If Ouranos is the original confiner than why the connection to the regime of Kronos? The description of Zeus as 'Kronos' son' as their liberator highlights their continued detention by Kronos. The narrator stresses the unhappy nature of their position before saying that the Son of Kronos, and the immortals born to Rhea brought them back up to the light.[326]

The re-emergence from beneath the earth has the same echoes of a second birth as the regurgitation of the Olympians, crossing over the threshold between the light and the dark, life and death. The three brothers are carried over that threshold by Zeus; who not only releases them from their extended captivity but provides them with ambrosia and nectar in a gesture which could be read as a form of deification.[327] The consumption of ambrosia and nectar by the gods replaces the need to consume bread and wine. Homer comments that through avoiding the consumption of bread and wine the gods remain bloodless and are thereby unaffected by mortality.[328] The revitalising effects of ambrosia and nectar are also demonstrated within the *Iliad* when Thetis is able to use the substances on Patroklos' body to prevent it from decaying naturally.[329] The preservative qualities of ambrosia and nectar when applied externally and the association of their consumption with the 'undying' nature of the gods suggests that they play a key role in maintaining the gods and in ensuring their immortality. At the very least the giving of nectar and ambrosia replenishes the physical strength of the brothers, at most it elevates them to the level of the Olympians themselves. The imprisonment of the Hundred-Handers by the previous generation allows Zeus to play the role of the liberator. Calling Zeus the 'Son of Kronos' at this point emphasises the link between the captivity of the Hundred-Handers and the previous generations. Despite the fact that Ouranos is the original captor he is not named within this passage; the use of Kronos's name twice within the passage links their captivity to Kronos' regime. This contrasts Zeus, the son and the liberator, with Kronos the father and the captor.

The Hundred-Handers go on to become decisive not only establishing the reign of Zeus within the *Theogony* but to the maintaining of Zeus' power within other texts. When Thetis prevents the overthrow of Zeus within the *Iliad*, it is Briareos who she calls on for assistance.[330] The presence of Briareos is powerful enough to stop the insurgents in their tracks and to prevent the overthrow of Zeus' rule.[331] The conspiratorial gods are not insignificant figures within mythology; the three figures listed are Poseidon, Hera and Athena. These three powerful gods are closely linked to Zeus; they are

[326] Hesiod *Theogony,* 624-626.
[327] Hesiod *Theogony,* 639-640.
[328] Homer *Iliad,* 5.341-2.
[329] Homer *Iliad,* 19 38-39.
[330] Homer *Iliad,* 1.403-5.
[331] Homer *Iliad,* 1.405-406.

respectively his brother, his wife and his daughter. They are each also figures who are in privileged positions under the regime. Poseidon is a powerful lord in his own right who considers himself equal in honour to his brother.[332] Hera is Zeus' wife, and Athena is arguably the favourite child of her father.[333] There is an important distinction to be made here between the texts, as Hesiod has Zeus elected to *anax* and *basileus* by the schemes of Gaia and public consent, whereas Homer places the three brothers on equal footing but divides the world into the three domains. The difference in presentation of Zeus' power in the *Iliad* demonstrates that there is room for variation in the interpretation of Zeus' rule even at this early stage. However, in both texts the Hundred-Handers are key to retaining Zeus' authority. The attempted coup is not prevented through the actions of Zeus himself, instead Zeus is reliant on the might of Briareos to intimidate the other deities and quash the insurrection. Hesiod's account focusses on Zeus' role as liberator and giver of gifts acquiring the Hundred-Handers' loyalty, whilst Homer's narrative shows the use of Briareos as a powerful ally who uses implicit threats of violence to prevent rebellion.[334]

The importance of gift-giving and the impact which this has on the power relationships within the divine family cannot be overstated. Gift-giving has already been explored within this work as a key asset of the Big-Man, who can gain a form of influence over those around him through the controlled distribution of assets. The giving of a gift is not an action which can occur in isolation from the relationship between individuals and often a sense of debt is incurred by the recipient. As it is phrased by Austin and Vidal-Naquet 'in the Homeric world, as in any current societies, there are no disinterested gifts: one does not give simply in order to give pleasure, but because one anticipates in the long run a gift or service in exchange.'[335] The liberation of the Hundred-Handers, and the giving of nectar and ambrosia form part of a pattern of gift giving which places Zeus at the centre of a complicated arrangement of gift exchange and loyalty.

This pattern is also demonstrated through Zeus' relationship with Styx and her children. Blickman highlights that Zeus earns the loyalty of Styx, and her children Zelos, Nike, Kratos and Bia, through promising to guarantee their honours and by respecting that promise.[336] A close examination of the text reveals two interesting features. First, there is the nature of Zeus' appeal to his fellow gods to join the fight against the Titans. In this passage Zeus summons his peers and asks them to fight for him; he appeals to them not out of a moral obligation and claims no authority over them by right of

[332] Homer *Iliad,* 15.185-189.
[333] *Homeric Hymn to Pythian Apollo,* 315-316.
[334] For the use of force in maintaining Zeus' power see Burkurt 1985, 128; Blickman 1987, 341-355; Dowden 2006, 22.
[335] Austin and Vidal-Naquet 1977, 43.
[336] Blickman 1987, 347.

strength or birth. Rather he focusses on the more immediate impact of his actions on them, how they will benefit. Zeus promises that no-one who fights against the Titans will be worse off than they were under his father, and that anyone who had been left out during the previous distribution of honours would be given honour and privilege.[337] The act is essentially one of bribery; if the gods will join the fight on Zeus's side, Zeus will ensure that they are rewarded once they are victorious. The relationship between the gods and Zeus is not entirely reduced to a transaction though. The gods must have some degree of trust that Zeus is capable of attaining victory and that he will honour his promise to remember their loyalty when he does. However, as Ulf observes in his discussion on reciprocal culture amongst the Homeric elites, the relationship between the giver and the recipient is dependent on the recipient accepting the gift.[338] The recipient is not always in a position to refuse a gift outright, as being of a lower social standing than the giver may make it difficult or impossible to evade accepting a gift. In this instance Styx approaches Zeus and offers her services proving that the acceptance of the gift is willing and that she is not coerced into a position of being indebted. Like the Hundred-Handers, Styx accepts gifts from Zeus and in this way binds herself and her children to his regime.[339]

The second feature of note is the specific gifts that Styx receives for her declaration of loyalty. Zeus appoints her as the oath-keeper of the gods, and promises that her children will live with him always.[340] The gift is both the act of a generous benefactor and incredibly self-serving. Styx is given honours and established as a powerful entity in her own right, and her children are granted favour through their proximity to Zeus. However, a cursory glance at the names of Styx's children suggests that Zeus might have his own motivation for wanting to keep them close to him. Styx's children, as listed in the *Theogony* are Zelos (Rivalry), Nike (Victory), Kratos (Supremacy) and Bia (Force). There is academic discussion over whether the minor figures within the *Theogony* should be understood as divinities in their own right, or whether they are merely personifications or abstractions. The complex debate around this issue aside, it is not difficult to understand why Zeus would welcome a strong tie between himself and the children of Styx. The acquisition of these figures into his household ensures that they are on his side and will not join the battle on the other side. Whether Nike is symbolic of victory as a concept or goddess in her own right it is logical to assume that Zeus would wish to have her associated with his household during the conflict. Similarly, Zelos, Kratos, and Bia are all forces which would be both useful during a war and to retain beyond the end of the

[337] Hesiod *Theogony,* 392-6.
[338] Ulf 2009, 88.
[339] For discussion on gift-giving culture in the Archaic period see Finley 1993, 217; Gill and Postlethwaite and Seaford 1998, 42-43; Tartaron 2008, 101.
[340] Hesiod *Theogony,* 399-401. See also Lloyd-Jones 1983, 5.

resolution of that war. Through giving Styx her authoritative position as the oath of the gods, and placing her children close both physically and politically, Zeus is able to strengthen his own position.[341] If they are indebted to his generosity and invested in maintaining the current political agenda then they will not seek to, or facilitate, any attempt to overthrow Zeus' rule.

Hekate

This pattern of Zeus using gifts and preferential treatment to gain the loyalty and integrate potentially rogue figures into his regime is also demonstrated in another instance where he is referred to as 'Kronos' son': his relationship with Hekate. Hesiod's description of Hekate and her influence is one which stands out in the *Theogony* not least for the length of the passage dedicated to her. Given her role as a relatively minor deity in the pantheon she is given a block of more than 40 lines within the 1022-line text. The passage is remarkable not only for its length but the emphasis on the relationship between Zeus and Hekate. As with Styx, Hekate is honoured by Zeus and given great gifts.[342] The line is not repeated verbatim but a comparison between the two can hardly be accidental as they occur less than 20 lines apart within the text. Zeus' actions in honouring and giving gifts to these female figures can be understood as the act of a protective and generous patriarch; however, it is notable that Zeus' actions towards other female deities are usually governed by his personal desires rather than his sense of altruism. Given that Zeus produces children with his aunts, sisters, and cousins, it is difficult to assume that his interests are supressed by a concern about incest or protecting the dignity of the female members of his family. So, what is the cause of this change in behaviour? What motivates Zeus to adopt these figures rather than to take them as lovers?

There are other key similarities between Styx and Hekate that should be discussed at this point. Styx is a daughter of Okeanos and Tethys, both of whom are siblings of Kronos and Rhea. Hekate is also a daughter of siblings born to Gaia and Ouranos. There is an argument to be made that if you trace the gods back far enough than they are all ultimately descended from Chaos; but there is a definite split between the children of Gaia and the children of Nyx, and again between the first children of Gaia and Ouranos and the others. This first group of children, as listed by Hesiod, is Okeanos, Koios, Kreios, Iapetos, Hyperion, Kronos and Theia, Rhea, Themis, Tethys, Phoibe and Mnemosyne.[343] These children almost all pair off into couples within themselves.

- Okeanos and Tethys
- Rhea and Kronos

[341] For the connection between Zeus and oath see Lloyd-Jones 1983, 5.
[342] Hesiod *Theogony,* 411-412.
[343] Hesiod *Theogony,* 132-137.

- Hyperion and Theia
- Koios and Phoibe

Two of the daughters either marry or can be considered partners of Zeus: Mnemosyne and Themis. This leaves two of the brothers without a partner: Iapetos and Kreios. Iapetos marries Klymene who is an Okeanid, and Kreios marries Eurybia who is a daughter of Gaia and Pontus. Logically it might be assumed that Iapetos and Kreios chose to marry outside of their immediate family before Zeus marries the two sisters, however the nature of ageless and immortal figures means that it is impossible to say for sure.[344] What is notable is that all of these marriages stay within Gaia's line of descent. All of the sons of Gaia marry a daughter of Gaia with the exception of Iapetos who marries a granddaughter instead. These unions all go on to generate children of their own as below. The figures in bold all enter into a union with Zeus either through marriage or through a form of agreed protection:

Okeanos and Tethys = Rivers and Nymphs inc. **Metis**, **Styx**

Kronos and Rhea = Zeus, **Demeter**, **Hera**, **Hestia**, Hades Poseidon.

Hyperion and Theia = Helios, Selene, Eos. -> Eos marries Astraios = Zephyrus, Boreas, Notos, The Dawn Bringer.

Iapetos and Klymene (daughter of Okeanos) = *Atlas, Prometheus, Menoitios, Epimetheus.*[345]

Koios and Phoibe = **Leto.** Asteria, Perses. Asteria and Perses **Hekate**

Themis

Kreos and Eurybia = Astraios, Pallas, Perses. Pallas and **Styx** = Zelos, Nike, Kratos, Bia.

Mnemosyne

As has been argued by Bonnafé, the matches made by Zeus are an integral part of his ability to gain and maintain his position.[346] With the exception of the children of Hyperion and Theia, who could perhaps be said to be amongst the more functional of the figures, Zeus forms alliances with a daughter from each of these lines. Iapetos is unusual as he has only sons.[347] Given that Zeus has numerous relationships with a variety of women, both mortal and immortal, it is perhaps unsurprising that Zeus would acquire wives from amongst his aunts and cousins. The absence of

[344] Palmer 1993, 148.
[345] Atlas does have a daughter, **Maia**, who is a partner of Zeus and the mother of Hermes, interestingly no mother is given within the *Theogony*. Hesiod *Theogony,* 938. See also Fernandez Camacho 2016, 209.
[346] Bonnafé 1985, 93.
[347] The sons of Iapetos will be discussed later.

aging for the gods allows these marriages to be made without the age differences between the generations having a particular impact on the ability of that relationship to provide children. However, there is a sense of consolidation in the unions that are made. As Zeus forges relationships between himself and the female family members he limits the spread of the family tree by reuniting it around himself. Through seeking a union with the daughters of the family Zeus ensures that they have a vested interest in not challenging his regime as their grandchildren will come from Zeus.[348]

Whilst Okeanos and Tethys have a great many children - we are told that there are over 3000 in total - Styx is established by Hesiod's narrator as the greatest of them all.[349] There is an underlying tendency within the *Theogony* for Zeus to subsume or to neutralise his female relations, which might highlight a concern with matrilineal descent lurking in the background of the text. A closer examination of the grandchildren of Gaia and Ouranos reveals some interesting patterns. The children of Okeanos and Tethys are numerous, but of those children Zeus welcomes Styx, the greatest of the rivers, into his household along with her children. He also takes Metis as his first partner. Metis is not singled out from amongst her sisters when the list of the daughters of Okeanos and Tethys is given. It is interesting that despite the prophecy of her children Metis does not play a more prominent role in this list, nor is she considered greater than her sister Styx. Metis is not even granted an epithet within the list, and yet she will go on to pose a danger to Zeus' authority through her potential to produce a challenger. Does this perhaps indicate that her prophesied role as the mother of a challenger rests on her position as Zeus' consort rather than her own individual fate? A comparison with the prophecy concerning Thetis, who will have a mightier son than the father, would seem to suggest not, but it is not entirely clear. Regardless of the details of the arrangement, Zeus has tied the two most prominent of his uncle's daughters into his social hierarchy.[350]

The same is true of the children of Koios and Phoibe. Zeus takes Leto as a partner and fathers Apollo and Artemis to her. He also brings their grandchild Hekate into his sphere of influence as a protected maiden.[351] The effect of this not only secures the loyalty of that branch of the family by joining them into the ruling faction, but prevents any other deity being able to marry into the family and father their own children from these genealogically significant women. There are very few goddesses within the *Theogony* who take multiple partners and, though some do produce children through

[348] Zeus may also acquire status through the sheer number of offspring that he is able to generate and provide for. Lacey highlights that it is not a given that a Greek man should have a family, it is contingent on his ability to support one. Lacey 1968, 16.
[349] Hesiod *Theogony,* 361.
[350] For a discussion of the importance of Metis see Vernant 1971, *Passim*. For a discussion of the significance of Metis and Thetis see Detienne and Vernant 1991, 107-109; and Harrison 1963, 481-491.
[351] Zeus' protection of maiden goddesses is discussed Lefkowtitz 1986, 30-31.

parthenogenesis, there is a broad pattern of monogamy from the goddesses. A key exception to this rule is Gaia who produces children with Ouranos, Tartaros and Pontos as well as generating them herself without a male consort. However, Ouranos' position as her husband is challenged by the original act of rebellion by Kronos. As he is castrated by his son it would be extremely difficult for Ouranos to provide additional children to Gaia. Burton goes as far as to equate castration, and the subsequent lack of fertility, with the end of a god's functionality.[352] I would agree that abundant fertility is a key aspect of deity, as is demonstrated by Poseidon's observation to Tyro that the unions of the gods are never in vain.[353] This assertion fits for both Kronos and Ouranos, who have no children born to them once been deposed, and would explain the copious amounts of children produced by the Olympians. Throughout the epic texts the loss of power is linked with the inability to father a child, either through physical mutilation or through a separation of the deity from their partner. Kronos is confined to Tartaros following his defeat, whereas Rhea continues to act in the world suggesting that she was not caught up in the Titanomachy, nor bound to Tartaros with the other Titans.[354] By entering into relationships with the powerful female figures, Zeus negates the possibility of a challenger marrying into the family.

It is apparent very early that Zeus takes control of the dynastic powers of his sisters. Zeus produces a child with Demeter and marries Hera. His one remaining sister is Hestia, who produces no children of her own, and we are informed in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* that she is one of the three goddesses immune to Aphrodite's powers, having taken an oath to remain celibate.[355] The texts are different in nature and scope but there is another example here of a woman coming under the protection of Zeus in association with gifts being given. In accepting the gifts, and adopting the role as a maiden Hestia protects Zeus' regime by ensuring that she will never produce a son to rival Zeus. The union of Zeus and Demeter produces Persephone whom Zeus arranges to be married to Hades, lord of the underworld, and who produces no children of her own. The union of Hades and Persephone invests Hades in the rule of Zeus as Hades marries a daughter of Zeus. The prestige of Hades' bride rests exclusively on her status as Zeus' daughter. If Hades participates in a rebellion against Zeus then the social value of his own bride will decrease. He therefore has a vested interest in protecting his brother's regime, or at least not actively challenging it. The only way that Hades could improve on his position would be to lead the insurrection and to take power himself. There is no gain in him supporting another challenger.

[352] Burton 2001, 52. See also Casadio 2003, 245.
[353] Homer *Odyssey,* 11. 249-50. See also Lefkowitz 2003, 40.
[354] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter,* 441-469.
[355] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite,* 29-30.

Zeus as *aigis*-bearing

The final descriptive term that will be discussed in this section is αἰγίοχος, or '*aigis*-bearing'. The first time that Zeus is mentioned by name he is described as '*aigis*-bearing Zeus' and he is the only figure who is referred to by this term within the poem.[356]

Aigis bearing	Line Reference	Verbal or Nominal	Figure Referred to
αἰγίοχον	11	Adjective	Zeus
αἰγιόχοιο	13	Adjective	Zeus
αἰγιόχοιο	25	Adjective	Zeus
αἰγιόχοιο	52	Adjective	Zeus
αἰγιόχοιο	735	Adjective	Zeus
αἰγιόχοιο	920	Adjective	Zeus
αἰγιόχοιο	966	Adjective	Zeus
αἰγιόχοιο	1022	Adjective	Zeus

Table 3 – the use of *aigis*-bearing within the *Theogony*.

There is great debate over the nature of the *aigis*.[357] To bear the *aigis* is to be in command of the outcome of conflict. The description of Zeus as '*aigis*-bearing' links him intrinsically with military supremacy and victory. This epithet of Zeus is not unique to Hesiod and is also used by Homer.[358] The use of this term as the first epithet of Zeus, and the repetition of the term two lines later, suggests that this attribute is an integral element of Zeus' characterisation. Zeus is referred to as '*aigis*-bearing' four more times within the text and often at moments when a figure is being defined by their relationship to Zeus. The Muses and Athena are described as the daughters of '*aigis*-bearing' Zeus,[359] the Hundred-Handers are described as the trusted guards,[360] and Leto unites in love with '*aigis*-bearing' Zeus to produce Apollo and Artemis.[361] Though the epithet is passed over without any elaboration on what the *aigis* itself actually constitutes it is interesting that it is associated with some of the pivotal figures within Zeus' power base. As discussed above, the Hundred-Handers are absolutely integral to the establishment of Zeus' reign, and its maintenance. The Muses are his daughters who sing to Hesiod their song, praising their father and delighting him with their dancing. Apollo and Athena are two potentially challenging figures who are seen by modern scholars as important supports to their fathers' rule.[362] As Orchard observes, Athena and Apollo are also two

[356] Hesiod *Theogony,* 11,13.
[357] Fowler 1988, 103-4; Marx 1993, 258. Fowler comments that the *aigis* of Zeus would be unknown to a pre-Greek Aegean. Fowler 1988, 111.
[358] Homer *Iliad,* 2.375.
[359] Hesiod *Theogony,* 11, 13, 25, and 966.
[360] Hesiod *Theogony,* 735.
[361] Hesiod *Theogony* 920.
[362] Felson 2011, 297.

figures who make use of the *aigis* themselves within the Homeric corpus.[363] The key detail of this is that they appear to borrow the *aigis* from Zeus.[364] As a borrowed item the *aigis* would still belong to Zeus whilst his children have physical possession of it. The lending of the *aigis* would fall under the broader pattern of distribution, demonstrated earlier. Importantly the *aigis* remains fully under the control of Zeus.

Any physical description of the *aigis* is entirely absent from the *Theogony*. The lack of a physical description is not entirely uncommon. Orchard stresses the absence of a coherent, or full, description of the manifestation of an *aigis* in the surviving Archaic literature.[365] The descriptions in the *Iliad* only reveal that it has golden tassels of extremely high material value but there is no detailed elaboration on the physical appearance otherwise.[366] It may be that the poet had not need to elucidate on the appearance of the aigis; either because it was universally understood or because its divine nature allowed it to remain conceptual. Whatever the physical form of the *aigis*, the consistent aspect of the power of the aigis is its decisive role in combat. This is stressed by its use within the texts. Deacy and Villing compare the *aigis* to armour, Fowler to a cloak and weapon with protective and offensive powers, and Orchard too highlights the protective function of the *aigis* both against physical and divine weaponry.[367] The *aigis* has been etymologically linked to 'goat-skin' which could explain the connection with shields.[368] The *aigis* also appears to have been able to rouse or rout combatants depending on the allegiance of the one wielding it. Famously Apollo is sent to aid the Trojans by shaking the *aigis* to break the courage and thereby the ranks of the Greek forces.[369] The impression of the *aigis* created from reading the texts is like a standard which can be raised in battle to rally fighters and drive for victory.[370] Unlike a spear, or perhaps even a lightning bolt, there is one *aigis*, and its use is restricted to key figures, notably preferred children of Zeus. Whether acting in a defensive or offensive capacity, the *aigis* seems to encapsulate a decisive moment of a combat. The ability to influence the outcome of a conflict seems to be an integral element of divine power in Homer.

[363] Orchard 2012, 89.
[364] Hartswick 1993, 274.
[365] Orchard 2012, 92.
[366] Homer *Iliad,* 2.447 and 5.738.
[367] Deacy and Villing 2009, 111; Fowler 1988, 103-4; Orchard 2012, 97-98.
[368] Fowler 1988, 111-112; Orchard 2012, 92, 97. Orchard is cautious of the etymological link based on the aig- stem.
[369] Homer *Iliad,* 15.318-322.
[370] Morris describes it as more of a symbolic object than a functional weapon, which is how I would also perceive it. The impact is undeniable but there is no direct contact or physical impact in the instances it is used. Morris 2001, 147.

The role of a basileus as a military leader is one which has attracted discussion.[371] In the absence of a natural cause of death or incapacity for Kronos, Zeus is reliant on his skills as a combatant and as a leader of troops to secure his ascension to power. The Titanomachy rages for ten years before it is resolved through Zeus' recruitment of the Hundred-Handers.[372] Whilst Zeus ultimately casts the decisive blow using his lightning bolts, the break in the ten-year stalemate is linked to his ability to persuade others to join his cause.[373] The phrasing of the passage is interesting as it suggests that the Hundred-Handers are able to tilt the balance, however, immediately after this Hesiod tells us that at this point that Zeus 'no longer restraining his strength' enters the conflict wielding the lightning.[374] The impression from this sentence is that Zeus is the figure who resolves the conflict absolutely. But the protracted ten-year war and the enlistment of the Hundred-Handers would suggest that the war was not so easily won by Zeus alone. Whether Zeus triumphed independently or through a cunning manipulation of allies, he leads the Olympians to victory and through victory to power. The division of the *timai* after the victory appears to be like the splitting of spoils after a Homeric conflict.[375] By becoming a successful military leader Zeus is able to ensure that he is in charge of the division of assets, and all of the associated influence, as discussed above. Successful military leadership both ensures Zeus is able to lead the coup against his father and allows him to build his powerbase at the same time.

2.6) Conclusions

Zeus is described as both an *anax* and a *basileus* within the *Theogony.* The title of *basileus* reflects key elements of Zeus' rule, but cannot simply be defined as 'king'. The term *basileus* is not a term which is unique to Hesiod; it has a meaning in the Bronze Age palaces, it has a meaning to the Archaic poets and it has a meaning to their audience. The difficulty of understanding that meaning is the changing nature of the societies using the term, and the subsequent transition of the meaning of the term. The term evolves to fit the need of the community using it, and whilst certain characteristics are retained continuation of the term does not mean continuation of exact position. Whilst an examination of the origin of the term is insightful, in that it shows the development of the concept, it cannot reveal a thorough level of understanding of that term when it is used centuries

[371] Antonaccio 2006, 382; Hall 2006, 132; McGlew 1993, 54; Nilsson 1932, 241.
[372] Hesiod *Theogony,* 635-8. Interestingly, Fowler highlights a connection between the Hundred-Handers and the *aigis*, as Briareos is also referred to as Aigaion in the *Iliad*. Fowler 1988, 95; Homer *Iliad,* 1.396-406.
[373] Hesiod *Theogony,* 687.
[374] Hesiod *Theogony,* 687.
[375] Homer *Iliad,* 1.92-171. The division of the prizes in the *Iliad* does appear to be decided in a slightly more egalitarian fashion as it is done by the 'sons of the Achaeans'. The parallel I am drawing is with the splitting of a conquered city into prizes which are distributed within the victorious side.

later. *Basileus*, then can be consistently attributed to a position of leadership within a community, but any other conclusions should be treated with extreme caution.

The discussion of the mortal *basileus* as they appear in Hesiod and Homer highlighted the connection between the *basileus* and decision making within a community. The *basileis*, plural, of the mortal *polis* have the authority to make judgements, and the responsibility for making them well. Hesiod consistently portrays Zeus as a figure who delivers straight judgements, in contrast to his crooked-counselled father, and one who distributes *timai* amongst the gods rather than hoarding it all for his own personal benefit. The positive portrayal of Zeus contrasts sharply with the 'gift-devouring' *basileis* of the *Works and Days*, and this combined with his role as the patron of *basileus* in the Homeric poems suggests that Zeus is portrayed as an ideal *basileus* within the *Theogony*. Zeus is able to protect his community from threats, internal and external, and fights in the front line against figures such as Typhoëos just as the mortal *basileis* of the *Iliad* are expected to. The most unusual aspect of Zeus' regime, in comparison to his mortal counterparts in Epic, is the solitary nature of his position.

The rule of Zeus within the *Theogony* has been demonstrated to rely on control, the control of the distribution of assets, the ability to exert physical control over dissenters, and control over the production of children. The need for Zeus to exercise individual control, and to keep demonstrating his control, over these three elements suggests that Zeus' position is not secure. Zeus is reliant on his individual power to persuade or coerce other deities, rather than able to assert dominance through the authority of the position he occupies. Within the power models explored above the closest match to this is the role of the chief rather than the king. Unlike the 'Big-Man', Zeus is able to occupy a named position within the social hierarchy, but is still dependent on his own influence and ability to retain his authority. With the distribution of the *timai* Zeus demonstrates the necessity of offering benefits to potentially rival figures in order to prevent them from forming their own factions. Zeus also shows an interest in controlling the reproductive elements of his family, suggesting that there is a concern about the potential production of children by other deities. In taking wives from almost all branches of his family, Zeus is able to assert a certain level of control over the children that the women of his family produce. This focus on family connections distances Zeus further from the 'Big-Man' model but is not strong enough to demonstrate kingship. The model of the 'king' is no more secure in the realm of the divine than it is in the mortal.

3) Conflicting Loyalty: The Goddesses and their Allegiances

3.1) Introduction

Once Zeus establishes himself as *basileus* of gods and men, his first action is to take Metis as his *alochos*.[376] The precise definition of *alochos* is not entirely clear, with the distinction between a wife and a concubine being blurred within the texts, but the term does relate to a sexual partner.[377] Having taken Metis as his partner, Zeus then swallows her before she can give birth to Athena, thus circumventing the birth of a son who would overthrow his reign.[378] Zeus then goes on to take Themis, Eurynome, Demeter, Mnemosyne, Leto and Hera as his partners, before adding Maia, Semele and Alkmene to his collection of lovers.[379] Zeus is exceptional in the number of immortal partners he takes.[380] Zeus' complicated marital situation could be seen as an aspect of his licentious nature, but under closer examination it forms a key part of his attempt to secure his own position. The goddesses are the gateway to the next generation, and as such they must be carefully handled to prevent the birth of future challengers.

This chapter will explore the tensions between spouses in the divine family and the reasons for those tensions. I suggest that there is an underlying concern about the loyalty of wives to their husbands in Archaic society which is reflected in myth, and amplified by the immortal status of the gods. Whilst it is crucial never to present the goddesses as simply women, it is interesting that the behaviours exhibited by the goddesses often mimic those of mortal women. Hesiod and the other Archaic poets cast the goddesses in the roles of wives, mothers, and daughters. Just as with mortal women, these relationships place them within the social hierarchy of Olympos and govern both their own behaviour and how other deities relate to them. As these relationships are shaped by the attitudes of Archaic Greek society, it is important to establish the expectations on wives in Archaic Greece. The fraught union of Zeus and Hera is often characterised by Hera's role as a jealous wife, but what exactly were the points of tension for Archaic couples?

It has been demonstrated in the previous chapter that manipulation of the familial relationships is integral to Zeus' ability to hold and retain authority. Zeus' use of marriage to gain control over

[376] Hesiod *Theogony*, 886-7.
[377] Patterson 1990, 48-9. Greenberg discusses the use of the term *kouridie alochos* in *Iliad* 1.114 to describe Klytaimnestra as Agamemnon's wife. Greenberg 1993,202.
[378] Hesiod *Theogony*, 886-900.
[379] Hesiod *Theogony*, 901-923, and 938-944.
[380] A notable exception to this is Gaia, who will be discussed in more detail later within this chapter.

branches of the family has been explored in great detail by Bonnafé, who argues that by taking at least one wife from each generation of the gods Zeus subsumes not only the powers and authority of his wives, but also that of their bloodline.[381] This will be explored in more detail; however, it is important first to establish how the bonds of family are used within Epic Verse more generally before applying this to the gods.

Family itself is a term which crosses three categories: household, kinship, and marriage. All three of these categories are important and highlight the integral role plays in various aspects of life. Family is perhaps most readily understood as the biological connection between individuals, the consanguineal relationships. The shared heritage binds individuals together. However, this only tells part of the story, as the affinal relationships created through marriage add members to the family unit. The importance of marriage to the family lies in its combination of two previously distinct family units, and in its control over the legitimacy, or not, of the next generation. The consanguineal and affinal relationships are more easily traced in comparison with the broader household relationships, which in the ancient world may include slaves, animals and other dependents. The household relationships are forged socially rather than through blood or a desire for legitimate offspring, but are still key in understanding family.

The predominant point of tension for Archaic Greek marriages is the conflicting loyalties of the wife between her husband and her son. Marriage in Archaic Greece was focussed on the production of a son to inherit the estate.[382] The focus on the production of a legitimate heir creates a preoccupation with the sexual fidelity of the wife. In the absence of paternity testing, it is impossible to prove fatherhood unless you can demonstrate that you are the only person who could possibly have fathered the child. Conversely, the mother will have absolute certainty that a child is hers, and it is in her best interests to protect the interests and the prospects of her children. Her status and future well-being are inherently linked with that of her children. When this moves into the divine sphere, immortality again creates a difficulty. A son can never naturally inherit from his father, and, throughout the succession myth of the *Theogony*, the conflict of loyalties consistently ends with the mother acting against the father in the interests of her children.

Whilst ideas of matriarchy, such as those suggested by Bachofen, are 'universally discredited',[383] the goddesses are not without their influence. The power of the goddesses lies in their ability to engender the next generation of gods, and their affinity with that generation. As the pairings of the

[381] Bonnafé 1985, 96.
[382] This will be developed further below.
[383] Boas 1973, xi.

gods occur between members of the same family, and often siblings, it is impossible to establish whether matrilineal or patrilineal descent is in effect. However, a close examination of the unions Zeus makes upon his elevation to *basileus* does suggest that there is a need to manage the lines of descent through certain branches of the family. In order to maintain his power, Zeus must neutralise the threat posed by the goddesses.

It is difficult to write with any specificity on the lives of women in Archaic Greece; nevertheless, it is important to use the information which is available to the best of our ability. Studies of marriage and the family in ancient Greece has been largely focussed on Classical Athens where there is a comparative abundance of surviving evidence, predominantly legal texts.[384] The difficulties of using Classical Athenian legal documents to support arguments for Archaic texts are well documented.[385] T avoid this difficulty, I will restrict the focus to the poems themselves. Whilst many of the concerns discussed will apply to both parties in the marriage, it is important to consider the representations of marriage from the male perspective as well as the female. The issues surrounding authorial voice are less contentious in this area, as male voices are better represented in the surviving texts. What is immediately apparent is that men too were heavily concerned with the production of an heir.

Hesiod is particularly vocal on the subject of marriage. Hesiod's depiction of Pandora features in both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* and offers his insight into the creation of wives.[386] It is telling that Hesiod's account portrays Pandora as a punishment for Prometheus' hubris, and contrasts the woes of the married and unmarried man. The former must ensure the burdens of a wife consuming the resources of the household, whilst the latter will have no carer in his dotage and his estate will be divided up between distant relatives upon his death.[387] The unpleasant choice is unmistakably economic in outlook. Either a man must take a chance upon a bride and hope that the evils she brings are balanced out by the good,[388] or he risks dying alone and the division of his estate. The description of Pandora as a beguiling but ultimately ruinous creature, comparable with a drone in the bee-hive, is far from a positive one.[389] The risk of not leaving an heir must have been significant to have balanced out the perceived bane of the wife.

---

[384] Notable works which discuss the family in Ancient Greece are: Lacey 1968; Patterson 1998; and Cox, 1998. The limits of family are also explored with a focus on *nothoi* or bastards by Ogden, 1996, 2010; and Patterson 1990.

[385] Morris 1989, 298. However, as Gagarin notes, historians of Greek law are limited by the available material, and are often dependent on material which would be excluded as evidence if more relevant material survived. Gagarin 2005, 33

[386] Hesiod, *Theogony*, 567-612 and *Works and Days*, 69-105.

[387] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 603-7.

[388] Hesiod *Theogony*, 607-13.

[389] Hesiod *Theogony*, 594-99.

One key difference between men and women in Archaic Greece was the expectation of sexual fidelity, something touched on briefly above. Whilst the bride would be married young and her exposure to men extremely limited, there was no expectation that her husband would remain entirely faithful. It was not viewed as a breach of the marital agreement for a husband to have relations outside of the marriage, either with other males, concubines or prostitutes.[390] It was considered best to keep the relationship out of the *oikos* but there was no stigma attached to the husband seeking company elsewhere. The reason for this disparity of between the sexes is the fear of the husband that he might be raising another man's child.[391] Whilst a woman is certain that a baby she is carrying is her own, her husband must take this on faith to a certain extent. Without the security of DNA testing the husband is reliant on prevention, through restricting his wife's contact with other men or take his fatherhood on trust. As the husband cannot keep his wife under constant supervision there must be an element of trust within the union.

This reliance on trust between the couple is why Lysias felt able to argue that adultery was a more serious crime than rape in Classical Athens.[392] The adulterer that led the wife astray cast doubt not only on any children born after the affair but any children born to that woman. Again, Lysias was an orator and employed rhetorical techniques, however it must have been a line of argument which would have appealed to his audience.[393] An act of adultery threatens the security of the household as the husband would be unable to prove beyond doubt his paternity and all children from the union would be vulnerable to rumour. As ancient Greece was a shame-culture rather than a guilt-culture, the damage done by rumour to the reputation of the husband and his household could be irreparable.[394] It was therefore imperative that a man ensure the reputation of his wife was beyond reproof in order to protect his line of descent.[395]

3.2) Mortal Women in Epic

The representation of women by poets such as Homer is fraught with difficulty. They are neither depictions of what could be described as a 'typical' woman, nor are they entirely alien. As such they are a problematic source for reconstructing the lives of women and it is only in the absence of other

[390] Cox 1998, 73; Robson 2013, 92.
[391] Slater 1992, 233.
[392] Lysias 1.32-3.
[393] Harris 1990, 375.
[394] Cohen 1991, 58-9.
[395] In the event that a husband in Classical Athens discovered or suspected his wife of infidelity he was expected to divorce her. Ogden 1998, 162.

substantial source material that these texts are used as historical documents.[396] The presentation of women, particularly those of high status within Archaic verse, is of particular value to this project as it provides a direct comparison with the depiction of the goddesses. The poets present both groups of females sometimes within the same texts, and this offers the opportunity to contrast both groups. The comparison demonstrates that both groups are subject to the same societal pressures and ideals, but that the goddesses are able to evade the consequences for breaching those ideals in ways mortal women cannot.

The women of epic suffer from the same difficulty as their later Greek counterparts in that they are represented by a male poet and from a male perspective. Though women in the genre speak and act, they speak the words placed in their mouths by a man and behave as the poet dictates. However, as the aim of this section is to establish the social expectations and pressures upon women rather than recreate their daily experiences this is less of a hinderance than it would otherwise be. The poems present female characters whose behaviour is often praised or criticised by the narrator or by characters within the narrative itself. These reactions show the prevailing cultural attitudes and highlight what behaviour was expected in those situations. Characters which are intended to provoke a sympathetic response from the audience are unlikely to behave in a way which invites universal criticism, and characters who are condemned within the narrative illustrate areas which were of concern to the poet and his audience.

In spite of a lack of domestic focus, women are central to Epic and without characters such as Helen and Penelope neither the *Iliad* nor the *Odyssey* would be the same.[397] They provide the central motivation for the heroes within these poems. The depictions of women within Epic are not uniform. Female characters can be broadly divided into three categories: owned women or slaves, noble women who are often the wives or mothers of the heroes, and divine or semi-divine figures who help or hinder the hero on his task. The categories are not exhaustive and may overlap at points. The way in which the male characters interact with women within these categories and their expectations of their behaviour is revealing. Despite the considerable differences between a slave-girl and a goddess there are still similarities in the expectations placed upon them. As shall be demonstrated below, women from all three categories are portrayed as manipulative, heavily invested in their children, and dependent on a male figure for status and security.

In Archaic Greece, women are unique in their ability to move between family units. When a woman is born, she belongs to her natal family under the guardianship of her father, and then on her

[396] Graham 1995, 3.
[397] Lefkowitz 1987, 504.

marriage she moves into a new family with her husband. This transition is a physical movement from her father's house into her husband's, and a ritual one, marked by public events to advertise and legitimise the union.[398] As shall be seen below, marriage offers an opportunity to the heroes of Epic to forge political alliances and to formalise existing bonds between individuals which is only possible through marriage and as such the social structures rely on the movement of women between households. This ability to transition from one household to another is extremely useful, but it also creates a sense of insecurity about the loyalty of women to their current household. As shall be demonstrated below, this insecurity crystalises around fears of infidelity and disloyalty. These vices are presented as inherent to the race of women and are epitomised by figures such as Helen, Klytemnestra and Mestra, all of whom violate the norms of marriage.

Marriage in Epic Verse

When Homer describes the shield of Achilles, he begins his depiction of mortal life in the city at peace with a wedding.[399] To the sound of the bridal song, the brides are led through the city, the young men dance, and the women stand in their doorway and marvel at the sight. The depiction of the wedding is made more poignant by the knowledge that Achilles will never take a bride and will go on to die in battle, wielding this very shield; and it serves to highlight the significance of marriage within? Archaic Epic. Whilst neither the *Iliad* nor the *Odyssey* are explicitly concerned with a wedding, the theme of marriage is pervasive within both texts.[400] Lyons observes that the *Iliad* focuses on the destruction of families and the *Odyssey* on their reconstructions,[401] and marriage is an integral part of the family unit. As with other elements of this thesis, it is helpful to explore the presentation of marriage amongst mortals in order to provide a frame of reference to compare with their divine counterparts. The depiction of marriage in Archaic Epic highlights the importance of marriage as a political tool to unify powerful families, as well as underscoring its importance for securing legitimate heirs.

Hesiod and Marriage

The most direct discussion of marriage in Archaic verse is in Hesiod's *Works and Days* when the narrator relates the best time for a man to take a wife. The narrator's advice in *Works and Days* is for a man to marry when he is not too far shy of thirty, or too much beyond it.[402] It is, however,

[398] Homer *Odyssey*, 4. 1-5.
[399] Homer *Iliad*, 18.490-496.
[400] Lefkowitz 1987. 504.
[401] Lyons 2020, 329.
[402] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 695-697.

unlikely that the union would have been a meeting of equals as, according to the narrator, the wife should marry in the fifth year after going through puberty.[403] Robson suggests that this places the bride between fourteen and eighteen, with closer to fourteen being the prevalent estimate.[404] Assuming that the ideal presented here matched the lived experience of the Archaic Greeks then the husband would have been considerably older than his wife. The cause of the disparity is attributed to the need to marry off a daughter as soon as she reached sexual maturity to a partner who would be established enough to provide guardianship for her.[405] This age gap becomes particularly significant when factors such as life expectancy are considered. A gap of around fifteen years is not inconsiderable; the relative emotional and physical maturity of the couple would be at different stages which would inevitably have an impact on the relationship. This age gap is particularly significant in the ancient world where life expectancies were shorter. Scheidel estimates that as many as four in ten male Athenians would have lost their father before entering the *ephēbeia*[406] and there is no reason to suppose that life expectancies would have been significantly higher in the earlier Archaic period. Assuming that a woman lived through childbirth, her older and more vulnerable years would be more likely spent with her children than with her partner.

Within the *Works and Days*, the narrator repeatedly expresses concern over the behaviour of women. The narrator stresses the importance of ensuring that the bride is a virgin, should live close to her suitor, and their union should not amuse the neighbours.[407] As will be discussed in the following sections, the need for virginity is part of a broader pattern of controlling female sexuality and ensuring that any offspring can be safely attributed to the husband. The need for the bride to live close to the suitor is more opaque. Perhaps there are concerns that marrying a woman from further afield might lead to a union with a bride whose faults became obvious after the marriage, however, the narrator does not elaborate on this. The reason for such rigour is that a good wife is a blessing, but a bad one is a parasite who will be his undoing.[408] The link between women and consumption is a recurring theme within Hesiodic verse. Within the *Theogony*, the narrator describes the race of women as a great woe for mortals and compares them to the drones in the beehive who devour the honey of the worker bees without contributing.[409] The idea of a wife as a drain on the resources that a farmer toils to produce is connected to the creation of Pandora, when

[403] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 698-699.
[404] Robson provides a selection of scholarship on this issue. Robson 2013, 16.
[405] Lacey 1968, 16; Walcott 1984, 37-38.
[406] Scheidel 2009, 32-33.
[407] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 699-700.
[408] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 702-705.
[409] Hesiod *Theogony*, 590-602. Arthur suggests that Hesiod makes the tension between men and women central to his poem. Arthur 1973, 24.

the narrator states that before Pandora opened the *pithos* men live without evils and did not have to labour or endure disease.[410] The implication is that the actions of Pandora, originator of the race of women,[411] condemned mankind to a life of toil.[412]

Hesiod's portrayal of women across both texts is not prevalent but what is there is far from flattering. It is difficult to see why an Archaic man would take a wife when all they do is consume and increase the labour on the farm. The answer can be found in the *Theogony* when the narrator explains that the alternative is far worse. Those who successfully evade marriage and the terrible deeds of women[413] are left without a carer in their old age and his estate will be divided up amongst his distant relatives upon his death.[414] The need for a wife is connected with the need for care in later life, and critically the need for an heir. The wife may be necessary for the production of a legitimate heir but that is not enough to fully redeem her in the eyes of the narrator, and the position of this passage, immediately following Pandora's creation as a punishment emphasises the negative connotations of marriage. The narrator comments that even those who acquire a good wife will find evil balanced with the good during their lives, whilst those who choose poorly will have an incurable evil within their lives.[415]

It is important to remember that these poems were performed for entertainment, and there may be some aspects which are either included or exaggerated for the purposes of entertaining the audience. It is also uncertain whether women would have been present for these performances. With this being said, the association between women, consumption, toil, and misery is consistent throughout the poem. The one redeeming feature of a wife, within the Hesiodic poems, is her ability to produce an heir. The gods are, of course, distanced from the need to labour in the fields or consume mortal food. They are also, through their ageless immortality, immune from concerns about having a legitimate heir to inherit their estate. Yet, as shall be demonstrated within this chapter, the goddesses do not completely escape the negative characterisations of their gender.

Marriage in the *Iliad*

Considering that the *Iliad* is a poem centred around a city at war, marriage is not a theme which features heavily, however, as has already been demonstrated, the poet does refer to weddings and marriage in various places throughout the poem. The depiction of a wedding on the shield of Achilles

[410] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 90-93.
[411] Hesiod *Theogony*, 591.
[412] Pandora is discussed in more detail in more detail in section 3.4
[413] Hesiod *Theogony,* 603.
[414] Hesiod *Theogony*, 604-607.
[415] Hesiod *Theogony*, 607-612.

has already been mentioned, and it is notable that the stated cause of the conflict between the Greeks and the Trojans is the theft of Helen. When Achilles and Agamemnon argue at the beginning of the poem, Achilles tells Agamemnon that he is not at Troy due to any harm the Trojans did him personally but to win *time* for Menelaos and Agamemnon.[416] The centrality of Helen to the motivation of the Greeks is stressed again in Book 2 when Hera presses Athena to prevent the Greeks from abandoning their cause. Hera asks whether the Greeks will leave Helen with the Trojans when so many Greeks have already died for her sake.[417] Helen is presented as something worth possessing, and her loss is presented as enough to bring two major powers into conflict. It is however notable that when Alexandros proposes his duel, he stipulates that the winner would claim Helen and all her possessions rather than just the woman herself.[418] The disruption of a marriage is enough to bring the Greeks and the Trojans into conflict, at least nominally.

Aside from the possessions that she is repeatedly associated with, Helen's value is in her beauty. When she approaches the Trojans on the walls of Troy in Book 3 of the *Iliad*, the Trojans themselves concede that she is so akin to an immortal goddess in beauty that it is no wonder they Greeks and the Trojans would suffer to claim her, but they still wish she would return to the Greeks and end the war.[419] Helen's extraordinary beauty makes her an attractive bride, and as Van Wees highlights, beauty is one of the three attributes routinely associated with the desirability of women in Archaic verse.[420] The other two are outlined by Agamemnon in his evaluation of Chryseis in Book 1, where he judges her to be superior to his wife in form, skill, and mind.[421] These traits add value to the household, and alongside discussion of her great beauty, Helen's weaving skills are alluded to in Book 3,[422] whilst her intellect is arguably best demonstrated in her interactions with Telemachos in the *Odyssey*.[423] Helen is a valuable wife and one which men will go to great trouble to possess.

The inherent value of a woman is a topic that appears repeatedly in the *Iliad* and Helen's hand is not the only one which is fought for. In Book 13 of the *Iliad*, the narrator talks of Orthyoneus who had joined the fray on the Trojan side in the hopes of winning Kassandra's hand in marriage.[424] Orthyoneus brought no bride-gifts, but promises that he would drive the Greeks from Trojan lands in exchange for the marriage. Despite its brevity, this passage demonstrates several features of

[416] Homer *Iliad*, 1.152-159.
[417] Homer *Iliad*, 2.160-162.
[418] Homer *Iliad*, 3.70.
[419] Homer *Iliad*, 3.154-160.
[420] Van Wees 2003, 1.
[421] Homer *Iliad*, 1.113-115.
[422] Homer *Iliad*, 3. 125-128.
[423] There is a more through examination of Helen's behaviour in the *Odyssey* in the discussion of divine women. 3.4.
[424] Homer *Iliad*, 13. 363-369.

marriage in Archaic Epic. Firstly, that it is noteworthy that Orthyoneus had arrived without bride-gifts, which suggests that typically the audience would have expected them to have been provided. Secondly, that Orthyoneus arrives in Troy having heard rumours of the war, and uses this as an opportunity to offer his military prowess in exchange for a marriage to Kassandra, who is described here as the fairest of Priam's daughters. The prospect of marrying Kassandra is valuable enough for him to enter a war. Either he thought highly of his own skills, or he was prepared to risk his life for the opportunity. Finally, the match is discussed and agreed between the prospective groom and the father of the bride. Orthyoneus makes his request and Priam gives his consent, but Kassandra herself is not shown to have any say in the matter, nor is there any allusion to a prior relationship between the couple. Priam and Orthyoneus enter into a bargain where a marriage to Kassandra is payment for services rendered.[425]

The bargain between Priam and Orthyoneus creates a relationship between the two men with Kassandra at the centre. Already a member of Priam's family by blood, Kassandra would become a member of Orthyoneus' family by marriage and connect the two factions into one family. The use of marriage to create bonds and deflect from conflicts is also seen in in Book 9 of the *Iliad* when Agamemnon attempts to appease Achilles with gifts. In addition to returning Briseis, Agamemnon proposes to honour Achilles like his own son, and give Achilles whichever of his three daughters is most pleasing to him as a bride.[426] There are obvious similarities between the situations despite the figures being on opposing sides of the conflict. In both cases the father offers marriage to the suitor's choice of daughter, without bride gifts, in exchange for the suitor joining the conflict on their side and securing victory. Agamemnon takes matters one stage further and promises a dowry beyond any previously given by any father, suggesting that both bride gifts and a dowry would both have been a necessary part of the arrangement.

Agamemnon's attempt to be publicly reconciled with Achilles includes an offer of marriage between the families. Achilles does reject Agamemnon's offer, and tells Odysseus that should he be fortunate enough to reach home Achilles' father, Pelias, will choose a wife for him from amongst the cities that surround his homeland.[427] Once again Achilles highlights beauty and skilled handiwork as two concepts integral to a prospective bride as he declares his disinterest in the match be she as beautiful as Aphrodite and as skilled as Athena. Achilles has no desire to be affiliated more closely with Agamemnon at this point. It is important to note that the marriage is not the only gift

[425] The exchange of an offer of marriage for services rendered can also be seen in the interactions between Hera and Hypnos. Homer *Iliad*, 14.267-277.
[426] Homer *Iliad*, 9.144-148.
[427] Homer *Iliad*, 9. 388-392.

Agamemnon offers to Achilles in this episode, but it is an important element of the promised offer. The offer could be far more substantial than it initially appears. Finkelberg suggests that there is limited evidence of sons inheriting power from their fathers in the Archaic Epics.[428] Instead, there is more evidence of the hero securing marriage to a daughter of a ruler and gaining authority through that union. Finkelberg highlights that many heroes acquire their positions through securing such a marriage, including Pelops, Bellerophontes, Melampous, Peleus, Telamon, Teukros, Andraimon, Diomedes amongst others.[429] Perhaps the most striking case in Finkelberg's argument is the example of Menelaos, who assumes power in Sparta through his marriage to Helen despite Helen having two brothers both of whom are alive and prospering at the time of the marriage. If Finkelberg's argument is correct, then Agamemnon is essentially offering Achilles the position as his heir and Achilles' rejection of the marriage takes on an extra level of significance.

From the above examples it is clear that there is a focus on the material value of women and the relationships that can be forged through their exchange. When read alongside Hesiod's rather negative view, this can create the impression that the relationship between husband and wife is not a particularly close one. Menelaos does not appear to be distraught about losing Helen's affection, only angry that she and her possessions are now in the power of another man. Within the *Iliad*, women are often collateral damage; objects to be fought over or controlled. Kassandra is able to be offered as a reward to a hero by her father just as women such as Chryseis and Bryseis can be given as prizes to their conquerors. However, there are relationships which clearly demonstrate the devotion between certain couples. Hektor and Andromache are an obvious example of this, as shall be explored in more detail in the following section.

Marriage in the *Odyssey*

If marriage in the *Iliad* serves as a promise of something desirable to be obtained and even fought for, it serves as a constant peril to Odysseus in his attempts to return home. Odysseus encounters numerous women in his travels and many of them desire to marry or to keep him. This is not to say that marriage itself is presented as a bad thing, quite the contrary, as Odysseus is offered the opportunity to marry highly desirable figures such as Kalypso,[430] a goddess, and Nausikaa, the daughter of a Alkinoos. Whilst figures like Polyphemos offer a very tangible threat to life, the prospect of a marriage still carries with it the threat of a premature ending to Odysseus' *nostos*

[428] Finkelberg 1991, *passim*.
[429] Finkelberg 1991, 305.
[430] This will be discussed in more detail in the following section: *The Treatment of Male Infidelity.*

should he take a bride and remain with her.[431] As the relationships between Odysseus and Penelope, Kalypso and Kirke are explored in more detail in the following sections, the focus here will be on how the poet uses Nausikaa to highlight the potential perils and pleasures of marriage within the *Odyssey*.

Of the dangers that Odysseus faces on his *nostos*, Nausikaa is one of the least threatening to life and limb. She is no physical threat to Odysseus and she shows no aggression or hostility towards him, in fact rather the opposite. Her position is rather unique in the *Odyssey* as she is presented as unmarried and childless, but also distanced from the role of temptress.[432] The prospect of marriage to Nausikaa is introduced before Odysseus has even met her in person. When Athena contrives to bring Nausikaa to meet Odysseus, Athena appears in the guise of one of her friends who chastises her for neglecting her clothes when her marriage is forthcoming.[433] Athena's push to encourage Nausikaa to leave the city and go to the water tanks to wash her clothes immediately draws attention to the idea of the girl as a prospective bride. The idea that she might be a match for Odysseus is then stressed by Athena's observation that although Nausikaa will soon be married, the prospective bridegroom has not yet been determined.[434] In the space of a few lines, the audience has leant that Nausikaa is a great beauty, of an age to marry, and has many suitors of noble descent already vying for her hand. Following the pattern of heroic behaviour that Finkelberg suggests, the natural course of action would be for Odysseus to arrive, marry the local princess, and claim authority following the death of her father. With the scene thus set by Athena, there is a distinct feeling that Odysseus may yet be waylaid by the prospect of a new bride.

The idea that Athena, who has been championing the return of Odysseus for the whole poem, would suddenly contrive to keep him in Phaiakia, is, of course, nonsensical. However, there is a distinct sense that this episode is designed to play off those ideas. Athena plants the idea of marriage in the mind of Nausikaa, as well as the audience, and when Odysseus bathes the salt water from his limbs Athena causes him to appear taller and more handsome.[435] The effect, and intent, of this beautification is made obvious when Nausikaa comments to her handmaidens that seeing Odysseus now, she wishes for such a man to become her husband and to remain here with her.[436] Murnaghan highlights the focus on Nausikaa's eagerness for the 'socially central, male orientated institution of

[431] Doherty 1995, 124.
[432] Shapiro 1995, 155.
[433] Homer *Odyssey*, 6.26-29.
[434] Homer *Odyssey*, 6.33-35.
[435] Homer *Odyssey*, 6.223-235.
[436] Homer *Odyssey*, 6.244-246.

marriage'.[437] Athena's intention is not to engineer a match between the couple, but to foster Nausikaa's hopes of one. By encouraging Nausikaa to view Odysseus as an attractive potential suitor, Athena ensures that Odysseus will be introduced under the most favourable of circumstances.

When Odysseus addresses Nausikaa, he wishes her a good marriage and describes a good marriage as one where a man and woman in a home, united in their thoughts, bringing grief to their enemies, joy to their friends and enjoying a good reputation.[438] As Bolmarcich observes this is often read as a comment on Odysseus' own marriage to Penelope, and is singularly explicit on the subject of what makes a good marriage.[439] This presentation of a marriage is extremely positive, particularly in comparison with the marriages of Agamemnon and Menelaos, both of which involve conflict and bloodshed or with the doleful depiction in the Hesiodic poems which has been discussed above. Bolmarcich suggests that this positive view is exceptional within the Homeric corpus, and that typically it would be more important for the groom and his father-in-law to think alike, as Alkinoos expresses later in the poem.[440] Odysseus' comments are, I think, carefully chosen. He refers to a future marriage for Nausikaa, describing it in terms which are likely to appeal to a young girl far more than the imagery of Hesiod's drones in the hive. In doing so, he reaffirms that marriage is a desirable thing for a young woman and presents his own views of marriage as ones which would be appealing.[441]

The need to maintain a good reputation is a public aspect of marriage, which Odysseus highlights as key in the passage above. Throughout the *Odyssey*, the behaviour of wedded couples, and especially the woman is under close scrutiny.[442] In spite of her obvious interest in Odysseus as a suitor, Nausikaa is very keen to protect her reputation by not being seen alone in his company in public. She warns Odysseus that tongues may wag if she is seen returning to the palace in the company of a strange man, and that people may assume that he is her husband.[443] The negative implications of this are stressed by her comment that she herself would judge a young woman who was seen consorting with a man before marriage. The impact of this passage is twofold, in that it allows Nausikaa to demonstrate to Odysseus that she is as yet unmarried and eligible to be married whilst also showing that she is conscious of her reputation and wishes to maintain it which further

[437] Murnaghan 1995, 67.
[438] Homer *Odyssey*, 6.180-185.
[439] Bolmarcich 2001, 205.
[440] Bolmarcich 2001, 209. Homer *Odyssey,* 7.312.
[441] This pressure to marry and bear a child would have been intense. Ormand suggests that a woman in Ancient Greece was not considered complete without becoming a mother. Ormand 2004, 323.
[442] Cohen highlights the importance of protecting a reputation, particularly for women in Classical Athens, as dishonour was public and irreversible. Cohen 1991, 61.
[443] Homer *Odyssey*, 6.255-287.

underlies her suitability as a potential bride. Nausikaa's desire to be married is not presented as atypical for a young woman, and this desire is exploited by both Athena and Odysseus to further their own goals.

The presentation of marriage in Epic verse highlights the centrality of marriage to the Archaic Greeks. Hesiod's dour statement that taking a wife is a necessary evil sits awkwardly with Orthyoneus' willingness to enter a war to secure a marriage to Kassandra, but this may be an issue of economics. Orthyoneus, as an Iliadic hero, is unlikely to be as concerned about the practicalities of adding another mouth to the household as the narrator of the *Works and Days*. The differences in the nature of the poems will naturally alter the views expressed within them. Yet, in spite of this, there are recurring themes. Marriage is something which is central to the organisation of society, which allows families to be joined together. The public nature of the union advertises the bond between the father-in-law and the groom, as well as joining the families in the next generation.

The role of the women in these situations is rather passive. As far as we are aware, Kassandra is not consulted about a marriage to Orthyoneus, any more than Agamemnon's daughters are about a possible marriage to Achilles. In both these instances, marriage to a daughter is presented as a valuable asset to be traded for services. Offering marriage is distinct from offering the daughter as an actual object for trade, and there is an underlying expectation that the daughter will be well provided for which the exchange of bride gifts and dowries would have helped to insure. The relationship between the couple is not shown to be important, and from Nausikaa's comments about being seen with a man it is unlikely that any potential suitor would have extensive access to develop a relationship. The marriages amongst heroes of Homer appear to be more political than personal, and the heavy

In contrast to this sits Odysseus' comments on a good marriage. Odysseus describes a good marriage as a union of two like-minded individuals, and his entire journey is driven by the desire to return to his home and his wife, Penelope. Odysseus' encounter with Nausikaa highlights that marriage is seen as something desirable to a young woman. Nausikaa is presented as a potential bride for Odysseus, and both Athena and Odysseus reference marriage in their interactions with her. The situation is set up to promote the idea of a marriage between Nausikaa and Odysseus. Following the pattern of other heroes of myth, Odysseus, the handsome hero arrives in a distant land and meets the beautiful princess. However, both Athena and Odysseus seem to be using these expectations to ensure that Odysseus receives a favourable reception. Clearly, marriage is supposed to be understood as appealing prospect to young women, and this understanding allows the poet to tease both Nausikaa and their audience with the prospect of a marriage to Odysseus.

Another aspect which both the Homeric and Hesiodic poems stress is the importance of a woman's reputation. Nauskiaa directly expresses concern over the gossip that might arise if she is seen consorting with a man, and the narrator of the *Works and Days* highlights the perils of taking a bride who is not a virgin, or who may cause the neighbours amusement. It is evident that both men and women feel the pressure for a woman to maintain her reputation. This concern with reputation is something which is echoed in the behaviour of Penelope and even Helen, as will be discussed in more detail in the following sections. This preoccupation with reputation has its roots in an insecurity about female loyalty which extends beyond mortal women and can be found in the behaviour of the gods and goddesses.

Dependents

The fragile boundary between free and captured women in Homeric Epic is one which resonates throughout the *Iliad*. Women are not able to rely on their own status as a shield and their social standing is entirely dictated by the strength and status of the male guardian in their lives. The difference between a strong guardian and a weak one can be seen in Chryseis' transition from freedom to slavery and back again once Apollo takes up her father's cause.[444] The fate of a woman without a guardian is neither ambiguous nor surprising to the heroes. Hektor predicts Andromache's life after his untimely death, led away weeping to work at another woman's bidding, constrained by force and lacking protection.[445] In doing so, Hektor acknowledges his role as the protector of the family and the sole obstacle between Andromache and a life of servitude. Andromache too picks up on this line of reasoning in Book 24, however she does not mourn her own future but her son's. What is notable here is the vulnerability of Andromache's position. Without Hektor she is as vulnerable as their infant son.

The relationship between Andromache and Hektor is one of the more emotionally intimate within the Homeric Epics.[446] Andromache tells Hektor that he is father, mother, brother and husband to her.[447] Andromache's position is unusually isolated as her entire family has already been killed by either Achilles or Artemis and she is entirely unprotected without Hektor.[448] She has no paternal *oikos* to return to in the event of Hektor's death. A life of captivity awaits her should Hektor, and subsequently Troy, fall. Despite her noble status Andromache is completely unable to protect herself

[444] Homer *Iliad* 1.1-147.
[445] Homer *Iliad*, 6.450-465.
[446] Arthur 1973, 11. I hesitate to use the word love due to the complex social constructions around the concept. Our idea of love may not overlap entirely with the Archaic Greeks. Bardis 1978, 277; Konstan 2000, 121.
[447] Homer *Iliad*, 6.429-30.
[448] Homer *Iliad*, 6.429-30.

or her child without a male defender. This highlights the precarious situation of women of any rank in Epic.

The focus on this couple is made more poignant because the audience knows that Hektor will die and Andromache's fears will be realised. The desire of the poet to use the difference between audience knowledge and character knowledge is demonstrated clearly in Book 22.[449] After the death of Hektor, the narration shifts to Andromache who is working at the loom as instructed by her husband in Book 6. When Andromache hears Hekabe's cries, she rushes out to the walls to see what has happened, allowing the poet to describe the death of the hero before shifting to the consequences of his death represented by the grieving wife.[450] The drama of the scene is undeniable, as it calls back to the passage in Book 6 and Andromache's fears. The realisation of her fears for Hektor also gives weight to her predictions for herself and for their son. However, these fears will not be realised within the *Iliad* itself as the narration breaks off before the fall of Troy.

Despite a significant gap in status between the captive Chryseis and Andromache, both women are referred to in terms of their male guardian rather than their own names. Segal comments that the omission of Andromache's name in this episode emphasises her complete reliance on her husband.[451] She is reintroduced only as Hektor's *alochos* and her own identity is further minimised by the focus on the loss of Hektor's life and Astyanax's future.[452] The importance of the patriarch to the *oikos* is explored in this passage as Andromache equates a child without a father to an orphan. The lament describes the plight of an orphaned child who is cut off from their peers running back to their mother for comfort having been spurned by his community.[453] This initially appears to be a contradiction in terms, as an orphan would have no mother to return to. However, whilst the child might not literally be parentless, he would lack the protection of his parents as it is his father's position in the community that provides that protection. This is emphasised by the callous treatment of the child by his father's friends, and his own peer group whose fathers still survive.[454] As the 'orphaned' child can run to his mother, he is clearly not motherless, however the mother is not able to offer him the same protection as his father could. Without a male guardian, Andromache can offer no protection to her son.

[449] Segal 1971, 37.
[450] Homer *Iliad*, 6.490-1. and 22.437-472.
[451] Segal 1971, 37.
[452] Homer *Iliad*, 22.437.
[453] Homer *Iliad*, 22.490.
[454] Homer *Iliad*, 495-496.

Muich has read Andromache's conversations with Hektor as a criticism of the Homeric warrior ideal, as well as a pre-emptive lament for her still living husband.[455] Arthur too describes this relationship as showing the clash between the values of the 'old heroic society' and the values of the emerging *polis* and highlights the change in attitudes towards women caused by the transition between these cultures.[456] There is one extremely significant difference between Achilles and Hektor within the *Iliad* and that it that Hektor is defending his city, and Achilles is laying siege to an enemy. Hektor is in a position where his home and family are directly threatened by the attacking Greek army. It makes that the Trojan hero would fix on the sense of danger and potential loss whilst the Greek hero might look to the prizes and honours that they intended to gain. Hektor is clearly deeply concerned for his wife's welfare and expresses concern over her future without him.[457] His wish to be dead before he hears of his wife's capture underlines his inability to offer any protection once he is no longer physically with the family.[458]

Again, what is overwhelmingly apparent is the complete dependence of Andromache on a male guardian for protection. With Hektor gone, and Astyanax only an infant, her position is extremely vulnerable. Whilst Andromache is a compassionate, clever and caring wife and mother, she has no standing in her own right, not can she defend herself or her child. With Hektor's death, she will inevitably have to endure the hardships of a life of slavery. The guardian centred existence of women makes them extremely vulnerable to abuse or mistreatment by friend or foe in the absence of that guardian. It is a reminder that the society portrayed in the *Iliad* is heavily focussed on the strength of the heroes and their ability to defend their own.

The obvious counter to Andromache's total dependence on Hektor would appear to be Penelope who survives for decades in the absence of her husband. Throughout the *Odyssey* Penelope is shown to be resourceful and capable, and yet on closer examination she too is reliant on the men in her life for protection. The impression of independence is not a personal attribute but a by-product of Odysseus' unknown status. In the absence of clear information on Odysseus' fate, Penelope is able to delay the Suitors but is not able to deny them entry to her home and would ultimately have had to marry again had Odysseus not returned.[459] For all her qualities, Penelope is no more capable of surviving independently than Andromache in Homeric society. Both Penelope and Andromache are portrayed as having meaningful relationships with their partners and the use of devices such as the bed test in Book 23 demonstrate that Penelope and Odysseus are well matched in terms of wits.

[455] Muich 2011, 4-5.
[456] Arthur 1973, 10.
[457] Homer *Iliad*, 6.450-65.
[458] Homer *Iliad*, 6.464-5.
[459] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.249-50. Finley 1978, 5.

Odysseus spends ten years attempting to get back to Penelope, rejecting immortality and other advantageous unions along the way. Nevertheless, Penelope's situation in Ithaka is not sustainable in his absence and this is shown by the mounting pressure from those around her to choose a new husband and begin a new family.[460]

Penelope's inability to expel the Suitors from her home is partly due to the complicated guardianship situation. In the absence of her husband and geographically distanced from her father's *oikos*, Penelope's situation is unique. Penelope is custodian of the *oikos* in Odysseus' prolonged absence until Telemachos comes of age.[461] It is clear that the Suitors are interesting in marrying Penelope to further their own material interests and their plan to dispose of Telemachos suggests that they see a marriage with Penelope as the key to acquiring Odysseus' position. The exact legalities of this have challenged scholars for decades.[462] Finley is extremely critical of speculation of echoes of matrilineal descent and matriarchal attitudes in this episode.[463] However, there are precedents of Homeric heroes marrying into ruling families and in marrying a daughter acquiring a kingdom. Finkelberg suggests that within the world of the Epic there is surprisingly little evidence for royal succession from father to son. She lays out several examples where heroes marry into royal families, and are able to take power through marrying the daughter of king taking precedence over a natural born son. Helen is one of the key examples used to demonstrate this concept as Menelaos becomes ruler of Sparta despite the existence of Kastor and Polydeukes.[464] Whilst Penelope may not be Laertes' daughter, he is unlikely to have more children, and with no other relatives a daughter-in-law, the mother of his grandson and heir, may have been close enough if the Suitors could dispose of Telemachos.

Penelope's introduction to the poem is through Telemachos' criticism of her behaviour, neither accepting a new husband or dismissing them entirely.[465] Telemachos' tone towards Penelope's perceiving inaction is critical, and his comments indicate he views her indecision as materially damaging to his inheritance as the Suitors consume the assets of his estate.[466] The focus of his anger is not on the Suitors themselves but on his mother facilitating their misdeeds by not bringing them to a swift conclusion. The Suitors perceive Penelope's indecision as a deliberate device to win *kleos* for herself by maintaining the attentions of so many Suitors.[467] Antinous, who presents this view in

[460] Homer *Odyssey*, 19-158-60.
[461] Clark 2001, 339.
[462] Finley 1977, 88.
[463] Finley 1977, 88-9.
[464] Finkelberg 2005, 65-71.
[465] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.249-50.
[466] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.250-1.
[467] Homer *Odyssey*, 2.87-88 and 2.125-6.

defence of the Suitors' behaviour, is unlikely to provide a balanced and neutral argument, but it must have been one he thought would excuse or explain their actions. Penelope's own hesitation allows for Odysseus' eventual return, which the audience is aware of but the characters themselves have no knowledge at this point. For Penelope, turning away the Suitors risks the potential loss of a future guardian should Odysseus not return, but accepting one places Telemachos in great danger and means forsaking her hope of Odysseus' return.[468]

With no guardian to act as a buffer between her and the male-dominated spaces Penelope is forced to do so directly. There is an obvious tension around this and the importance of policing this contact is evident throughout. The first time that Penelope is seen directly within the poem is when she enters the hall to ask the bard to change his choice of song. Despite this being her home, Penelope is completely absent from the hall to begin with and when she does approach, she comes to the doorposts, veiled and accompanied by handmaids.[469] The use of the veil emphasises the continued need for division between male and female space, even when one is present in the others. Penelope's seclusion is not unusual, however her brief incursion into the hall is. Telemachos is quick to instruct her to return to the women's quarters and her weaving.[470] As noted by Clark, this instruction is strikingly similar to the one given to Andromache by Hektor in the *Iliad*, and the formula of 'go back to the loom and leave x to the men' is repeated again by Telemachos in Book 21.[471] In both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the implication is that the women have overstepped their boundaries by entering the male-dominated sphere. Tellingly Penelope does not rebuke Telemachos, nor do the Suitors suggest that he has spoken disrespectfully to his mother. In the absence of a guardian Penelope cannot seclude herself entirely but her exposure to the male dominated spaces is potentially damaging to her reputation and invites rebuke from all quarters.

The reference to returning to her weaving cannot help but remind the audience of Penelope's resourcefulness in delaying the decision of remarriage. Her tricking of the Suitors using the shroud of Laertes is the epitome of female cunning as she subverts the task of a dutiful wife into a prolonged deception. Penelope chooses a task which both stems from an accepted social duty, preventing the Suitors from objecting to it and which can be completed within the women's rooms. The plan is ingenious on two levels, firstly, as Bergren observes '[t]he service to the father [Laertes] enforced by the blame of the other women, defers the Suitors' sexual and social drives by tapping into their fear of an ignominious death.[472] Secondly the location allows her to carry out her task completely out of

[468] Lowenstam 2000, 336.
[469] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.333-5.
[470] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.356-7.
[471] Clark 2001, 336; Homer *Iliad*, 6.490-3. Homer *Odyssey*, 1.356-7 and 21.350-3.
[472] Bergren 2008, 222.

view from the Suitors.[473] The Suitors have confidence that once this finite task has been completed Penelope will make her choice which gives false hope to the Suitors that the task may be completed swiftly. The trick is only possible due to the delineation of space between male and female. Penelope's scheme fails as a result of her unfaithful female companions who betray her to the Suitors. It is apparently not only the men who need to fear the treachery of women.

Telemachos touches on the underlying conflict at the heart of Penelope's actions, the division of her loyalty between her absent husband and her son.[474] Once Telemachos comes of age and is able to assume control of the *oikos*, Penelope could remarry without risking his inheritance. Penelope is conscious of Telemachos' frustrations with the consumption of the estate but her stalling tactics allow Telemachos to retain his position as presumptive heir.[475] The moment the power balance between them appears to alter is when Telemachos orders Penelope back to her rooms and she obeys. The Suitors are not ignorant of this and suggest that Telemachos use his new-found authority to send Penelope back to her father who could then compel her to marry again.[476] It is at this point that Telemachos becomes the one evading their demands as he says he does not wish to force his mother from his home, or repay her dowry to her father, and that it would cause ill will within his own family.[477] The Suitors' remedy for Penelope's indecision is to return control to the men in her life, pushing her son to return her to her father's *oikos* so that she can be compelled to remarry.

The presentation of Penelope in the *Odyssey* does not support the notion that a woman could operate independently within Homeric Epic. Rather it reinforces the fragility of women's status in the absence of a male guardian. Penelope is consistently portrayed as a capable and clever woman within the text, but as soon as her teenage son comes of age he could dismiss her from the household. Whilst Penelope is broadly depicted in a positive manner, and she is steadfastly loyal to her son and her absent husband, her actions lean heavily towards deception and manipulation. For all her guile Penelope is unable to exist perpetually without a guardian. The expectation that she will take a new husband is at the heart of the Suitors' plans and her relative independence is caused by the ambiguity of her current guardian's status rather than afforded to her as an exceptional individual.[478] If Odysseus was known to be dead the situation would resolve itself and Penelope would be placed either under the guardianship of her son or her father who would then arrange another marriage for her.

[473] Lowenstam 2000, 335; Schein 1995, 22.
[474] Foley 1995, 108.
[475] Homer *Odyssey*, 19.158-9.
[476] Homer *Odyssey*, 2.113-4.
[477] Homer *Odyssey*, 2.130-7.
[478] Arthur 1973, 15.

Fears Around Fidelity

The fixation with fidelity is clearly shown among the wives of Homeric Greeks. I disagree with Zeitlin's claim that the *Odyssey* is 'noticeably reticent about addressing acts of adultery',[479] as concerns about the loyalty of wives recur throughout the poem. From Menelaus' reference to Deiphobos, to Ares and Aphrodite, and Agamemnon and Klytaimnestra, the *Odyssey* echoes with concerns about infidelity and female disloyalty.[480] The most obvious contrast between the loyalty of wives is the one between Penelope and Klytaimnestra. Both are women left alone whilst their husbands campaigned in Troy, and this allows the poet to compare the two directly to explore fears surrounding female fidelity. Unlike Penelope, Klytaimnestra is never presented as a character within the narrative, or given an opportunity to speak in defence of her actions, but her actions are discussed throughout the *Odyssey*. The respective homecomings of Agamemnon and Odysseus and their receptions on arrival represent the two extremes. Neither husband knows which reception awaits them, and the parallels between the two stories encourage the reader to fear that Penelope might intend to follow in Klytaimnestra's murderous example.[481]

The story of Agamemnon's demise at the hands of Klytaimnestra and Aigisthos is retold several times within the *Odyssey*.[482] It is notable that the first mention comes at the very beginning of Book 1 when Zeus bemoans mortals who blame the gods for the troubles they cause themselves and cites Aigisthos as the prime example.[483] This introduces the disastrous reunion of Agamemnon and his wife from the outset of the poem. Zeus casts Aigisthos as the instigator and Klytaimnestra herself is not referred to by name within the passage, only as Agamemnon's wife.[484] Later Athena too touches on the story when talking to Telemachos in Book 3.[485] Athena's comment that it would better to arrive home after many years than to arrive home and be slain by your wife and her lover directly contrasts the *nostoi* of Odysseus and Agamemnon and by extension Penelope and Klytaimnestra.[486] The early repetition of the contract suggests that it is deliberate and that the audience is intended to consider the two narratives alongside each other.

Klytaimnestra is never given the opportunity to speak in her defence, however many male figures do elaborate on the story. Nestor picks up the narrative when speaking to Telemachos, informing him

[479] Zeitlin 1995, 128.
[480] Homer *Odyssey*, 4.276, 8.266-369. The frequency of the repetition of Klytemnestra's betrayal draws comment from D'Arms, Edward and Hulley who note it is retold a dozen times. 1946, 210.
[481] Olson 1990, 57.
[482] D'Arms, Edward, and Hulley 1946, 210.
[483] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.32-43.
[484] Homer *Odyssey*, 1.35-6.
[485] Homer *Odyssey*, 3.232-8.
[486] Homer *Odyssey*, 3.235.

that initially Klytaimnestra remained faithful to Agamemnon. It is only when Aigisthos removed the minstrel that Agamemnon had left to watch over her that Klytaimnestra followed Aigisthos willingly.[487] The implication is that Klytaimnestra was loyal to her husband whilst there was a male guardian there, but once that guardian was removed her willpower dissipated and she followed Aigisthos home.[488] The presentation of Klytaimnestra's will power is like that of a child. She is only able to exercise restraint and behave as she ought as long as the minstrel is there to guide her and once the minstrel is removed, she immediately attaches to another male guardian figure. Her will power and self-control are entirely guided by the male figure and once he is gone, she gravitates to the next. The fickleness of mindset is something which Athena echoes when she tells Telemachos to return to Ithaka and ensure that Penelope has not remarried in his absence.[489] Athena's assertion that Telemachos knows what is in the heart of women suggests that she is playing off Telemachos' fears about the nature of women, rather than a specific comment based on his personal circumstances. In both instances, women are presented as fickle, not through malice but through susceptibility. The need for a strong guardian, repeated so many times throughout the poem, is not a cruel and misogynistic judgement on the nature of women by Homer, but suggests an agreed understanding that women need a guardian to protect them from malevolent influences.

It is perhaps unsurprising that Agamemnon is less forgiving of his wife, and he has the opportunity to express his outrage in Book 24. He directly compares Penelope to Klytaimnestra and suggests that Penelope will win undying honour on account of her loyalty with pleasant songs being sung about her, whilst Klytaimnestra will have hateful songs composed about her evil deeds.[490] In this scene the behaviour of the two women is compared side by side, and also the reception of their behaviour by the community. Arthur suggests that Agamemnon is the most vocally critical of Klytaimnestra as her betrayal is so personal to him.[491] The anger of a murdered husband is hard to dispute, but the repercussions of Klytaimnestra's behaviour extend beyond Agamemnon and Orestes and contribute to the perceptions of women's behaviour more generally.[492] Arthur observes that 'it was not necessary for 51% or more of women in eighth or seventh century Greece to have betrayed their husbands or families, for there to have existed the perceptions that, since women were regularly transferred from family to family, their allegiances were not necessarily steadfast.'[493] Klytaimnestra

[487] Homer *Odyssey*, 3.262-75.
[488] Homer *Odyssey*, 3.272.
[489] Homer Odyssey, 15.20-3.
[490] Homer *Odyssey*, 24.191-204. Schein discusses these songs in more detail. Schein 1995, 23.
[491] Arthur 1973, 23.
[492] Homer *Odyssey*, 24.201-2.
[493] Arthur 1973, 25-6.

sets the mythical precedent for real women.[494] This attitude is expressed by Athena in the earlier passage, and is also demonstrated by Odysseus' hesitation in approaching Penelope without testing her first. Penelope's individual loyalty is not enough to rescue the reputation of women, whilst Klytaimnestra's betrayal is enough to condemn the rest of her gender.[495] Odysseus cannot take Penelope's loyalty as a given, and the burden of proof is on Penelope to prove her innocence rather than on Odysseus to prove her guilt.

The sexual fidelity, or otherwise, of the wives of the heroes is a recurring theme within the *Odyssey* despite the relative lack of focus on the lives of women. Penelope is ultimately rewarded for her patience by the return of Odysseus and the reunion of their *oikos*. The metaphor used to describe her joy is like that of a relief of men adrift at sea catching sight of land, one which would perhaps be more literally applicable to her husband.[496] Penelope, who has been adrift without her guardian, is returned to the security and stability of her marriage. In contrast, Klytaimnestra's betrayal leads to her murder by Orestes and the destruction of the *oikos*. It is not difficult to see why a patriarchal culture might praise the patient Penelope as it represents the ideal home coming for Odysseus. Pomeroy suggests that these myths represent 'man's attempt to impose a symbolic order upon their universe' which makes the fates of Penelope and Klytaimnestra examples of reward and brutal punishment.[497] A husband away at war or sea [498] would hope to come home to a patient and faithful wife like Penelope rather than be betrayed by a disloyal Klytaimnestra.

The Treatment of Male Infidelity

In the above sections it has been demonstrated that there is a serious concern about female promiscuity in the absence of a male guardian. The fear is linked with the heroes' insecurity around the fatherhood of children and their fixation on continuing the family line. The need to police women's sexuality is driven by a man's fear of being cuckolded and leaving the estate to someone not of his bloodline. This is demonstrated by the complete imbalance between attitudes towards male and female promiscuity. The attitudes of the male heroes towards taking additional partners is a world apart from their ferociously jealous guarding of their women. Agamemnon sees no conflict

[494] The implications of Klytemnestra's actions are so far reaching that her name is evoked in a law speech in Classical Athens where a step-mother is accused of murdering her husband. Antiphon, 1.17.
[495] Fantham et al, 1994, 39.
[496] Homer *Odyssey*, 23.233.
[497] Pomeroy 1995, 1.
[498] Fantham et al, 1994, 33.

with taking Chryseis as a lover, or taking Kassandra home with him from Troy, not does Odysseus seek to obscure his infidelity throughout his *nostos*. The practical difference between the positions is that in taking multiple lovers a hero does not risk raising a child not of his own blood. As long as he is the only man with access to that woman, his parentage is guaranteed.

Given Odysseus' exploits whilst on his *nostos*, his treatment of the maids and his expectations of Penelope's twenty-year patience seem rather hypocritical. Odysseus is involved with Kirke and Kalypso, amongst others, and by the logic of the *Iliad* would likely have taken women amongst the plunder from the Kikones.[499] There is no mitigation due to the perilous nature of his journey, as even when Kalypso tells Odysseus that he is able to return to Penelope they retire to bed together.[500] The narrator, not Odysseus himself at this point, does not suggest that there is a conflict between wanting to return to his wife and spending another evening with his lover. It could possibly be argued that Kalypso is a goddess and could potentially have posed a threat to Odysseus were he to refuse her, and that the best way to placate them and secure his own safety is through sex.[501] Having risked angering the goddess by wishing to return to his mortal wife, Odysseus placates her by flattering her and then taking her to bed.[502] The implication is that that a powerful goddess can be pacified through sex. The relationship between Kalypso and Odysseus is shown at its nadir, Odysseus is described as no longer pleased by the sight of Kalypso which does imply that he was initially attracted to her.[503] It is notable that the phrase used to illustrate his reluctance to accompany Kalypso is an inversion of the phrase used to describe Klytaimnestra following Aigisthos in Book 3.[504] This reversal is possibly an indication of a stock phrase, or it indicates an inversion of the traditional power balance between men and women. The implications are very different, Klytaimnestra is universally condemned whilst Odysseus is largely excused.

The use of sex to placate goddesses is not limited to Kalypso and appears in the episode with Kirke as well though not without peril. Odysseus is warned by Hermes that Kirke will unman him unless he rushes upon her drawing his sword, and Odysseus must not refuse to go to bed with Kirke.[505] The imagery throughout this episode is decidedly phallic, particularly Hermes' comments about being unmanned unless he rushes forward with his sword drawn. The concerns about being emasculated by Kirke are overcome through force and sex.[506] Again, the primary threat from Kirke is deception,

[499] Homer *Odyssey*, 9.41-2.
[500] Homer *Odyssey*, 5.227-8.
[501] Schein 1995, 19.
[502] Hogan 1976, 195. Homer *Odyssey*, 5.215-7.
[503] Homer *Odyssey*, 5.153.
[504] Homer *Odyssey*, 3.272 and 5.155.
[505] Homer *Odyssey*, 10.296-301.
[506] Hogan 1976, 194.

something which is consistently associated with female figures. Odysseus' men report that Kirke was singing and weaving when they first approached which mimics the behaviour of the idealised wife; however, her intentions are far more sinister. Even with this deception uncovered, Kirke attempts to lure Odysseus to bed before swearing the oath not to harm him. Again, she is subverting female norms and giving the impression of a captured women but with the intention of harming him once his guard drops. In forcing her to swear the oath, Odysseus is able to reassert his dominance over the situation, and cements the patriarchal order by taking her to bed on his terms.[507]

It is evident that neither Odysseus nor Agamemnon anticipate a moral or social problem with taking women other than their wives into their beds. Agamemnon is extremely forthright with his intention to take Chryseis home to work his loom and his bed, and his comments to Chryses indicates that he is not concerned with how his wife would respond to this. Odysseus too is keen to return to Penelope, but neither he nor the narrator express qualms about his relationships with other women. The Homeric presentation of these relationships ends when Odysseus leaves, however Hesiod elaborates further and reveals that both of these goddesses had children by Odysseus.[508] Given the hostile treatment of Klytaimnestra and Odysseus' maids, the behaviour of both heroes seems incongruous unless it is accepted that male fidelity was far less important than female. It is not damaging for future of the *oikos* for Odysseus to sleep with other women, but Penelope's virtue must be beyond any doubt or she risks severe judgement. This is because it was the production of a legitimate heir whose origin was beyond doubt that was important.

Motherhood

The fixation on the legitimate heir is echoed in the importance of marriage to women throughout the Homeric poems. It is not a coincidence that when Telemachos visits Menelaus they are celebrating the wedding of Menelaus' children.[509] It is interesting that Menelaus' son, Megapanthus, is the child of a slave woman as the gods never grant Helen a son. As the most infamous wife of the ancient world, Helen is never able to fulfil her social function and provide Menelaus with a son.[510] Helen also presents Telemachos with gifts for his bride when he takes one.[511] Odysseus too is beset

[507] Schein 1995, 19.
[508] Hesiod *Theogony*, 1011-1018.
[509] Homer *Odysseus*, 4.10-14.
[510] Lefkowitz 1987, 515. This is, I think, due to Helen's position as Zeus' daughter as none of his daughters produce sons.
[511] Homer *Odyssey*, 15.127.

by potential brides throughout his *nostos* with Kalypso and Nausikaa presented as eligible and eager brides. Their interest in him is matched only by his lack of interest in taking another bride. The theme of marriage also appears in the *Iliad*. Briseis reflects on the wedding she was promised when mourning Patroklos, and marriage takes centre stage on Achilles' shield.[512]

The centrality of marriage and the family unit in both epics is fascinating given the martial focus of the poems. Neither poem is overly concerned with the domestic sphere, focussing instead on the deeds of heroes, but there are revealing signs of a concern with children, sons in particular. Marriage in the Homeric epics is not focused on the relationship between the couple but on the production of sons. The women in Homer are largely defined by their relationships with their husbands and fathers, however there is one bond for the woman which is even more powerful and that is the bond with her son. As has already been discussed Andromache is overwhelmingly concerned for the fate of Astyanax rather than her own, and Penelope shifts her priorities once Telemachos comes of age.

The intense connection between a mother and son is most clearly expressed at the point at which they fear them lost. Antikleia, Odysseus' mother, is described as wasting away from the prolonged absence of her son, despite the continued endurance of her husband and grandson. When Odysseus speaks to the shades in the underworld her shade appears before him and is able to express directly the grief she endured and how this overwhelming sense of loss claimed her life.[513] The death is not described as a suicide, there is no violence involved and she describes the sorrow at the loss of her son killed her. The emotion is not only from mother to son as Odysseus is moved to tears to discover her death.[514] His ill-fated attempts to embrace her add poignancy to the scene; he attempts to embrace her three times and each time he is unable to take hold of her form.[515] Odysseus is renowned for his cunning and ability to wait patiently for the right moment to strike, but his reason is overpowered by his emotion when confronted with the shade of his mother. Failing to grasp her not once but twice should have indicated that there was a problem, but Odysseus attempts it three times before he despairs and asks if Persephone is deliberately torturing him.[516] Odysseus, for all his wiles, is overwhelmed by his emotions when faced with his mother's shade.

[512] Homer *Iliad*, 18.491-492.
[513] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.202.
[514] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.87.
[515] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.206.
[516] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.210-15.

This bond between mother and son is shown to be a powerful force within epic. Hekabe uses that bond to appeal to Hektor when he intends to leave Troy and fight Achilles on the plain. Hekabe bears her breast and pleads with him to respect their relationship and stay with her. Her emotive appeal plays on the conflict of the hero of duty to the *polis* and duty to the *oikos*. Her appeal is not for her own safety but for his, and her ability to correctly perform the funeral rites should his body be taken by the Greeks.[517] Hekabe's short and highly emotional appeal is in stark contrast with Priam's which relies heavily on logic. Priam gives a long and eloquent speech in which he reasons that Achilles is the stronger of the two and that he has lost other sons to Achilles, before lamenting his own fate once his sons are killed.[518] Hekabe is worried about protecting her child, even when her own fate hangs in the balance.

Hekabe's pleas are deeply moving and she appeals to Hektor in the way only a mother can. She refers to him as a *teknon* or *thalos* four times within the eight-line passage, reiterating his status as her child. Her focus is on protecting her son and her family, and she appears unconcerned with the social occupations that drive her son. For his part, Hektor is heavily motivated by his fear of reproach. He tells Andromache that he worries what the women will say of him if he does not join the fighting, he fears the reproach of Poulydamas in spite of his parent's pleas and he is concerned about the shame he would feel before the Trojans and their wives.[519] The opposition of concerns places the parent and child into conflict. Hekabe is asking Hektor to forgo his duties to the city and honour his duties to her, and Hektor is compelled to honour his duties to the city at the cost of his life and his familial duties. Both know that facing Achilles is a death sentence for Hektor, but Hektor this is preferable to the idea of continuing to live and earning the contempt of his friends. Hekabe's behaviour is not self-centred, she does not beg Hektor to stay with her for her own benefit, but she is focused on the family rather than the civic sphere. Hektor's final decision emphasises the strength of the shame-culture for a hero in Homeric epic, fear of being perceived as a coward defeats the duty to the family, as well as the sense of self-preservation. From a mother's perspective, Andromache and Hekabe both prioritise the survival and protection of their sons whilst the male heroes prioritise honour and a glorious death for the city.

The bond between mother and son is portrayed as powerful and emotive, even in epic where the focus is removed from the domestic sphere. For a mother this bond is all-consuming, as shown by Antikleia's untimely demise in the absence of Odysseus. Their loyalty to their sons is absolute and does not conflict with their obligations to the city or to honour. Hekabe makes no reference to

[517] Homer *Iliad*, 22.79-89.
[518] Homer *Iliad*, 22.38-90.
[519] Homer *Iliad*, 6.441-2, 22.100 and 22.105.

Hektor's father, nor to Troy, in her appeal to Hektor, and her complete grief on the discovery of his death highlights the singular power of the relationship between mother and son as she questions the reasons for her own existence.[520] The strength of a statement of this sort is always open to speculation; and whilst Hekabe does not take any steps to harm herself the story of Antikleia wasting away undermines the sense of hyperbole. The singular focus on the son could be said to undermine the argument that women are fickle and unreliable, however that focus also make them dangerous to men when it conflicts with their own needs and desires. It also demonstrates that the bond between mother and son was perceived as far more powerful than the bond between husband and wife.

3.3) Divine Women

The focus on mortal women thus far has provided a helpful context on which to base discussion of the immortal women. Divine women occupy a significant amount of space within epic poetry and their behaviour is shaped by the social pressures applied to mortal women. The predominantly anthropomorphic presentation of the gods in Greek religion does not mean that the goddesses can be perceived as fully reflecting the concerns of mortals, but it is significant that there are anthropomorphic elements. Linking the experiences of the mortals to the experiences of the gods helps to explain the divine interest in the mortal sphere and prevents them from being entirely distanced from the world of men.[521] The concerns of women, and of their behaviour, are echoed in the halls of Olympos and although the stakes are different it speaks to the same social pressures.[522] The opportunity to commit adultery is dependent on the acceptance of a marriage as an exclusive bond between two adults. Without a concept of marriage, adultery cannot exist. Whilst the consequences for the undying gods are much less severe than they might be for a mortal couple, the fact that there are consequences at all is significant. The incident with Ares and Aphrodite proves that the gods are not above the social pressures of mortals.[523]

The pressure to maintain their status through an appropriate marriage is also significant to goddesses. In Hermes' exchange with Kalypso in Book 5, Kalypso accuses the gods of being hard-hearted and resenting any goddess taking a mortal lover.[524] Kalypso gives examples of Eos and Orion

[520] Homer *Iliad*, 22.431-2.
[521] Lefkowitz 2003, 213.
[522] Kirk 1970, 193.
[523] Homer *Odyssey*, 8.266-366.
[524] Homer *Odyssey*, 5.118-120.

and Demeter and Iasion both of which end in the death of the male partner.[525] Kalypso's indignation at Hermes' instruction does not imply that she is under any threat as a result of her involvement with a mortal, but does highlight that the gods might punish or persecute Odysseus. Just as Odysseus punishes the Suitors for their pursuit of Penelope, there is an implication that that Odysseus might be persecuted for becoming involved with a goddess who should be out of his mortal reach.[526] The deaths of Orion and Iasion are explicitly linked to their relationships with goddesses in this passage and Zeus and Artemis are given as the punishing agents. The avenging deity is not restricted to a male god acting in the role of protector, but it should be noted that Artemis is a daughter of Zeus and may have been acting in her father's interests.[527]

The most obvious example of goddesses being held to similar standards of behaviour is the tale of Ares and Aphrodite in the *Odyssey*.[528] Just as the story of Klytaimnestra is told to contrast the behaviour of Klytaimnestra and Penelope, the inclusion of the affair of Ares and Aphrodite is intended to show what happens when a wife is disloyal. Aphrodite and Ares are quite literally caught in the act after being trapped by Hephaistos as they made love. The couple are then exhibited by the outraged husband and exposed to the mockery of their fellow Olympians. The outcome of this incident is minimal in consequence for those involved; the lovers are humiliated but unharmed, and Hephaestus neither divorces his wife nor demands his courting gifts back from his wife's father. Compared with the fate of the Athenian *moichos* who could be killed if caught in the act, Ares and Aphrodite get off extremely lightly.[529] Aphrodite flees to Cyprus and is bathed clean by her nymphs, as though to physically cleanse her of the humiliation of her exposure, but suffers no further penalty.[530] The consequences for a goddess are clearly much less severe than for their mortal counterparts, however it is interesting that there are consequences at all. There is no compulsion on the Greeks to have created a pantheon held together by family bonds and marriage. Despite its prevalence in human societies monogamy is not a natural state of being.[531]

Kalypso's accusation again speaks to a double standard between the behaviour of male and female gods. Zeus is hardly in a position to lecture any other deity on conducting affairs with mortals. There is a subtle distinction between the two positions as Kalypso makes it clear that she wishes Odysseus to remain with her and become immortal whereas the gods tend not to pursue a prolonged

[525] Homer *Odyssey*, 5.121-128.
[526] Pomeroy 1995, 10.
[527] Larson 2007, 101.
[528] Homer *Odyssey*, 8.266-366.
[529] Demosthenes, 23.53,
[530] Homer *Odyssey*, 9.364-5.
[531] Patterson 1998, 23.

relationship with the women they seduce. In seeking to elevate their partners, these goddesses threaten the boundary between mortality and immortality.[532] This is perhaps why Zeus is so keen to put an end to dalliances between mortals and immortals in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite.*[533] Kalypso assumes that the hostility is largely due to jealousy and Hermes makes no attempt to correct her. Hermes instead encourages her to think of the wrath of Zeus and to use this to motivate her to release Odysseus.[534]

It is easily but unwisely forgotten that the marriage of a demi-goddess lies at the heart of the Homeric epics. Helen is a daughter of Leda and Zeus and thereby at least partly divine. Helen's elopement with Paris and the abandonment of her husband Menelaus is presented as the cause of the Trojan war. Helen is reminiscent of Pandora.[535] Both are beautiful and tempting women who are created by the will of Zeus and ultimately a cause of great strife to man.[536] Helen is portrayed as awesomely beautiful; even the Trojans who long for her to be returned to the Greeks and end the conflict acknowledge her beauty.[537] Helen's beauty is beyond that which any mortal should possess and brings with it its own dangers. As an exceptional woman Helen is favoured by Aphrodite, but the favour of the goddess is fickle. When Helen refuses to go to Paris after his rather ignoble defeat and rescue, Aphrodite threatens to turn both the Greeks and the Trojans against her and devise an unpleasant end for her.[538] Helen's beauty attracts the attention and affection of Aphrodite, but Aphrodite is not a loyal supporter and is quick to anger even with her favourites. Helen highlights the principle that any quality to excess is a danger and her great beauty inspires conflict and misery. Helen, as a demi-goddess, possesses a beauty which is unobtainable by mortal women but exemplifies the dangers of women's sexual appeal both to themselves and to those around them.

Helen is a character who simultaneously transcends conventional morality, and on the other actively engages with criticism of her behaviour. She abandons her husband and their daughter to elope with Paris, yet on her return to Sparta she is reinstated into her role as Menelaus' honoured wife.[539] Helen is the image of the perfect wife with the inability to function as one. Her beauty and her expressions of concern over her own behaviour belie her lack of ability to function as a wife. Helen cannot provide Menelaus with a son, nor can she remain loyal to him, and her infidelity is one of the

[532] Thetis is a notable exception to this; she is discussed in more detail below.
[533] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite,* 45-52.
[534] Homer *Odyssey*, 5.146-7.
[535] Lev Kenaan 2008, 9.
[536] Dowden 1995, 51.
[537] Homer *Iliad*, 3.413-7.
[538] Homer *Iliad*, 3.413-7.
[539] Homer *Odyssey*, 120-40.

most infamous in the Western world.[540] Helen is aware of her own shortcomings. She refers to herself as 'shameless' when speaking with Priam on the walls of Troy, and when speaking to Telemachos in the *Odyssey*.[541] Worman notes that she is the only character to abuse herself in the *Iliad*.[542] She is acutely aware of the opinions that other characters have of her, and condemns her own behaviour perhaps to allow her to mitigate the worst of their judgement. Even a daughter of Zeus cannot escape censure.

Helen also highlights the fickle nature of female loyalty as she shifts her allegiances between the Greeks and the Trojans as the balance of the war shifts. When speaking to Telemachos, Helen tells the story of sheltering Odysseus when he was undercover in Troy.[543] Having already acknowledged her 'shamelessness' Helen tries to portray herself in the best possible light. She makes sure to include her despair at the blindness inflicted upon her by Aphrodite, admitting she is blameworthy but shifting the root cause of her behaviour to Aphrodite.[544] In doing so, Helen betrays her predisposition towards manipulation as she attempts to influence Telemachos' impression of her. Her behaviour was not so clear cut, as Menelaus points out. He tells of Helen walking around the outside of the Trojan Horse imitating the voices of the Greek soldiers' wives alongside Deiphobus, her second Trojan husband.[545] Helen's behaviour is fully in support neither of Greeks nor of Trojans and she does all within her power to appeal to those who are most likely to offer her protection. Her vulnerability as a female captive of war is as great as Andromache's and both sides have their reasons to dislike her. Helen's method of appeasement leaves her in the position of working hard to please both sides whilst failing to fully convince either of her complete loyalty. Helen's inability to fully commit to one side or the other is perhaps an extreme example of the fluidity of female loyalty.

The loyalty of women is questioned throughout the epics. Helen and Aphrodite both show a fickle nature, each prepared to change alliances if they feel their interests are better served by another party. Their changeability is linked with the broader insecurity around female fidelity. Fidelity and loyalty are intrinsically linked, and the sexual loyalty of women is of paramount importance. This is interesting because it highlights the danger that men face in placing their hopes in female loyalty for an heir.[546] The link between female sexuality and inconsistency is highlighted by the comparative

[540] Homer *Odyssey*, 4.12. Lefkowitz 1987,154; and Bardis 1978, 228.
[541] Homer *Iliad*, 3.180. Homer *Odyssey*, 4.145.
[542] Worman 2001, 21.
[543] Homer *Odyssey*, 4.240-64.
[544] Homer *Odyssey*, 4. 261-2.
[545] Homer *Odyssey*, 2.265-90.
[546] Lardinois and McClure 2001, 19.

consistency of Athena. As a goddess who abstains from any form of sexuality, Athena faces no division of loyalty between father, husband and sons as the latter two never exist at all.

The divided loyalty of the mother is exemplified by Thetis.[547] She is married to Peleus, mother to Achilles and daughter to Nereus. Thetis' attachment for her son is obvious; she overhears Achilles weeping on the beach and is by his side in a moment.[548] It is notable that she does not come from her husband's side, but from her father's. Peleus is still alive within the Homeric epics, as Achilles' shade reveals to Odysseus when he expresses concern about the treatment of his elderly father.[549] Thetis' contempt for her mortal husband is evident. She reveals in her conversation with Hephaistos that the marriage to Peleus was arranged against her will. Her dislike for Peleus is driven by her sense of a marriage below her station. She has been corralled into a marriage with a mortal who will age and die, and he has given her a son who too will perish.[550] As a goddess, Thetis is removed from the world of aging and death and she cannot abide to be with her elderly husband.[551] But however easily Thetis can distance herself from Peleus, she cannot abandon her son. Thetis knows that Achilles is destined to die and she cannot prevent his early death, yet she remains attached to him, When Achilles is weeping, she is by his side in a heartbeat, and when he needs new armour she acquires it from Hephaistos himself.[552] Thetis, who despises Peleus for his mortality, cannot break the bond between mother and son. The fickle nature of female loyalty is surpassed by the maternal bond.

The households of the heroes hold more importance than might otherwise be expected in poems centred on conflict. There are clear differences for men and women. These range from the practical with the separation of space, to the moral with the concerns over fidelity. This provides insight into the way that Homer's audience would have conceived of the world portrayed. A degree of caution must be applied when interpreting this as evidence of social organisation as Homer makes no claims to be setting out a historically accurate, detailed and referenced account. But the approach of the narrator to various situations and the reactions of the characters within the world itself demonstrate which elements were intended to be viewed as normal or abnormal. In this way we are able to better understand the world that the Archaic Greeks inhabited.

[547] Thetis is a fascinating figure. Notable works relating to Thetis include: Aston 2009; Davies 1986; and Slatkin 1986.
[548] Homer *Iliad*, 1.357-63.
[549] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.494.
[550] Homer *Iliad*, 18.429-441.
[551] Homer *Iliad*, 18.435-436. Lefkowitz 2003, 39.
[552] Homer *Iliad*, 18.457-461.

The concerns around family and marriage can be seen in discrete ways. There are small and touching moments such as when Odysseus leaves the Phaeacians and wishes both Alkinous and Arete delight in their marriage and their children.[553] The respectful tone and Odysseus' need to reflect the family in his farewell suggests a broader cultural importance of family and children. The importance of children is closely linked with concerns around female fidelity and the inability of a man to be completely certain that any child born is actually his. The insecurities around women's loyalty are personified by women such as Helen and Klytaimnestra whilst Penelope is exceptional in her fidelity. The primary attribute praised in women is loyalty. In praising Penelope, epic poems make this quality aspirational and encourages other women to emulate her.[554] This is perhaps because it was assumed that women were not naturally inclined towards sexual fidelity and therefore needed to be guided towards it. The portrayal of Aphrodite and Helen indicates that this fickle nature was not limited to the mortal sphere.

The one area in which women's loyalty can be demonstrated to be absolute is to their children. Penelope knows she must remarry to prevent Telemachos' inheritance being devoured by the Suitors, but stalls for long enough to allow him to come of age, Thetis cannot abandon her mortal child, and even Helen laments leaving Hermione behind in Sparta.[555] The tightness of the bond between mother and child may have given husbands another reason to feel that their wives were not invested in the marriage. The competition for their wives' attention and affection would only have intensified with the arrival of a child. This would explain why goddesses such as Athena who never marry or bear a child are portrayed as more steadfast than those who do not, or why Klytaimnestra is able to murder her husband in cold blood but cannot bring herself to kill Orestes despite knowing he will grow up bound to avenge his father. The bond between mother and son draws on the emotional and the primal in a way which the father-son bond does not, as demonstrated by the respective pleas of Hekabe and Priam to Hektor. This is most keenly shown by Thetis who gladly abandons Peleus to age and die alone, but cannot do the same to Achilles.

The inherent distrust of women does not necessitate a concept of inherent evil to the gender. There is instead a concern about susceptibility. Klytaimnestra is able to withstand the temptation of Aigisthos until she is without male supervision, and Helen elopes with Paris when Menelaus is away. Women alone are vulnerable to persuasion and manipulation as much as they are likely to practise

[553] Homer *Odyssey*, 13.60-1.
[554] The audience of Homeric poetry is a contentious subject as there is little concrete evidence available. Scodel 2002 examines the subject directly. I am here suggesting that by presenting Penelope's behaviour as praise worthy, the poet would have reinforced that those values would have been positive for women.
[555] Homer *Iliad*, 3.173-5.

these traits. The only way for a man to keep control of his household was to maintain a physical presence and ensure that his wife was never left alone in the company of other men.

Pandora

As she is the origin point for the race of women, it is worth taking a moment to discuss Pandora.[556] Pandora is created by Zeus as a punishment for Prometheus' actions. The story is told twice by Hesiod, once in the *Theogony* where she listed as the origin point of women, and once in the *Works and Days* in which she is given as a wife to Prometheus's brother, Epimetheus.[557] The variations between the narratives are extremely interesting, not least because Epimetheus is a Titan rather than a mortal which makes Pandora's position as the origin of the race of mortal women rather confusing.[558] In both versions of the story Pandora's creation is a response to Prometheus' challenge to Zeus' supremacy and her arrival has devastating consequences for those around her. Pandora's name is only given in the *Works and Days*; in the *Theogony* she is not named at all. The name Pandora is linked with Gaia in one of the *Epigrams* attributed to Homer, and Lyons notes that it can be translated as the 'all-giver' or 'all-gifts'.[559]

Abundance of generation is something frequently associated with Gaia, and Pandora should be understood in contrast with Gaia. Pandora is the origin for the race of women, just as Gaia is the first goddess to emerge and the beginning of the ruling branch of their family tree. Just as Gaia represents the origin of many of the gods, Pandora represents the origin point for mortal descendants. It is notable that Hephaistos crafts Pandora from *gaia*.[560] In the absence of a definitive way to discern between nouns and proper nouns in Archaic Epic, it is impossible to say for certain whether the poet means 'earth' as the origin of clay, or intends for his audience to think of Gaia in her divine form. It is also possible that the ambiguity between the two positions is deliberate and the two concepts were not separate to the Archaic Greeks and should not be separated by modern scholars. Crafting Pandora from *gaia* ensures that her form has an outer layer of Gaia, and presents her as a facsimile of the original, primal goddess. However, unlike Gaia, Pandora is not able to give birth to deities; the generations that come from her will age and die.

The creation of Pandora inverts the relationship between creator and created established by Gaia at the outset of the family. Gaia creates Ouranos to be her partner and her husband whereas Pandora

[556] Hesiod *Theogony*, 591.
[557] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 83-88.
[558] Hesiod *Theogony*, 590-3.
[559] Homer *Epigrams,* 7. Lyons 2003, 98.
[560] Hesiod *Theogony*, 571.

is created by Zeus as a partner for mankind. Gaia has no parental figure and no deity is listed as her creator. She takes an active interest in the issues of succession and in promoting the success of her progeny. By contrast, Pandora is specifically created by a male deity to be given as a wife to another male deity.[561] It is notable that she is described as a semblance of a maiden rather than an actual maiden.[562] Her artificial nature again contrasts with Gaia. Pandora is a creation of male deities, at the behest of another male deity. It is notable that within the *Theogony* the only goddess involved with her creation is Athena; the androgynous goddess who rejects all ties to motherhood and marriage.[563] Pandora is literally the model wife, in form if not in function.[564]

Hesiod moves swiftly from the creation of Pandora to the destructive impact womankind has on the lives of men, comparing women to the drones in the beehive devouring honey and contributing nothing.[565] Hesiod's presentation of women characterises them as a threat to mortal men through their lack of production and excessive consumption. A man must either marry and endure the miseries of marriage, or they will come to old age with no-one to tend to them and their distant relations will divide up their estate once they perish.[566] This threat does not hold the same resonance amongst the undying, however the need to create a powerful son is more urgent when the young god will have to rely on his own might to flourish.

The creation of Pandora occurs at a critical moment within the poem. It does not occur immediately after Prometheus' trick with the division of sacrifice, rather it follows Prometheus' theft of fire.[567] The theft of fire has particular resonance because of the associations that fire has with immortalisation. At this point in the narrative, gods and mortals have made their division at Mekone and the sacrificial portions have been allotted. This split marks the delineation of gods and men. In response to Prometheus' attempted deception, Zeus withdraws fire from man.[568] The withdrawal of fire is significant. Fire is the medium through which men can elevate themselves above animals, through cooking their meat, and also through which mortal flesh can transcend the world of man and ascend to the Olympians themselves.[569] It is difficult not to think of figures such as Achilles being taken from his funeral pyre in the *Aithiopis* and carried away to the White Isle.[570] Thetis' success in

[561] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 59-68.
[562] … παρθένῳ αἰδοίῃ ἴκελον… '… the image of a modest maiden…' Hesiod *Works and Days*, 71.
[563] Hurwit 1995, 181.
[564] Hesiod does credit other goddesses with adorning Pandora in the *Works and Days*, most notably Aphrodite, Peitho and the daughters of Zeus: the Graces, the Seasons. 69-82.
[565] Hesiod *Theogony*, 594-602.
[566] Hesiod *Theogony*, 602-612.
[567] Hesiod *Theogony*, 561-569.
[568] Hesiod *Theogony*, 561-564.
[569] This will be discussed in more detail below.
[570] *Aithiopis*, 4. It is notable that almost every hero in epic is cremated, aside from Aias. Holt 1992, 324.

this moment is reminiscent of her earlier attempts to make her children immortal through fire, which will be discussed in more detail below.[571] Pache too highlights that transition through fire is associated in particular with the immortalisation of infants.[572] If fire is the gateway to immortality then Zeus' withdrawal and Prometheus' theft of fire is far more significant than it initially appears. Fire offers humanity a chance to achieve transition beyond their mortal condition. This would explain the severity of Prometheus' punishment as well as explaining the creation of women as a way for mortal men to gain pseudo-immortality through their offspring. As Segal notes, family and community are the 'closest man can come to immortality.'[573] The diversion of attention from the perilous quest for immortality of the individual to the comparably obtainable immortality achieved through the continuation of family is completed by the introduction of the wife, for a cost.[574]

Within the *Works and Days* there is further elaboration on the creation of Pandora. As in the *Theogony*, the central craftsman is Hephaistos who sculpts Pandora from *gaia* and water into her form.[575] In addition to Hephaistos, other deities contribute to her assembly. Athena provides the domestic skill of weaving, Aphrodite makes Pandora desirable, and Hermes provides her with her dog's mind and thieving nature.[576] In spite of the prestigious nature of the deities involved, the qualities are not universally pleasant. Aphrodite's gift is lust rather than love or companionship, and Hermes imbues Pandora with his thievish character and trickery. The trap is baited by Peitho and the Graces who adorn Pandora with a girdle, spring flowers and golden jewellery.[577] With the exception of Aphrodite, all of these deities are children of Zeus and are heavily invested in the preservation of his order.[578]

The characteristics given to Pandora are never seen in action, only described. It is notable that Pandora is given no agency within the texts. She is made and handed to Epimetheus as a gift, almost like a doll, in accordance with the will of Zeus. Her own motivation is never explored because it is of no consequence within the narrative. Pandora exists only as a tool of Zeus and the wife of Epimetheus. Pandora's silent acquiescence to her marriage suggests both her obedience to Zeus as her father and the natural order of marriage between man and woman in Archaic Greek thought.

---

[571] These two narratives are not found in the same source, but the recurrence of the imagery is interesting.
[572] Pache 2004, 52-53. Griffiths observes that this motif was popular enough for Euripides to subvert. Griffiths 2002, 651-652.
[573] Segal 1974, 206-207.
[574] Foley 1993, 86. 'Reproduction is a way to overcome the tragic feeling of contingency which is the result of mortality.' Bal 1983, 114.
[575] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 60-64.
[576] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 65-68.
[577] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 69-76.
[578] The parentage of Aphrodite is explored in more detail in the appendix. Whilst Hesiod does not make Aphrodite a daughter of Zeus, Homer's account doe. Homer *Iliad*, 5.370.

The Loyalty of the Goddesses

The section above explored the portrayal of women and goddesses in the Homeric poems and demonstrated that there is some overlap in the expectations on the behaviour of both. The Homeric poems are unique in their scale and narrative style. One limitation of the Homeric poems for this project is the heavy focus on the mortal sphere, albeit with the gods as recurring characters. In contrast, Hesiod's *Theogony* is entirely focussed on the genealogy of the gods but lacks the characterisation of Homer. After a lengthy dedication to the Muses, Hesiod's *Theogony* outlines its purpose to describe how the gods came to be and how they shaped the world, dividing the honours and taking possession of Olympos.[579] It is a bold declaration of purpose and highlights the scale of Hesiod's undertaking; not only to provide a genealogy for the gods but to unravel their origin.[580] The structure of the pantheon reflects mortal family life in that it is a family tree. The gods, like mortal men and women, take a partner and produce children, completing two of the 'trio of inescapable human processes'; however, they are undying.[581] With notable exceptions, goddesses are born, take a partner, experience pregnancy, labour pains, and give birth to their children.[582] Their lives follow the pattern of their mortal counterparts.

Mortal women, as seen above, transfer their primary loyalty between the men in their lives. Firstly, they are loyal to their father, then to their husband, and then to their sons. This transference makes sense on a practical level as the age difference between husbands and wives means that the woman will most likely be reliant on her sons to sustain her in her senior years.[583] Each step is a necessary movement towards the next male guardian figure. For the male figure, who loses their role as guardian as the new man takes their place, the fear of replacement could have been keen. Modern stories have demonstrated that it is not uncommon for a father to feel jealous or pushed out by the connection between mother and baby.[584] Whilst modern marriages prioritise the relationship between the couple more than the Archaic Greeks seem to, the movement of the woman's loyalty from her husband to her son would still be a threat to her loyalty to her husband.

---

[579] Hesiod *Theogony*, 108-113.
[580] West 1966, 190.
[581] Parker 1983, 74.
[582] Athena, Hestia and Artemis are some obvious examples of goddesses who do not have children of their own.
[583] Finch discusses the effect of the age gap in Archaic Greek marriages. Finch 2010, 366. This age gap is laid out as the ideal in Hesiod *Works and Days*, 694-701.
[584] Karen 1994, 105, 362.

The fluidity of women's loyalty is linked with the view that women were inherently susceptible to external pressures and therefore prone to infidelity or betrayal. In spite of being both ageless and deathless, the goddesses are not exempt from concerns around their loyalty. As shall be demonstrated below, goddesses too are subject to pressures around marriage, motherhood and sexual fidelity. The need to control the behaviour of the goddesses relies on a careful negotiation of these bonds. Unlike mortal families, the father of the goddesses and their partners will never die or age, however the next generation is still born. This means that the loyalty of the mother to the son is an acute threat to their husbands as they are likely to act to further the interests of their children rather than their partner.

The Need for a Guardian

The reliance of mortal women on a male guardian has been demonstrated in the previous section: unless Odysseus returns Penelope must remarry, Andromache laments her fate and that of Astyanax after Hektor is killed, and Klytaimnestra attaches to Aigisthos in Agamemnon's absence. This vulnerable status is echoed in the divine realm as the goddesses too seek a partner, even creating one when they have no other available. The first independent action which Gaia takes in the *Theogony* is to create Ouranos to be her equal and sexual partner.[585] Gaia's motivation is intriguing; her ability to create Ouranos demonstrates that she does not need a father to produce children. Her next action is to give birth to the mountains, the nymphs who dwell on those mountains, and then Pontos; all of whom are born without 'delightful love.'[586] Gaia's need to create a partner is clearly not solely to allow her to produce children as she is capable of doing this without.

Felson suggests that Ouranos' birth is an admission from Gaia that she is unable to maintain 'cosmic order' and that she will need a male partner to ensure the continued stability of the universe.[587] She highlights that *kalupto*[588] can mean 'eclipse' and suggests that Gaia's attempt to create a partner results instead in the accidental creation of a superior force who will cover and subjugate Gaia. Felson's argument implies that Gaia is motivated by a desire for power and is unable to suppress Ouranos once he is created. However, Gaia does not protest at Ouranos' behaviour until he confines her children. Gaia describes Ouranos as a wicked father than a wicked husband and appeals to her

[585] Hesiod *Theogony*, 126-7.
[586] Hesiod *Theogony*, 129-132.
[587] Felson 2011, 6.
[588] Hesiod *Theogony,* 127.

children to right the wrongs done to them.[589] Gaia's attempt to push her children to act emphasises her role as mother, but at no point does she indicate that they are avenging a wrong against her, rather she focuses on the wickedness done to them by Ouranos. Gaia's role in the plot is limited to inspiring Kronos, and supplying the weapon. There is never the suggestion that she would wield the dagger herself. It could possibly be argued that as she is a female deity violence is not within her remit; but Greek mythology does not shy away from female violence towards their partners. Klytaimnestra's brutal murder of her husband is a case in point, as are the martial and hunting aspects of Athena and Artemis.

There is a significance to the fact that Gaia does not carry out the act herself. Ouranos does not rebuke her within the *Theogony*, instead focussing his ire against his children.[590] The relationship between Gaia and Ouranos is not explicitly portrayed as an unhappy one until the confinement of their children within Gaia. The idea of an unhappy union could be inferred from the violent castration of Ouranos, however there is very little otherwise that would suggest difficulties within the couple. Lefkowitz cautions against reading more into the texts than is actually present and in this instance, there is no indication of hostility between Gaia and Ouranos directly.[591] In contrast with Kronos who 'overpowers' Rhea, Ouranos approaches Gaia eager and full of love.[592] This could be a deliberate choice to throw the castration into sharp relief, but there is no suggestion anywhere else in the text of any animosity between Gaia and Ouranos except when Ouranos impedes the birth of their children.

It might be expected that there would be more conflict between the couple after the gruesome act, but there is no evidence of that. Rhea approaches Gaia and Ouranos together when she needs to overcome the difficulties of Kronos as an unwilling father.[593] Rhea's appeal is directed to both of her parents, and together they offer counsel on how she can best protect her own children and ensure their success. I would suggest that Gaia creates Ouranos to be her partner and, rather than being unsettled by his assumption of the dominant role, she is content until his behaviour threatens her children's ability to thrive and assert themselves. For a father among the gods, the production of children is a perilous act; creating an heir is who is unable to inherit except through violence is inherently dangerous. This dichotomy of the father, wanting to satisfy his desires whilst wanting to preserve the stability of the household, is termed the 'Pandora Complex' by Brown, who suggests

[589] Hesiod *Theogony*, 164-6.
[590] Hesiod *Theogony*, 207-210.
[591] Lefkowitz 2007, xviii.
[592] Hesiod *Theogony*, 453;177.
[593] Hesiod *Theogony*, 469-473.

that it illustrates the 'classic statement of the male dilemma over women'.[594] The desire to create children must be a powerful one as it risks so much.

Gaia's first action is to make a partner but some goddesses remain unmarried. Even those who do not take a husband demonstrate the need for a male protector. It may seem perverse to argue that a goddess who remains unmarried demonstrates the necessity to take a guardian, but even those who do not marry find powerful guardians. One example of this is Hekate. Hekate is the daughter of Asteria and Perses which makes her a great granddaughter of Gaia and Ouranos and Gaia and Pontos.[595] Her position at the meeting point of the two dynasties is exceptional and Clay has explored this fascinating genealogical mix in detail.[596] It is worth noting that Hekate is described as having a share of the earth, sea, and sky, all of which are the domains of her earliest ancestors.[597] Hekate is clearly a significant figure to the poet, who spends more time discussing Hekate's honours, spheres of influence and privileged position within Zeus' hierarchy than he does any other single figure within the poem.[598]

In spite of the praise that is given, Hekate is also presented as being extremely vulnerable. Hekate is without a husband or a brother, and her father does not feature heavily in action or word within the *Theogony*. Her vulnerability is stressed by the poet at three points within the passage. Firstly, when the narrator comments that Zeus did not use violence against her, secondly, when in spite of her status as an only child she retains her honours, and thirdly, when it is reiterated that she is honoured even though she is an only child.[599] Underlying all of the complements to the goddess' prowess and power is the continued precariousness of her position. It is repeatedly stressed that Zeus does not use force against her, which heavily implies that this is a realistic outcome. Instead Zeus, father of gods and men, takes on the guardian role for Hekate, negating the need for her to take a husband. His paternal interest is in notable contrast with his approach to many other goddesses and, as Zeitlin highlights, giving Hekate the role as nursemaid allows her to pursue maternal interests whilst never taking a partner.[600] In assuming the role as her guardian, Zeus not only extends his protection to the otherwise isolated figure, but blocks other gods from taking her as a partner. Hekate will never be a wife or a mother, and Zeus as a paternal guardian can be sure of her total loyalty.

[594] Brown 1997, 26.
[595] Hesiod *Theogony*, 133-136; 239
[596] Clay 1984; 2003, 129-140; forthcoming, 56.
[597] Hesiod *Theogony*, 411-15.
[598] Hesiod *Theogony*, 411-452. West 1966, 278-7.
[599] Hesiod *Theogony,* 423; 426;428.
[600] Zeitlin 1996, 75.

One of the questions that this arrangement poses is why would Zeus need or want to do this? Clay has argued that Hekate operates as an *epiklēros*, an heiress who is unable to inherit directly but who can bestow inheritance on her husband when she marries.[601] I suggest instead that the threatening element of Hekate is not the potential husband, but the potential son. The argument is an interesting one, as it highlights the complex dynastic situation of the gods. In a family where brothers and sisters intermarry it is extremely difficult to trace whether the power is passed through the father or the mother. It is a son of Gaia and Ouranos and then of Rhea and Kronos who seizes power, but as they are all related it is impossible to say for certain which parent power moves through. One element is clear, the goddesses are never in a position to rule directly themselves; however, they consistently press for advantages for their children. This is why Zeus not only seeks unions with dynastically significant goddesses but also restricts the unions of his children, especially his daughters. Zeus' unions focus on blocking other deities from marrying his aunts, cousins and daughters, which would only be significant if they had the power to transmit power to the next generation.[602]

Matrilineal Descent and its Difficulties

It is important to distinguish between matriarchy and matrilineal descent. The power of the goddesses is not one which they wield directly. Goddesses do not compete with their male counterparts for control of the universe; rather they have the ability to pass on the right to power to their sons. This is highlighted by Zeus' desire to consolidate the branches of his family through marriage. Unlike Kronos, Zeus takes multiple wives and the first wife he takes is not one of his sisters. He instead marries Metis who is a daughter of Okeanos and Tethys.[603] Okeanos and Tethys are siblings of Kronos and Rhea, which places them in the generation above Zeus.[604] Next Zeus marries Themis, a sister of Kronos and Rhea,[605] before marrying Eurynome another of Okeanos' daughters.[606] Zeus also has children with Leto, who is herself a child of Phoibe and Koios,[607] two more of his father's siblings. Mnemosyne is another daughter of Gaia and Ouranos,[608] and he then

[601] Clay 2003, 22-4.
[602] This is something discussed in the previous chapter.
[603] Hesiod *Theogony*, 358.
[604] Hesiod *Theogony*, 132-136.
[605] Hesiod *Theogony*, 132-136.
[606] Hesiod *Theogony*, 358.
[607] Hesiod *Theogony*, 405-6.
[608] Hesiod *Theogony*, 135.

goes on to father children with the two of his sisters who have not sworn chastity: Demeter and Hera.[609] This means that Zeus marries all of his aunts who are without a partner, his sisters who have not abstained from marriage and two of the daughters of his married aunt and uncles. There appears to be a concern to take control the female line of the family and to ensure that the children that they produce are all descended from Zeus himself. The need to control the fathering of children with the female members of the family implies that there is a dynastic element to the position of *basileus*. In marrying the women who are within that line, and ensuring that they bear his children, Zeus is able to prevent any other god from producing children with them who may go on to threaten his rule. This would suggest that there was a need to prevent alternative gods from marrying into the line of descent. The need to protect the line of descent suggests that hereditary descent does have some bearing on the succession of the position of *basileus*.

The power of the mother to impart power to her children, as well as the drive for her to further their interests, is also shown by Gaia. Before Zeus is able to secure power in Olympos, Gaia produces her youngest child in a union with Tartaros incited by Aphrodite.[610] Typhoëos, the product of their liaison, is the last significant threat which Zeus faced before his eventual consolidation of power. The behaviour of Gaia in this episode has caused difficulty to scholars, as Gaia goes from creating the single most devastating threat to Zeus to endorsing his right to rule.[611] Gaia's position as the first member of the dynasty of ruling deities means that all those who hold power over the other deities are her children. Gaia produces children with Ouranos, Pontos, and finally Tartaros, who represent the sky, sea and the underworld. The mirroring of these three roles in Zeus, Poseidon and Hades when they divide their respective domains is tellingly similar and suggests the completion of the handover of power to the Olympians. Gaia's youngest child, Typhoëos, is a step-brother to Kronos and Ouranos, and opens up the concept of a third potential line of descent.

Typhoëos is able to produce three children of his own with Echidna: Orthos, Kerberos and the Hydra.[612] The monstrous nature of these figures is instantly apparent, and is unsurprising based on their parents' attributes. Echidna is described as not at all alike to men and gods, possessing the top half of a beautiful nymph and the lower half of a monstrous snake, and devouring raw flesh.[613] Typhoëos is even more monstrous, with a hundred snakes' heads each breathing fire and unleashing

[609] Hesiod *Theogony*, 912-914 and 921-924.
[610] Hesiod *Theogony*, 820-22. See also Robson 2013, 16 for a selection of sources from Classical Athens on the ideal age of husbands.
[611] A brief selection of examples can be found in Clay 2003, 26.
[612] Hesiod *Theogony*, 306-318.
[613] Hesiod *Theogony*, 295-303.

a cacophony of terrible inhuman sounds.[614] The offspring of Typhoëos are swiftly dealt with: Orthos and the Hydra are both killed by Herakles. Kerberos is set to guard the underworld, the domain of his grandfather, and is overpowered by Herakles during his labours. It is noteworthy that a son of Zeus defeats the sons of Typhoëos, just as Zeus defeated their father. In overcoming Typhoëos, Gaia's youngest child, Zeus is able to assume dynastic control of the family. This is secured when Gaia advises the other deities to elect Zeus as their leader.[615] Until Gaia has no more children of her own to advance, her loyalty to Zeus is not guaranteed.

The other notable example of a goddess seeking to create a challenger to Zeus' power is Hera. Hera is a fascinating case of a goddess who is limited by the rules of polygyny. Zeus is free to take multiple partners, but Hera is prevented from seeking an alternative consort herself. Instead, Hera seeks to advantage her children over her husband. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Hera is incensed by the birth of Athena. She directly compares Athena to her own crippled son Hephaistos before criticising Zeus for not producing a child with her, his wife.[616] The issue for Hera, as presented in the Hymn, is not that Zeus has slept with another goddess; Metis is never mentioned by name in this hymn. The issue is rather that Zeus now has a child who is more prestigious and favoured than Hera's child Hephaistos. In response to this slight, Hera then plots to produce another child who will be able to overcome her husband and rule over gods and men. Unlike Zeus, whose many affairs are more of a vexation to his wife than a serious problem, Hera cannot simply find another god to father a child and must find a way to conceive a child which does not disgrace the holy bed.[617] This is not only a clear example of the behavioural codes of the goddesses adhering to the behavioural codes of mortal women, but a demonstration of the anger of the step-mother whose child is disenfranchised by the arrival of a new family member.[618]

Hera's response to the threat of Athena is to produce a new child, more effective than Hephaistos, to rival her husband. An open declaration of intent to create a rival is subversive, but Hera's return to parthenogenesis to create a child is even more seditious as it negates the need for a father at all. Parthenogenesis is not a dominant form of reproduction in mythology, but it is rare this late in the family tree. In imitating the earlier goddesses, Gaia, Nyx and Styx, Hera's actions call back to the primordial goddesses and evoke their power.[619] Her desire to produce a child without a father to replace Zeus suggests that a child who was descended from Hera would have the power to displace

[614] Hesiod *Theogony*, 820- 835. Brockliss 2018.
[615] Hesiod *Theogony*, 881-886. Clay 2003, 27.
[616] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 314-17 and 324-25.
[617] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 328.
[618] Watson 1995,27.
[619] Hesiod *Theogony*, 126;211-25; 226-232.

Zeus either through birth right or raw power. Given the precedent set by Kronos and Zeus, a combination of the two would presumably be the ideal. If Hera is able to pass on the right to rule to her child through the maternal line, just as Gaia is able to pass that power to Typhoëos, it would suggest that the right to rule passes to the sons of dynastically significant goddesses rather than gods.

Within this passage it is once again stressed that Hera in isolation cannot be a threat to Zeus; the threat must come from her son. Both Rhea and Hera appeal to Gaia and Ouranos to aid them against their husbands and to advance their children. Within the Hymn, Hera strikes her palm against the earth in a gesture of chthonic prayer and asks for a child mightier than Zeus, as Zeus was mightier than his father.[620] Rhea and Hera are both key conspirators in their husband's overthrow before the child who may threaten is even born. Amongst the goddesses the loyalty to their husband transfers to their son before birth. The reason for this early transference may be the undying nature of the gods. Whilst mortal women can be fairly secure that one day their son will inherit from his father as part of the natural progression of aging, the same cannot be said for the goddesses. For a god to 'inherit' his father's authority he must take it by force. This means that the possible birth of an heir is treated with hostility by the father who sees a potential threat, and the joy of a mother whose ambitions and desire for status will be satisfied through a powerful and successful son.

The existence of Hephaistos could be said to undermine this point as Hera already has a son who does not challenge Zeus. However, Hephaistos is never represented as a serious contender for Zeus' position. Hera's desire to produce another son is a direct consequence of Hephaistos' failure to satisfy his mother's ambitions for her child. It is overwhelmingly apparent that Hephaistos is a source of shame to his mother due to his physical imperfections. Hephaistos' parentage is ambiguous within the Hymn, with Hera referring to him as her son, but no reference to Zeus as his father.[621] This is possibly to increase the contrast of the comparison between Athena and Hephaistos, but does also leave open the possibility that Hephaistos was also born through parthenogenesis as he is in the *Theogony* where the two children are contrasted again.[622] Hera's distress at Hephaistos' inadequacy is so strong that she hurls the child into the sea, where Thetis intervenes to care for the child.[623] The bond between mother and son is disrupted by his inability to challenge his father and succeed him.

[620] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 339.
[621] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 317.
[622] Hesiod *Theogony*, 925-929.
[623] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 316-20.

Hephaistos is clearly no threat to Zeus. Hera's subsequent dismissal of her son recognises his failure, and implicitly her own inability to succeed as his mother.[624]

The Fears of the Father

The threat that a child poses to Zeus has been downplayed in scholarship, but it is important to recognise that the Archaic poets present the birth of divine children as potentially regime-shattering. When the poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Athena* describes the birth of Athena, he relates that she was born fully armed from the head of Zeus. Her arrival causes the earth to cry out, the sea to churn and the sun to stop as it travels across the sky.[625] This passage is not only dramatic in its own right, but evokes the imagery of the *Theogony* when the gods clash with the Titans, and Zeus fights with Typhoëos.[626] The intergenerational conflicts of the *Theogony* cause the world to recoil at their ferocity, and the birth of Athena inspires a similarly volatile reaction. The threat of physical conflict between Athena and her father is further stressed by her arrival fully armed. Ouranos and Kronos both attempted to dispose of their children either before, or immediately after their birth which denies the children a serious opportunity to threaten. Athena emerges from the head of Zeus fully armed and with good reason to be hostile towards the father who swallowed Metis whilst she was pregnant. Instead, Athena inverts the pattern. She is born armed but immediately removes her armour and her weapons, much to the delight of her father.[627] Athena is presented as a figure with the potential to overthrow her father but despite her 'hyper-masculine' presentation, the threat does not materialise and she instead accepts her role as daughter.[628]

After her initial arrival, Athena's loyalty to her father is understood to be fixed. Athena's position as one of the maiden goddesses is, I think, an aspect of that loyalty being secured. Unlike Rhea or Hera, Athena will never have to choose between her father, her husband or her son, as she never takes a husband or gives birth to a child. This declaration of perpetual maidenhood leaves Athena permanently under the guardianship of her father and leaves her completely dependent on him as her guardian. If Zeus is overthrown then she loses her guardian, so it is in her best interests to ensure that he is not.

[624] Caldwell 1989, 179.
[625] *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 10-14.
[626] Hesiod *Theogony* 695-6 and 847.
[627] *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 14-16.
[628] Felson 2011, 12.

Athena's position is not as unique as might be expected. The dramatic nature of her birth belies the underlying similarities that she has with many of her half-sisters. Zeus has nearly thirty daughters within the *Theogony*. Of these, only three take a partner. Athena and Artemis are two obvious examples of daughters of Zeus who remain prominently unmarried. Hestia too, the only one of Zeus' sisters that he does not enter into a union with, remains celibate.[629] The daughters who do marry all marry figures who are close to Zeus, but who have flaws which prevent them from posing a serious threat. Aglaia is married to Hephaistos, whose unsuitability as a challenger has been elaborated on above.[630] Hebe is joined to Herakles, an elevated demi-god, and Zeus' son.[631] Finally Persephone is married to Hades, Zeus' brother and ruler of the underworld. Even in a poem which focusses specifically on the genealogy of the gods, none of these unions are listed as producing children. The absence of children is easily overlooked amongst the general abundance of the family, but it is consistent across Zeus immortal daughters. As mentioned above, Helen is only able to produce a daughter, and that daughter is herself incapable of conceiving an heir. Zeus appears to select husbands who are closely related to him, as well as those who are in some way disenfranchised from the main body of the gods. This is a conscious decision to limit the threat of any children that his daughters might bear.

Zeus' fear of the rival is not limited to his grandchildren and there is also an implicit threat from his sons. This fear is demonstrated both in his swallowing of Metis to deter the arrival of the prophesied son,[632] and also in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. When Apollo approaches Olympos, bow in hand, at the beginning of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* the other gods are intimidated by his approach. Clay is correct to highlight the danger that Apollo poses in this episode, which has been significantly underplayed by other scholarship.[633] These denials of Apollo's threat range from suggestions that Apollo is merely carrying the bow, or is being playful, to Miller's suggestion that Apollo's violence is directed against those enemies outside of Olympos and he has just neglected to disarm himself before entering the hall.[634] The issue with these lines of argument is that they ignore the response of the other gods. When Apollo enters the room, the gods tremble and flee their seats.[635] This suggests that Apollo's actions are out of the ordinary and are a cause of fear to them. The gods are, by definition, *athanatoi* and as such it is worth considering why another god wielding weapons would

[629] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 21-32.
[630] Hesiod *Theogony*, 945-6.
[631] Hesiod *Theogony*, 950-6.
[632] Hesiod *Theogony*, 886-900.
[633] Clay 2006, 21. For an example contrasting view see Miller 1986, 13.
[634] Miller 1986, 13.
[635] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 1-5.

cause them such distress. Apollo has the pedigree of a divine challenger, and Zeus is not beyond the threat of the next generation.

The threat of a successor to Zeus is made plain in the *Theogony*, where Zeus is advised by Gaia and Ouranos that Metis will bear not only Athena, but a son. This son is described as a *basileus* of god and men, possessing a heart of overwhelming power.[636] This son is not Apollo, but the prophecy should serve as a reminder that Zeus is under threat of a successor from the moment that he takes a partner and produces a child. This threat is not a unique one, Aiskhylos too refers to a son of Zeus who will be his undoing in *Prometheus Bound*.[637] These threats drive Zeus to swallow Metis and to send Hermes to demand answers from Prometheus which suggests that these challengers have some credibility. Zeus is never supplanted within the myth, but there is a clear and recurrent association between his sons and potential rivals. This is perhaps why Zeus only has three sons by goddesses: Apollo, Ares and Hermes. Apollo's position as Zeus' son places him in prime position to be that successor.

The desertion of the other deities leaves an armed Apollo face to face with his father. The abandonment of the gods indicates both that they are afraid of Apollo, but also that they are not prepared to intercede to protect Zeus. Their abandonment leaves an armed Apollo face to face with his father, who is presumably unarmed given the context, with only Leto to intercede. Chappell dismisses the idea that Apollo as the 'most Olympian of gods and the loyal son of Zeus' can be considered a threat to Zeus at this point.[638] However, if this incident describes Apollo's first ascent to Olympos then this would be the first direct encounter between Zeus and his son. Regardless of what information the audience may be party to, the characters within the narrative are limited to the information presented to them. The flight of the gods indicates that they expect Apollo to behave violently, and through them the poet highlights the tension of the scene without having Apollo and Zeus come to blows. The gods anticipate a clash between father and son, and clear the room to avoid becoming collateral damage.

The threat of Apollo is made apparent very early in the poem. Stepping forward in the hymn and backward in the story chronologically, it is clear that the threat of Apollo exists before the god is even born. When Leto is searching for a place to give birth to her son, she struggles to find a location which will grant her permission to bear her child there. The reason is not made apparent until Leto reaches Delos and negotiates with the island to give birth to her son there. Delos reveals to the

[636] Hesiod *Theogony*, 897-8.
[637] Aiskhylos *Prometheus Bound*, 768.
[638] Chappell 2001, 75.

audience that Apollo's birth has been foretold, and fears that Leto's son will be a dangerous figure who will rule over gods and mortals alike.[639] The description of a mighty son of Zeus who will become ruler of gods and men echoes the prophecy of Gaia and Ouranos in the *Theogony*, albeit with a different mother.[640] It is notable that Delos has access to this information, as apparently did all the locations which Leto had previously visited. Delos does not name a source for this information which might imply that just being a son of Zeus is enough to cause disquiet. Leto is the daughter of Phoibe and Koios,[641] two siblings of Rhea and Kronos[642] which would make her as dynastically significant as Metis who is a daughter of two more gods of that generation: Okeanos and Tethys.[643]

Whether the threat of the challenger comes from Zeus' paternity, or Leto's bloodline, Apollo's birth brings the prospect of another power struggle at the head of the family. The large scale, devastating impact of a conflict between generations of gods is demonstrated twice in the Titanomachy, firstly, when Zeus and the Olympians seize power from Kronos and the Titans and, secondly, when Zeus and Typhoëos come to blows.[644] Both of these events are portrayed as seismic in scale; the seas churn and the earth groans and seethes. The clashes between the gods have a devastating impact on the world around them. With Apollo rumoured to be the next challenger, the prospect of another power struggle may have been a daunting one; especially for gods who are tied to geographic locations. In denying Leto a place to give birth to her child, the deities seek to delay or prevent the birth of Apollo. In order to convince Delos, Leto is forced to negotiate, making promises that Apollo will honour the island after his birth and not destroy it.[645] Delos' fear that Apollo might begrudge the humble location of his birth and stamp her beneath the waves demonstrates the expectations of violence and pride from a god not yet born.[646] As yet unborn, Apollo's temperament and ambition are unknown; but there is the consistent impression that he will be a dangerous figure who will upset the balance of Zeus' reign.

The presentation of Apollo at the beginning of the hymn repeatedly stresses his potential to challenge his father and yet Apollo never fulfils that role. The confrontation between Zeus and Apollo ends almost as soon as it begins as Leto approaches her son and disarms him.[647] It is not a coincidence that it is Leto and not Zeus who disarms Apollo. The intervention of the mother is a key

[639] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 66-70.
[640] Hesiod *Theogony*, 897-898.
[641] Hesiod *Theogony*, 404-408.
[642] Hesiod *Theogony*, 133-136.
[643] Hesiod *Theogony*, 358.
[644] Hesiod *Theogony*, 687-711 and 820-852.
[645] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 60-90.
[646] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 70-75.
[647] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 5-14.

moment within the poem. Throughout the *Theogony*, the transition of power from one generation to the next relies on the connection between mothers and sons. Gaia calls upon her children to take up arms against Ouranos when he contains their children, and Rhea too schemes to protect her children from Kronos' desire to devour them. The goddesses, for all their scheming, are never able to act themselves; the son is always the agent. However, the goddesses are the driving force behind their son's actions, defending their children as best as they can. In contrast to his father, Apollo is never threatened by his father, nor are his siblings. This means that Leto has no cause to act against her husband. Leto breaks the pattern by remaining alongside Zeus and disarming her son. It is only once Leto has unstrung the bow that Zeus offers his son nectar and welcomes him to the hall. It is significant that Zeus takes no action within the poem until this moment as it allows Apollo's intentions, as well as his own, to remain ambiguous. Neither son nor father acts directly against the other, in fact they do not interact at all until the mediating influence of Leto has done its work. This is rather unfortunate, as Zeus' reaction to his son's armed approach could have been hugely revealing.

Unlike his father and grandfather, Zeus makes no attempt to restrain or consume his sons. The lack of animosity between the father and the unborn son means that there is no conflict between wife and husband, as the wife is not forced to choose between her partner and her child. The only intervention in the birth of Apollo is from his step-mother Hera.[648] Hera's jealousy of Leto is not related to her relationship with Zeus, but explicitly because Leto will give birth to a son who is noble and powerful in contrast to her own sons.[649] Hera's persecution is not on the orders of Zeus but rather in defence of the prospects of her own children. Zeus' tolerance of Apollo's birth and place in the pantheon neutralises the threat of the son by placating the mother. Since Leto does not need to act in defence of her child; she has no need to conspire with Apollo against her husband.

Zeus and Persephone

Whilst Zeus is able to successfully manage Leto's ambitions for her son, the same cannot be said for his handling of Demeter and Persephone. Persephone's abduction, and subsequent marriage to Hades, is conducted without Demeter's knowledge and Demeter's wrath is so severe it threatens the order of the universe. The abduction of Persephone highlights the association of marriage and abduction in Archaic Greek thought and Parker notes the centrality of the similarities between Zeus

[648] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 93-101.
[649] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 100.

and a mortal father at the beginning of the poem.[650] From the outset of the hymn it is apparent that Zeus has consented to the match as Persephone is 'given' by her father.[651] But Zeus' approval stands in stark contrast with Demeter's ignorance and the violent seizure of Persephone.[652] The seizure of Persephone is sudden and swift; only Helios witnesses it and only Hekate hears Persephone's cry.[653] Demeter is unable to discover the fate of her child until Hekate advises she speaks with Helios and she is unable to interfere directly after the event as Demeter is unable to travel to the underworld to retrieve her child. The need to conduct the marriage of Persephone and Hades without the consent of her mother implies that Zeus is aware that Demeter will not be happy with the match, and also that she may act against his wishes to prevent it.

The connection between mothers and daughters is evident throughout the hymn. When Helios speaks to Demeter, he refers to her as the 'daughter of Rhea' rather than the daughter of Kronos or the wife of Zeus. But Helios does instruct her to cease her grieving and respect the union which Zeus has ordained between Hades and Persephone as it is a fitting match.[654] The anger that Demeter feels is not directed towards Hades, who stole her child, but towards Zeus, the father who gave her daughter away.[655] Rudhardt stresses the complete separation of mother and daughter in this hymn. As the gods, with very few exceptions, cannot move freely between the world of the living and the world of the dead, when Persephone is taken to the underworld, she is removed from her mother's world entirely.[656] Rudhardt further suggests that Demeter's suffering, the loss of a divine child to the underworld, humanises the goddess to an extent. Which is why Demeter abandons her divine duties and descends to the mortal world.[657] Demeter's connection to her child is far stronger than her loyalty to Zeus and Zeus' attempt to sever that relationship brings him into direct confrontation with the mother of his child.

Demeter's response to Zeus' actions is strikingly similar to Hera's attempt to produce a rival through parthenogenesis. Having reached Eleusis, she becomes nursemaid to a mortal prince called Demophoön and seeks to immortalise the child. Lefkowitz notes that, having lost a child, Demeter immediately seeks out another child to nurse.[658] Demeter's actions are rather more subversive than just the displacement of maternal affection, as she seeks to make Demophoön immortal.[659] The

[650] Parker 1991, 6.
[651] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 3.
[652] Clay 2006, 209.
[653] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 21-27.
[654] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 82-87.
[655] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 91.
[656] Rudhardt 1993, 203.
[657] Rudhardt 1993, 209.
[658] Lefkowitz 2007, 50.
[659] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 235-47.

boundary between gods and men is marked by the god's undying nature. In bringing Demophoön across that boundary, Demeter would prove that it was possible for a man to become a god and she would have introduced another potential challenger to Zeus' regime. Demeter feeds her charge on ambrosia and conceals him in the fire at night, seeking to change him physically into an immortal. The hymn does not elaborate on whether the process would be a painful experience for the child, but the reaction of his mother suggests that is was alarming to behold. Aston highlights the similarities in the 3rd Century BC *Argonautika* where Thetis attempts to immortalise Achilles through fire and is discovered by an equally horrified Peleus.[660] The closeness in imagery is deliberate; Mackie has observed linguistic similarities between these passages which suggest that the hymn may have directly inspired the later text.[661] The retention of this motif in a much later poem suggests that the idea continued to hold resonance in Greek thought beyond the Archaic period. In both cases the horrified reaction of the parent causes the goddess to throw the child to the floor and abandon the process, ruining the planned immortalisation.

With this attempt to produce a challenger to Zeus abruptly ended, Demeter withdraws from the world further. Her absence is devastating for the mortals who depend upon her for their harvests, and through them, the gods who are deprived of sacrifice.[662] The myth has drawn comparison with the Hurro-Hittite myth of Telipinu, amongst others which demonstrate concern over the withdrawal of an agricultural deity.[663] Given Zeus' position as *basileus* of gods and men, it is extremely interesting that Zeus cannot compel Demeter to return to her duties. Zeus initially sends Iris to instruct Demeter to return; when that message fails, he sends other gods to offer Demeter gifts and honours to return.[664] Zeus is well established as the ruler of Olympos but Demeter refuses both his instructions and his enticements until he has negotiated the return of their daughter. It is not coincidental that it is Demeter's own mother Rhea who is finally able to convince her daughter to return to Olympos.[665] The bond between goddesses and their children is far stronger than the political loyalties of individual goddesses to Zeus. As a daughter Persephone is not a threat to her father in her own right; and in marrying Persephone to Hades, Zeus prevents her from marrying a more dangerous suitor or producing a son.

[660] Aston 2009, 101. Ap. Rhod., *Argon*. IV, 868-879.
[661] Mackie 1998, 333.
[662] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 305-313.
[663] Reyhan 2009, 87.
[664] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 310-333. Zeus' influence on the distribution of *timai* is an important element of this hymn and of Hesiod's *Theogony*. Rudhardt notes that Zeus' authority over *timai* is not exclusive and that some key figures do acquire their *timai* without being given it by Zeus. Rudhardt 1993, 198-199.
[665] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 441-469.

Whilst the focus here has been on the relationship between Persephone and Demeter, it should also be observed that the marriage to Persephone is as effective in tying Hades into Zeus' regime as well. Bonnafé' argues convincingly that the marriage of Hades and Persephone is an important aspect of Zeus gaining control over his potential rivals.[666] Hades is one of Zeus' brothers, and has no daughters of his own for Zeus to marry. Instead, he marries a daughter of Zeus. As has been shown in the discussion of marriage in epic verse, the daughters of powerful rulers make attractive matches to wandering heroes.[667] Here Persephone functions in the same way as the figures such as Kassandra who were discussed previously. As Persephone is a daughter of Zeus, marriage to Persephone formalises and publicises the alliance between Zeus and Hades. If this was a mortal union, then the marriage may also have carried expectations of inheritance of power after the death of Persephone's father, however, the issue of inheritance amongst the gods is a vexed issue. The marriage of Hades and Persephone neutralises any threat Hades may have presented, as well as preventing Persephone from making a less suitable match.

The Absent Mother

It must be acknowledged that not all of the goddesses are so invested in their children. Hera's relationship with Hephaistos has already been discussed above. The reason for Hera's disdain for Hephaistos is his inadequacy as potential heir to Zeus. Aphrodite too has a problematic relationship with motherhood.[668] Aphrodite is unique in Hesiod's pantheon as she is born to two fathers.[669] The absence of a maternal role model for Aphrodite might explain her own lack of mothering instinct, but imposing modern psychoanalytic ideas too firmly onto a society so distant from our own can be perilous. Aphrodite is certainly distanced from the maternal image and this is demonstrated in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. In the hymn, Aphrodite is tricked into a liaison with Anchises by Zeus. When Aphrodite realises that she is to bear a child to Anchises, she distances herself from both the father and the child almost at once. Aphrodite orders that the nymphs will raise Aineias until his fifth

[666] Bonnafé 1985, 93-94.
[667] This was discussed in section 3.2 *Marriage in Archaic Verse.*
[668] Breitenberger 2007, 15.
[669] In the appendix, I argue that the two fathers of Aphrodite are Ouranos and Pontos based on the influences of the Hurro-Hittite *Kinship in Heaven Cycle*. This contrasts with her parentage in Homer where she is the child of Zeus and Dione. Homer *Iliad*, 5.370. The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, refers to Aphrodite as a daughter of Zeus following the Homeric lineage. *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 107.

birthday and threatens Anchises with the thunderbolts of Zeus should he reveal that she is mother of his child.[670]

Aphrodite's abandonment of Anchises and the baby is more akin to the male gods such as Zeus, who often do not pursue a relationship with the mother of their child beyond the initial conception. The inversion of gender roles is implicit throughout the hymn as Anchises is discovered alone in a pastoral environment by a deity who desires him.[671] The deity takes a physical form that they think will please their prospective partner and seduces them before revealing their divine identity and vanishing. This pattern is only deviated from in two respects. Firstly, Aphrodite must bear the child so cannot abandon her partner to raise Aeneas immediately. Secondly, in order to entice Anchises, Aphrodite disguises herself as a vulnerable maiden alone in the wilderness. This gives the illusion that Anchises is the one in the position of power, or rather it would if Aphrodite was more convincing. Anchises appears to pick up on the deception almost immediately and even speculates that she may be Aphrodite.[672] Aphrodite's repeated denials of her true nature allow enough plausible deniability for the liaison to proceed, but are never totally convincing. Once the seduction is over, Aphrodite is quick to reveal her true nature and to threaten Anchises with punishment should he ever name her as the mother of his child. Like Thetis, Aphrodite is grieved to have a mortal son and has no interest in seeking to elevate her partner to immortality.[673] In both cases the mother abandons the son to the care of their father, but is never able to fully break the maternal bond.

Aphrodite's attraction to Anchises is entirely artificial. It is stated at the beginning of the hymn that Zeus deliberately causes Aphrodite to desire a mortal to prevent her from being able to mock the other gods that she has compelled to fall in love with mortals and bear children.[674] Aphrodite's ability to ensnare other deities and cause them to fall in love is a very potent threat to a ruler afraid of the next generation of gods. Within the *Theogony*, it is Aphrodite who causes Gaia and Tartaros to mingle and produce Typhoëos which suggests that Aphrodite is complicit in the creation of a challenger to Zeus.[675] Aphrodite is never presented as a malicious threat to Zeus, but her power over gods and mortals is clearly one which cannot be left unchecked. Unable to counter Aphrodite's power directly, Zeus resorts to manipulating her through her relationships to her partner and her son. By ensuring that Aphrodite experiences the embraces of a mortal and bears a mortal child who will perish, Zeus ensures that she will not meddle any further. Clay describes the union of Aphrodite

[670] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 286-8.
[671] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 75-88 and 252-290.
[672] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 93-106.
[673] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 198-99.
[674] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 44-52.
[675] Hesiod *Theogony*, 820-22.

and Anchises as the final union between gods and mortals, a reading which is rejected by Faulkner who suggests the text cannot support unambiguously support this conclusion.[676] I suggest that Zeus is specifically targeting Aphrodite's behaviour in order to prevent her from populating the world with demi-gods for her own amusement.

There is certainly a stigma attached to goddesses bearing children to mortal men which the gods do not experience. Zeus' manipulation of Aphrodite relies on her shame at taking a mortal partner. Given how easily Aphrodite is able to wash off the stain of her affair with Ares, the stigma of a goddess taking a mortal partner must be significant. The difference between a mortal child and a divine one is that a mortal child will age and die, exposing the divine parent to grief and loss which they would otherwise never have to experience.[677] Gods to age, in that they move from infancy to adulthood, however this is not limited by the passing of time and they appear to be able to start and stop at will. For example, Apollo matures as soon as he tastes ambrosia but never ages beyond being a young man.[678] The theme of aging is highlighted within the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. Aphrodite relates the fate of Tithonus, a beloved of Eos, who gains immortality but never ceases to age. As devoted as Eos was to her love when he was young, she is unable to maintain that affection in his old age eventually closes him behind doors to babble to himself alone.[679] Aphrodite clearly has the knowledge to prevent Anchises from suffering a similar fate, as she acknowledges Eos' error in omitting to ask for Tithonos to become ageless, but she is still unwilling to elevate Anchises. Her protestations that she is protecting Anchises from a terrible fate are followed by an admission of her own shame at taking a mortal to her bed. The shame that Aphrodite will feel amongst her own kind clearly outweighs her consideration of Anchises' best interests.

Fluidity of Form

The goddesses, like the gods, are not restricted for one form. As Ormand notes, what is notably different between male and female shape-changers is that the female figures lose the ability to change their form after they have married.[680] The fluidity of form prior to marriage highlights a social concern with the intrinsically unstable nature of female loyalty before the birth of a child. Ormand suggests that this occurs at the point of marriage, but does include instances of rape as both

[676] Clay 2006, 170; Faulkner 2008, 14.
[677] Lefkowitz 2003, 39.
[678] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 123-130.
[679] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 233-238.
[680] Ormand 2004, 303.

instances mark the transition from *parthenos* to *gune* and then to *mater*.[681] As has already been demonstrated, the line between abduction and marriage in Archaic Greek culture is deliberately vague. Ormand views marriage as a way to lock down female loyalty, and this is manifested in the loss of shape-changing ability.[682] I suggest instead that the loss of this flexibility of physical shape is linked with the point at which a woman becomes a mother and her loyalty fixes to her children.

When exploring this concept, Ormand uses the example of Mestra. Mestra is able to change her form at will. As her father, Erysichthon, is afflicted with a terrible hunger, Mestra and her father engage in a series of deceits. Erysichthon accepts a dowry for his daughter from a suitor and, once the deal has been conducted, Mestra changes her form, slips away from her unsuspecting partner and returns to her father. The trick is repeated several times until they attempt to gull Sisyphos who then takes the case before a deity and successfully marries Mestra.[683] Whilst Sisyphos is able to compel Mestra into marriage, he is not able to beget a child by her.[684] Instead Poseidon carries Mestra away, far from her father and in spite of her cleverness.[685] The reference to removing Mestra from her father, and to her guile, suggests that even marriage to Sisyphos is not enough to lock down Mestra's loyalty. This is further cemented when Mestra returns to her father with her children by Poseidon rather than her husband.[686] Her defining relationships are to her father and her children.

Mestra is a mortal example but changing one's form to avoid the advances of a man is not restricted to the mortal realm. The *Kypria* details Nemesis' attempted evasion of Zeus through shapeshifting.[687] The pursuit moves through the three major spheres of influence, earth, sea and air, which highlights Nemesis' efforts to escape her pursuer. There is no doubt that Zeus will catch Nemesis, but it is notable that her primary method of escape is to change her form. Nemesis' attempts to elude Zeus are unsuccessful and once again a shape changing female is secured by the conception of a child. There is no implication that Zeus and Nemesis wed but she does bear his daughter, Helen, and with the chase concluded the shape- changing ceases.

Aphrodite and Anchises provide a similar example within the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. Aphrodite's disguise as a *parthenos*, as flimsy as it may be, is abandoned as soon as the pair have consummated their relationship. Anchises is roused by Aphrodite in her full divine glory and is

[681] Ormand 2004, 314.
[682] Ormand 2004, 304.
[683] Hesiod *Catalogue of Women*, Fr.70.
[684] Hesiod *Catalogue of Women*, Fr.69.2. 77-80.
[685] Hesiod *Catalogue of Women*, Fr.69.2. 79-80.
[686] Hesiod *Catalogue of Women*, Fr.69.2. 93.
[687] Kypria fr. 10 West.

dazzled and frightened by the sight.[688] The timing is significant as this abandonment of her change of form is accompanied by her declaration that she is pregnant with their child, Aeneas. Aphrodite has no intention of remaining with Anchises and becoming his wife, instead she reverts to her divine form and prepares to leave him. The loyalty she has to the family unit is negligible, she threatens Anchises with the thunderbolts of Zeus if he ever discloses her identity. This threat is notable. It would have been far easier to protect her reputation by keeping her identity hidden. The guise of a nymph or another goddess would have explained her disappearance and maintained some degree of anonymity. Placing the revelation of her identity alongside the announcement of her pregnancy emphasises the connection between the child and the loss of her disguise.

Conclusions

The Greek goddesses do appear to be vulnerable to the same pressures as mortal women in Epic poetry. Their loyalty is divided between the key male guardian figures in their lives with the strongest bond being their loyalty to their children. But if the child is not in a position to become a suitable guardian then the child does not displace their father's place in their mother's hierarchy of loyalty. There are differences between mortal women and goddesses. The key difference is the undying nature which divides mortals and gods generally. A goddess cannot wait for her son to inherit. Gaia cannot wait for Ouranos to age past his prime and surrender power to her sons; for Kronos to reach his potential he must seize power. Clay comments that Gaia is the 'prime mover and promoter of succession in heaven, and the constant enemy of the status-quo.[689] Gaia is certainly the figure pressing for the advantages of the next generation, but this casts Gaia as the promoter of the natural order. The status-quo is the passage of time, the changing seasons and the handing over of each generation to the next. It is the gods themselves who sit outside of that natural order and whose undying nature causes points of tension within the family structure of the pantheon.

The male gods are keenly aware of the dangers of their situation. The sense of threat that they feel is shown through their actions. The ruling gods react to their children negatively, they hide them away, they eat them, they seek to prevent their births. The 'dread' children of Ouranos are hateful to their father because they represent a threat to his dominance which can only be resolved through their suppression or conflict.[690] In actively stifling the prospects of their children, the ruling deity

[688] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 177-179.
[689] Clay 2006, 13.
[690] Hesiod *Theogony*, 154-156.

forces their mother to choose between her partner and her children; one which he will almost certainly lose. Zeus is able to mitigate the worst of this by allowing his children to be born and allocating them honours. This prevents the goddesses from acting directly against him to promote the interests of their child.

In spite of their elevated station, the goddesses remain in need of a guardian. Those who marry look to their husband, and then to their children to safeguard their interests and protect their standing. Zeus ensures that those who remain unmarried depend on him for protection from other male deities who may otherwise have abused them and claimed their *timai*. The fragility and vulnerabilities of women are echoed in the behaviour of the goddesses. The consequences for goddesses are different, particularly for the partners of Zeus whose sons have the potential to challenge for supremacy over gods and men. These high stakes lead to competition between the goddess to produce a powerful heir, as well as tensions between gods and their sons. The goddesses are as defined by their roles as wives and mothers as they are by their status amongst the undying. The goddesses' close connection to the children highlights their potential threat to Zeus as they will often act against his authority to protect the interests of their child. In the absence of aging or death amongst the gods, it is impossible for the goddesses to wait for their children to inherit their position, and if they wish to press their childrens' interests they must take a more active role.

4) Maintaining Loyalty: Dealing with Dissenters

4.1) Introduction

The violence and discord that accompanied the transitions of power throughout the *Theogony* appear to end with the ascension of Zeus to power. With Zeus' rule established, power settles into its final position. It is important to appreciate that, whilst this might be the final configuration of the hierarchy within the myth, there is nothing to say that Zeus is entirely secure within his position. Indeed, there are numerous challenges to Zeus' reign. These challenges demonstrate the possibility that Zeus could be dethroned, and this impression is strengthened by Zeus' responses to any perceived threat. This suggests not only that Zeus' position as *basileus* of gods and men to retain his power is insecure, but also that he is aware of the fragile nature of his regime. It is evident within the *Theogony* that Zeus acts to strengthen his power base. In previous work there has been an examination of some of these methods including making tactical marriage alliances with goddesses and controlling the distribution of the *timai*, but these rely on a level of co-operation or at least an openness to being persuaded to support the regime. Not all members of the pantheon are so quick to show their loyalty, and these figures pose a very real danger to Zeus. There are gods who consider the possibility of power greater than the fear of failure.

Zeus' management of problematic figures has been discussed, albeit from a different angle, in the discussion of his role as *basileus*. In those sections the focus was on preventing or disincentivising deities from becoming a threat through positive means: gift giving and incorporation into the regime. The deliberate recruitment of figures such as the Hundred-Handers is a good example of this. By presenting the brothers with nectar and ambrosia and liberating them from their incarceration Zeus is able to neutralise any potential threat they may have posed, and provides them with a role and purpose within his regime.[691] Throughout the *Theogony*, there is a continued impression of conscious and deliberate recruitment of powerful individuals. This is either done through marital unions with the goddesses, which I have argued prevents the birth of future challengers, or through alliances which ensure the *time* and authority of the divinity within Zeus' administration.[692] In spite of these efforts there are still deities, as well as some mortals, who present themselves as rivals and challengers to Zeus and managing these figures poses a real difficulty.

[691] This was discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.5 'Zeus as *anax*'.
[692] Hekate and Styx are clear examples of this. See discussion in 2.5. 'Hekate' and 3.4 'The Need for a Guardian'.

An examination of the historical record highlights four key forms of punishment which could be used as a deterrent: incarceration, exile, financial, or corporal punishment.[693] Separating out the forms of punishment into four distinct groups is somewhat artificial as it implies that they operate in complete isolation and it is, of course, possible for an individual to experience two or more of these punishment types at once. Moving the punishment from the mortal world to the divine brings with it additional complications. As will be explored in more detail below, whilst a mortal might face exile from their *polis*, exile from the company of the gods is less straightforward. Gods who oppose Zeus are not permitted to build a new life within a new community but are instead confined within Tartaros. In this way, exile and incarceration work hand in hand as the offender is exiled from the company of the Olympians, but also firmly confined within a designated area which they cannot leave of their own volition. Those confined within Tartaros are not only disconnected from their peers, but they also lose the ability to operate beyond the bronze gates.[694]

The removal of agency is reminiscent of the honour given to Styx by Zeus after his victory against the Titans.[695] Zeus honours Styx by establishing her as the oath of the gods. Initially this is mentioned as part of his recruitment of gods to fight against Kronos, and then this is elaborated on after his victory. Any deity who deceives must lie breathless and motionless on a bed for a year, before facing nine years of exile from the company of the gods. The suspension of motion and breath is as akin to death as any immortal comes within the body of work examined here. This state is not permanent, and neither is the absence from their peers. Instead, there is clearly limited time allotted to this punishment. It is notable that the description of Styx' power follows on from the description of Tartaros, Hades and their guardians. The close position of the two passages highlights the similarities between this punishment and death, but this also juxtaposes the temporary nature of the effect for the gods against the permanence of death for their mortal counterparts.

Physical punishment is effective against a deity is a theme which the poets touch on but do not treat consistently. Within the *Iliad* Dione is able to wipe away the wound to Aphrodite's arm just as she can wipe away the ichor that came from it, however the wounds inflicted on Hades and Hera by Herakles continue to cause them suffering.[696] If the gods can heal injuries with the wave of a hand it

[693] These will be explored in more detail below.
[694] As Faraone notes there are two notable exceptions to this within Archaic verse: when Hera appeals to the chthonic deities to grant her a child more powerful than Zeus in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and when Hera is compelled by Hypnos to swear an oath by 'all the gods of Tartaros' in the *Iliad*. Faraone 2010, 398. *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 331-42; Homer *Iliad*, 14.278-9.
[695] Hesiod *Theogony*, 399- 451 and 775-806.
[696] ἦ ῥα καὶ ἀμφοτέρῃσιν ἀπ᾽ ἰχῶ χειρὸς ὀμόργνυ /ἄλθετο χείρ, ὀδύναι δὲ κατηπιόωντο βαρεῖαι. 'She [Dione] spoke, and with both hands she was wiping the ichor from her arm, and the arm became whole and the heavy pains were allayed.' Homer *Iliad*, 5.416-417.

is difficult to imagine that the threat of physical pain would be enough to dissuade a deity from insurrection.[697] That then leaves the option of imprisonment. Zeus uses the prison of Tartaros, deep within Gaia as a place to contain the most troubling of his rivals. As shall be demonstrated, metal and earth appear to be the key to restraining both a deity and their power.

One key question which needs to be addressed is what exactly is Zeus punishing the deity for? At first glance it seems extremely obvious, they have rebelled against him and therefore must be punished. It would however be extremely hypocritical for Zeus to claim a moral high ground on this count. Zeus has violently deposed his own father and imprisoned him in Tartaros, seemingly without censure from the other gods. My suggestion here is that they are being punished for their *hybris* rather than their actions. The fault lies not in their attempt to take power, but in their failure to secure it. Through challenging Zeus, they declare their feeling of superiority to him and they declare it publicly. This means that the punishment dealt by Zeus must respond directly to their public claim of dominance as well as the physical or social challenge that they pose. The brutality of the punishments dealt to those who attempt to disturb the social order of Olympos is necessary as it functions both as a penalty to the insurgent and deterrent to others who may have been tempted to chance their own arm. There is no scope for tolerance or leniency, as every attempt unpunished would undermine Zeus' authority by suggesting he lacked the capacity to retaliate.

4.2) Mortal 'Punishments'

The way in which the Archaic poets discuss divine punishment would have been shaped by their own understanding of how mortal leaders dispensed justice within their own communities. There are two key concepts which recur throughout the examination of mortal punishments. The first is the focus on individuals to defend themselves and their own families, and the second is the apparent need to restrict the revenge of individuals to prevent the escalation of disputes from destabilising the community. The impression created is that individuals were responsible for protecting their own *oikos*, and that violence was an accepted response to a slight or wrong. The intervention of the broader community to curtail this violence suggests that this process was prone to escalation. As will be demonstrated below, this escalation can be seen in the Homeric poems, where a comparatively

[697] It is notable that Aphrodite does not heal her own injury, rather it is her mother who can take the pain away. This has a dual effect as it emphasises the bond between the two goddesses, infantilising Aphrodite further, and provides a contrast for her interaction with her father Zeus. Neither Hera nor Hades appear able to heal their own injuries dealt to them by Herakles. Homer *Iliad*, 5.392-400.

minor disagreement between heroes threatens the success of the Greek army, as well as in the surviving law codes, and in the *Works and Days*.

The importance of being able to show that one is able to defend one's household is as important as the ability itself. One aspect of the mortal *basileus* that was demonstrated in the first chapter was the insecurity of his social position. The absence of a formalised political hierarchy means that powerful individuals were constantly vying to improve or fighting to maintain their own position. One of the key ways in which challengers could improve their own standing was to displace a figure above them. This leaves them reliant on a balance of personal charisma and brute force to retain their power. The challenger then has two ways to undermine their leader, either by whittling away at their support base or by challenging them outright in combat. It would be fascinating to know what, if any, legislation the *basileus* may have attempted to put in place to protect themselves and their families from the dangers of a coup, however there is very little surviving evidence. As previously discussed, there is no clear evidence for kingship in Archaic Greece.[698] The illusion of kingship carried over from Bronze Age Greece has been dispelled by Morris, who demonstrated that Greek leadership in this period was tied into aristocratic competition which neither allowed one figure to entirely dominate the political sphere, nor disseminated power broadly enough for a more democratic model to be applicable.[699] This model of agonistic elites vying for control is important to this thesis as I propose that it extends into Archaic conceptions of divine politics.

As the leading figure amongst the gods, Zeus is recognised as *basileus* of gods and men. In understanding challengers to Zeus as warranting punishment, there is an implicit acceptance that challenging Zeus' authority constitutes a social transgression and that Zeus' response to the challenge is proportional and legitimate. When compared with their mortal counterparts, it is possible to reframe the challenges to Zeus as part of this internal jostling for individual gain rather than a broader political coup. The key difference of this approach is that the challenger gods are not seeking to undermine the current political system, instead they are seeking individual advancement at the cost of another individual's standing. Much like the Homeric heroes, Zeus' ability to respond to these challenges is integral to retaining his position. If Zeus is unable or unwilling to meet the challenge then his position as leader is lost, therefore he must respond swiftly and decisively to any hint of insurrection.

The introduction of laws within the community shows a need to regulate this individual competition by restricting the capacity of the wronged party for violent retribution. This suggests that there are

[698] See discussion in chapter 2.4 '*Basileus* of Gods and Men.'
[699] Morris 2003, 1. See also Anderson, 2005, 178; Raaflaub 2009, 3.

situations in which recourse to violence is acceptable and situations in which it is not. This separation is reliant on a mutual understanding of what actions would require a forcible response and which actions would not. As Wohl observes in her discussion of Athenian oratory, the law requires enforcement in order to function, but the use of appropriate force within the law must differentiate itself from the force used by those outside of the law.[700] Whilst there is no formal constitution for the Olympians, the poet and his audience would have been part of a society had expectations on the behaviour of members of that community and consequences for those who deviated from those expectations. This understanding of what is and is not acceptable behaviour within their communities would have influenced their portrayal of figures within their poems. With that in mind it is worth spending some time considering the role of law enforcement within Archaic society, which actions constitute a crime and what is viewed as an appropriate punishment?

Written Law in the Archaic *Polis*

One might expect that the answers to these questions would be found in the laws which survive from the Archaic communities themselves. However, as often the way with the Archaic period, the surviving evidence for laws themselves is extremely limited and often geographically disparate.[701] The examples that do survive reflect a preoccupation with what we might term family law, especially the movement of property through marriage, inheritance and divorce, and comparatively little interest in what we might term criminal law. It would be naïve to suggest that these communities were idyllic and immune from the impact of theft or violence, so there are two possibilities for this absence. Either the evidence simply has not been discovered, or the community did not enforce criminal law in the same way that they policed family law. This disparity has been noted by Gagarin who observed that the Greeks themselves seem comfortable with the gaps, as the importance of precedent is secondary to the importance of an underlying sense of justice.[702] This poses a difficulty for the modern scholar, as an agreed but undocumented code of behaviour leaves less of an impression in the archaeological record.

The earliest 'complete' law code is the Gortyn Code found inscribed on Crete.[703] The Gortyn Code is dated to 5th Century BC, and inscribed onto a large semi-circular wall.[704] The location of these law codes cannot be overlooked, as Crete had sustained exposure to the Near Eastern cultures. This proximity may be significant as Westbrook has argued that the early Greek law codes resemble models seen in the Near East, where cultures who had diverse languages and cultures appear to

[700] Wohl 2010, 66-67.
[701] Sealey 1994, 29.
[702] Gagarin 2005, 35.
[703] Robb 1991, 641.
[704] Maffi 2016, 2.

have shared their legal tradition.[705] This underlying connection, Westbrook suggests, can be also be demonstrated in the *Iliad* when Patroklos cites the mitigating factors in his own crime as anger and accident; he struck in anger and with no intention of murder. These two factors would count as extenuating circumstances within the Near Eastern law codes, and it is telling that both are used by Patroklos in his own defence in the *Iliad*.[706] The issue with Westbrook's argument is that it demonstrates a connection between Homer and the Near Eastern law codes rather than Archaic Greek society and these codes.[707] This does not make the similarities any less notable, nor does it necessarily mean that these laws would not have been known and accepted by Homer's audience, rather it is a reminder that early Greek society and early Greek society as portrayed by Homer are not the same; however, one may help elucidate the other.[708]

Law codes have been seen as proof of a widening political authority towards a more egalitarian model, but, as Whitley has convincingly argued, this is only possible in societies where levels of literacy are broad enough to make written laws accessible.[709] This presents an interesting point of consideration; is the purpose of the law courts to allow justice to be done, or to allow justice to be seen to be done? By engraving the codes in stone in a prominent location the state makes them both visible, and fixed.[710] There is no opportunity for someone in authority to conveniently forget a clause or precedent if the laws are displayed publicly, as they would in theory be open to challenge from anyone who could read the laws.[711] The very gesture of displaying them suggests at least a desire to be seen to apply law consistently, though it is worth keeping in mind Westbrook's observation that whilst those in authority might not be above the law they were 'usually better placed to avoid its consequences than ordinary mortals'.[712] Whilst the level of literacy in Crete at this time is debatable, the Gortyn Code itself does not portray a particularly egalitarian society, as there are clear levels of social stratification.[713] There is a clear division between an elite citizen body

[705] Westbrook 1992, 66, and 55. See also Roth, 1976, 335.
[706] Westbrook 1992, 71.
[707] It is possible that these laws would have been known to the Archaic Greeks but the absence of evidence for them outside of the Homeric poems means this can only be speculative.
[708] Sealey highlights that the borrowing of legal codes only occurs in instances where the borrowing party feels that there is a need for the legislation. Sealey 1994, 11.
[709] Whitley, 1997, *passim*. Maffi takes issue with Whitley's argument, suggesting that Cretan literacy rates may have been higher than Whitley estimated and therefore the code would have been accessible to the majority of the Cretan population. Maffi 2016, 2-3.
[710] Sealey notes that the importance of the Near Eastern law codes lay more in that they could be seen than they should be obeyed. Sealey 1994, 32.
[711] See Canevaro 2017, 218.
[712] Westbrook, 1992, 69. Also, it is important to remember that the coming of written law is 'not necessarily equivalent to the emergence of greater justice or equality, let alone of democracy.' Thomas 2005, 42.
[713] Morris 1990, 250-251.

and a dependent class.[714] Canevaro stresses that we should not be too quick to deny the rule of law in ancient states, as many modern Western states would not meet the rigorous standards that are demanded by critics of the *poleis*.

The trial itself is likely to have been overseen by a single judge who may or may not have held the position of *kosmos*.[715] The reference to the *kosmos* naturally brings to mind the earliest law, discovered at Dreros, which restricts the length of time which someone can occupy the role of the *kosmos*.[716] This is echoed in the Athenian laws recorded by [Aristotle] where a would-be tyrant, and anyone found to be aiding them, risks the expulsion of his entire family.[717] The threat of exile is explored by Forsdyke who views this as part of an ultimately unsuccessful attempt to suppress the conflict between elite families and minimise the tensions between factions.[718] Raaflaub too suggests that this need to apply regulations to positions of authority is an attempt to curtail elite ambition and prevent too much power from accumulating in the hands of one man or family.[719] If the focus of these laws is to prevent an individual from gaining too much power and making themselves a ruler then it is futile to search for law codes protecting the position of the autocrat as they were never supposed to have obtained that role to begin with. Indeed, Aristotle's description of a previous Athenian law suggests that there were strong deterrents to attempts to seize power by individuals or small factions, though these did not prevent tyrants challenging the political balance in Athens. The broad consensus is that the driving force behind the surviving laws is the protection of stability within the community something which may explain why law codes are often established during times of turmoil.

The focus of the laws that do survive is fascinating. A significant portion of the Gortyn Code is given to the movement of property and family law, rather than what might be considered criminal law.[720] The absence of recorded legislation for murder or for theft cannot mean that these events never occurred within Cretan society at this time, but might suggest that these incidents fell outside of the court's jurisdiction or that they were simply not inscribed.[721] The punishments which are outlined

[714] Maffi 2016, 4. See also Adcock 1927, 95.
[715] Maffi notes that there is some ambiguity over whether the judge held the title of *kosmos*. This ambiguity comes from whether the *dikastas* was a public official and therefore a kosmos, or whether they were a private official. Maffi 2016, 15.
[716] Robb 1991, 641.
[717] [Aristotle] *Ath. Pol.*, 16.10.
[718] Forsdyke, 2005, 1-2.
[719] Raaflaub 2009, 45. See also Forsdyke 2005, 26, who argues that this attempt to curb elite competition was ultimately futile, but important to the development of the polis.
[720] Davies 2005, 308. For a full breakdown of the sections see Gagarin 2004, 131. Sealey poses the question of whether Athens ever fully developed a concept of crime. Sealey 1994, 125.
[721] There is a section which covers rape within the code, see Gargarin 2004, 131.

within the Gortyn Code typically involve the imposition of a fine on the individual deemed to have transgressed. The notable exception to this is the homicide laws laid down by Drakon in Athens c. 620-1 BC.[722] Drakon's homicide laws are the earliest known laws relating to murder. It is naïve to suggest that murder was unknown in archaic Greece; yet the punishment of the murderer rested not with the state, but with the family and their supporters. Bonner and Smith suggest that this was because murder is viewed as a crime for the family to respond to rather than the state.[723] This begs the question of whether any violence dealt out to the murderer would count as revenge or as a punishment. The line between the two positions is a fine one, but it is significant and will be discussed in more detail below.

The one exception to this in Athenian law is the murder of a would-be-tyrant where the guilty party is protected from punishment.[724] Aristotle records that should a man attempt to make himself tyrant both he and his family would be disenfranchised and declared *atimos*, 'without honour', making them vulnerable to be killed without consequence.[725] Forsdyke argues that this is an attempt to maintain the status-quo through ensuring that the elites were constantly keeping each other in check.[726] The potential tyrant could escape this threat of retaliation by removing themselves from the community, much like those who have committed murder themselves. There is a complex balance of responsibility and retribution which is managed in the interests of the broader community. The removal of the threat to the social order either through geographical distance or through their killing ensures that they are no longer a disruptive presence within that social group. It also provides a deterrent to others who might be tempted to enlarge their own social position. The equation of exile or execution would also indicate that the preference is for a removal of the threat rather than incarceration or the imposition of a fine which would allow the perpetrator to remain within the community albeit at a loss.

The role of incarceration is not entirely clear in Archaic Greece. Even in Classical Athens there is only fragmentary evidence for the role of prisons, mostly from sources who assume a level of familiarity with the system.[727] Hunter comments that there is a distinct lack of scholarship on the prison of Athens, highlighting that scholarship has been preoccupied by the question of whether incarceration is normal rather than more practical details.[728] What is of concern here is who would have been

[722] Sealey, 1983, 275. See also Gagarin 1981, 1.
[723] Bonner and Smith, 1930, 17.
[724] Forsdyke 2005, 83-4. See also footnote 26.
[725] [Aristotle] *Ath. Pol.*, 16.10.
[726] Forsdyke 2005, 84.
[727] Hunter 1997, 296.
[728] Hunter 1997, 296.

incarcerated and what for? The prison in Athens appears to have been used as a temporary holding centre for those awaiting trial or another form of punishment rather than a long-term correction facility.[729] In a distinct difference from our own penal system the prison was not designed to hold men in isolation or for extended periods of time and prisoners would have been secured using chains or fetters rather than relying on the structure itself or guards.[730] Food for the prisoners most likely depended on friends and family rather than being the responsibility of the poleis, and those with sufficiently affluent friends would most likely have been able to secure their release through sureties.[731] Classical Athens cannot be used as a template for Greek society more broadly, but this does emphasise that incarceration in this period was not seen as a viable long term solution, and merely a stopgap to a more permanent one.[732] The notable exception to this is the imprisonment of debtors as they may have remained in fetters until their debt was cleared.[733] This attitude towards incarceration is a logical one in a community where the focus of the judicial system is on restitution rather than correction. To hold an individual captive is expensive both in resources and labour and requires imprisonment to be viewed as beneficial to society generally. Removing all moral or emotional considerations, it is far more economic for criminals to be removed from society, either by exile or execution.

The Gortyn codes, along with others of this period, are not without their difficulties as they are far from extensive, something which Robb suggests is a deliberate choice as this reflects the 'residual oralism' of the laws themselves with people electing to focus on specific instances in the written record and omitting the general principles which did not necessitate elaboration.[734] There are two notable features of these laws that bear further consideration. Firstly, is must be acknowledged that in the era of written law the focus of law is stasis and controlling inheritance and property law. Criminal law, as a modern reader would understand the term, is either omitted or secondary to family law, and prosecution often remains in the private sphere. Secondly, it highlights how exceptional Zeus' role as *basileus* of gods and men would have been to the Archaic mind. If legislation from this period that does relate to positions of power is centred around protecting them from being abused by an autocrat, then Zeus' violent ascent to sole power must have been striking. There is a distinct lack of evidence which makes it impossible to speak with any certainty on the legal

[729] Hunter 1997, 298.
[730] Hunter 1997, 312.
[731] Hunter 1997, 306.
[732] D'Amico comments that public police and prisons were introduced under Solon. D'Amico 2010, 471.
[733] Hunter 1997, 300.
[734] Robb 1991, 643 & 646.

position of any challengers to a historical *basileus*, but the epic poems do provide examples of powerful figures jostling amongst themselves for power.

Competition and Authority

If the law codes omit the importance of punishing transgressors, the Homeric poems emphasise the weight that individual heroes placed upon revenge and retaliation. The Epic heroes are constantly engaged in a process of challenging their rivals and retaliation to their rivals' challenges. This competition places the emphasis for policing behaviour onto powerful individuals whose power struggles provide the context for both the wrongs and the response to them. Achilles' challenge to Agamemnon is not presented as a crime, but rather as a conflict between the two individuals which they must ultimately resolve between themselves. This presents an interesting consideration for the conflicts between Zeus and his challengers, as it begs the question of whether the challenges to his rule would have fallen into a similar pattern of accepted elite competition rather than treason or a coup against the state.

In moving from the structure of law to the conflicts of the individual personalities of the epic heroes it is worth taking a moment to consider the difference in concept between punishment and revenge. Punishment has widely been seen as the actions of the state censuring an individual, or group, prioritising law, whilst revenge is a much more personal act of retaliation. This distinction between the two is discussed by McHardy who suggests that the continued use of private litigation in the courts of Greece blurs the lines between private revenge and civic punishment.[735] In the absence of a centralised police service, authorised to make arrests and investigate crime on behalf of the community, the pressure remains on the individual to assert their rights. The failure to defend, or at least the perceived failure, had implications for the individual's social standing. Arguably this is more important to figures such as Achilles, or Zeus, who have significant social standing to maintain and defend, than it is to those at the lower end of the spectrum. The higher up the social ladder a figure is, the more they have to lose both socially and materially, and the more a challenger has to gain. The need to revenge oneself on an individual who has wronged one then becomes a tool of maintaining social order as much as the laws which are later inscribed.

The great leaders of Archaic Epic are constantly caught up in a world of competition, both with external forces and amongst themselves. The most obvious example of a clash is the disagreement between Achilles and Agamemnon which begins the *Iliad*. Achilles' public rebuke of Agamemnon escalates rapidly from an exchange of words to serious consideration of murder, prevented only by

[735] McHardy, 2008, 2. See also Wohl 2010, 67.

the Olympians.[736] Athena does not rebuke Achilles for his murderous wrath, but bids him bide his time and promises rewards if he will refrain from drawing his sword.[737] The problem with Achilles' desire to kill Agamemnon lies not with the desire to kill, but with the intended victim; as Hera cares for both men she does not wish for one to do harm to the other.[738] With the conflict between the two heroes publicly initiated, Achilles and Agamemnon are then locked into an impasse which neither can be seen to back down from. Though Nestor reminds them that the infighting will bring joy to their Trojan enemies, neither of them will be swayed.[739] It seems irrational in a time of war to put petty squabbles above the needs of the collective, which suggests that this matter is not a small one to the heroes involved. The stakes of the disagreement are revealed when Agamemnon comments that he will take Briseis to ensure that Achilles remembers his place, and to deter any one else from declaring themselves his equal.[740] Agamemnon needs to punish Achilles for challenging his position in the hierarchy, and he needs to do it in such a way that Achilles' punishment will deter others from undermining him in future. Agamemnon may be leader, but his behaviour indicates that his position as leader is far from unassailable.[741]

The fragility of the social order amongst the Homeric heroes means that every hero must constantly look to protect their own status by engaging in rivalry with their peers. This competition centred around the concept of *time*.[742] *Time* is a concept which has occupied a considerable about of academic attention but, as with many Greek terms, fails to conform neatly to a corresponding English translation. *Time* can be loosely translated as 'honour' but this fails to reflect the scope its social implications with Van Wees suggesting that 'deference' may reflect a more accurate meaning.[743] Scodel suggests that there are three basic forms of *time*: fixed, relationship based, and what she terms 'face' *time*.[744] Fixed *time* is governed by the position that an individual holds within society; a ruler will always hold more than a slave. Relationship *time is* granted when a person of a higher social ranking shows concern for someone who would be perceived to be beneath them. This does not threaten the authority of the higher status figure, as they are bestowing freely not being

[736] Homer *Iliad*, 188-196. Bonner and Smith describe Achilles' inclination to violence as an 'instinctive response'. Bonner and Smith 1930, 14.
[737] Homer *Iliad*, 1.206-214.
[738] Possibly because it would require Hera to take retributive action against Achilles for striking down one of her favourites.
[739] Homer *Iliad*, 1.255-258.
[740] Homer *Iliad*, 1.184-187.
[741] Sillitoe, in his discussion of 'big men' and war, notes that 'big men' struggle to compel others to fight for them and often rely on manipulation rather than orders. Sillitoe 1978, 253.
[742] There is a great deal of research which explores this concept in far more detail than there is space for here. For key works which influenced my work, see discussions in Adkins 1960a; Cairns 1993; Campbell 1992; Carter 1986; Van Wees 1992; and Zanker 1988.
[743] Adkins 1960b, 23. Van Wees 1992, 69.
[744] Scodel 2008, 12-13.

forced to concede something against their will. It is the third type, face *time,* that I think is most of concern to this discussion. It is given its name from the expression 'to lose face', and describes the social value of an individual within a community. The ability of an individual to build face *time* is reliant not only on their own abilities but on how their actions are perceived within a community. This is an extremely complicated social interaction as it is shaped by the individual's own perception of their social value which is in turn based on their interpretation of the reactions of the community to their behaviour. Face *time* is the least durable of the three models, as it is the most susceptible to challenge and damage.

Face *time* is perhaps closest to the idea of zero-sum *time* which had been suggested by other scholars, though Scodel herself regards this as an incomplete understanding due to its absolutist nature.[745] The idea of the zero-sum game is that there is a finite amount of *time* available and in order to gain it a hero must take it from another.[746] Though I would agree with Scodel that *time* is more complicated than this model allows, there is particular value to the idea when confronting the agonistic nature of Homeric society. The heroes of Homeric epic are constantly in competition with each other, in an ongoing struggle to improve or maintain their standing within the community.[747] The hero cannot decide to disengage from the competition without conceding loss of face within his community, lowering his social standing. Adkins writes that the 'Homeric hero nor merely feels insecure, he is insecure' as it is only his ability to defend his position and his property that prevents a descent to the bottom of the social order.[748] In the absence of an ability to disengage from the competition, the hero is constantly tasked with challenging those of similar or superior authority in an attempt to secure their own position. This jostling is limited to those of a similar social ranking, as there is no glory in surpassing someone who is evidently inferior in status or ability, and the risks of defeat and humiliation in challenging someone decidedly superior in ability are self-evident.[749] This system is, of course, reliant on the hero's ability to accurately assess their own abilities and social worth, something which Beidelman suggests Homeric heroes are particularly given to overestimating.[750]

The recourse to violence is seen by Van Wees as a natural occurrence as the Homeric hero is caught up in an attempt to maintain and increase their own share of *time* with no centralised power to

[745] Scodel outlines the key scholarship around the idea of zero-sum *timē* and her own interpretation of this in Scodel 2008, 7-8. See also Wilson 2002, 36.
[746] Van Wees provides a discussion of the Zero-Sum game
[747] Beidelman, 1989, 233.
[748] Adkins 1960b 29.
[749] Beidelman, 1989, 231.
[750] Beidelman, 1989, 249.

regulate the conflict and prevent it from escalating to violence.[751] This, coupled with the raised levels of aggression, encouraged by the societal dependence on warriors for protection means that the heroes are playing a high stakes game with weapons easily accessible and no referee. The primary deterrent for a hero is the possibility of retaliation. One way to prevent challengers from making a hostile move is to make a public example out of the first person to try, or even threaten to try, to usurp the hero's position. The more brutal the response to any attempt to slight the *time* or property of a hero the more likely it is to dissuade others from emulating the challenger.[752] This relies on two key factors, firstly that the hero is capable of retaliating, and secondly, the retribution must be publicly executed. It is vital that the retaliation must be at least as public as the perceived slight, as this ensures that the original challenge is answered and maximises the reach of the deterrent effect through increasing the number of witnesses to it. If the usurper is too strong to allow for an effective retaliation then the hero must accept the loss of *time* or find others to assert themselves over.

The impression that this gives is one of extreme fluidity coupled with intense violence, where a man of superior physical prowess could dominate the community by overpowering the current ruling elite. It is evident that whilst there is some room for manoeuvre there are also factors that are determined by birth rather than through merit alone. Van Wees stresses that Homeric society, despite its presentation, is not a meritocracy and there are limitations on who can rise within the community.[753] The heroes of consequence are all distinguished by their parentage as well as by their own personal prowess, with many such as Achilles and Aeneas even claiming divine lineage. The ability to move up within the social order is restricted to those who already have a position which they could potentially lose. This can be seen in the treatment of Thersites within the *Iliad.*

Thersites is described as a particularly unpleasant figure within the *Iliad*; he is the most ill-favoured of all the men who came to Troy: bandy-legged, lame in one foot with sloping shoulders and a 'peaked' head.[754] In addition to his physical disadvantages, Thersites is also socially limited as he is given no patronymic or a place of origin.[755] In denying Thersites an established background Homer not only highlights the isolation of his position but makes it clear that Thersites stands in direct opposition to the heroes who can often cite their ancestry back to deities. In some cases, such as Achilles or Aeneas, the connection is very direct, but others go back through several generations. Marks suggests that Thersites' social position is more ambiguous than other scholars have

[751] Van Wees 1992, 63.
[752] See McHardy 2008, 7.
[753] Van Wees 1992, 72.
[754] Homer *Iliad*, 2.215-220.
[755] Stuurman 2004, 183.

acknowledged, as Homer does not explicitly refer to it.[756] Marks highlights that should Thersites be entirely without standing then it would be beneath Odysseus even to engage with him in public.[757] However, the lack of a patronymic and the focus on the physical defects of Thersites would suggest that if Thersites had an elevated position it has been deliberately omitted.[758] Thersites' self-identification with the men over the *basileis* suggests that he is excluded either by choice or circumstance from their company. Whether Thersites should be understood as a low ranking *basileus* or a member of the soldiery speaking out against his commanders there is a notable difference in the way that he is treated compared to Achilles both by the poet and by other characters within the narrative.

It is highly likely that the speeches of Achilles and Thersites are designed to be compared with each other. The speeches are made at roughly the same point in their respective books, involve similar criticism of Agamemnon, and at one point, as pointed out by Postlethwaite, Thersites even uses the same phrase as Achilles to condemn Agamemnon's behaviour.[759] The arguments made by Thersites and Achilles are also overwhelmingly similar.[760] Why should men continue to fight and die so that Agamemnon is able to increase his haul of prizes at their cost?[761] Although Achilles and Thersites both draw attention to the disparity between Agamemnon's actions in the war and the rewards that he receives, their treatment is very different. Agamemnon takes away Achilles' prize in an attempt to curb Achilles' ambition and to deter others from seeking to prove themselves his equal.[762] The seizure of Briseis does little to deter Thersites' verbal attack. Stuurman observes that Thersites is a career critic whose very name betrays his insolent nature.[763] Unlike Marks, Stuurman sees aspects of proto-egalitarianism in Thersites' address: his comments on the distribution of booty, his call to leave the kings to do their own fighting, his ability to speak out at all, and the ambiguous response of the soldiers to his punishment.[764]

The culmination of the Thersites episode does not involve the direct intervention of the gods, nor does it involve an act of redistribution intended to assert superiority through unhappy obedience. In

[756] Marks 2005, 1.
[757] Marks 2005, 25.
[758] As Postlethwaite suggests we are free to speculate on Homer's reasons for doing this, but must acknowledge that, without a complete understanding of Homer's society, speculation is all it can be. Postlethwaite 1988, 125-6.
[759] … ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδη νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο. '… for now, son of Atreus, this would be the last of your outrages.' Homer *Iliad*, 1.232.
ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδη νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο. Homer *Iliad*, 2 242.
[760] Cook 2003, 193.
[761] Homer *Iliad* 1.160-171 & 2.235-245.
[762] Homer *Iliad* 1.182-187.
[763] Stuurman 2004, 176 and 183.
[764] Stuurman 2004, 176-8.

fact, Agamemnon makes no direct redress to Thersites at all; it is Odysseus who restores the social balance by striking Thersites into silence. The use of violence against lower ranked soldiers, rather than persuasion, is established earlier in the scene as Odysseus uses the two approaches respectively, though Marks cautions against taking Odysseus' use of violence as proof of Thersites' low status.[765] Marks suggests that if Thersites is of a low social standing then Odysseus would be lowering himself by simply interacting with him.[766] I would challenge this logic, as Odysseus does not respond in kind to Thersites and instead inflicts physical punishment. Achilles' challenge to Agamemnon is issued and answered in the language of *time*. Though Achilles does reach for his sword as a result, Agamemnon initially answers Achilles verbally and there is no suggestion that Agamemnon will strike or imprison Achilles for his insolence in the way that Thersites is publicly beaten. Whilst this may possibly be because a physical altercation between Agamemnon and Achilles would most likely end badly for Agamemnon it does suggest that the two heroes are engaging within the same system. As Thersites lacks this position he is able to be treated poorly as there is no threat of redress.

Representations of Justice in Epic

There is one moment in the *Iliad* which refers to justice which has not yet been addressed and that is the trial scene on the shield of Achilles. As this is one of the rare moments where judicial procedures are directly represented in Epic, this offers an interesting insight into how Homer represented justice beyond the heroes themselves. When Achilles is given his new shield, crafted by Hephaistos on the instruction of Thetis, there is a description of the elaborate decoration. One of the scenes described is an assembly where two men are in dispute over the payment of blood-money.[767] There is debate as to the nature of the dispute, with some scholars suggesting that the killer is claiming to have paid in full and the other man claiming he has not and other scholars suggesting that the second man is refusing to accept the payment. It is notable that the trial is not to determine the guilt or innocence of an alleged murderer, but rather policing the retaliation of the wronged party. This again suggests that the point of difficulty for the community is not the actual murder, but the potential for a blood-feuds and in-fighting amongst families. Westbrook describes this passage as one of the most disputed passages in the *Iliad* and provides ample evidence of scholarship on both sides of the

[765] Marks 2005, 15-16.
[766] Marks 2005, 25.
[767] Homer *Iliad* 18.499-500.

debate.[768] No solution to their debate is offered here, but it is important to consider this scene as evidence for a criminal trial within the epic poems. There are several key points of the description which warrant further discussion here. Firstly, the inclusion of a murder trial on the shield of Achilles suggests that the trial is an aspect of life in the *polis*. Whilst it is unlikely that a community would need to deal with a situation as extreme as a homicide case on a frequent basis, the poet's presentation of the scene suggests that it is one which would be familiar to his audience. Like the wedding which precedes it and the war which follows it, the scene is not alien to the world of the poet but not an everyday occurrence.

Secondly, there is no question about the guilt of the murderer but rather a disagreement about the terms of his punishment. This is not a trial to determine whether the victim had been murdered, by whom, or whether there were any mitigating circumstances. These points have already been decided and instead the difficulty lies with the penalty owed by the murderer. Leaf suggests that the pressure of the community might have compelled the killer to submit himself for trial, but there may be a more basic solution to that issue.[769] If the killer could be killed with impunity by the avenging agent of the victim then submitting himself for trial may have offered the accused a chance to avoid the constant threat of violence. By presenting themselves to the court the killer was able to exert some control over the repercussions of their actions. It is interesting that the assembly themselves do not condemn the killer and praise the family of the victim exclusively, but show their support for both men.[770] The support shown for the killer suggests that the crime is not one which has horrified the community, in spite of its obvious consequences. The assembly as a whole does not stand in condemnation of the killer. Bonner and Smith comment that the concept that murder is a threat to the community is a modern problem, whilst the Archaic Greeks would have been comfortable allowing justice to rest entirely with the family.[771] Westbrook has suggested that the reason the killer is giving his address is because he is attempting to demonstrate mitigating circumstances, which his opponent has rejected.[772] This is based on a study of the homicide courts using Near Eastern models. This could explain the balance of the audience as they may or may not be sympathetic to his case.

The last point that will be developed here is the role of the judges. Interestingly, Homer does not refer to a *basileus* here but to elders. The elders are gathered together to listen to the case and each in turn offers a verdict with the one who gives the straightest judgement receiving payment for his

[768] Westbrook 1992, 54.
[769] Leaf 1887, 124.
[770] Homer *Iliad* 18.502.
[771] Bonner and Smith 1930, 17.
[772] Westbrook 1992, 75.

verdict.[773] The idea of 'straight' justice is one which features prominently in Zeus' rise to power, and contrasts his judgement with the 'crooked' judgement of his father. The question that immediately springs to mind is who decides which is the straightest verdict? The verdict which is most pleasing to both of the litigants or to the assembly being held at bay by the heralds, or to the other judges? The idea of straight justice sounds idyllic but it is difficult to know how that would manifest in practice. Gagarin highlights that there is no evidence in any of the scenes relating to judgements which place restrictions on the settlements that they were able to suggest.[774] The introduction of a financial incentive to deliver a pleasing verdict is one which will be explored in more detail in the section below; however, it is notable that it occurs in the Homeric poems as well. The trial scene presents a version of justice distanced from the *basileis* and autocratic rule in a poem which centres around the conflicts and turmoil of the heroes vying for individual glory whilst nominally working in unison. The temptation is to say that one reflects the world of the poet and the other the world of his narrative but this is pure speculation.

Hesiod and Discontent with the *Basileus*

Whilst the *Theogony* deals predominantly with issues amongst the gods, *Works and Days* focusses more on the mortal aspects of Hesiod's world. In the *Works and Days*, Hesiod discusses the role played by courts in the *polis* and his obvious frustration at the opportunities for corruption. The narrator's obvious frustration with the 'gift-eating'[775] *basileus* of the mortal world suggests a recognition that those in authority are able to manipulate situations to their advantage. The portrayal of justice, or its absence, in the mortal world provides an interesting foil for the image of power in Olympos. If the mortal *basileus* is a corrupt official manipulating the courts for their own gain, then should Zeus' behaviour be viewed in a similarly critical light? Hesiod places Zeus as the judge over all men, the figure who will wreak vengeance on the unjust rulers but Zeus is himself a *basileus*.[776] Hesiod's conceptions of power and its manipulation within the community must have shaped his portrayal of divine power.

McInerney describes Hesiod's conception of justice as sitting at the cusp of a structured system for resolving disputes, but one where personal connection still dominated the outcome.[777] McInerney

[773] Homer *Iliad* 18.508.
[774] Gagarin 2005, 86.
[775] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 221.
[776] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 238-274.
[777] McInerney 2010, 203.

goes on to suggest that this shift in the balance of power within the community perhaps reflects a change in the size of settlements. He argues that as the *polis* grows the personal connections between individuals grow weaker, this forces the community to create a new bond that integrates all members of the community.[778] Law is introduced to create a relationship between the citizen body and the community, with individuals connected simultaneously with everyone in the *polis*. The diminishing power of the *basileus* as an individual ruler is then a natural consequence of the changing social order. As the *basileus* is reliant on complex social relationships to maintain his influence he will struggle to retain his authority as the number of people within the community grows. The waning of the power of the individual means that the *basileus* must adapt to the changing social order or they will be made redundant. As McInerney states, Hesiod's writing survives from a point in time where this transition is underway and there is debate about the nature of authority implicit throughout the *Works and Days.*

Certainly, Hesiod's narrator is concerned with the role of the *basileus* and the law courts in exercising authority. He accuses his brother, Perses, of swindling him out of his fair share of inheritance though flattering the gift-eating kings.[779] This statement suggests both that Hesiod's narrator has experience of an agonistic exchange in front of a judge, and that he has been compelled to accept the judgement that was proposed by that court. The case relates to the division of inheritance, and the narrator is certainly not impressed with the verdict he received from the courts, with implications of bribery and corruption reflecting his dissatisfaction. The *basileis*, and it is plural within the text, are described as 'gift-eating'; a term which suggests that they are not only the recipients of gifts, but that they consume what is given to them, removing it from circulation and impoverishing the community at large for their own pleasure. The portrayal is not a positive one, though the case is related entirely from the narrator's perspective and Perses is given no opportunity to refute or challenge the assertions made. What is apparent though is that Hesiod is familiar with the intervention of people in positions of power within the community presiding over disputes between family members and providing a judgement in favour of one side or the other. This agonistic approach is something that follows through into later law making, as was demonstrated in the previous sections.

There is nothing in the discussion of the judgement of the *basileis* which suggests how the outcome of their decision will be imposed upon the parties involved. This is not elaborated on until the narrator bemoans being born into the race of iron. The race of iron is the last of the five races which

[778] McInerney 2010, 209.
[779] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 37-41.

have occupied the earth, beginning with the pinnacle of excellence with the race of gold and ending with the inglorious race of iron.[780] Each of the races is described, along with their approach to the world they inhabit, before they are covered up by the earth and the next race begins.[781] Whilst the fourth race bucks the general trend, there is a decided sense that the races get progressively worse. The narrator protests at being born into the fifth race rather than one of the earlier generations and the distribution of justice is a prominent theme in his condemnation of the men of iron. Notably the narrator complains that they assert their rights by hand, literally *cheirodikēs*.[782] The violent overtones of this phrase are further emphasised when the line continues on to say that a man will destroy the cities of the other. This turn of phrase is particularly interesting as it ties the concept of *dikē*, or justice, to the threat of physical violence. The basic principle of this sentence is the maxim 'might is right', with the stronger man able to physically assert his influence on the weaker.

Throughout the description of the race of iron the narrator continues to reinforce the idea of the importance of the ability to impose on another through force, even repeating the idea a few lines later.[783] The turn of phrase is different but there is a clear connection between power and *dikē*, however *aidōs* is made exempt from this relationship. The overall portrayal of the execution of power by those who hold it is not a positive one. They ignore the bond of obligation owing to individuals such as their parents and oath keepers, and instead assert their dominance over the communities.[784] The portrayal of the race of iron is a rather bleak presentation of the plight of man, but even the narrator is not entirely without hope. Though outrageousness may appear to triumph in the short term, there is the surety that eventually justice will eventually be restored.[785] This hope is borne out by those whose cities live in peace and prosperity due to their continued adherence to justice and straight judgements, though no example cities are provided within the narrative.[786]

Though this section is focused on the evidence for mortal procedures it is worth examining the parallel that is drawn between the role of Zeus and the role of the *basileus*. Both are credited with giving judgements, but Zeus retains the reputation for 'straight-judgements' that he is credited with in the *Theogony*.[787] This stands in direct contrast with the crooked words of the rulers of the men of iron. Not only does Zeus provide fair judgement, but he is also the defender of it. The narrator

[780] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 109-202.
[781] There will be further discussion of this under the section on imprisonment beneath the earth below.
[782] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 189.
[783] δίκη δ᾽ ἐν χερσί, καὶ αἰδὼς /οὐκ ἔσται. 'Justice will be in their hands, and there will be no respect.' Hesiod *Works and Days*, 192-3.
[784] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 180-188.
[785] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 219-224.
[786] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 225-237.
[787] Hesiod *Theogony,* 457. This was discussed in more detail on page 64-65.

encourages the *basileis* to remember that Zeus is overseeing all of the decisions that they make and that their unjust decisions will ultimately result in punishment. Fisher notes that it is not only the ruler who will be made to suffer on account of their misdeeds but the entire community; this is an idea which is also prevalent in Homer and Near Eastern cultures.[788] The punishment of the people for the behaviour of their ruler seems particularly harsh if the person in charge of their community is maintaining their position through violence or intimidation, however this is not an uncommon idea in Greek thought. The plagues caused by Agamemnon's refusal to release Chryseis and Oidipous' presence in Thebes demonstrate that collateral damage was not alien to Greek literature. The narrator ends this section with the assertion that although injustice is rife in the world, and those who behave unfairly are likely to triumph in the short term, Zeus will not allow this state of affairs to continue.[789] Whether Zeus' behaviour is worthy of the narrator's high opinion of his judgement is a question that will be addressed later.

The discussion of the judgement of *basileis* dominates the earlier section of the *Works and Days* but later the narrator talks in more detail about the smaller scale interactions between individuals. This section begins with the slightly ominous instruction to keep in mind that the gods take retribution.[790] This is essentially a reminder that the motivation to behave well comes not from a desire to do good, but rather from a fear of punishment. The overt reference to 'retribution' highlights the vengeful nature of punishment in the Archaic Greek mind. The gods are not described as maintaining justice but as taking revenge which is an important distinction. As the gods are more powerful than even the strongest of men, they are able to provide a deterrent when the threat of retribution from the victim might not. This line precedes instructions from the narrator on how to treat people, and sets the tone for the remainder of the section. The tone of this section is very much focussed on retribution as the narrator advises the audience to do no harm to someone who has not wronged them, but if someone has wronged them to pay that wrong back twice as hard.[791] There is no justification for why such behaviour is necessary, and there is no recommendation of intervention by any civic body or external arbitrator. This implies that the responsibility for resolving disputes lies with the wronged party.

It is important here to note that Hesiod's narrator is not referring to a specific crime; rather he speaks of someone acting or speaking in a way which is unpleasant or hateful.[792] It could be argued

[788] Fisher 1992, 197.
[789] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 273.
[790] εὖ δ' ὄπιν ἀθανάτων μακάρων πεφυλαγμένος εἶναι. 'Keeping well in mind the vengeance of the blessed gods.' Hesiod *Works and Days*, 706.
[791] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 707-711.
[792] ἀποθύμιος. Hesiod *Works and Days*, 710.

that actions such as theft or murder could be described as unpleasant, but it seems like a very mild term for actions which would now be regarded as criminal. It is possible here that the actions referred to are smaller scale disputes of the sort which cause friction between neighbours but no loss or damage to property or persons. In either case, the response of the narrator is to offer not only like-for-like retaliation but to respond with twice the force. This would seem to encourage escalation, as one slight is repaid by another each time increasing in scale; however, the narrator goes on to stress that if the originator of the conflict offers friendship again then it should be accepted.[793] This gives the cycle the opportunity to be broken, as if the transgressor offers justice for their actions the pressure is put onto the wronged party to accept that justice rather than perpetuating the violence.

Conclusion

The impression gleaned from the available material is that the line between punishment and revenge is extremely narrow during the Archaic period. The law codes that survive reflect concerns more to do with inheritance and civic positions than criminal law; and the agonistic court exchanges from later periods support the idea that cases are brought by individuals against individuals rather than the state. The conflation of personal revenge and criminal proceedings makes it difficult to discern where there is a punishment being inflicted by the *polis* or where the *polis* is merely providing a controlled outlet for actions which could otherwise have escalated between individuals. The best example of criminal law, Drakon's homicide laws, allow the killer to live without harassment from the victim's family in exile as long as they remain in exile and, whilst exile is undoubtedly a punishment, the behaviour of the victim's family is also constrained by the bounds of the law. They cannot pursue or harm the killer. Sealey stresses that criminal proceedings do not always protect the victim, and often restrict their retaliation against the perpetrator.[794] The emphasis is on maintaining social order rather than justice for the individuals involved. The killer is removed from the volatile situation, reducing the risk of them coming into contact with the victim's family, accidentally or otherwise, and thereby lowering the likelihood of a retaliatory killing. The exile also acts as a deterrent for others, as to be driven out from your home and away from your

[793] εἰ δὲ σέ γ᾽ αὖτις /ἡγῆτ᾽ ἐς φιλότητα, δίκην δ᾽ ἐθέλῃσι παρασχεῖν, /δέξασθαι. 'If he is guided back again into friendship, and if he is willing to hand over justice, accept it.' Hesiod *Works and Days*, 711-713.
[794] Sealey 1994, 132.

community is a public and visible punishment. The de-escalation of the situation by the court promotes stability and helps to prevent feuds developing between families.

This concern for stability and control over powerful families is echoed by the measures curbing the authority of public figures within the law codes. It is extremely interesting that the earliest surviving law codes show a high level of concern with the length of time that a position of authority can be held for. The act of inscribing laws onto stone is in itself interesting. Mack describes one of the functions of an inscribed decree as reinforcing the decision of the *polis* as binding and final, as well as to emphasise the rule of order and regularity within the courts.[795] Though Mack is writing about later decrees, it is important to consider that these objects do not exist in isolation. It takes time, effort and resources to provide a stele and there would have been a specific purpose in the mind of those setting up the stone. Whether this is a direct response to the Near Eastern tradition or there are other factors at play, the establishment of written law codes which are publicly accessible represents a deliberate choice by the community.

Whilst the literal setting in stone of law codes gives a superficial impression of a stable and fixed social order, the poems of Homer portray a much more volatile environment. The heroes of epic, as demonstrated above, are constantly caught up in a fluid system of honour, where an insult can spell disaster if not responded to appropriately. The cause of the clash of Achilles and Agamemnon is the return of one captive, which seems almost trivial in the face of the entire Trojan war, and yet neither Achilles nor Agamemnon are able to back down. The pressure on those individuals to be perceived as the stronger and more dominant of the two is so powerful that they are prepared to risk the outcome of the Trojan war to win. This is because the tension between the two is more than a contest of ego, despite the role that ego clearly plays within it. The competition between the two figures is presented as the struggle between ideas of hereditary leadership and meritocracy; Agamemnon holds power through his position and the number of fighters he commands and Achilles has influence as the best fighter. These two roles can coexist until one feels that the other has attempted to undermine him. At that point, the challenger must be dealt with to prevent the other from losing social status. The fear of being supplanted is therefore a natural issue for the person who occupies the top role; the only way for them to move in the social order is down and there is no shortage of potential rivals.

It is important, however, to stress that the fluid aspect of the social hierarchy in the Homeric epics is limited to the heroes. Not everyone has the opportunity to compete in the hierarchy of honour; only those with the right pedigree are eligible. This more rigid aspect is perhaps underplayed in the

[795] Mack 2015, 91.

poems as it undermines the concept that the heroes occupy the dominant roles due solely to their superior abilities. This is not to say that the poet deliberately denies the limitations placed on characters by the family history, but rather he focusses on promoting the positive elements of those born to the right situation. This is highlighted by the contrast between Achilles and Thersites; both men make essentially the same criticism of Agamemnon but Achilles is not publicly beaten by Odysseus to the amusement of the army. Thersites may challenge Agamemnon's authority but he poses no credible threat to Agamemnon's position as such he requires no direct response from the ruler. Achilles status, and probably his physical prowess, offers him a protection from the public beating for defying the orders of his superior in rank. But as Achilles poses a credible threat to Agamemnon's leadership this threat must be answered by Agamemnon. The privilege of being born into the hierarchy is that the hero is capable of competing to improve their station, the cost is that they are constantly caught up in the struggle not only to defend but to improve upon their position. There is no dignified abstention; to be a non-participant is to lose and to invite others to take advantage of your passivity.

Finally, Hesiod's depiction of the role of laws and punishments in the *Works and Days* sits between the two worlds. This is a world where the court room has gained some prominence, even if corrupt *basileis* are able to manipulate it behind the scenes, but where the individual is still responsible for protecting themselves to an extent. It is extremely interesting that the narrator describes court intervention regarding inheritance, something which can be demonstrated as a prominent concern in early law codes such as the one found in Gortyn. The narrator does not elaborate on how the court's verdict is enforced, nor on how the participants of the trial could be compelled to attend, but the implication of the poem is that members of the community would have been expected to adhere to the decisions made by the rulers. The narrator questions the motivation of the judges, and bemoans the ability of the powerful to abuse those below them. Though there is an accusation that the system favours those who are not afraid to pursue their own interests regardless of the morality of their action, the narrator proposes no alternative system nor offers any solution to the difficulty. There is only the threat of a higher authority.

The pinnacle of power in the *Works and Days* is Zeus. The narrator highlights Zeus' position as overseer and ruler and suggests that the mortal rulers should remember this when making their decisions. The implication is that the threat of punishment by a more powerful being is a substantial deterrent for those who could otherwise act with impunity. The narrator's implicit threat is that if someone abuses someone who is more vulnerable then themselves Zeus will intercede on behalf of the victim. As Zeus' intervention can involve punishing an entire community for the poor behaviour of their leader it seems unwise to invite Zeus' attention at all but what this does show is that the

power to check the behaviour of an individual is wielded by a stronger individual rather than the community as a whole. The competition of the elites is broadened to include the gods themselves, and it is extremely unwise to challenge them. In Hesiod's world retaliation for wrongs committed against individuals remains a matter of personal enforcement and when a person is unable to defend themselves, they defer to the knowledge that Zeus' judgement will one day restore the balance.

The role of punishment in the Archaic period seems to have centred around the idea of preserving the *status quo* with minimum disruption to the community at large. There are concerns around individuals cultivating and abusing their influence. These concerns are expressed both by the law makers and the narrator of *Works and Days*, albeit in different ways, and the model for agonistic competition between the elite can be seen in Homer's *Iliad* where the heroes are constantly fighting to maintain their social standing. As the Homeric heroes are unable to back down from their personal dispute despite it actively harming the communal effort in the Trojan War it is easy to see how the undercurrent of tension might threaten to destabilise a community. The imposition of a control on powerful figures perhaps suggests that the negative aspects of this competition have been recognised and that the community is distancing itself from the charismatic rule of the 'Big-Men'. Importantly the comparative absence of criminal law, and the pressure evident on individuals to avenge wrongs suggests that the need to protect yourself and your own extends beyond the elite, even in a time when law was emerging. The mortal world depicted by the poets shows the fragility of the social order. There is a clash between personal and communal responsibility is intense amongst the elite and this tension affect their behaviour. This pattern suggests that the higher up the social ladder a figure is, the more intense the elite competition, and the gods occupy the very highest tiers of authority in Archaic Greek Epic.

4.3) Prometheus and the Gift of Pandora

The above discussion of mortal punishments has highlighted the impermanence and inherent vulnerability of power in Archaic society. The constant need to maintain and defend authority is shown as a driving force for the actions of the heroes, and the same can be shown among the gods. As the ruling figure, Zeus' position is the most insecure as challengers have the most to gain from displacing him, and Zeus is not able to climb within the social order. Not only are the gods constantly vying amongst their own generation for power, but every subsequent generation of gods introduces new threats and new rivals without removing an elder generation through natural causes. The birth of Apollo and the conflict with Typhoëos have already been shown to threaten Zeus' position. Whilst these challenges are ultimately unsuccessful, they are presented in a way that suggests that there was genuine jeopardy to Zeus' authority. It could be argued that these attempts only serve to

strengthen Zeus' power by demonstrating his ability to overcome challengers, but the repeated threats from numerous figures reiterates the fragility of Zeus' position. Some threats, such as Typhoëos, are very obvious physical challenges which can be overcome through the deployment of a thunderbolt, or deterred through the presence of physically powerful allies, such as Thetis' preservation of Zeus's rule in the *Iliad* by fetching Briareos to intimidate Poseidon, Athena and Hera which prevents their attempted coup.[796] Other challengers, such as Prometheus, rely on more subtle methods which focus on seizing control over distribution and gift giving. As the brief threat of Typhoëos has already been discussed in the first chapter, I intend to focus on Prometheus's challenge to Zeus' power.

Prometheus' Challenge

Prometheus is a fascinating figure within Hesiodic poetry. As a son of Iapetos and Klymene, a daughter of Okeanos, Prometheus can claim a line of descent entirely through the progeny of Gaia and Ouranos just as Zeus and his siblings can.[797] It is notable too that Iapetos and Klymene only have sons: Prometheus, Atlas, Epimetheus and Menoitios. This means that Iapetos' branch of the family cannot be subsumed under Zeus' control through the marriage, or pseudo-adoption of a daughter leaving them as dangerous outliers of the regime. This is not acknowledged as a difficulty within the poem; however, Zeus interacts with all four of the brothers within the poem and in all instances, it ends badly for the son of Iapetos. He sets Atlas to hold up the sky, he gives Pandora to Epimetheus, he casts Menoitios down into Erebus because of his undisclosed wickedness, and he punishes Prometheus by binding him to a pillar and sending an eagle to devour his liver daily.[798] The outcome for the sons is overwhelmingly negative. Later even the *timai* given to Atlas has a negative angle, as later writers portray Atlas as an unwilling bearer looking to escape his role.[799] Without a daughter to subsume into the order, Zeus is reliant on alternative methods to mitigate the threat of Iapetos' children. The suppression of the sons of Iapetos suggests that they pose a realistic threat to the rule of Zeus. With Atlas and Menoitios essentially confined, and Epimetheus easily overcome through cunning, Prometheus is the most obvious challenger from amongst the sons of Iapetos. It is easy to neglect the fact that Prometheus is a cousin of Zeus, and of the same generation.[800] Prometheus

[796] Homer *Iliad*, 1.400-406.
[797] Hesiod *Theogony*, 507-511.
[798] Hesiod *Theogony*, 507-535.
[799] Apollodorus *Lib*, 2.5.11.
[800] Detienne and Vernant 1991, 74.

does not stand to inherit, nor does he benefit under the reign of Zeus. He has no vested interest in maintaining the status quo and is well placed to challenge Zeus.

Unlike the physical challenges of Titanomachy, Prometheus poses a challenge to Zeus' wits. The tactic is subtler than the physical contest between the Olympians and the Titans which causes the universe to shake and groan under the pressure; but is nonetheless a genuine challenge. Zeus' power is built around his control of distribution of assets. As demonstrated above, within the *Theogony* Zeus offers both *timai* and nectar and ambrosia to win over key figures. Zeus gives the Hundred-Handers nectar and ambrosia before he attempts to persuade them to join his cause, Styx is given honour and 'exceptional gifts' for her allegiance, and Hekate is permitted to keep her portion, in spite of her position as an only child, by the will of Zeus.[801]

This link with distribution is maintained outside of the *Theogony* in the *Homeric Hymns*. Zeus welcomes Apollo with nectar in a golden cup on Apollo's first appearance to the company of gods, a gesture of giving which acknowledges Apollo's status and recognises his right to be within the company of the Olympians.[802] It is also Zeus who authorises Hermes' acquisition of the bee oracle in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, showing that it is not within Apollo's power to give the oracular skill to Hermes without higher approval.[803] The distribution of *timai* is not irrevocable though, and there is an underlying threat of redistribution. When Demeter is preventing the crops from growing, withholding food from the mortals and sacrifice from the immortals, Zeus sends the other gods to her and compels them to offer their own *timai*. Dutifully they follow Zeus' instructions, calling to Demeter and offering many beautiful gifts and whatever honours she may choose amongst the deathless gods.[804] The association Zeus has with distribution is not accidental, and it cannot be separated from his role as *basileus* of the gods. When Zeus is made *basileus* his first act as ruler of the immortals is to divide the honours amongst the gods.[805] His power base is built around the control of the division and his ability to reward allies and to deprive opponents of their *timai*.

Prometheus' challenge to Zeus is based around this control of distribution, firstly in the timing of his challenge, and, secondly, through the method he employs. The timing of Prometheus' scheme is

[801] Hesiod *Theogony*, 639-640; 399; 311-452.
[802] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 10-11. This also mirrors Zeus' presentation of ambrosia and nectar to the Hundred-Handers in the *Theogony* as discussed in the first chapter. Hesiod *Theogony*, 635-641.
[803] *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 568a-b. It is notable that both Hermes and Apollo are shown to jostle for their honours in an already crowded world. Apollo must displace Telphousa and Python, acquiring their positions through violence, and Hermes challenges his brother through less direct means to gain his *timai*. Clay 2006, 130-131.
[804] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 327-9.
[805] Hesiod *Theogony*, 885.

significant as it comes when the gods and mortal men are reaching their decisions at Mekone.[806] The translation of this line is problematic; West notes that the word *krinonto* stems from a division made from legal settlement but adds that the word is not necessarily always used in a legal context and suggests that this marks the point of division when gods and men no longer share a world.[807] Clay suggests that this is more of a fundamental division between divine and mortal; 'what is a god and what is a mortal.'[808] If that line in the *Theogony* is combined with the line in the *Works and Days* where Hesiod's narrator suggests that gods and men come from the same place,[809] along with the conspicuous absence of a creation myth for man within Hesiod's universe,[810] then Hesiod appears to be challenging his audience with the proximity between gods and men. To resolve this artificial tension Hesiod must then demonstrate a concrete division between gods and men and restore the balance. The Golden Race of man lived at the time of Kronos' reign and are comparable in many ways to the gods themselves. They live without aging, they do not struggle to farm as the crops flourish without nurture and their existence is described as carefree 'like the gods.'[811] The distinction between mortal men and gods, at this point, is that the men of the Golden Age die. If men live amongst and like the gods during this period and are capable of children with goddesses then the line between gods and mortals is marginal. As the youngest generation to exist, the men of the Golden Age are a potential threat to the absolute supremacy of Zeus. Prometheus chooses the moment when the distinctions between the factions are being established to act, and he acts to favour man over the Olympians.

Secondly, Prometheus' method is also intriguing. It is Prometheus who divides the ox into the two baskets and offers them to Zeus to choose between. He takes on the role as distributor. In the context of the Titanomachy Zeus' role as the allocator of spoils is intrinsically tied up with his role as *basileus* of the gods. Prometheus' challenge to Zeus is to play the role of the distributor of the spoils when men and gods are setting their boundaries, as Zeus does for the gods after the Titanomachy.[812] In both cases the verb κρίνω is used to describe this settlement which implies that the circumstances are comparable and perhaps that they are intended to be compared. The resolution of the Titanomachy decides whether the Olympians or the Titans will reign, and cements Zeus as the authoritative power over the Olympians. Through taking over the role of distributor and arbitrator between the two factions Prometheus is demonstrating an intent to replace Zeus in his role as

[806] Hesiod *Theogony*, 535-536.
[807] West 1966, 317-318.
[808] Clay 2003, 101.
[809] Hesiod *Works and Days,* 108.
[810] Vernant 1981, 62.
[811] Hesiod *Theogony*, 109-126. Hesiod *Theogony*, 112.
[812] Hesiod *Theogony*, 881-882

governor of distribution but through cunning rather than through brute force. The challenge is ultimately unsuccessful, as Zeus is able to outmanoeuvre Prometheus in the distribution of goods to man. Whilst the gods accept the sacrifice distribution, Zeus is able to introduce the final gift of Pandora to men.[813] The acceptance of Pandora, along with the hardships that she brings, reasserts Zeus' authority as the distributor of all things and demonstrates Prometheus' inability to protect his favoured race.

Pandora is given to man as the resolution of a battle of wits between two powerful figures. Prometheus' attempt to undermine and replace Zeus' role as the giver of gifts to mankind is a challenge to Zeus' authority over man.[814] The gods' role as distributors to man is stressed by Hesiod at the beginning of the *Theogony*.[815] The allocation of authority is linked to the roles as givers of gifts from the outset, and Hesiod states clearly that the distribution of honours and gifts is an intrinsic part of the balance of power within the creation of the universe. Prometheus' challenge allows Zeus to assert control; he overcame the Titans through deal making, he overpowered Typhoëos with his own strength and he outwitted Prometheus in the battle of cunning. Zeus' control is constantly being challenged and whilst his ability to overcome those challengers demonstrates his power and asserts control, the repeated attempts to dethrone him, coupled with the prophecies that Zeus will one day be overthrown, highlight the fragility of the balance of power within the cosmos. The creation of Pandora in this context forms an imposition of control by Zeus onto both Prometheus and mankind. Prometheus plans are foiled by mankind's acceptance of the final gift in the exchange from Zeus and the mortal condition is imposed onto man reducing their capacity to pose a threat to the Olympian rule.[816]

Prometheus' division of the sacrifice materials is presented as a deliberate attempt to defraud Zeus in the *Theogony*. Two baskets are set up, one containing the meat and innards rich with fat concealed by the unpleasant stomach of the ox, and the other the bones covered over with the shining fat.[817] The idea that one is much more visually appealing but less valuable is emphasised from the beginning. Prometheus sets out to deceive Zeus.[818] The appearance of the two options is

[813] It is worth noting that Pandora herself comprised of the gifts of the gods: Hephaistos and Athena in the *Theogony*, and Hephaistos, Athena, the Graces, Peitho, the Horai, and Hermes in *The Works and Days.* Hesiod *Theogony*, 571-580; Hesiod *Works and Days*, 69-82.
[814] Clay 2003, 109.
[815] Hesiod *Theogony*, 111-113
[816] I have argued in a previous chapter that Zeus' suppression of Aphrodite's mixing of gods and mortals shows a similar concern with controlling the mixing of bloodlines. Ormand presents the *Catalogue of Women* as cementing the division between gods and men and ending the age of the *hemitheoi*, whose hybrid nature places them as potentially threatening figures. Ormand 2014, 208-215.
[817] Hesiod *Theogony*, 538-541.
[818] Hesiod *Theogony*, 537.

deliberately the inversion of their contents. Zeus' negotiation of Prometheus challenge is skilful; he reasserts his control over gift-exchange and through an excruciating choice of punishment deters others from following in his footsteps. Prometheus' challenge to Zeus is not doomed, in that it had the potential to succeed, but Hesiod is narrating the past deeds of the gods. The defeat of Prometheus is established, but not pre-determined.

The Politics of Giving

Zeus' response to Prometheus mirrors the challenge posed by Prometheus. Prometheus attempted to take the role of the distributer by giving to Zeus, placing himself above Zeus in the social order, and in return Zeus gives a gift of his own. In returning the gesture of the gift Zeus cancels out any debt created by Prometheus and re-establishes his superiority. This is shown by how closely the division of the ox into the two separate portions is mirrored in Pandora's creation.[819] Pandora is created out of earth as a likeness of a *parthenos*.[820] Within the *Theogony* the clay creation of Hephaistos remains nameless and without agency. She is an object whose entire purpose is to dazzle with her appearance whilst providing nothing of actual substance. The similarity of Pandora to the portion of the ox given to the gods demonstrates Zeus's reclamation of control of the situation. The gift of Prometheus has been repaid in kind, and Zeus has decisively shown his cunning to be far beyond his rivals. The use of a counter-gift to re-establish his control demonstrates Zeus' dominance of the gift giving negotiations.

Prometheus' division of the sacrifice materials is presented as a deliberate attempt to defraud the gods in the *Theogony*. The contents of the two baskets are deliberately disguised to obscure their nature.[821] The idea that one is much more visually appealing but less valuable is emphasised from the beginning. Prometheus sets out to deceive Zeus.[822] The appearance of the two options is deliberately the inversion of their contents. This is also true of Pandora. Pandora's adornment is like the fat covering the bones, hiding the true nature of the contents within.[823] Her silvery garments glisten like the white fat covering the bones of the animal.[824] The allure of Pandora's golden headband and shining clothing is at least as wonderous as Pandora herself; both articles inspire

[819] Zeitlin 1996, 56.
[820] Hesiod *Theogony*, 571-2.
[821] Hesiod *Theogony*, 538-541.
[822] Hesiod *Theogony*, 537.
[823] Ogden 1998, 372.
[824] Pandora's dress is ἀργυφέη, 'silver shining', and the animal fat used to trick the eye of Zeus is ἀργέτι meaning 'bright or glancing'.

wonder from the onlooking gods.[825] Pandora herself is only described as a wonder to behold when she is presented to the gods and mortals wearing her divine accessories. Like the bones presented to Zeus concealed in shining, distracting, fat, Pandora is alluded to as a worthless gift coated with enough beautiful packaging to delay the moment of realisation until after the gift has been gleefully accepted.[826]

The need for female figures to be adorned to elicit attraction is not unique to Pandora. In the *Iliad* Hera approaches Aphrodite to borrow her girdle when she needs to distract Zeus, and Aphrodite, like Pandora, is a wonder to behold when she dresses in gold and jewellery to seduce Anchises.[827] The act of adornment in the Homeric Hymn has been described by Clay as like a warrior donning his armour before combat.[828] The comparison is an interesting one as it provides a contrast of gender roles, the male combatant preparing himself by donning his protection for battle and the female preparing herself for an encounter by increasing her allure, using jewellery in place of a shield. The extension of this is to ask who exactly is the 'enemy' that women must arm themselves against? In the case of the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* the target is Anchises, and in the *Iliad,* it is Zeus; both texts use the image of adornment to precede a seduction. With Pandora too, the motivation of her encounter with Epimetheus is seduction, albeit the motivation belongs to Zeus rather than to Pandora herself. By casting the male partner as an enemy in the imagery the Greeks create a world where the relationships are confrontational. The act of seduction is an act of aggression where the other partner must be overcome through either force or sheer desire. Pandora as a gift from Zeus operates within the narrative as a Trojan Horse. She is enticing in her gilded armour but her allure marks her as a danger to men.

The sexual allure of women is viewed as perilous to men by Greeks. Hesiod frequently highlights their role as consumers, comparing them to be drones in the *Theogony* and reminding his brother of the perils of a decorated woman in *Works and Days.*[829] It is perhaps worth noting that the alternative sacrifice option, the one not chosen by Zeus, is meat contained within the stomach of the ox. Ogden notes that the word for stomach, *gaster*, can also mean womb.[830] Pandora as the mother of all mortal women is the origin of the womb, and its significance in the human condition. She is also the origin point of the all-consuming woman who will add to the labours of man through her voracious

[825] θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι, 'a wonder to behold' is used twice, once to describe the silvery clothes in line 575, and once to describe the headband in line 581. Hesiod *Theogony*, 575 and 581.
[826] Any discussion of this passage is inevitably indebted to Detienne and Vernant, 1989, which has had far reaching influence on the understanding of this episode.
[827] Homer *Iliad*, 14 211-223; and *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 86-91.
[828] Clay 2006, 171.
[829] Hesiod *Theogony*, 594-612; and Hesiod *Works and Days*, 373-375.
[830] Ogden 1998, 372.

appetites.[831] As Odgen highlights, in this way Pandora can also be compared to the sacrificial portion allotted to man as well as the one claimed by the gods.[832] Through encapsulating both the portions of the sacrifice in Pandora Zeus is able to outwit Prometheus and prove his superiority over the potential rival. As demonstrated previously the control of gift giving and the allocation of resources is integral to maintaining a position of authority and, whilst the challenge from Prometheus is a reminder than Zeus' reign is not entirely secure, Zeus is able to assert his control over the situation.

Zeus' Choice

Zeus' initial reaction to Prometheus' sleight of hand with the sacrifice portions is to grow angry and withdraw fire from the world. The question posed by Hesiod's account is why? If Zeus withholds fire from mortal men then they are unable to cook the meat, rendering the benefit from Prometheus' trickery null, but equally they are unable to sacrifice to the gods. Sacrifice is not only important as a means of communication between gods and men, as explored by Vernant,[833] but in some instances the gods are presented as reliant on it as well.[834] Demeter is able to hold Olympus to ransom by withholding the harvest from men and subsequently denying the gods sacrifice within the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* until she is reunited with her daughter.[835] The withholding of fire is clearly a significant gesture for both parties. The concealment of Zeus's 'tireless fire' from mortals must have broader connotations than simply a breaking of communications which would seem to damage the gods as well as the mortals.[836] Hesiod does not engage with the difficulties of denying gods sacrifice within the *Theogony* but within the *Works and Days* the lack of sacrifice is cited as the reason Zeus conceals the Silver Race beneath the earth.[837] The relationship between the gods and sacrifice is complex, they do not need to consume and yet they desire sacrifice to the point where they will obliterate a race which does not offer it, and must be interested enough in the smoke from the altars for it to open a channel of communication between the mortals and the immortals.

[831] Zeitlin 1996, 56.
[832] Ogden 1998, 371.
[833] Vernant 1981, 54-55.
[834] This is a concept with which Hesiod does not engage, but which is more prominent in the *Homeric Hymns*. The reliance of the gods on sacrifice does present the gods as comparatively vulnerable, but unless the gods benefit from sacrifice then there would be no incentive for them to aid mortals in exchange for sacrifices made. The mutually exclusive ideas of a deity without desires, and a deity dependent on mortal sacrifice may explain why the poets engage with this in different ways as they explored the underlying difficulties of the transactional model.
[835] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 305-313.
[836] Hesiod *Theogony*, 563.
[837] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 137-9.

The substances allotted to each of the two factions are also revealing of the nature of the group which receives them. As Zeus states, the division between the baskets is unfair.[838] The portion allotted to the gods contains the bones of the animal coated in white fat and is, without doubt, intended to be viewed as the lesser portion. Prometheus deliberately disguises the bones and, whether he was aware before or not, Zeus is enraged when the trick is revealed. But whilst the gods lose out on the preferred option, they simultaneously gain the portion most suited to immortality. They gain the bones, which do not rot like flesh, as well as the fat which acts as a preservative, and the resultant vapours which rise to the heavens. In contrast, the portion given to men contains perishable meat concealed within the *gastēr* or stomach. The distribution seems so appropriate to the states of being of the two different factions that the anger of Zeus seems incongruous. The gods do not need to eat and, as Vernant observes, in Archaic literature to eat is to be mortal.[839] Within the Homeric Hymns both Hermes and Demeter are shown to distance themselves from eating; Hermes slaughters the cattle of Apollo but cannot bring himself to eat it and Demeter declares it is unlawful for her to drink red wine.[840] The link between food and mortality is also stressed in the *Iliad* when Aphrodite is stabbed by Diomedes and the narrator details that she does not bleed blood but ichor because the gods do not eat or drink as mortals so do not bleed like them.[841] If immortality is tied so closely to abstinence from mortal foods then the portion of meat concealed from them would be detrimental to their status as the undying.

If diet is tied to mortality in Archaic Greek thought, as seems to be the case from the *Homeric Hymns* and the *Iliad*, then Zeus' ire at the selection seems completely irrational. To gain the apparently desirable portion containing the meat would mean either accepting the limitations of the mortal condition or claiming a portion which the gods have no use for and is potentially detrimental to their position as the 'undying'. One way to negotiate the difficulty is to suggest that the connection between mortality and ingestion is only applicable once the division has been made and mortals have been allotted the meat as their portion. This seems largely unsatisfying, as, if the effect of the substance is influenced totally by the group that claims it, it renders the choice rather moot in the first place. There is no significance to a selection which has no consequences. Another way to approach the choice is to suggest that whilst the portions are unfairly divided, the division is not balanced in the expected way. The portion with the bones is the superior option as it exempts the

[838] Hesiod *Theogony* 544.
[839] Vernant 1991, 34-5.
[840] *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, 132; and *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 207-8.
[841] οὐ γὰρ σῖτον ἔδουσ', οὐ πίνουσ' αἴθοπα οἶνον,/τοὔνεκ' ἀναίμονές εἰσι καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται. 'For they do not eat grain, or drink sparkling wine, therefore they are without blood and they are called the undying.' Homer *Iliad*, 5 341-2.

party which claims it from the necessities of appetite, consumption, and eventual decomposition. Before Zeus' choice is made, Hesiod states very clearly that Zeus recognises Prometheus' attempt to deceive him and that Zeus foresees the evils for mortal human beings.[842] This could be taken to foreshadow the removal of fire and the creation of Pandora, but it does not say that Zeus planned retribution against men, rather than he could see the misfortunes they were destined to experience, perhaps as a direct result of their mortality.[843] In choosing the bones Zeus distances himself and the gods from the trappings of diet induced mortality. It is not a choice made through ignorance, and it is illogical to assume that Zeus would knowingly pick an option that would be to the long -term detriment of his kin. The question remains then, why is Zeus so angry about the bones beneath the fat?

If Zeus is not unhappy with the portion the gods gain then his anger must come from the actual actions taken by Prometheus. When Prometheus bids Zeus choose one of the options he is twice described as a trickster.[844] The intention is clearly to deceive and Prometheus' intention is that Zeus should pick the option with the bones. It is also worth noting that *ankulometes*, crooked-counselled, is used to describe Kronos in line 137. Kronos is the first to challenge the authority of the family patriarch and does so through a mixture of trickery and violence, hiding in ambush before emasculating his father. By taking on the epithet of Kronos Prometheus' role as a potential challenger is established. The repetition of the exact word calls back to the image of the scheming Titan and highlights the threat to Zeus' rule. The significance of repeated language is also demonstrated when Zeus becomes angry. His anger is provoked by the discovery of the bones and the 'result of the deception'.[845] Zeus' anger in the passage can be attributed to the attempt to deceive rather than the claiming of the bones themselves. Prometheus is outwitted by Zeus' acceptance of the bones and the subsequent disconnection from the world of consumption; yet his intention was to undermine Zeus' authority both by subsuming his role as controller of distribution and through using trickery against Zeus. Zeus anger is at the presumption of Prometheus. The anger felt in the instant of discovering the bones is the anger of the confirmed suspicions and that moment when a betrayal is realised.

[842] Hesiod *Theogony*, 551-2.
[843] Clay 2003, 113.
[844] 'Crooked-counselled Prometheus': Hesiod *Theogony*, 546. 'He did not forget his treacherous craft': Hesiod *Theogony*, 547. The deceptive craft is mentioned using similar vocabulary in line 540, δολίῃ ἐπὶ τέχνῃ, when Prometheus sets out the skins and the repetition within such as short space of text is emphatic.
[845] Hesiod *Theogony*, 555.

If we accept that, as Vernant observes, the distribution of the sacrifice fixes the positions of the men and gods within the universe, placing men between beasts and gods,[846] we must also accept that the event also fixes the position of the gods in relation to humans. The need to create a dividing point between the two groups, either for illustrative purposes or for a deeper need to distinguish the two states of being, suggests that the relative position of the groups is not entirely fixed before this point. The division of the ox in the sacrifice places animals beneath humans as the objects of consumption, humans above as those who must consume by necessity, and the gods above both neither being consumed or compelled to consume. The separation of the factions is fixed alongside the establishment of a set hierarchy when Zeus selects the portion of bones. The split between gods and men is cemented by introduction of Pandora and the need for procreation, emphasising the transient nature of human life and the role of descendants for preservation.

Pandora and Appetite

Whilst the distribution of the sacrifice portions highlights the connection between consumption and mortality through the abstinence of the gods, Pandora emphasises the connection between mortals and consumption. Pandora is the prototype woman, she is the origin of the 'deadly race of women' and Hesiod is not ambiguous as to her detrimental effect on mankind.[847] Pandora, silent and without independent agency within the *Theogony*, is not able to confirm or deny Hesiod's assertion by word or action. It is interesting that Hesiod's narrator seems to associate women with consumption, both in terms of material goods and actual eating. Women are described as unsuited, or unwilling, to endure poverty and only accompany excess, and compared to the drones in the beehive lining their own stomachs on the produce of another's labour.[848] The comparison is unfavourable, the one consolation a man is given for accepting the burden of a wife is the knowledge that at least his own children will inherit his property upon his death. The introduction of women brings with it both an increase in demand for food and prosperity and as such they add to the burden of the husband.

When Zeus accepts the portion containing the bones, he rejects the portion covered by the stomach of the ox. The stomach is deliberately used by Prometheus to dissuade Zeus from selecting the portion with the meat, so it is likely that the stomach was not viewed as an appealing part of the animal. The word used for the stomach is *gaster* which is possibly best translated as belly, as it can

[846] Vernant 1991, 280.
[847] Hesiod *Theogony*, 590-594.
[848] Hesiod *Theogony*, 598-599.

mean the stomach, the womb, the appetite and the wide curved edge of a container or shield. Given the association between eating and mortality that can be demonstrated from the Homeric texts, it seems entirely appropriate that mortals should receive the portion containing the stomach, condemning them to appetite, and the means of satisfying the ensuing appetite.[849] Man is limited by the necessity of eating, to survive he must produce and ingest enough food to sustain his body until the next meal.[850] In accepting the juicy meats of the sacrificed ox there is an implicit acceptance of dependence upon them.

Given that Pandora is introduced as a consequence of the divide, it is difficult to avoid the implications of an alternative translation of *gaster* as 'womb'. The Greek ideas concerning the womb present it as largely problematic for both genders. Later writers describe in detail the complications that the womb causes for women when it dries out and moves around the body suffocating other organs,[851] and for men the womb was another drain on their vitality.[852] The creation of the race of women occurs after the divide of the sacrifice in which mankind is allotted the meat covered by the womb; the acceptance of mortality also requires an acceptance of maternity. Murnaghan suggests there is a strong connection throughout the Homeric texts in the roles of women both at birth and death.[853] The role of women at birth is undeniable; the baby develops inside the mother's body and the transitional moment into life emerges is marked by the emergence from her. Women too take the lead in mourning rites within Archaic verse, the most obvious example is when Hekabe, Andromache and Helen speak at Hektor's funeral.[854] Murnaghan asserts that within the patriarchal society of the ancient Greeks the connection of women to both birth and death makes them implicitly responsible for both. She observes that it is often a mother who informs the son of his mortality, and in doing so she reinforces his mortality.[855] That is not to say that the mother consciously or maliciously condemns their children to death but acknowledges that all that children born to mortal women will die. The womb as the source of life is ultimately the source of death. Pandora, and the race of women, carry children almost like physical inversion of the second sacrificial portion: mortal flesh of the child concealed within the *gaster* of the mother.

[849] Vernant 1989, 51.
[850] This idea of being trapped in a cycle of consumption and renewal is very eloquently phrased by Vernant: ''like a fire that consumes itself as it burns, and that must continuously be fed in order to keep from going out the human body functions in alternating phases of expenditure and renewal.' Vernant 1991, 32.
[851] Plato *Timaios*, 91b-e. Hippocrates *On Virgins*, 8.466-70.
[852] Vernant 1991, 101. Vernant 1981, 52. Ogden 1998, 37.
[853] Murnaghan 1992, 242.
[854] Homer *Iliad*, 23. 722-777.
[855] Murnaghan 1992, 243.

The association of women with greed and consumption places women in a unique position. Men are dependent upon them for the continuation of their line, and simultaneously women operate almost in opposition to men. They are created through an act of revenge for a trick that mankind did not originate. Prometheus' attempt to deceive Zeus by taking control of distribution is paid back in kind. Mankind receives mortality through the meat, and the appetite in the *gaster*. Zeus' creation of Pandora mirrors the portions put before him by Prometheus. The bejewelled Pandora, gleaming in her gold adornment, is reminiscent of the bones concealed by gleaming fat, looking appealing but providing no actual nourishment. The race of women that ensue from her bring appetite and mortality. In taking on the role as the givers of life women ultimately bear the responsibility for their death.

Conclusion

It is easily forgotten that Prometheus is a cousin of Zeus, and whilst not an Olympian, is a powerful deity, and descendent of Gaia and Ouranos. His attempt to subvert Zeus' position occurs at the pivotal moment of division between gods and men. As Prometheus is not a man, his motivation for attempting to trick Zeus must offer Prometheus a benefit beyond improving man's station. In attempting to assume the role of the distributor, and giving gifts to Zeus, Prometheus challenges Zeus' position. Just like the Big-Man discussed in the first chapter, Zeus must return the gesture to restore the balance of power or risk being out manoeuvred by his ambitious rival. Prometheus' challenge to Zeus' authority is very different from the threat of Typhoëos, or from the conflict of the Titanomachy, as it is a much more subtle threat. Zeus' power base is constructed from a complex network of gift exchanges where Zeus either provides *moira*, and through that *time*, or allows a deity to retain the *moira* that they already possess. By challenging Zeus' role is the primary benefactor of the community, Prometheus attempts to supplant him in his role.

4.4) Policing the Boundaries: Mortals who Overreach themselves

Introduction

One of the difficulties which needs to be addressed is how exactly Zeus is able to defend his position. Zeus is surrounded by powerful and ambitious figures who must be managed in order to prevent them from acting against him. These figures are aware that Zeus will not part with authority

willingly, and, also, that inheritance is not an option amongst the undying. This means that they must act to displace him if they wish to assume his authority. Zeus' options when responding to these threats are limited. Zeus cannot permanently remove threats from existence through execution or exile, and therefore how to manage rebellious figures becomes an extremely important concept. To examine the difficulties of punishing a deity, it is helpful to understand how the gods punish those who are not protected by their divine station. The gods are vengeful and quick to anger and mythology provides a vast array of figures who offend them, either by negligence or intent so there is no shortage of examples. In this section, the focus will be on the complicated figures who breach the division between mortality and immortality, and who thereby offer the strongest parallels with the punishment of the *athanatoi* themselves. It is interesting that consistently within myth mortals who negotiate this barrier are portrayed as suffering severe and lasting punishments.[856] The desire to punish, brutally and publicly, suggests a level of insecurity on the part of those with power. If the gap between mortality and divinity was absolutely impermeable there would be no need to guard it so jealously. Many of the figures who are punished by the gods blur the line between mortal and immortal as the heroes of myth often have divine parentage in their lineage. The heroes who have divine ancestry but are not among the *athanatoi* occupy a unique place both outside and within the divine family. They are sons and daughters of deities but are denied the status of their divine parent. The link between the gods and their children is powerful, Zeus weeps blood over the death of Sarpedon,[857] and, as discussed in the last chapter, Thetis cannot abandon Achilles despite having no qualms about deserting Peleus. By considering figures with divine heritage as distinct from the divine, it is possible that we are creating division which the Archaic Greeks may not have held themselves but allows for a distinction between the punishments of those who can die and those who cannot.

It must be acknowledged that it is impossible to speak with uniformity about Greek attitudes to the afterlife. Here I am specifically concerned with the versions represented within epic verse. Though, of course, these versions may not accurately reflect the understanding of an individual member of an Archaic *polis*, they do offer some insight into discussion around events after death which would have had some cultural resonance. When considering Archaic concepts surrounding death, the diversity of approach to burial practice serves as a caution against expecting consistency from expectations of the afterlife as it oscillates between burial and cremation in different regions and time periods.[858] Primarily here I am concerned with the portrayal of the underworld and its

[856] One notable exception is Ganymede, who is not shown to actively pursue immortality.
[857] Homer *Iliad*, 16.459.
[858] Felton 2007, 87.

inhabitants within epic verse, and any arguments are limited to this world. Due to the fragmentary nature of the source material, it will be necessary at points to use later texts as to supplement the available information but this will be kept to a minimum.

Hades and Tartaros

The key divide between mortals and immortals in Archaic Greek poetry is mortality. The gods are repeatedly given the title of *athanatoi*, the undying, and as such it is man who requires a destination after death. Within the Homeric poems, the destination for the dead is Hades, ruled over by the eponymous deity. This overlap between the deity and the domain is reminiscent of the difficulties of Gaia and Pontos, where there is ambiguity as to whether the poet is referring to the god or the location. Whilst Hesiod does not elaborate on the allocation of roles between the Olympian brothers, in a famous scene in the Iliad Poseidon explains that the universe is divided between the three sons of Kronos; the sky is given to Zeus, the sea to Poseidon, and the underworld to Hades.[859] This split is organised by lot and leaves Olympos and the earth as neutral territories which all three of the brothers are free to access. Whilst this version is not overtly repeated in other texts, such as the Theogony, it does highlight the idea of a division of regions. Whilst this division provides each of the three sons of Kronos with their own dominion, it is telling that the earth and Olympos are kept neutral. This implies that Hades is not restricted to the underworld and has the same ability as his siblings to interfere with the world of men, however this is not what happens in the narrative. Throughout the Iliad Zeus and Poseidon play prominent roles, with Poseidon pressing for the Greek interests and Zeus attempting to maintain the order of events, but Hades himself has a minimal role within the text. In a narrative crowded with death and war one might suppose the god of the underworld to play a more active role, however in the entire Iliad he is mentioned less than fifty times, and the majority of these are passing references to a hero entering the halls of Hades.[860] This lack of presence within the narrative is not restricted to the Iliad, it extends into other texts where he might also have reason to be more present. An obvious example of this is the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* where Hades' actions drive the entire plot but his own motivations and actions are given minimal attention. This behaviour might not be entirely unexpected from a deity named the 'invisible one'[861] but there is in incongruence between Hades and his brothers which warrants further investigation.

[859] Homer *Iliad*, 15.188-193.
[860] It is worth noting that whilst Hades is the ruler of the underworld, Thanatos and Ker, two children of Nyx, are specifically gods of death. Hesiod *Theogony*, 211-213.
[861] Gazis 2018, 13-14.

Hades stands apart from his brothers in two major aspects; firstly, his apparent disinterest in the affairs of mortals and, secondly, his lack of children. The absence of any children born to Persephone and Hades is particularly striking when contrasted against the extreme fertility of Zeus, but it is significant that Hades is the only one of the three brothers to produce no children at all. There is an implicit logic to the idea that a god of death might be unable to produce life which is perhaps why this has not been overtly questioned. The significance of Hades' fertility, or lack thereof, is of importance when we consider the dynastic importance of Persephone. Persephone is a daughter of Zeus and his sister Demeter. Despite polygyny being unusual within the Greek pantheon, Demeter is Zeus' fourth partner. It is notable that Zeus marries both Hera and Demeter, and presumably would have married Hestia as well had she not taken a vow of chastity. There appears to be a preoccupation with controlling the next generation of the gods with Zeus seeking to ensure that he is father to as many of them as possible and minimising the access of other gods to goddesses. Through marrying Persephone to Hades, it is possible that Zeus is extending that control through ensuring that Persephone will be the last in her line.

Hades in Hesiod

Just as in the *Iliad*, Hades is given very little attention within the *Theogony* but the times that he is mentioned are revealing. Unlike Poseidon and Zeus who are both mentioned within the first fifteen lines of the poem,[862] the first time that Hades is mentioned within the text he is referred as the master of Kerberos, who is a son of Echidna. This associates him instantly with the children of Echidna. Echidna herself is a descendent of Pontos and she is born of the incestuous union of Keto and Phorkys.[863] The association with the sea through her grandfather highlights Echidna's potentially dangerous nature through her proximity to death. As Vermeule highlights, the sea is a place where the boundary between life and death is made manifest by the waterline, with a descent below the water often representing death.[864] This fearful nature is echoed by the monstrous nature of Pontos' descendants.[865] Other children produced by the union of Keto and Phorkys include the Graiai and the Gorgons, both of which are defeated by Perseus, a son of Zeus. Notably Echidna's other children include Orthos, the dog of Geryoneus, and the Hydra, who, alongside Kerberos, are conquered by Herakles as part of his trials. It is also possibly worth noting, although Hesiod does not, that Hades

[862] Hesiod *Theogony*, 4 and 15 respectively.
[863] Hesiod *Theogony*, 237-8 and 295-297.
[864] Vermeule 1979, 179. Morris too highlights the perils of the sea as monsters and the potential for an ignoble death. Morris 1984, 5-6.
[865] Clay describes the children of Pontos as the 'monster catalogue'. Clay 1993, 107.

himself is also injured by Herakles in the *Iliad*.[866] By having the first mention of Hades alongside these figures, Hesiod associates Hades with these dark and monstrous children, all of whom are subjugated by a son of Zeus and a mortal woman.

The next time that Hades is mentioned is at his birth. Hades is described by Hesiod as dwelling below the earth and possessing a 'pitiless heart'.[867] The implacable nature of Hades is not unique to Hesiod; Homer too draws attention to the lack of malleability of the god of the underworld in the passage where Agamemnon suggests that Achilles should be open to his apology and the return to the fighting.[868] The comparison in the *Iliad* is an interesting one as it shows Agamemnon unafraid to refer to Hades as the most hated of the gods, something which a man of more discretion may have shied away from. The idea that Hades' implacable nature is what makes him so terrible is perhaps rather telling in a world where man's relationship with the gods is governed by a form of barter through sacrifice. Hades cannot be appeased or persuaded to act in favour of an individual. Through comparing Achilles to Hades, it is also possible that Agamemnon is implicitly trying to highlight his own similarity to Zeus.

Zeus is recognised as *basileus* over all the gods but Hades retains his power as a ruler of his own domain.[869] Like Agamemnon, Zeus holds a position of command over all of the other deities but must, to some extent, recognise the individual authority of the other gods or risk being challenged. The threat of potential challenge is not found from Hades within the texts but is demonstrated by the thwarted overthrow attempted by Hera, Athena and Poseidon.[870] This threat, posed by Zeus' brother, wife and daughter, has been described as reflecting a royal coup where the suzerain is only able to retain his power through the intervention of the 'foreign powers' of Thetis and Briareos.[871] Through comparing Achilles to Hades, Agamemnon reinforces the idea of himself as a supreme overlord and casts Achilles as a vassal king. Not only that, but he portrays Achilles as an unpopular and unchallenging deity. Hades is, perhaps, passively loyal to his brother in that he does engage with any attempt to overthrow his brother but remains apart from the action. Hades is arguably inert, neither responding to the world or participating in the politics of the Olympians outside of his domain.

---

[866] Homer *Iliad*, 5.395-397.
[867] ἴφθιμόν τ᾽ Ἀίδην, ὃς ὑπὸ χθονὶ δώματα ναίει /νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχων… '[And Rhea bore] powerful Hades, who dwells in house beneath the earth, bearing a pitiless heart…' Hesiod *Theogony*, 455-456.
[868] Ἀΐδης τοι ἀμείλιχος ἡδ᾽ ἀδάμαστος, /τοὔνεκα καί τε βροτοῖσι θεῶν ἔχθιστος ἁπάντων. 'Hades, mark you, is implacable and relentless, and this is why he is most hateful to men of the undying gods.' Homer *Iliad*, 9. 158-159.
[869] See footnote 1 for the passage.
[870] Homer *Iliad*, 1.395-410.
[871] Nilsson 1932, 248.

The next two times Hades is mentioned in the *Theogony* occur within seven lines of each other at line 768 and 774. Again, the positioning of this passage is interesting as it follows on from the defeat of the Titans and a description of the children of Nyx. After their defeat, the Titans are cast into Tartaros and the description of Tartaros is eerily similar to the description of Hades' domain.[872] The enclosed space is gated with bronze, filled with murky gloom and those within its walls are unable to escape without assistance from a powerful outsider.[873] The similarity is interesting, and is thrown into sharp relief by elaborating on Hades' domain shortly after the description of Tartaros. Like the mortals who pass into Hades, the Titans are hidden beneath the earth in an inescapable and miserable prison. They too must reside in the gloom of a domain sealed by a son of Kronos. The distinction between Tartaros and Hades becomes significant at this point, as the undying gods cannot belong in the land of the dead, but the physical similarities and proximity of the domains are notable.

After the description of Tartaros, which like Hades and Thanatos is hateful to the gods,[874] Hesiod diverts from the family of Gaia and Ouranos to elaborate on the children of Nyx. Nyx's descendants are entirely separate from the children of Gaia, from whose line the Olympians claim their descent. Gaia and Nyx both emerge very early in the sequence and produce their children with male gods who do not originate from the other line. The closest to a union between these dynasties is the proposal made by Hera to Hypnos in the *Iliad* where she suggests that he could secure marriage to one of the Charites, Pasithea, if he aids her in her plan to distract Zeus.[875] It is telling that the prospect of this union is enough to convince Hypnos to risk Zeus' wrath, although the proposed marriage is never referred to again within the *Iliad.* The children of Nyx are characterised, I think, primarily by their implacable nature. Including children such as 'Old-Age', 'Day' and the Fates, Nyx's children are fundamental to the organisation of the universe, albeit they represent some of the less pleasant aspects of that organisation. This is perhaps best exemplified in Thanatos, the god of death. Thanatos is described with a temper of iron and a bronze, pitiless heart.[876] The same word, *neles*, is

[872]ἔνθα θεοὶ Τιτῆνες ὑπὸ ζόφῳ ἠερόεντι /κεκρύφαται βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο /χώρῳ ἐν εὐρώεντι, πελώρης ἔσχατα γαίης./ τοῖς οὐκ ἐξιτόν ἐστι. θύρας δ᾽ ἐπέθηκε Ποσειδέων /χαλκείας, τεῖχος δὲ περοίχεται ἀμφοτέρωθεν. 'There the Titan gods hid in the murky darkness, by the counsels of cloud-gatherer Zeus, in this dank place at the farthest edge of the broad earth. They cannot leave, for Poseidon placed bronze gates, and a wall runs around all sides.' Hesiod *Theogony* 729-734.
εὐρώεις is used to describe Tartaros in line 739 of the *Theogony* but is also used of the underworld in the *Iliad*, 20.65 and *Odyssey*, 10.512,23.322 as well as in *Works and Days*, 153.

[873] Zeus is able to liberate the Hundred-Handers, and in doing so acquires their loyalty. Hesiod *Theogony*, 660-665.

[874] Hesiod *Theogony*, 739.

[875] Homer *Iliad*, 14.267-268.

[876] … τοῦ δὲ σιδηρέη μὲν κραδίη, χάλκεον δέ οἱ ἦτορ / νηλεὲς ἐν στήθεσσιν· ἔχει δ᾽ ὃν πρῶτα λάβῃσιν /ἀνθρώπων, ἐχθρὸς δὲ καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν. '… the other has a heart of iron, and a pitiless bronze spirit

used to describe the pitiless nature of Thanatos, Kerberos, and Hades.[877] Like Hades, Thanatos does not relinquish his grasp on an individual once he has taken hold of them, and Thanatos has no children of his own either. The gods are so similar in their depiction that it begs the question of why they are two distinct deities from opposing family lines.

There may be a clue to this distinction in the passage which connects the section on Thanatos to Hades, which is, again, a description of Kerberos. In this passage Kerberos stands before the echoing halls of 'powerful Hades and Dread Persephone'.[878] This is a phrase which is repeated not only within the *Theogony* but within the Homeric texts as well.[879] Kerberos too is 'pitiless' functions as a guard on the gates of Hades. He allows people to pass within the gate, but denies them the ability to leave again, devouring those who attempt to leave the gates. The idea of a merciless and inescapable outcome underlies all three of the key figures associated with death: Thanatos who takes hold of a man and refuses to release him, Kerberos who welcomes them into the mansions of the dead happily, but will not allow them to leave again, and Hades who rules unseen over the domain of the dead, unchanging and merciless. These three all claim descent from a different line of the family: Nyx, Gaia and Ouranos, and Pontos, meaning that all three branches of the family converge to control their dominion over the inescapable concept of the Greek mind, death.

The passages preceding the mention of Hades have provided some insight into Hesiod's portrayal of the underworld deity, and the passage which immediately follows furthers this. The text moves on to a discussion of Styx, the terrible, eldest daughter of Okeanos. Like Hades, she is separated from the other gods, and lives in her own dwelling. The water of Styx is used as a punishment for any god who is caught swearing a false oath. Any god who comes into contact with the water, having sworn a false oath must lie breathless for a year, not eating or drinking nectar and ambrosia, and once this is complete, they must go for nine more years unable to participate in the assemblies of the gods.[880] As the gods within the Greek pantheon are characterised by their undying nature it is as close to death as a god is said to come, within the texts being examined here.[881] Again, this passage is placed close to a description of the Underworld which highlights the deathlike aspects of the situation. To lie motionless, without taking sustenance or drawing breath, is as akin to a description of the deceased as it is possible to give without actually referring to them as dead, and draws attention again to the

within his breast, and whomever of men he first seizes, he holds, and he is hateful even to the undying gods.' Hesiod *Theogony*, 764-766.

[877] Kerberos: Hesiod *Theogony*, 770. Hades: Hesiod *Theogony*, 456.

[878] Hesiod *Theogony*, 768 and 775.

[879] Homer *Odyssey*, 10.524.

[880] Hesiod *Theogony*, 793-805.

[881] Both Zeus and Dionysos do have myths around their deaths, but these are not explored in the works of Hesiod or Homer so are not discussed here. For a brief discussion of the tomb of Zeus, see West 1966, 291.

parallels between death and an inability to act and interact with others. This lack of agency is similar to the gods in Tartaros who are unable to exert their power beyond the boundaries of their prison.

The final time which Hades is mentioned in the *Theogony* is when Hesiod is describing the unions of Zeus and the offspring that result from them. When Demeter comes to Zeus' bed, they produce Persephone. Hades, under his alternative name of Aidoneus, abducts Persephone from her mother, with the permission of Zeus.[882] There is a strange contrast here between actions of Hades towards the two parents: Persephone is snatched from Demeter, but freely given by her father.[883] This is either an interjection of the narrator to assert that Hades cannot act against the will of Zeus, so must have had the authority from his brother to take Persephone, or is another attempt to reduce the agency of Hades; he did not steal Persephone, he was given her. In both cases, this would again suggest a limitation on Hades' ability to act. Hades is either constrained his brother's authority, or he is dependent on Zeus giving Persephone to him. There is again, as there has been throughout the portrayal of Hades in the *Theogony* a sense of impotence.

The depiction of Hades in the *Theogony* contrasts the stoic and implacable power of Hades with a lack of action in the affairs of the world. This lack of action could potentially be a genuine disinterest from the god who knows that mortals will eventually enter his domain one way or another, or it could suggest an inability to act in the world of the living. Hades' role within the *Theogony* is a minor one and mentions of him are few and far between which prevents a clearer understanding from being established. There are clear similarities between the presentation of Hades and Tartaros indicate that the two should be seen as corresponding locations for their respective communities.

Tityos[884], Tantalos and Sisyphos

The difference between Tartaros and the underworld is a fascinating one, especially given the similarity of the description and the physical proximity of the two zones, as discussed above. The primary distinction between the two is which figures end up in which location. Part of a hero's rite of passage was to journey down to the underworld, either to retrieve a prize or to gain knowledge from those who had already passed on. The earliest description that survives of this tradition is in Book 11

[882] αὐτὰρ ὁ Δήμητρος πολυφόρβης ἐς λέχος ἦλθεν, /ἣ τέκε Περσεφόνην λευκώλενον, ἣν Ἀιδωνεὺς / ἥρπασε ἧς παρὰ μητρός, ἔδωκε δὲ μητίετα Ζεύς. 'Then he came to the bed of bountiful Demeter, and she bore Persephone, whom Hades snatched from her mother, counsellor Zeus gave her.' Hesiod *Theogony*, 912-914.
[883] This will be discussed in more detail when examining the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter.*
[884] Tityos is a son of Gaia, with no father given by Homer. As such he cannot be considered a mortal; however, he is included by Homer with the other transgressors on Odysseus' journey to the underworld.

of Homer's *Odyssey* when Odysseus travels down to the underworld to consult Teiresias. The oracular role of those who have passed into the underworld is something which will be considered later, and is here complicated by Teiresias' pre-existing prophetic prowess.[885] One interesting feature that should be mentioned here is Odysseus' promised sacrifice of a black ram to Teiresias on his return to Ithaka.[886] Felton sees sacrifice of a black ram is significant, as it is an animal closely associated with chthonic deities and, importantly, hero cult.[887] This has been seen as evidence of Homeric awareness of hero cult, even though hero cult is largely omitted from Homer's works. The absence of hero cult is perhaps a result of the setting, with the poems describing the heroic age where the heroes are mostly alive and active and therefore not accessible through cult. The significance of the allusion to hero cult in Homer is that it means that his audience would have been aware of hero cult, and this would have shaped their understanding of the relationship between the living and the dead.

When Odysseus describes his journey to the underworld, he tells Alkinoös of many figures he encounters. Amongst them are the three infamous criminals Tityos, Tantalos and Sisyphos.[888] All three are already enduring their punishment, though only the crime of Tityos is elaborated on in the text itself. Sourvinou-Inwood has convincingly argued that the punishments of the three figures are designed to suit the nature of their transgression. [889] Transgression is key term for these figures, as all three present a challenge to the boundaries between mortals and immortals, something which threatens the order of the cosmos. A brief summary of her argument is provided here to minimise any chance of confusion between which arguments are hers and which are my own.

As Sourvinou-Inwood states Tityos' crime is in attempting to rape Leto, who is described in her role as the wife of Zeus.[890] The violent action is carried out against the goddess, but Homer highlights her position as Zeus' wife. This reframes the crime from an act of violence against a female deity to a subversive action against the ruler of the gods. The act is an implicit challenge to Zeus' dominance as much as it is an assault on a goddess. In attacking Zeus' wife, Tityos demonstrates that he is

[885] Felton suggests that the *Odyssey* associates prophecy with the dead, but Teiresias is an established prophet whilst he is alive. Whilst Agamemnon can offer information that is new to Odysseus regarding Ithaka this is due to information he gleaned whilst he was alive rather than knowledge he has acquired since passing, Achilles too must ask information of Odysseus rather than vice-versa. Felton 2007, 86.
[886] Τειρεσίῃ δ᾽ ἀπάνευθεν ὄιν ἱερευσέμεν οἴῳ /παμμέλαν᾽… 'I would sacrifice to Teiresias alone a wholly black ram…' Homer *Odyssey*, 11.33-34.
[887] Burkert 1985, 199; Felton 2007, 90. Ekroth has posed a substantial challenge to this view by proving that there are white victims who are sacrificed to heroes. Ekroth 2002, 133.
[888] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.576-600.
[889] Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, *passim.*
[890] Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, 37-39. … Λητὼ γὰρ ἔλκησε, Διὸς κυδρὴν παράκοιτιν… 'for he seized Leto, the glorious wife of Zeus…' Homer *Odyssey*, 11.580.

undeterred by Zeus' potential to retaliate as well as his contempt for Zeus' authority. As such Tityos' action is threatening to the whole social order of Olympos. Sourvinou-Inwood suggests that, as Tityos is a son of Gaia and a Giant, Tityos is a subversive character who straddles the gap between the worlds of mortals and immortals. The attack on Leto is a manifestation of that subversive character as Tityos attempts to claim the goddess as his own, and presumably father a child with her. Whilst a god fathering a child with a mortal woman is generally not seen as a problem for the order of the universe, a goddess taking a partner who is not a deity is far more problematic.

To deviate from Sourvinou-Inwood's argument for a moment, it is significant that the punishment of Tityos is listed just after Odysseus describes seeing Orion. Orion's ill-fated love affair with Eos has already appeared within the *Odyssey*.[891] In her discussion with Hermes, Kalypso details the fate of Orion as proof that the gods could not tolerate a goddess taking a mortal as her partner. There is one key difference between Orion and Tityos which is shown by Kalypso's complaint that Orion was struck down by Artemis because Eos had chosen him for a lover. Kalypso's comment places the goddess in the dominant role in the relationship: Eos chooses Orion. There is no suggestion that Orion attempts to force his attentions onto Eos. This may be why Orion is allowed to continue in his role as huntsman in the afterlife whilst Tityos suffers more directly. Though an endless, unsuccessful hunt may be no less gruelling if less obvious. Eos' penchant for mortal lovers is unusual among the goddesses and is especially interesting as she belongs to the only branch of the family stemming from Gaia and Ouranos who Zeus does not form a marital connection with. Perhaps her dalliances with mortals made Eos an unappealing choice, or her choice of suitor was unlikely to pose a threat to the Olympian order.

When considering the actions, and the punishment, of Tityos, it notably is similar to the tale of Ixion.[892] Like Tityos, Ixion attempts to seize one of Zeus' sexual partners and his hubris is punished through an eternal confinement in torment. In Ixion's case, it is bound to an endlessly rolling wheel. Ixion also bears similarities to Tantalus as another figure who is granted immortality and the company of the undying. Rather than being grateful for the boon, Ixion proceeds to push his boundaries further by attempting to rape Hera.[893] The story is given in Pindar's *Pythian* 2, and though the exact date of Pindar's ode is contestable, this is the first surviving record of Ixion's transgression and punishment which dates this version of the myth to the fifth century BC.[894] Pindar describes Ixion's two faults: firstly, Ixion is the first to incur pollution through killing a member of his

[891] Homer *Odyssey*, 5.112-130.
[892] This discussion is based on Pindar's account, as Ixion's appearance in Homer is restricted to *Iliad* 14.317 when Zeus described being seized with desire for Ixion's wife.
[893] Pindar *Pythian*, 2. 21-40.
[894] Blickman 1986, 194. For a discussion of *Pythian* 2 see Blickman, 1986; Gantz, 1978; and Grimm, 1962.

kin, and secondly he attempts to rape Hera. Far more attention is given to the second of the crimes, and the first is almost glossed over within one line and the second taking up nearly twenty. Clearly the slight against the Olympians eclipses any other transgression. Pindar's criticism of Ixion's behaviour is not focussed on his actions, but rather on his ingratitude towards Zeus as his benefactor. As Gantz phrases it 'Ixion's real transgression is his inability to perceive the realities of his situation.'[895] The lesson appears to have been learned by the end of his narrative; as Ixion rolls eternally on the wheel, Pindar has him imploring other mortals to repay their benefactor and to treat them well.[896]

The attempted violence against Hera is foiled by Zeus' foreknowledge of Ixion's intentions. When Ixion seizes Hera, he instead seizes a cloud in her image.[897] Despite the ephemeral nature that a cloud might suggest, the figure is not only substantial enough to deceive Ixion but also to bear a child to the union. Ixion's son, Kentauros, is born without the favour of the graces and is honoured by neither man nor god.[898] Like other monstrous figures, Kentauros is described as overbearing,[899] and the singularity of both him and his mother is heavily stressed by Pindar.[900] Kentauros later mates with the mares of Magnesia and produces the race of Centaurs, whose carnal appetites and lack of self-control lead them to be antagonistic figures throughout Greek myth.[901] It is implied that Kentauros must have had a human form, as his children are described as having the top half of their father's body and the lower part of their mother's. Zeus' response of giving a transgressor a fabricated female, just as he did with Pandora, ensures that the overreaching man is a blight for mankind rather than just personal torment for Ixion. The consequences of Ixion's attempt are further reaching than his own fate.

Ixion is not unique in his desire to seduce a goddess; another famous transgressor is Tityos. As punishment for his attempted assault of Leto, Tityos is tied out across an expanse of land whilst vultures tear out his liver. The similarity between the punishment of Tityos and of Prometheus has been highlighted by Pease, who sees the punishment of Prometheus as the precursor due to the focus on the liver as the seat of intelligence, rather than the later location of lust.[902] The focus on the liver is important to Sourvinou-Inwood who highlights the association of the liver with sexual

[895] Gantz 1978, 21.
[896] Pindar *Pythian*, 2. 21-24.
[897] Pindar *Pythian*, 2.30-40.
[898] Pindar *Pythian*, 2. 42-43.
[899] ὑπερφίαλος. Pindar *Pythian*, 2. The term is also used of the Cyclopes in Homer *Odyssey*, 9.106.
[900] μόνα καὶ μόνον… 'Singular mother and singular son…' Pindar *Pythian*, 2.80.
[901] Pindar *Pythian*, 2.49.
[902] Pease 1925, 277-278.

appetite.[903] The punishment is suited to the crime as Tityos is helpless and immobilised whilst the source of his motivation is forcibly removed. Sourvinou-Inwood suggests that the prone position of Tityos emphasises the helplessness of his position as it mimics a corpse, unable to protect itself as it is violated by carrion eaters.[904] As Tityos' offence is to reach beyond his situation and to attempt to claim a dynastically significant goddess as his lover, he is punished by a dramatic reduction in situation. Tityos is forced to eternally experience the worst fears of man. This raises the prospect of a fate worse than death for these transgressive figures. To be trapped in an endless cycle of pain, fear and humiliation is perhaps worse than an eternity in the murky depths of Hades.

The punishment of Tantalos cannot be proven to be fitting from the *Odyssey* alone as Homer does not elaborate on what his crime actually was. Sourvinou-Inwood argues that his crime lies in killing and disguising his son Pelops as food which he then offered to the gods, a story which survives from later sources.[905] None of the gods actually eat Pelops, with the exception of Demeter who is said to have eaten the shoulder blade as she distracted by the loss of Persephone. Pelops is restored to life by the gods and his shoulder blade is replaced with one of ivory. The story, as is reconstructed here, demonstrates Tantalos' threat to the sanctity of Olympos through offering the Olympians human flesh to eat, as well as a subversion of the family order.[906] In offering his own son as food Tantalos participates in an act of cannibalism and, to compound his crime, he attempts to trick the gods into joining his act.[907] Sourvinou-Inwood suggests that in dining with the gods Tantalos has drawn too close to the undying, and nature corrects itself by bringing him closer to the bestial through an act of cannibalism which strikes at the heart of the social order. The difficulty with this interpretation is that if Demeter is the only one who consumes Pelops' body, then Tantalos never actually eats, and the gods are perhaps distinct enough from mortals for any suggestion of cannibalism to be quickly quashed.

It is important to question what Tantalos hoped to achieve with his act. The intention is clearly for the gods to partake of the meal; would the consumption of flesh be enough to break down the division between gods and men established at Mekone? The scene echoes of the division organised by Prometheus, where the gods are offered a tempting portion with a disguised, unpleasant interior. The gods are not able to eat mortal food. As has been discussed in previous work, Hermes' immortal nature will not allow him to consume the immortal cattle he has sacrificed despite his appetite for them. Homer comments that gods themselves subsist on nectar and ambrosia which is why they do

[903] Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, 38.
[904] Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, 39.
[905] Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, 40.
[906] Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, 40-43.
[907] The cannibalism is an interesting connection with Lykaon. For a discussion of Lykaon see Aston 2011, 102.

not have blood.[908] Neal comments that the gods rarely eat at all in the *Iliad* and highlights that the exception to this is the much-loathed Ares whose hunger for blood can be seen as a mark of his abnormality.[909] Through attempting to feed the gods mortal food, and a particularly defiling food at that, Tantalos is challenging the entire hierarchy of Olympos by bringing the gods down to mortal level. The killing of Pelops is perhaps another rejection of the mortal condition where immortality is impossible for an individual who must settle for producing children to carry on their family name. Tantalos' attempt is, ultimately, unsuccessful and the discovery of his deception inevitably leads to his punishment.

The punishment that Tantalos endures as a result is to be constantly tormented with an abundance of food and water that recedes as soon as he attempts to take them.[910] Though Tantalos presumably has no more of a physical form than any of the other shades, he is described as seeming to be thirsty for the water[911] and is presumably hungry for the fruits he reaches for. Tantalos is trapped in a cycle of reaching for things he desires which he cannot possibly attain.[912] Perhaps a fitting penalty for a mortal who aspired to the company of the Olympians.

The final member of this unfortunate triad is Sisyphos. Sisyphos is another figure whose crime is not listed in the *Odyssey* but who experienced eternal punishment. Sisyphos' punishment is to push a boulder up a hill, but when the boulder is about to crest the hill it rolls back down again. The idea of relentless repetition of an arduous task is one which Sourvinou-Inwood perceives as fighting against the futility of death.[913] This would be a fitting punishment indeed for a figure who successfully cheats death before his eventual punishment. Again, we must look outside of the Homeric material to locate the crime that causes Sisyphos to be punished. Raffalovich and Sourvinou-Inwood both state that Sisyphos' crime lies in cheating death, though this is a story which does not occur in Hesiod, or even in Apollodorus.[914] The record of this myth is found in Pherekydes.[915] By imprisoning Thanatos, and tricking Hades into allowing him to return to the world of the living to admonish his wife for not correctly completing the burial rites, Sisyphos is able to delay the time of his death and even move between the worlds of the living and the dead.

---

[908] Homer *Iliad*, 5.340-342.
[909] Neal 2006, 27-28.
[910] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.582-592.
[911] στεῦτο δὲ διψάων… Homer *Odyssey*, 11.584.
[912] This punishment mirrors that of Erysichthon, briefly discussed in chapter 2. The endless cycle of striving to satisfy a desire that is eternally out of reach seems to have been considered fitting to those who aspired so far beyond their station.
[913] Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, 53.
[914] Raffalovich 1988, *passim*. Sourvinou-Inwood 1986, 42.
[915] *FGrH*, 3 F 119.

The motif of death and the trickster is an interesting one, as in Archaic Greece Thanatos and Hades are not portrayed as a figure who actively cause death as in some cultures.[916] Instead, they operate more as guides for those who have reached the natural conclusion of their lives. Death is a natural part of the human condition and a key division between the gods and men. In trapping Thanatos, Sisyphos not only delays his own passing but prevents Thanatos from performing his duties and conveying others to Hades until he was released by Ares. In doing so, Sisyphos single-handedly broke down the cosmic order by removing the division between the undying gods and mortal men.

Sisyphos' crime is one which cannot be ignored, and like the crimes of his fellow sufferers, it has implications which reach beyond the action itself. It poses a challenge to the supremacy of the Olympians and the division of the universe. The response of the gods was to create the paradox of fixing Sisyphos in a single location using perpetual motion. The struggle of Sisyphos against the boulder is one which is recorded in Homer, though the reason for its implementation is not. He must push the stone boulder uphill only for it to roll back again once he is on the crest of the hill. The symbolism of an endless struggle against an insurmountable obstacle is encapsulated in this one action imposed on a figure who fought death as fervently as possible, succeeding twice. There is a significance to the use of stone in this punishment, which will be explored further in the next section. Trying to escape death might be entirely human, but succeeding is a very different matter.[917]

As Sourvinou-Inwood argues, all three of these figures committed actions which threatened the established social order and the supremacy of the gods. These three figures are all transgressive figures whose behaviour challenges the division between mortals and immortals and who attempt to acquire divine privileges for themselves. As a result, they are singled out for an unpleasant afterlife, remembered more for their punishments than their individual actions. Burkert comments that they are often referred to as 'sinners', despite the Christian overtone,[918] and this is perhaps because the offense is fundamentally against the divine order. The punishments are designed to fit the crime, but if the nature of punishment is to provide a deterrent, they are also designed to terrify anyone who might have similar aspirations.[919] In each of these instances the perpetrator is punished beyond the grave for actions they took in life. Confined in the underworld they must endure the judgement of the gods for eternity. One aspect, which Sourvinou-Inwood does not address, that is perhaps troubling in this narrative is the presence of Herakles, or rather his phantom, who is another

[916] Felton 2007, 91.
[917] Burkert 2009, 154.
[918] Burkert 2009, 153.
[919] Burkert 2009, 143-4.

of the troubled souls within this episode. There is a division here between the phantom and Herakles himself who has taken his place amongst the immortals as the husband of Hebe.[920] Given his excesses in life and his chequered past, including infanticide and taking Kerberos from the underworld, it is perhaps unsurprising to find him as one of the great transgressors enduring a bleak afterlife. However, Homer clearly separates the Herakles and his phantom, condemning one to the gloom of Hades and elevating the other to divinity.

There is a particular significance to the use of a boulder in Sisyphos' punishment. As Forbes-Irving has argued, stone is lifeless.[921] Stone is emblematic of sterility, boundaries, and death. Thus, when Sisyphos is tasked with endlessly struggling against the weight of the boulder against the incline of the hill he is symbolically repeating his struggle against death but this time with no chance of success. The stone cannot be tricked or beguiled, nor can it offer any respite. The immobility and impassivity of stone makes it well suited to contain troublesome figures, either through petrification or through imprisonment. There are several transgressive figures in mythology who are closely associated with stone. Petrification is an unusual punishment; in that it often follows death and appears to replace the descent into Hades.[922] Imprisonment within the earth is also a negotiation of the norms, of representation in literature at least, of events surrounding death.

Dynastic Control

When a mortal asks a deity for a gift in Greek mythology, even when it is offered, there is always an element of danger present. There is usually a catch, which the mortal has not anticipated either through their own folly, or through divine scheming, which will soon be made painfully apparent. The giving of immortality is an especially keen double-edged sword. Once Kaineus has been granted immortality, it is only a matter of time before he comes to a sticky end. There is a certain practical necessity to this, in so far as Kaineus is no longer present so some explanation must be offered for his disappearance. Being bludgeoned into the ground by centaurs explains his absence from the world, whilst allowing him to maintain a fixed geographical connection to his region. Through gaining immortality, Kaineus bridges the gap between the dying and the undying. The bridging of this gulf encourages him to attempt to transgress another boundary in setting up his spear as an object of veneration and rivalling the gods. The punishment for this cannot be death, as Kaineus has been

[920] Homer *Odyssey*, 11.601-630.
[921] Forbes Irving 1990, 139.
[922] Forbes Irving, 1990, 142.

made invulnerable, so an alternative sentence of eternal confinement inside the earth is issued. Zeus is not the one to strike the blows himself; however, the centaurs are said to be acting on his instruction; and there does seem to be a sense of correcting the balance of things in this episode as Kaineus escapes the subterranean gloom of Hades for an eternity confined within the earth. Zeus is able to reclaim the prerogative of the *athanatoi* without directly negating the gift given by Poseidon.

This crafty negotiation of the nuances of a gift is not unique to this myth. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, Zeus notoriously tricks Eos when she comes to appeal for Tithonos' to be made immortal.[923] Zeus grants Eos request for Tithonos to be made undying, but Eos neglects to ask for her lover to be made un-aging as well. Even with the administration of nectar and ambrosia, Eos is unable to prevent Tithonos from growing older. Eventually, unsure of what else to do, Eos shuts Tithonos away behind shining doors, leaving him to lie in the dark, chuntering nonsense and lacking the strength to move of his own volition. Although this is not explicitly labelled as a punishment, and is attributed to Eos' naivety rather than Zeus' malice by Aphrodite, it is difficult to see this as anything but a punishment for blurring the lines between the dying and the undying. Tithonos is perhaps more sympathetic than Tityos or Sisyphos as he is not actively attempting to make himself immortal, he is carried off by Eos and is presented as rather passive in the episode, but nonetheless he is the one who crosses the boundary. Whilst it is Eos who makes the verbal slip, it would be easy to argue that the sentiment of her request would have been immediately apparent, and, in choosing to ignore the sentiment in favour of a literal interpretation, Zeus selects the option which does the most damage to Tithonos. Eos' lack of detail in the request provides Zeus with plausible deniability; he can completely neutralise her wish, and Tithonos' functional immortality, without breaching the promise he made to Eos.

This interpretation places heavy emphasis on Zeus' desire to avoid fulfilling Eos' request and making Tithonos her eternal, youthful partner. This might seem like it is attributing unnecessary malice to Zeus' decision making, however it does bear scrutiny. From the beginning of the hymn, Zeus is cast as a mendacious figure. His declared goal is to humiliate Aphrodite so that she would no longer cause divinities to fall in love with mortals.[924] The hymn suggests that 'laughter-loving' Aphrodite is matchmaking between the two disparate groups for her own amusement, causing the gods to father mortal sons, and goddesses to lie with mortal men.[925] Zeus' stated intention is to play her at her own game so that she can no longer find amusement in the pairings. This is perhaps unsurprising as Zeus

[923] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 218-240.
[924] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 45-55.
[925] φιλομμειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη: *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 49.

himself is described as vulnerable to Aphrodite's manipulation.[926] But it is notable that Zeus intends to punish Aphrodite in a way which will deter her from matching mortals with immortals rather than simply dissuading her from targeting him personally.

As has already been shown with the punishment of Tityos, the gods take a very dim view of any attempt of a non-Olympian to pair with a goddess. The obvious exception to this being Thetis, who is compelled to marry a mortal on account of the prophecy surrounding her first-born son but who also clearly considers Peleus, her husband, a far from suitable match. Mortal men who attempt to take an immortal lover are often punished, either by the goddess they approach or by another divinity who takes exception to their presumption. The myths repeatedly shown a breach of the divide between mortality and immortality before punishing the transgressor and often reducing their status to below its original position. The boundary is not so much impermeable as rigorously defended by jealous guardians.

4.5) Returning to Olympos

An examination of the application of justice in the mortal world of Archaic Greece offers context when examining the divine world; though it is worth noting that, as has been demonstrated throughout this thesis, the two worlds are never entirely distinct from each other in Archaic Greek thought. What was evident from the evidence on punishment explored at the beginning of this chapter is that the state is minimally involved with the enforcement of criminal law and that a powerful man is often expected to act to defend himself and his household. When the state does involve itself, it is almost exclusively to diffuse tensions which might otherwise build beyond those immediately affected and risk broader social upheaval. Imprisonment is used as a stop-gap measure, designed to contain an individual until judgment or a more suitable punishment such as banishment or exile can be applied. This is one area in which the gods have more restrictions upon them than mortals. Zeus does not have the ability, as far as we are aware, to execute a challenger nor can he exile them from his realm as the realm of the gods encompasses the world. Imprisonment is the only option available to deal with a problematic deity. It is impossible to ostracise or execute a deity, therefore confinement becomes the primary method. However, as Zeus himself demonstrated with the Hundred-Handers, an incarcerated deity is still a threat waiting for freedom and the opportunity to strike. The undying nature of the gods means that no divine challenger is ever full neutralised and

[926] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 33-45.

the more gods who Zeus comes into direct conflict with, the more enemies he has to be on guard against, and the more important it becomes to have a secure location to confine them within.

Tartaros as a prison

The place most associated with confining deities is Tartaros. Tartaros is the third deity who emerges in the Greek pantheon, proceeded only by Gaia and Chaos. Like Gaia, his characterisation is heavily associated with the physical aspects of his domain. Tartaros is described at his introduction by his murky nature and his location in the depths of the earth.[927] It is unusual for a god to be described as permanently positioned inside another deity. When Ouranos confines his children inside their mother it is seen as a wrong which needs to be corrected, but there is no such difficulty for Tartaros. There is perhaps a distinction as there is no implication that Tartaros is constrained or that Gaia finds his presence intrusive, and it is with Tartaros that she produces her final child Typhoëos. Aside from these moments, Tartaros is referred to predominantly as a location rather than as an individual. The primordial deities straddle this line between concept and god in a much less clearly defined manner than the Olympian deities, and the balance with Tartaros leans heavily in the direction of the location rather than the personification.

The descriptions of Tartaros focus heavily on the physical aspects of the domain which are conspicuously similar to the description of Hades.[928] In both cases the enclosed space is gated with bronze, filled with murky gloom and those within its walls are unable to escape without assistance from a powerful outsider.[929] The similarity is interesting, and is thrown into sharp relief by the position of the descriptions within the *Theogony*. The proximity of the descriptions means that it is elaborating on Hades' domain shortly after the description of Tartaros. Like the mortals who pass into Hades, the Titans are hidden beneath the earth in an inescapable and miserable prison. They too must reside in the gloom of a domain sealed by a son of Kronos.

---

[927] Τάρταρά τ᾽ ἠερόεντα μυχῷ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης… 'murky Tartaros in the innermost corner of the broad earth…' Hesiod *Theogony*, 119.

[928] ἔνθα θεοὶ Τιτῆνες ὑπὸ ζόφῳ ἠερόεντι /κεκρύφαται βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο /χώρῳ ἐν εὐρώεντι, πελώρης ἔσχατα γαίης./ τοῖς οὐκ ἐξιτόν ἐστι. θύρας δ᾽ ἐπέθηκε Ποσειδέων /χαλκείας, τεῖχος δὲ περοίχεται ἀμφοτέρωθεν. 'There the Titan gods hid in the murky darkness, by the counsels of cloud-gatherer Zeus, in this dank place at the farthest edge of the broad earth. They cannot leave, for Poseidon, wall builder, placed bronze gates, and a wall runs around all sides.' Hesiod *Theogony* 729-734.
εὐρώεις is used to describe Tartaros in line 739 of the *Theogony* but is also used of the underworld in the *Iliad*, 20.65 and *Odyssey*, 10.512,23.322 as well as in *Works and Days*, 153.

[929] Zeus is able to liberate the Hundred-Handers, and in doing so acquires their loyalty. Hesiod *Theogony*, 660-665.

There is a significance to the positioning of the Tartaros in the depths of the earth, as not all of the gods have such a difficulty with the boundary. The children of Nyx are able to cross the threshold. This is stated very clearly when Nyx and Hemera are described as greeting each other as they pass through the bronze gates, never able to be in the same place as the other.[930] This ability to negotiate the boundary is not restricted to these two, but extends to Hypnos and Thanatos, both of whom live in the same location as their mother. There is an interesting difference between the descendants of Gaia, who can be contained against their will within Tartaros and those of Nyx who can come and go across this boundary as they please. This is a distinction which has interesting connotations, particularly given Tartaros' location within Gaia.

Imprisonment within Gaia

The first figures who are described as confined within Gaia are the children of Gaia and Ouranos. Both Ouranos and Pontos, who are born to Gaia alone, escape this fate, but Ouranos incarcerates all of his offspring within their mother. The children, later termed the Titans[931] by their father, include Okeanos, Koios, Kreios, Hyperion, Iapetos, Theia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Phoebe, Tethys and Kronos, as well as the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers.[932] These children are described as 'the most terrible' and 'hated by their father from the beginning'[933] and are concealed within their mother. The concealment, reminiscent of the episode in the *Enuma Elish*,[934] causes discomfort for both the mother and the children. However, whilst Apsu resolves to kill his children to prevent their uproar disturbing his sleep, Ouranos appears unable to dispose of them in a more permanent manner. Their containment within their mother is either sufficient for his aims, or is the best option available to him at the time. The children are not able to cross the boundary until Kronos castrates their father. There is no elaboration on what actually changes to allow the children to exit Gaia. West suggests that there is a break in the physical link between Gaia and Ouranos at this point, allowing the children into the world. [935] West's conclusion highlights the role of Near Eastern creation motifs, detailing the separation of Heaven and Earth, with the couple being disentangled though the castration. If this is the case then it is perhaps not difficult to understand why Hesiod

[930] ὅθι Νύξ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἆσσον ἰοῦσαι /ἀλλήλας προσέειπον, ἀμειβόμεναι μέγαν οὐδὸν /χάλκεον. 'Where Nyx and Hemera coming nearer to each other call to one another, crossing over the great bronze threshold.' Hesiod *Theogony*, 748-750.
[931] I will be using the term Titans to refer to these children specifically to avoid having to list them in full every time they are referred to.
[932] Hesiod *Theogony*, 126-153.
[933] δεινότατοι παίδων, σφετέρῳ δ᾽ ἤχθοντο τοκῆι /ἐξ ἀρχῆς. Hesiod *Theogony*, 154-155.
[934] This will be discussed in more detail in the appendix.
[935] West 1966, 212.

might have glossed over the finer details. However, the impediment to the emergence is removed and the children are able to exit their mother and enter the cosmos. By contrast Nyx has no such difficulties: her children make their home at the boundary of Tartaros, and, as Nyx has no children by Ouranos, her children are never bound within Gaia by him.

What is interesting is that, whilst the siblings are still within Gaia, they do not become parents themselves. This might seem unremarkable, but it does hold significance, especially when their future partner is confined along with them. If Tethys and Okeanos are going to produce children together, as they do in lines 337-371, then what prevents them from doing this whilst they are inside Gaia? It is possible that there is a need for them to transcend the boundary of birth before they are able to become parents in their own right, but they are clearly mature enough for Kronos to be physically able to enact Gaia's scheme. Not all of the deities marry a sibling, however; it is striking that many are confined alongside their future spouses and do not produce any children during that time. This is in contrast to the *Enuma Elish*, where several generations of children are born whilst the gods are imprisoned within Tiamat.[936] It is impossible to say for certain whether this lack of children is a result of their captivity within Gaia, but it is significant that no child is born from a parent confined inside Gaia, be it this initial period, or from Hades who also described as beneath the earth. Given Gaia's connection with intense fertility it might be expected that she would facilitate rather than inhibit reproduction, but this does not appear to be the case.

The escape from Gaia may not have been universal to all her children. The Kyklopes are next described as imprisoned in deadly bonds by their father.[937] Given Ouranos' sudden and violent defeat, it is unlikely that the Kyklopes are bound by him after his overthrow, which would imply that this relates instead to his initial imprisonment of all of his children. This would imply that when the children of Gaia are released into the world it is only the Titans who are released, and their brothers remain in their prison. This seems problematic as it would mean that Gaia would have kept some of her children within her. Gaia's motivation to act against Ouranos is to relieve the constriction caused by having the children inside her.[938] If the scheme against Ouranos is expressly to relieve the pressure caused by having the children inside her then it would be counterintuitive to leave the Kyklopes there when their siblings were able to leave freely. The possible constraining factor on this

[936] *Enuma Elish* 9-20.
[937] λῦσε δὲ πατροκασιγνήτους ὀλοῶν ὑπὸ δεσμῶν / Οὐρανίδας, οὓς δῆσε πατὴρ ἀεσιφροσύνῃσιν. 'He freed his father's brothers from their deadly fetters, the sons of Ouranos [Kyklopes], whom their father had bound in his folly.' Hesiod *Theogony*, 501-2.
[938] ἣ δ᾽ ἐντὸς στοναχίζετο Γαῖα πελώρη /στεινομένη, δολίην δὲ κακήν τ᾽ ἐφράσσατο τέχνην. 'But gargantuan Gaia was groaning within, becoming full. She pondered a treacherous and terrible craft.' Hesiod *Theogony*, 160-161.

may be that it is Kronos who assumes control after the defeat of Ouranos rather than Gaia, and he may have had a particular interest in keeping his powerful brothers confined. It is possible that this might also be a contributing factor to Gaia's eagerness to help Rhea when she comes to ask for help in protecting her own children. As Vermeule comments, contradictions are an inherent element of Archaic Greek literature, and to worry too much about them can be detrimental to our understanding of the texts, but they cannot be ignored completely.[939]

The description of the restraint of the Kyklopes is particularly interesting as well. The term used translates as 'deadly' bonds or fetters. The Kyklopes are born to divine parents and as such they can be regarded as amongst the 'undying' gods. The immortal state of the gods is defined in Greek through a lack of dying rather than a sense of living endlessly.[940] This might again seem like an insignificant detail but does stress the importance of the fact that natural death is alien to them entirely. When the Kyklopes are bound by their father, their chains are described as 'deadly'. The same word is used by Hesiod of the tribe of women stemming from Pandora.[941] I have argued previously that the acceptance of Pandora, and through her of the race of women, is an acceptance of mortality as it separates the world of men from the world of the gods. The use of this word to describe the fetters suggests that there is a connection being drawn between immobility and mortality among the gods.

The act of rendering a god immobile is as close to death as it is possible to take them.[942] The water of Styx is used as a punishment for any god who is caught swearing a false oath. Any god who comes into contact with the water, having sworn a false oath must lie breathless for a year, not eating or drinking nectar and ambrosia, and once this is complete, they must go for nine more years unable to participate in the assemblies of the gods.[943] As the gods within the Greek pantheon are characterised by their undying nature it is as close to death as a god is said to come, within the texts being examined here.[944] This passage is placed close to a description of the Underworld which highlights the deathlike aspects of the situation. To lie motionless, without taking sustenance or drawing breath, is as akin to a description of the deceased as it is possible to give without actually referring to them as dead and draws attention again to the parallels between death and an inability to act and

[939] Vermeule 1981, 30.
[940] Vermeule 1989, 121.
[941] ἐκ τῆς γὰρ γένος ἐστὶ γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων, /τῆς γὰρ **ὀλώιόν** ἐστι γένος καὶ φῦλα γυναικῶν… 'For from her is the race of female women, for of her is the deadly race and tribe of women.' Hesiod *Theogony*, 590-591. Highlighting in bold is my own.
[942] Vermeule 1989, 125.
[943] Hesiod *Theogony*, 793-805.
[944] Both Zeus and Dionysos do have myths around their deaths, but these are not explored in Archaic Epic so are not discussed here.

interact with others. This lack of agency is similar to the gods in Tartaros who are unable to exert their power beyond the boundaries of their prison, and to the Kyklopes in their bonds.

In keeping the Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers imprisoned Kronos neutralises their immediate threat, but also offers the chance for Zeus to liberate them from their confinement. Zeus is able to release his uncles, and in doing so is able to secure the thunder and lightning, and the allies, needed to secure victory over his father. The act of bringing these disenfranchised figures back from the political and social death of Tartaros is enough to cement their loyalty. Returning their agency returns their power which then allows them to reinforce Zeus' position.

The Imprisonment of Ares

This link between immobility and death is not only found in Hesiod but is also demonstrated in the *Iliad* in a fascinating episode in which Ares is imprisoned by the sons of Aloeos within a bronze jar.[945] The incarceration of Ares is an exceptional moment within the literature as it goes a stage further than suggesting that incarceration functions as a substitute for death, where the deity is so incapacitated and lacking in agency that they are functionally deceased, and implies that prolonged captivity can lead to death. Ares is imprisoned for thirteen months, and this period of time is enough to take him to the brink of destruction. The unusual aspects of this story have been explained by Strutynski as a reflection of the Indo-European origins of Ares.[946] Strutynski suggests that Ares is following a tripartite pattern similar to mortal heroes such as Indra, or Herakles which eventually culminates in their ascent to immortality. Unlike his mortal counterparts, Ares is already a deity and would have no need to complete tasks in order to ascend to from the mortal realm to the divine. Though this episode perhaps suggests that the boundary between the two is thinner than perhaps would be generally acknowledged.

The materials used to imprison Ares are, I think, particularly telling. Once again there is a reference to bronze, just as at the gates of Tartaros, and the vessel is described as *keramos*, or an earthen jar. By placing Ares within a vessel made of earth, the sons of Aloeos mimic the conditions of both

[945] τλῆ μὲν Ἄρης ὅτε μιν Ὦτος κρατερός τ᾽ Ἐφιάλτης /παῖδες Ἀλωῆος, δῆσαν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ /χαλκέῳ δ᾽ ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας /καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο, /εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια / Ἑρμέᾳ ἐξήγγειλεν. Just as Ares suffered when mighty Otos and Ephialtes, sons of Aloeos, bound him in mighty bonds, and in a bronze vessel he was bound for thirteen months, and even then, Ares, insatiate of war, would have perished if not for the beautiful stepmother [of the sons of Aloeos], Eëriboea, telling Hermes. Homer *Iliad*, 5.385-390.

[946] Strutsynski 1980, *passim*.

Tartaros and Hades. The god is contained within a confined space, and is unable to breach the boundary of that space from within. It is also implied that the gods cannot see or interact with Ares at this time, as he must wait thirteen months before Hermes is notified by Eëriboia and is able to come and release him from his bonds. Either the gods do not know he is there, or they choose to leave him in the vessel until the last opportunity to rescue him. The earthenware jar, coupled with its bronze detailing provides Ares with his own personal Tartaros. It restricts his ability to operate in any realm as well as physically containing him in a fixed location. The extended confinement not only renders Ares practically lifeless by removing his agency, but runs the risk of actually killing the god.

The choice of Hermes as a rescuer may also imply a connection to the underworld, as Hermes is one of the few deities who can move freely between the worlds of the living and the world of the dead. Hermes' ability to move between these worlds is demonstrated in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter,* when it is Hermes who is sent to instruct Hades to send Persephone to Demeter.[947] Though it is by no means clear that Hermes could have compelled Hades to allow Persephone to leave, it is significant that it is Hermes who carries her from the underworld back to the world above on his chariot. Persephone, though queen of the dead, cannot cross back out of that realm without assistance from Hermes. The involvement of Hermes in freeing Ares could then be considered as a similar act of transference. Hermes is the one to release Ares because he is the one with the power to convey between the realm of the living and the realm of the dead.

Hermes' ability to move between these spaces is a recognition of his liminal position between god and mortal. This is an element of his character which has been observed by previous scholarship, Versnel's chapter on Hermes' desire to eat is particularly interesting in this regard.[948] Versnel highlights that during the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, Hermes wavers on the boundary between mortality and immortality as he slaughters two of the immortal cattle and deliberates over whether to eat them. Hermes' position as an outlier could possibly be indicated by the conditions of his birth. Hermes is a son of Zeus and Maia. Maia is a daughter of Atlas, who is in turn a cousin of Zeus. There is no ambiguity over his divine pedigree, however his position as a god is far less certain. Hesiod does not elaborate on the particulars of the story, and Hermes' birth is dealt with in two lines within the Theogony; however, in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* more details are provided.[949] The hymn details that Maia is a shy goddess who avoids the company of the gods and dwells in a shady cave.[950] It is in this cave that Hermes is conceived and born. Caves are at the boundary, sitting both above and

[947] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 334-392.
[948] Versnel 2011, 322.
[949] Hesiod *Theogony*, 938-9.
[950] ὃν τέκε Μαῖα, /νύμφη ἐυπλόκαμος, Διὸς ἐν φιλότητι μιγεῖσα, / αἰδοίη, μακάρων δὲ θεῶν ἠλεύαθ᾽ ὅμιλον, /ἄντρον ἔσω ναίουσα παλίσκιον. *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 4-6.

below the earth which is why they are so often linked with passage to the underworld.[951] By having Hermes born in a cave, the poet highlights his transitional role with a foot in both worlds.

Conclusion

The Epic poems highlight that there is no shortage of potential challengers to Zeus' authority. The style of the threat varies and each attempt requires a different response from Zeus. The primary difficulty is the inability to permanently remove an immortal, whether they were born or became immortal from existence. This means that the most effective form of punishment that Zeus can employ is incarceration. The first instance in which Zeus does this, chronologically, is with the incarceration of the Titans within Tartaros. After the long and terrible battle, the Titans are defeated by Zeus and his allies and they are cast into Tartaros. As discussed above, Tartaros is initially placed within Gaia, which suggests that the Titans return to within their mother. There is a slightly different description of the boundaries given in this passage as the gates are here described as marble rather than bronze, although the threshold itself remains bronze.[952] The Titans driven from the sky and the company of the other gods must exist in this space which mirrors the underworld, hidden in the murky gloom and unable to extend their reach beyond that space.[953] The imprisonment of the Titans within Tartaros places them as far below the earth as the earth is below the heavens in Hesiod's account, emphasising the scale of the distance between the locations.[954] Unlike imprisoning a mortal, confining an immortal to Tartaros does not have a material cost to the community. The imprisonment is not without peril, however, as a confined god may be released and add their strength to any potential challenge, just as the Hundred-Handers supported Zeus against Kronos.

The similarities between Tartaros and Hades, both in location and nature, are numerous and cannot be coincidental. The need to distinguish between the two locations suggests that there was a need to keep the confined deities separate from the dominion of Hades, but that the two spaces represent a need to contain both the shades of the mortals and any deities that proved problematic. The subterranean aspect of both regions is especially interesting as it echoes the initial confinement of the children of Gaia and Ouranos within their mother. The boundary of Gaia is impermeable to Kronos and his siblings until the castration of Ouranos, and continues to restrict the movement of

[951] Giannakis, 2000, 193.
[952] Hesiod *Theogony*, 811-814.
[953] Faraone explores the power of Kronos and the Titans in later magical spells; however, these are significantly later than Archaic Epic poetry. Faraone 2010, *passim.*
[954] Hesiod *Theogony*, 721-729.

other potentially challenging figures such as Kaineus. Eternal imprisonment beneath the earth, immobile and helpless is a prospect perhaps as frightening as death itself as it mimics many of the aspects of death whilst allowing the individual to maintain a conscious awareness of their suffering and the knowledge that it will extend indefinitely. The combination of earth with bronze appears to be particularly effective against gods, as a bronze barricade is extended around Tartaros and bronze gates are set at its access point.[955] This combination of earth and bronze is potentially also present in the vase which Ares is captured in, as the combination of ceramic and metallic fastenings is able to hold a deity against his wishes. It is also impossible to ignore Pandora's nature as an artifice formed from *gaia*, or earth[956] and who carries with her a *pithos* which is able to contain the evils which are then unleashed upon mankind only when the jar is opened.[957]

As a leader in a precarious position, Zeus must rely on punishment not only to serve as a deterrent but also to ensure that he is never seen to lose face in front of the other deities. Insurrection must be dealt with swiftly, and brutally, to reinforce Zeus' continued position at the top of the social order. There is no space for Zeus to show leniency or mercy as this would give the impression of concession rather than compassion and would only undermine his own position. Zeus rewards those who show loyalty, such as Styx, and offers protection to deities who might otherwise be at risk of abuse, such as Hekate, but this is akin to the gifts of the Big-Man discussed in the first chapter. No gifts are neutral and their acceptance ties the deity into Zeus' network, thus increasing his own power. The agonistic model used to structure the hierarchy of the Homeric heroes is also applicable to the gods. As the figure at the head of the pantheon, Zeus stands to lose the most from any challenge to his authority, and offers potential challengers the greatest chance to improve their own position.

[955] Hesiod *Theogony*, 726-733.
[956] Hesiod *Theogony*, 571-2.
[957] Hesiod *Works and Days*, 90-100.

5) Conclusion

This thesis encourages the reader to view the perception of the gods in Archaic verse as embedded in the political and social orders of their poets. When Hesiod or Homer describe Zeus as a *basileus*, or presents Hera as his wife, there are ideas which are associated with these concepts and which would have had resonances with their audience. Whilst these ideas may be idealised or distorted by the immortal nature of the gods, they must have been recognisable in order to convey meaning. The poets are, of course, often describing events which are not part of day-to-day life and would have been outside of the lived experiences for their audience. But one might be reminded of the *Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* where stories are told of the golden age of the Galactic Empire 'when men were real men, women were real women, and small furry creatures from Alpha Centauri were real small furry creatures from Alpha Centauri.'[958] Even if the world presented does not match the historical record exactly, the idealised version is extremely valuable in exploring the values of the communities portraying it.

At the very beginning of this thesis, I stated that my aim was to explore the power dynamics of the family of the gods. Initially, I had thought that the focus would be on the familial roles; the relationships between parents and their children, as the extended family network. The construction of the pantheon as a family is so prevalent in mythology that it is extremely difficult to find a clear example of a group of gods who are not connected by blood or marriage. The desire to present their gods as one related network is not unique to the Greeks, however, their understanding of the implications of those relationships is integral to understanding how they conceived of their gods. This is most clearly shown by the presentation of Zeus as both 'father' and '*basileus* of gods and men'. The association between fatherhood and political leadership which Brock suggests becomes more prevalent in the 6th Century BC, but which can clearly be seen amongst the gods in Hesiod and Homer.[959] Despite his numerous liaisons, Zeus cannot be described as the father of many key deities, nor is he ever referred to as the creator of man within these surviving poems. Placing Zeus as father suggests that the role has importance beyond the biological within Archaic thought.

The conflation of family and political roles led me to question the nature of Zeus' authority. The role of the mortal *basileus* has been explored by Classicists, Ancient Historians and Archaeologists who have, quite rightly, challenged the understanding of the role. The initial interest in the Bronze Age of Greece owes a lot to the writings of Homer, but this brings with it its own perils. When figures such

[958] Adams 1979, 118.
[959] Brock 2013, 25

as Schliemann were excavating, they were looking for the jewels of Priam and the palaces of Homeric heroes and, accordingly, they found them. As discussed in the first chapter, subsequent scholarship has posed significant challenges to the existence of kingship in Ancient Greece, both in the archaeological record and within the poems themselves. What has been notably absent from this discussion is the impact that this would have on the representation of Zeus as a *basileus.* Through examining the evidence for the historical *basileus* and comparing Zeus' behaviour, as presented in the *Theogony*, I have challenged the presentation of Zeus as a king in the modern Western sense of the term. There is no clear evidence of constitutionally sanctioned monarchy in Archaic Greece, in fact the evidence we do have presents members of a highly competitive elite constantly vying to improve their own position, often at the direct cost of their rivals. As the social hierarchy is comparatively fluid, no figure can consider themselves beyond the reach of their peers, and must constantly guard their own position. It becomes necessary for high profile figures to constantly protect themselves and their property, and to be seen to do so. Zeus' position is referred to using the same terminology as his mortal counterparts, and he is consistently associated with their success or failure, which would suggest that his authority should be considered from the same perspective as the mortal *basileus*. In light of this, it becomes impossible to justify the presentation of Zeus as a secure monarch. This is significant because it demonstrates that Zeus' power base is far from secure, and must be constantly guarded and maintained.

The main way in which Zeus can secure his position is to ensure that other figures are invested in his regime. As shown in chapter one, the distribution of gifts is a key aspect of this. By making sure that powerful figures are awarded *time* and protection, Zeus is able to initiate a gift-debt between himself and other deities, such as the Hundred-Handers. The act of giving places Zeus in the position of benefactor and ensures that other deities rely on him for their continued success. This is a significant difference from a ruler who is automatically entitled to their support, or who primarily demonstrates authority by taking away assets by force. The importance of gift-exchange in Epic poetry is well documented, and it is logical that the gods too would rely on an established method, even if the gifts themselves are on a grander scale.

Throughout this thesis, the recurring theme has been the fragility of Zeus' power base. One of the biggest threats that faces Zeus is his own children. In each of the transitions of power within the *Theogony*, the father is overthrown by his son. These coups are violent and plotted by the mother in response to the father's confinement of her children. This troubled relationship is caused by the combination of two sources of friction. The first is the mother's loyalty to her children rather than their father, and the second is the undying nature of the gods. Again, the issue of Greek conceptions of female loyalty is a subject well covered with regard to mortal women, but less attention has been

paid to the expectations of goddesses. It was extremely interesting to compare the social pressures on mortal and immortal women, and fascinating to see that these pressures extend to the goddesses. In particular there are concerns about the loyalty of goddesses which can be seen throughout Archaic Epic, as well as pressure on the goddesses themselves to produce a worthy heir.

The situation is complicated by the conflict between the aspiration of the son and the security of the father. As the father will never age or die, he will never willingly cede authority to a younger figure, however, the next generation will always be eager to fulfil their potential. When Ouranos and Kronos are seen to suppress or confine their offspring, then Gaia and Rhea intervene to further the interests of their children. This fear of the child, which causes the god to act against his children, brings the deity into direct conflict with the mother of his children. However, as shown by Leto and Apollo, when the father allows his child to take their place within the political structure the mother is mollified.

One concept which was inescapable during this discussion of goddesses and motherhood was the tension between matrilineal and patrilineal descent. Whilst the system remains consistently patriarchal, it is significant that the constant intermarriage of family members makes it extremely difficult to establish whether the lines of inheritance run between mother and child or father and child. This tension is highlighted by Zeus' numerous unions with various aunts, sisters and cousins which draw together the disparate lines of the family and secure them into his regime. It is also important that very few of Zeus' daughters take partners themselves, and those that do appear to have married figures who are either already heavily associated with Zeus, or are in some way unthreatening. This is explored in more detail in the appendix as its roots may lie in the Near Eastern influences, particularly the Hittite court where sons-in-law were considered alongside sons of the ruler in matters of succession.

Zeus' power is constantly under threat from a variety of sources, both mortal and immortal. The division between the dying and the undying is one which the poets stress on numerous occasions, but the poems are also littered with figures who cross that boundary. It is easy to neglect the importance of individual enforcement in the Archaic period. The surviving laws and poems consistently emphasise the need for high profile figures to actively defend themselves and their property against challengers or to risk loss of status. For Zeus, as the pinnacle of power, the stakes are the highest as he can only lose status. The need to administer an appropriately unpleasant punishment is thereby essential to maintain his authority.

There are a number of figures in myth who manage to transcend the divide between mortality and immortality, some with greater degrees of success than others. What is extremely interesting about

this is that it means that it is not viewed as impossible, rather the penalty for crossing the boundary is public and eternal. There is an implicit threat to the superiority of the *athanatoi* if mortals are able to make themselves immortal, particularly those such as Sisyphos who do it without the blessing of a deity. The suppression of these figures is akin to Odysseus striking Thersites in the assembly for speaking out of turn, public and violent. The punishment is intended as much to deter emulation as to reprimand the individual responsible. This is significant because it characterises the division of gods and men as something which could potentially be negotiated but which is heavily policed by the gods themselves.

The question of how to punish a god is an intriguing one, and looking at the punishments known from Archaic communities provides an interesting insight into the available options. Fines and exile are both difficult to enforce against deities, and incarceration appears to have been the preferred option for immortal figures. The presentation of Hades and Tartaros are markedly similar and there may be the implication that imprisonment in Tartaros is essentially a living death for the confined deity whose lack of agency renders them essentially inert. The position of both Hades and Tartaros within Gaia is certainly reminiscent of the unborn Titans confined by Ouranos within their mother, and there is perhaps an implication of undoing their creation by returning them to that space. There is certainly a link between containment within Gaia, or as in Ares' case earth in the form of ceramic material, and punishment of the immortals.

The individualistic nature of enforcement in the Archaic *polis* would suggest that when Zeus acts to punish another deity, or an overly ambitious mortal, he is not acting in the interests of the community but in protection of his own personal role. As the head of his household Zeus is responsible for protecting that unit, and any inability, or perceived inability, to do so would undermine his position and authority. There is no room for leniency when it will only be seen as exploitable weakness.

6) Appendix - Near East Connections

As has been demonstrated in the first chapter, the association between Zeus and kingship is fundamentally undermined by the absence of a tradition of kings in the monarchic sense in Mycenaean or Archaic Greece. There are, however, poems which have been found in the Near East from civilisations which did have monarchies, and which have striking similarities to Hesiod's poem. At the heart of the *Theogony* is the 'succession myth' which captures Zeus' rise to supreme authority through a mixture of political manoeuvring and the liberal application of force. At the culmination of Hesiod's composition Zeus secures his place as *basileus* of gods and men, and partners with goddesses to produce the next generation of gods. The transition of the position of ruler from Ouranos to Kronos and then to Zeus forms the central narrative of the poem. However, Hesiod's description of the transmission of power from the Sky-god to the Storm-god is not unique within myth. Notably the Hurro-Hittite *Kingship in Heaven Cycle* (*KiHC)* and the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* see a storm god triumph over previous generations to become ruler of the gods. With the estimated date of composition for the *Enuma Elish* in the 11th Century BC, and the *KiHC* preserved in clay tablets present during the sacking of Hattuša c. 1200 BC, Hesiod's poem can be comfortably dated after these works.[960] The preservation of these poems in written form from a period significantly earlier than the earliest possible dating of Hesiod led West to conclude that the model of the succession myth is an Eastern development which spread into Greece.[961] As Rutherford acknowledges, the similarity of myth between these cultures could reflect a similarity of approach and custom rather than illustrating the exchange of one single myth.[962] However, there are key features of these narratives that heavily suggest that there is significance to the similarities.[963]

The parallels between Hesiod's *Theogony* and the mythology of the Near East have been observed since the 1940s when Güterbock published an article on the Hurro-Hittite tablets.[964] Scholarship has generally accepted that there is an interaction between the cultures of the Near East and the Greeks.[965] The field is not without contention, and particular criticism has been made of the term

[960] See discussion in Güterbock 1948, 123; Heidel 1963, 13; Lambert 2013, 3; López-Ruiz 2010, 90-91; Walcott 1966, xi; West 1966, 20-22.
[961] West 1966, 24 and 40. See also López-Ruiz 2010, 8.
[962] Rutherford 2009, 19-21.
[963] These similarities will be discussed in more detail below.
[964] Güterbock's original article was published in 1946 with a second article in English following in 1948. Güterbock 1948. See also discussion in Hoffner 1990, 40; and Rutherford 2009, 10.
[965] The following works deal with this extensively: Burkert 2004; Burkert 1998; Meltzer 1974; Rutherford 2009; Scully 2006, 50-67; Webster 1964; West 1966, 20-21; and West 1997.

'Near Eastern' which appears to group a large number of individual cultures and a vast chronology together into one mass.[966] The term is retained here, as in Burkert and West, due to the complex interrelationships between these civilisations which makes it extremely challenging to examine these cultures in complete isolation. Scholarship may agree that there is contact between the Near East and Greece, but there is very little consensus on how and when specific information may have been exchanged. The moment of transmission of myth, especially those which may have been transmitted orally, is extremely difficult to fix.

There are three key points which have been highlighted as periods of heightened interaction between Greece and the Near East:[967]

- c. 1400-1200 BC[968]
- c. 1200 -1000 BC[969]
- c. 800 BC

These three periods have attracted the attention of scholars because the material culture indicates that there was active exchange between Greece and the Near East during these times. Blackwell highlights that, alongside Hittite objects recovered from sites on the Aegean, there are similarities between Anatolian and Mycenaean building styles which seem to be too specific to be accounted for by general trends.[970] These objects offer tangible evidence that the cultures of the Near East and the Aegean are both aware and interested in each other long before Hesiod. The connection demonstrated by object exchange extends into religious iconography during this period as well; the Mycenaeans adopt the statuette of the armed warrior god previously associated with the Syrio-Hittite region.[971] The adoption of the statuette is of significance because it demonstrates that the Mycenaeans are adopting and adapting elements of Near Eastern religious iconography into their own. To be clear, I do not think that the Mycenaeans are simply copying this iconography passively, but that they are selectively adapting the elements that they find useful or interesting to suit their own purposes.

The transmission of objects and information between cultures is a contentious issue. Transmission has been understood as a dominant culture asserting its superiority over a less advanced culture. West, in particular, was a strong advocate for this view, going so far as to describe the dissemination

[966] Burkert 2004, 4; West 1997, vii-ix.
[967] See discussion in Rutherford 2009, 31-31; Scully 2015, 50-51; West 1997, 625.
[968] West 1997, 5.
[969] Burkert highlights that the dating of the *Enuma Elish* to the 11th Century BC may make the poem too young to have been transferred during these earlier periods. Burkert 2004, 32.
[970] Blackwell 2014, 477.
[971] Burkert 1992, 19.

of culture as similar to a gas spreading from areas of high to low concentration.[972] The difficulty with this view is that it portrays the society which is adopting elements as devoid of culture. The Mycenaean world was not a void waiting to be filled, it was an established civilisation with its own thriving culture which chose to incorporate elements of another culture. As Burkert argues, the adoption of features from another culture demonstrates that civilisations cannot develop entirely independently from their neighbours and are engaged in a 'continuous process of learning' and 'willingness to learn.'[973] The Mycenaeans were in contact with a civilisation who communicated power through specific visual language and they chose to adopt and adapt elements that they found helpful to communicate their own ideas of power.

After the collapse of the Mycenaean palaces it might be expected that the contact between Greece and the Near East might break down or collapse. Burkert demonstrates that this is not the case; contact never breaks down, and in fact the number of imports from the Near East increases during the ninth and tenth centuries, peaking in the eight and seventh.[974] Burkert also highlights that the temple building that becomes a key feature of *polis* development in the Archaic period appears to follow Near Eastern examples rather then Mycenaean or Minoan architecture; and the Near Eastern influences on the Greek alphabet are well established.[975] The sustained interest in Near Eastern religious iconography is evident too, with the cult statue of Artemis at Ephesus and the cult statue of Hera and Zeus from the sanctuary at Samos showing Near Eastern influences.[976] The Orientalising period is so called because of the broad range of motifs and images found in Greek art which are inspired by Near Eastern models. This broad interest may have extended into the culture of oral poetry however this is difficult to establish beyond doubt. Burkert highlights that there are specific features of Greek Epic verse which are also found in Near Eastern Epic poetry. The use of 'long verse which repeats itself indefinitely without strophic division' and repeated epithets are two stylistic markers, whilst there are significant similarities in the subject matter of the poems.[977] The marked similarities of form in both literary and visual mediums suggest that these two cultures are aware of each other.[978]

Given the extended interaction between Greece and the Near East it is near impossible to pin down the exact moment when ideas were exchanged. Scholars are understandably reticent to offer a

[972] West 1997, 1.
[973] Burkert 1992, 129. See also Hoffner 1998, 11 and López-Ruiz 2010, 19.
[974] Burkert 1992, 12 and 15.
[975] Burkert 1992, 20 and 25; Burkert 2004, 13-14.
[976] Burkert 1992, 20 and 94; Burkert 2004, 32.
[977] Burkert 1992, 115.
[978] Similarities between Greek and Norse Epic have also been observed. Wanner 2009, 213.

definite answer. Guthrie expresses this difficulty rather eloquently when he writes '[i]n trying to penetrate the fog of preliterary antiquity we are dealing with a subject where certainty on many things is impossible and probability or improbability is the most that we can allege.'[979] It is implausible to suggest that Greece could have developed in complete isolation from the cultures of the Near East. There is evidence of craftsmen moving between the regions, either through patronage or through practical needs such as avoiding areas of conflict.[980] People moving between areas would have carried with them their possessions and their culture. With an interchange of both people and objects, the opportunities for small scale interaction are almost limitless.[981] This need not have been on Greek soil to have an impact on Greek culture; West views Syria as the key location of interaction, 'where Greek, Hittite, Hurrian, Mesopotamian and Egyptian elements all come together.[982]

The relationship between Greece and the Near Eastern cultures is complicated and extends over a significant period of time. One element that can be safely established is that the Greeks are in contact with the Near Eastern cultures before the composition of the *Theogony* and that the Epic poems of the Near East predate Hesiod's composition. This is important to consider when approaching the *Theogony*. As shall be demonstrated below, there are marked similarities between the *KiHC*, the *Enuma Elish* and the *Theogony*. These extended similarities show that these three poems are influenced by each other and engaging with issues which retain their importance cross culturally. It is extremely interesting that a poet in Archaic Greece would choose to engage with a Near Eastern cosmological myth when composing his own account of creation. Despite its clear influences, Hesiod's *Theogony* is not simply a copy of the earlier poems and there are key differences between the poems as well as similarities. These will be discussed in more detail after a short summary of the three major poems under discussion.

6.1) The Texts

Hesiodic Succession Narrative

The succession myth in Hesiod is relatively well known but it is worth providing just a basic overview at this point, not least because my decisions on which features of the myth are important to highlight will demonstrate to the reader the key elements which inform my understanding of the

[979] Guthrie 1950, 58.
[980] Burkert 2004, 8.
[981] See López-Ruiz 2010, 2-6.
[982] West 1997, 4.

myth. Hesiod's version of the narrative is detailed in the *Theogony* between lines 104-962. The poem contains many interesting episodes alongside the succession myth which I have omitted to focus on the linear narrative of the myth.

The first entity to emerge in Hesiod's cosmogony is the grammatically, gender neutral Chaos. The next to come to be is Gaia, who is described as the foundation for the deathless ones, Tartaros, Eros, Erebus and Nyx.[983] The use of 'come to be' is deliberate; the verb used is γίγνομαι which can be translated as 'to be born' but in this instance there does not appear to be anything to be born from. If we decide to acknowledge Chaos as the first parent then it still leaves the awkward matter of where Chaos is born from. The first female deity to give birth is Nyx, who produces children both with Erebus and through parthenogenesis.[984] Gaia swiftly follows her example, giving birth to Ouranos and Pontos without a partner before uniting with Ouranos to give birth to the Titans. The youngest of these children, Kronos, is described as the most terrible and born with a hatred of his father Ouranos.[985] Gaia goes on to produce the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers, all of whom are hated by their father who hides them away inside their mother. Unable to tolerate this, Gaia appeals to her children for assistance. She reveals her plan to them but requires one of them to act as her agent. The rest of the children are too afraid to act, but Kronos volunteers, echoing his mother's claim that Ouranos was the first to think of shameful things.[986] Gaia rejoices in the news and sets Kronos in ambush for his father. When Ouranos next comes to make love to Gaia, Kronos is able to castrate him using a jagged-toothed sickle provided by Gaia.[987] Aphrodite is born from the white foam of the discarded phallus, and the Erinyes and Giants are born from the blood which falls onto the earth. Ouranos rebukes his children for their wicked deed and foretells that the act will not be unavenged.[988]

Hesiod then returns to his genealogy, providing detailed lists of the unions of gods and their progeny. In line 253 the succession narrative is resumed as Hesiod describes the union of Rhea and Kronos and their children. Rhea is another daughter of Gaia and Ouranos who is overpowered by her brother and produces Hestia, Demeter, Hera, Hades and Poseidon. All of her children are swallowed by Kronos who is concerned by a prophecy that he will be overthrown by one of his children. This is the first time that Kronos is referred to as being a ruler or having the power of a *basileus*.[989]

[983] Hesiod *Theogony*, 116-7.
[984] Hesiod *Theogony*, 124, 214.
[985] Hesiod *Theogony*, 137-8.
[986] Hesiod *Theogony*, 166, 172.
[987] Hesiod *Theogony*, 180.
[988] Hesiod *Theogony*, 210.
[989] ἔχοι βασιληίδα τιμήν. Hesiod *Theogony*, 462.

Unhappy with the fate of her children, and fearing for the child yet to be born, Rhea approaches her parents and asks for their assistance to avenge her father and protect her unborn son. They inform Rhea of the events destined to pass and provide her with assistance to conceal Zeus from his father as he is born and to substitute a rock for the baby. Kronos swallows the stone and is none the wiser, allowing Zeus to grow into a mature deity. Once Zeus is grown, Gaia is able to beguile Kronos into regurgitating the stone and the rest of the children.[990] With his siblings beside him, Zeus begins a conflict against the Titans and his father. The war is waged over ten years, with neither side able to bring it to a conclusion, until Zeus recruits the Hundred-Handers to his cause.[991] With the Hundred-Handers to turn the tide of the battle, Zeus is able to seize his moment and strike the final blow. Zeus casts the Titans in to Tartaros, where they are confined by bronze gates.

Once the Titans are defeated, Gaia produces Typhoëos through a union with Tartaros. Typhoëos is a monstrous creature with snake heads with fire and flickering tongues who produces a cacophony of noises. The vocalisations of Typhoëos include a recognisable form of speech, the bellowing of a bull, the sound of a lion, whelping and hissing.[992] The conflict between Zeus and Typhoëos is brief, Zeus strikes down Typhoëos with a lightning bolt. With Typhoëos defeated, Gaia prompts the gods to elect Zeus as both *anax* and *basileus* of gods and men. Zeus the learning of a prophecy that a son of Metis will overthrow him, swallows Metis whilst she is pregnant with Athena to prevent the conception and birth of the son.

The Kingship in Heaven Plot

Whilst Hesiod's *Theogony* is well known to those with an interest in Archaic Greek verse, the *KIHC* may be less familiar. The *KIHC* is thought to break down into two shorter sections: the *Song of Kumarbi* and the *Song of Ullikummi*. Thought to have been composed by the Hurrians initially, the *KIHC* is preserved on a series of tablets found in the royal archive in Hittite capital of Hattuša.[993] The tablets themselves were dated by Güterbock to 1400-1200 BC meaning that the version of the narrative they contain can be said to be at least as old as the tablets.[994]

[990] Hesiod *Theogony*, 492-5.
[991] Hesiod *Theogony*, 655-663.
[992] Hesiod *Theogony*, 820-841. For a detailed examination of the sounds of Typhoëos see Brockliss 2018.
[993] Güterbock 1948, 123.
[994] Güterbock 1948, 30; Rutherford 2009, 10-12.

The Hurrian Song of Beginning[995]

The *Song of Kumarbi* begins with an evocation to the primordial gods, urging them to listen to the telling of the narrative. [996] Long ago, we are told, Alalu was king in heaven with Anu, foremost amongst the gods as his cup bearer. This situation lasts for nine years before Anu challenges Alalu, and, having defeated him, drives him into the Dark Earth. Anu then reigns for nine years with Kumarbi, Alalu's son, as his cup bearer. During the ninth year Anu attacks Kumarbi, who retaliates. Anu is not able to match the strength of Kumarbi and attempts to flee into the sky. Kumarbi seizes Anu's legs, as Anu attempts to flee, and bites off Anu's genitals. Kumarbi celebrates his victory over Anu, rejoicing and laughing out loud. Anu reproaches Kumarbi for his rejoicing and tells him that through swallowing his genitals he has impregnated himself with Anu's children: Teššub (the storm god), Aranzah (the river), and Tasmisu, as well as two other gods to burden his insides. With his terrible prophecy delivered Anu withdraws to the heavens to hide.

Kumarbi is distressed by this news and spits out the semen, which when mixed with his spit allows him to spit up something; the text at this point becomes fragmentary which is exceedingly frustrating. After seven months the gestation period is complete. The gods inside Kumarbi begin negotiating with those outside, and Anu begins encouraging them to emerge. There is a great deal of attention paid to the difficulties of a male god giving birth; lacking the necessary bodily parts to deliver a baby naturally the children must be born from another orifice, much to the delight of Anu. The gods waiting to be born are less exuberant and the debate from their perspective focusses heavily on avoiding defilement. In the process KA.ZAL is born from the skull of Kumarbi and bows before Ea.

Kumarbi is still fighting the birth of these children and calls for Ea to return Teššub to him so that he can devour them. Rather than the children Kumarbi devours something hard, possibly a stone,[997] which damages his teeth. The text at this point becomes even more fragmentary and it becomes difficult to make sense of the narrative. It is surmised that within this missing section Teššub is able to wrest control from Kumarbi as the power has transferred before the beginning of the *Song of Ullikummi*.

[995] Unless otherwise stated, the translation of the *KIHC* used is Hoffner 1990.
[996] The title of the song is missing due to the condition of the clay tablet meaning that it is unknown to us. The text is previously referred to as the *Song of Kumarbi* although Corti reconstructs the title to the *Song of Beginning* or *Song of Genesis*. Corti 2007, 109, 119-120.
[997] López-Ruiz 2010, 92.

Song of LAMMA

Teššub and Sauska, his older sister, are speaking when Sauska is pierced by an arrow. A second arrow is loosed, by LAMMA and the siblings run to the chariot but are unable to escape. LAMMA takes the reins of the chariot from Teššub, which transpire to be sacred. Teššub instructs LAMMA of the constrictions on the reins before the text breaks off for approximately thirty-forty lines which most likely contains the section in which Ea makes LAMMA ruler of the gods.[998] LAMMA rejoices at this and travels up to heaven, at which point the text becomes rather fragmentary again. Picking up again, LAMMA refuses a request from Kubaba to show deference to the previous generation of gods, called the Primeval Gods. Upon hearing this carried upon the winds Ea becomes enraged and he and Kumarbi turn away from the new and complacent king.

Ea sends a messenger to LAMMA to rebuke him for failing in his duties as a ruler. LAMMA rejoices to hear this, but Ea now considers him a deposed ruler and plots with Izzummi to mobilise the animals of the earth against LAMMA. At the conclusion of the hymn LAMMA is, from the surviving fragments, violently removed from power.

Song of Hedammu

Once again, the text is highly fragmentary, but the outline can be understood as follows. Kumarbi schemes with the Sea God, meeting with him secretly. The Sea God gives Sertapsuruhi, his daughter, to Kumarbi in order to produce Hedammu who will challenge Teššub for his position as ruler of the gods. Hedammu is described as a serpent god with a monstrous appetite for all manner of creatures. Sauska discovers Hedammu and rushes to inform the other gods, not stopping for food or drink on her arrival. Teššub weeps at the news of the terrible new challenger.

Ea, in his role as the king of wisdom, asks Kumarbi why he is harming mankind. He emphasises that if mankind is destroyed they will cease sacrificing and the gods will have to till the land themselves. Kumarbi is angered by this public rebuke and indignant that Ea should take mankind's side in this matter. He raises up Hedammu against Teššub and again the text is too fragmentary to continue this narrative from this point. Picking up later Teššub informs Sauska that he intends to fight Hedammu. Sauska pre-empts this, she goes to the bathhouse and anoints herself with oil adding to her allure. She then takes Ninatta and Kulitta along with her as musicians, and visits Hedammu. Hedammu is struck by her charms, and Sauska is able to elicit a strong enough sexual reaction from him to cause

[998] Hoffner 1990, 46.

him to leave the sea. The text breaks off at this point but Hoffner assumes that in the missing section Hedammu is defeated whilst he is on land.[999]

The Hurrian Song of Ullikummi

The very beginning of the tablet is broken away once again, but the poet's declaration that they will sing of Kumarbi is still legible. Kumarbi has been deposed and is making plans against Teššub, once he has a plan in mind, he sets out from Urkis and arrives at the Cold Spring. At the Cold Spring there is a rock of gigantic proportions which Kumarbi thrusts his penis into numerous times. Impaluri sees Kumarbi doing this and rushes to tell the Sea God. The Sea God sends Impaluri back to Kumarbi to ask why Kumarbi has come against them in violence. When Kumarbi arrives at the Sea God's house he is invited to dine with them, which he does.

After a break of several lines, a son is born to Kumarbi and the rock. The goddesses of Fate and the Mother goddess set the child on Kumarbi's knee and Kumarbi plays with the child. He names the child Ullikummi and outlines his plans for Ullikummi to destroy Teššub and the other gods. Kumarbi then sends Impaluri to summon the Irsirra deities so that they can guard the child until he comes of age.

Ullikummi grows at a rate of one *ammatu* a day, or one *iku* a month. The height is emphasised by the description of his height on day fifteen, with the sea lapping around his knees. At this height he is unable to hide from the gods, and he is seen by the Sun God who rushes to tell Teššub. He is in such a hurry to give the news that he refuses the food and drink before he has told Teššub about Ullikummi. There is a break in the text where the news must be delivered to Teššub. Teššub is angry and, after inviting the Sun God to eat and drink again, he joins with his siblings Tasmisu and Sauska to investigate Ullikummi. Teššub is initially overcome by the sheer scale of his foe, but Sauska attempts to defeat Ullikummi by seducing him. She is unsuccessful as he can neither see nor hear her. She returns to her brothers defeated. Teššub and Tasmisu then prepare for battle against Ullikummi. During the conflict with Ullikummi, Teššub is cut off from his wife Hebat who fears that he has been lost. Tasmisu and Teššub hold a war counsel to try and come up with a strategy to defeat Ullikummi. They decide to approach Ea who is able to provide them with the copper cutting tool used to separate heaven and earth, which will allow Teššub to cut off Ullikummi off at the base and Teššub is able to defeat Ullikummi.

[999] Hoffner 1990, 51.

The *Enuma Elish*[1000]

The Babylonian epic, the *Enuma Elish*, details the birth of the gods and the establishment of order within the cosmos. Heidel highlights that it is problematic to refer to the text as a creation myth as though the narrative details the creation of the world it does not prioritise it.[1001] The text instead provides a genealogical sequence for the gods and details Marduk's rise to power.

Apsu and Tiamat beget their children in a time when heaven and earth had not yet been named. Lahmu and Lahamu are born to them, then Anshar and Kishar. Anu is then born to Anshar, as his heir, described as the 'rival of his fathers'.[1002] Anu fathers Nudimmud, who is even stronger than his father and grandfather. As with Gaia in Hesiod's version, there is the implication that the gods after Apsu and Tiamat are not fully born as they move about within Tiamat causing her pain and distress. The noise and the raucous behaviour of the gods not only upsets their mother, but also their father who cannot abide the disturbance. Unable to rest, Apsu approaches Tiamat with Mummu, who has existed alongside them since the beginning, and tells her that he plans to destroy the gods inside her and to restore quiet. Tiamat is horrified at the idea of destroying their children, Mummu, however, agrees with Apsu and they plan to destroy the children.

Ea is able to save the children by casting magic over Apsu causing him to fall asleep. Whilst Apsu is asleep, Ea steals the 'splendor' of Apsu, the band and tiara which signify his power, and then kills him.[1003] Ea builds his dwelling upon Apsu and subjugates Mummu. With this accomplished Ea settles in to rule, taking Damkina as a wife and fathering Marduk. Marduk is a delight to his father, being powerful and skilled.

At this point Anu stirs up the winds, and Tiamat is disturbed by them. The gods mutter at Tiamat, accusing her of abandoning her husband and failing to avenge his loss. Tiamat is driven to act, she calls up her allies, including Mother Hubur and summons monstrous creatures including serpents and dragons to fight on her behalf. She also raises up Kingu, her first born, to power by making him her spouse and giving him the tablet of destines.

When Ea hears of Tiamat's actions he is overcome by fear and asks his grandfather Anshar for advice. Anshar instructs him to go to Tiamat and to quieten her spirit. Ea approaches Tiamat but is

[1000] The translation used is Heidel 1963.
[1001] Heidel 1963, 11.
[1002] *Enuma Elish* 1.14.
[1003] *Enuma Elish* 1.67-69.

unable to bear her presence and returns to his grandfather. With the gods in despair, Ea summons Marduk and asks him to confront Tiamat on their behalf.[1004] Markduk agrees to be their champion but only on certain conditions: firstly, that he shall speak destinies rather than his father, secondly that his creations shall be unaltered, and finally that his commands will be obeyed.[1005]

Anshar summons all of the gods, even those who have joined Tiamat sending a messenger to give the news. Lahmu and Lahamu are outraged by Tiamat's actions and attend the assembly. During this assembly Marduk is made commander amongst the gods, and his power is proven by destroying a garment with a command, and then restoring it with a second.[1006] With this being done, Marduk is given the sceptre, throne and royal robe, alongside an irresistible weapon to use against Tiamat.[1007] Taking up his weapons he heads out to face Tiamat.

When Marduk faces Tiamat he lists her transgressions which include raising up Kingu, building an army and attempting to supplant the authority of Anu. The two then enter into combat with Tiamat using her magic against the weapons of Marduk. Marduk is able to capture her in his net, and when she opens her mouth to devour him, he uses the winds to engorge her before shooting through the open mouth and splitting her heart. The remainder of the rebels are swiftly rounded up and imprisoned, including Kingu who counts as a 'dead god' from this point. Marduk claims the tablet of destinies and uses Tiamat's body to form the heaven and the earth, establishes the twelve months and the movement of the moon.[1008] Next Marduk creates man to work on behalf of the gods and save them from labour. On the advice of Ea, man is formed from the blood of Kingu, and Babylon is erected as a sanctuary for the gods to rest within.

6.2) Comparing the Texts

The summaries of the poems highlight that there is more to the connections between them than a basic similarity of theme. There are five key details which have been observed that appear too specific to have developed completely independently, especially in combination.[1009] They are:

- The progression through generations
- The castration motif

[1004] *Enuma Elish*, 2.92-102.
[1005] *Enuma Elish*, 2.127-129
[1006] *Enuma Elish*, 4.22-26.
[1007] *Enuma Elish*, 4.29-30.
[1008] *Enuma Elish*, 4.135-146 and 5.1-22.
[1009] See footnote 1005.

- The swallowing of a stone
- The birth of a deity through the head of another deity
- A male god conceiving through contact with another god's semen

The reoccurrence of these five key details does not mean that the poets engage with them in the same way and, with the broad similarities agreed, it is important to consider the differences in how these moments are treated by the poet. Walcot cautions against placing too much weight on the similarities when they are far outweighed by the differences, and it is important to consider both when approaching the poems.

Progression through Generations

One of the key similarities which scholars have highlighted is the structure of the succession myth within the poems. Whilst this might initially sound rather obvious, the details are more specific than just the movement of power from one generation to the next. It is notable that the sequences of rulers in all three cases begins with the god of the Sky: Ouranos in Hesiod, and Anu for the Hurro-Hittites and the Babylonians.[1010] It is also significant that in all three poems the final figure to take power is the storm-god: Zeus, Teššub and Marduk. Both the Greek and the Hurro-Hittite poems include a challenger to the Sky-God who castrates the ruler and assumes power himself before being deposed by the Storm-God. Despite being the ultimate ruler, the Storm-God is not free from challengers himself and must survive a challenge from a contender in order to preserve their rule. The similarity between the three narratives is striking, and is not limited to these three cosmogonies alone. López-Ruiz establishes that there is a strong similarity in the succession of power, not only between these three poems but in the Ugaritic texts and the *Phoenician History* as recorded by Philon of Biblos.[1011] The succession of rule begins with the Sky-God and ends with the Storm-God. However, whilst the structure of the myth remains consistent, the manner in which power changes hands and the driving forces behind it are often different and require closer examination.

It is worth noting that the Sky-God is not the first figure to emerge in either the *Theogony* or *KiHC*. There is no explanation for why Ouranos should be ruler when the first figure to emerge is Chaos, aside from perhaps that Chaos is grammatically gender neutral.[1012] Even if Chaos is excluded on these grounds, there are three male deities belonging to the generation above Ouranos who make

[1010] Rutherford 2009, 10-12.
[1011] López-Ruiz 2010, 88.
[1012] Hesiod *Theogony*, 119-120.

no claim to power or authority: Tartaros, Eros and Erebos.[1013] Ouranos is not the first male deity and has no automatic claim to rule. Interestingly, Ouranos is never referred to as a *basileus* or as *anax* within the *Theogony*.[1014] The idea that Ouranos is a ruler is perhaps based more on Kronos' assumption of the role after castrating his father, but the idea of inherited kingship is problematic from the outset.[1015] The ambiguity of Ouranos' position is especially important when contrasted with the *KiHC* where it is clearly stated that Alalu and Anu are kings for nine years each.[1016] It may be that the model of dynastic monarchy is not appropriate to apply to the Greek model. The Greeks have a complex relationship with the concept of kings which leads Faraone and Teeter to suggest that the prominence of monarchy within the myth is reflecting an Egyptian influence.[1017] It would perhaps be simpler to dispense with the idea of kings in the *Theogony* at all. The only power that Ouranos demonstrates is his suppression of his own children within their mother. There is nothing within the texts itself which suggests he holds any broader influence over the pantheon.

By contrast with Ouranos, the Hurro-Hittite Sky-God, Anu, is named clearly as a king and displaces a previous ruler to achieve his position. Whilst Hesiod stops short of referring to Ouranos as a *basileus*, the Hurro-Hittite pantheon is portrayed as a royal court with Anu holding the position of cup-bearer to Alalu during his reign.[1018] Interestingly, Anu has no dynastic claim to the throne as he is not a child of Alalu. His ascent to power is based solely on his ability to defeat Alalu in combat and in doing so he secures his rule. There is no objection from any other deities on the grounds of a rival claim, and no accusation of any wrongdoing on Anu's part. Anu simply steps into position having overpowered his predecessor. The outright conflict between Anu and Alalu interesting, especially when compared to the *Enuma Elish* when Anu's son, Ea, defeats Apsu through cunning; stealing his splendour through cunning before killing him.[1019] Ea is the only deity to kill his predecessor. This is an especially interesting contrast as both other texts stop short of this but then have to deal with the difficulties of the defeated deities' continued existence.

As well as the relationship between the Sky-God and his challenger, the other marked difference at this stage in the narrative is the role of the goddesses. Within the *Theogony*, Hesiod places great importance on the parents of each generation of the gods. West describes this family tree as the 'flesh and blood' of the *Theogony* and highlights how it is used to draw attention to the

[1013] Hesiod *Theogony*, 123.
[1014] Bremner 2008, 9; Detienne and Vernant 1991, 61.
[1015] As discussed in chapter 1.
[1016] *Song of Emergence*, 5-17.
[1017] Fararone and Tecker 2004, 177-180.
[1018] *Song of Emergence*, 12-17.
[1019] *Enuma Elish*, 1.4.

manipulation of the model of the mortal family.[1020] One goddess in particular stands out as integral to the narrative, and that is Gaia. Gaia is at the heart of every action taken within the succession sequence. She bears Ouranos through parthenogenesis, and when he confines their children, she plans the ambush and arms Kronos. When Kronos swallows his own children, Gaia counsels Rhea on how to avenge the wrongs committed by Kronos. Gaia also gives birth to Zeus' final challenger, Typhoëos and, after the defeat of Typhoëos it is Gaia's wiles which secure power for Zeus. At every stage Gaia's influence can be felt; but her central role is conspicuous by its absence within the *KiHC* and the *Enuma Elish*. Gaia is unable to wield power herself, but she consistently pushes forward the interests of each new generation and her actions provide the motivation for major changes within the power structure of Olympos.

Whilst a corresponding maternal figure is simply absent from the *KiHC*, the role could be said to be occupied by Tiamat in the *Enuma Elish*. Both Gaia and Tiamat are born very early in the sequence, Gaia second and Tiamat third in their respective poems, and both provide the structure of the earth.[1021] Gaia and Tiamat are both troubled by the continued containment of their children within their bodies beyond the Both goddesses also elevate their first-born sons, Gaia takes Ouranos as her lover and Tiamat makes Kingu her general.[1022] Despite these similarities, the two goddesses deviate substantially in their loyalties. Gaia is resolutely faithful to her children, whilst Tiamat remains loyal to her partner. This split is made very clear when Tiamat hears that her husband plans to destroy their noisy children, and despite being horrified Tiamat takes no action to protect her children. Gaia may not be able to act against her husband directly, but she does everything short of that to protect her children. Gaia incites her children to action, and even provides the weapon that Kronos will use. Tiamat's loyalty is to her husband, who she will later attempt to avenge, whilst Gaia's resides with her children, the next generation of the pantheon.

Whilst the relationship of the children with their mother is markedly different, the relationship with the father is antagonistic in both the *Theogony* and the *Enuma Elish*. Ouranos and Apsu both confine their unborn children within their mother preventing them from assuming roles within the pantheon. Apsu takes matters a stage further when he proposes destroying his children who disturb his rest with their rowdiness, and rejoices 'because of the evil that he planned against the gods, his children.'[1023] Hesiod's poem makes no reference to any attempt to harm Ouranos' children beyond their confinement, but Ouranos too rejoices at the evil deed of confining of his children.[1024] Both

[1020] West 1966, 31 and 34.
[1021] Hesiod *Theogony*, 117-118; *Enuma Elish*, 1.4.
[1022] Hesiod *Theogony*, 133; *Enuma Elish*, 1.146-158.
[1023] *Enuma Elish*, 52.
[1024] Hesiod *Theogony,* 156-159.

Sky-Gods are actively suppressing the next generation by trapping them within their mothers. The Greek poem stops short of suggesting that Ouranos attempt to kill his children, but Greek myth tends to rely on confinement rather than destruction for troublesome divinities as was explored in more detail in the chapter focussed on dissenters. There are notable similarities between the roles of the Sky-God and the Earth-Goddess within these texts, but there are also important differences which suggest that the poets are adapting rather than copying existing stories to suit their purpose.

Emasculation and Ascendance

The next parallel within the sequence of the succession myth is the castration and overthrow of the Sky-God. This is found within the *Theogony* and the *KiHC* but not the *Enuma Elish* where Apsu has already been killed by Ea.[1025] The parallel between the Hurro-Hittite and the Greek poems is particularly strong and suggests an interaction between the two narratives.[1026] In both instances the challenger castrates and drives out the previous ruler, the Sky-God. The castration of the Sky-God appears to render the deity impotent and allows the challenging god to assume his authority. The combination of loss of rule with emasculation is a fascinating one, and the association of male virility with rulership may explain why the goddesses are unable to hold power in their own right. Having been castrated Ouranos promises vengeance against his son but takes no action himself; instead he is limited to prophesying the forthcoming avenger.[1027] Anu too retreats into hiding after his castration after foretelling the birth of Teššub and his siblings, and the difficulties they will cause for Kumarbi. Neither Sky-God attempts to continue the conflict directly, or to retaliate themselves against their assailant. Kumarbi too makes no direct move against his challenger, but continues to father children intended to threaten Teššub.[1028] There is perhaps a recognition by the defeated god that they have been defeated by a more powerful deity and would not be able overcome that deity in any subsequent conflicts, however this is not openly stated in either poem. Kumarbi demonstrates the danger of leaving the previous ruler alive and intact, whilst Kronos and Kumarbi both prevent the previous ruler from siring any further children.

Kronos and Kumarbi both castrate the Sky-God, which is seen as one of the key motifs linking the poems. However, whilst the act is the same, there are significant variations in their motivation and their social bonds which should be explored. As mentioned above, Kronos is spurred into action by

[1025] López-Ruiz 2010, 91.
[1026] Rutherford 2009, 10-12.
[1027] Hesiod *Theogony*, 207-210.
[1028] These children include LAMMA, Hedammu and Ullikummi.

his mother, Gaia, and even armed by her. Gaia provides the initial spark, but Kronos needs very little encouragement to use violence against his father. The justification for Kronos is that Ouranos was the first to contrive unseemly deeds, but his siblings are far less enthusiastic.[1029] The reticence of his siblings contrasts sharply against Kronos' behaviour, and Kronos acknowledges that he is about to take action against his own father. The prolonged containment within Gaia does not appear to present any threat to the siblings, certainly there is no reference to Ouranos plotting to kill his children as Apsu plans in the *Enuma Elish*. The absence of an imminent threat lessens the urgency of Kronos' actions; there can be no mitigation for self-defence in Hesiod's poem. The willingness of Kronos to harm Ouranos is stressed by the poet when he describes Kronos reaching out 'eagerly' to castrate his 'dear father'.[1030] Ouranos is clearly not dear to Kronos, who states as much less than ten lines beforehand. The emphasis on the paternal bond combined with Kronos' eagerness only serves to highlight the social transgression of a son emasculating his father and stress the hostility of their relationship.

The actions of Kumarbi differ from Kronos' in two important ways. Firstly, Kumarbi does not initiate the conflict between himself and the Sky-God, and secondly, the Sky-God is not Kumarbi's father. The violence between Anu and Kumarbi is sparked by Anu: 'in the ninth year [of his rule], Anu gave battle against Kumarbi.'[1031] It has been suggested that the scribe may have transposed the two deities but in the absence of any alternative copies to check this against this must remain a suggestion.[1032] The timing of the conflict is notable, as Anu attempted to overthrow Alalu, Kumarbi's father, in the ninth year of Alalu's reign, then comes into conflict with Kumarbi in the ninth year of his own rule. It is possible that Anu may have anticipated a coup by Kumarbi, but there is nothing in the text to suggest that Kumarbi was scheming against him. If the surviving version is accurate, then Kumarbi's actions are arguably self-defence rather than self-interest. Kumarbi is able to defeat Anu, and it is as Anu flees that Kumarbi emasculates him. This presents a very interesting contrast between Kronos, who ambushes and mutilates his own father, and Kumarbi, who is attacked by the ruler who deposed his father and responds with violence. The difference in presentation perhaps reflects a need for Kronos to be characterised negatively to justify Zeus' actions against Kronos, his own father.[1033]

[1029] Hesiod *Theogony*, 167-173.
[1030] Hesiod *Theogony*, 180-181.
[1031] *Song of Emergence*, 18-24.
[1032] López-Ruiz 2014, 141.
[1033] For a more detailed discussion of this idea see van Dongen 2011, 191. For a detailed discussion about the complex portrayal of Kronos in Archaic Greek literature see Vernsel 1987, 121-132.

The methods employed by Kronos and Kumarbi in their emasculation of the Sky-God are also notably different. Kumarbi bites off the genitals of Anu, whilst Kronos uses a sickle given to him by Gaia. The difference is interesting and appears to be deliberate as Hesiod describes Kronos' sickle as *karcharodous*, or 'jagged toothed'.[1034] The sickle has long been acknowledged as unusual, Nilsson observed that a toothed sickle is far from ideal as a weapon, and noted its association with Zeus and Herakles on vases, alongside Homer's use of *karcharodous* to describe dogs catching prey in their teeth.[1035] The connection between *karcharodous* and biting in Homer draws a connection between the weapon and concept of biting which Louden has attributed to the personification of the sickle through the use of the adjective.[1036] It is perhaps simpler than this, and the associations with biting are a deliberate echo of Kumarbi's attack against Anu. Van Dongen stresses that the image of a male deity having another deity's genitals in his mouth would have been a difficult image for the Archaic Greeks to engage with.[1037] By keeping the idea of biting, but ensuring that Kronos himself does no actual biting, Hesiod is able to adapt the narrative to make it tolerable to a Greek audience whilst leaving a recognisable trace of the earlier poem.

The motif of usurpation of the Sky-God through castration is a very specific feature which suggests that it is unlikely to have developed in two separate cultures independently. The sustained connections between Greece and the Near East make it likely that the Greeks may have adapted material that they came into contact with. However, even in this very specific instance there are clear differences between the narratives. One is a violent assault against a father who poses no immediate danger to his children, and the other is a retaliation to an attack from the deity who deposed his father. The imagery is closely linked, and the castration of the Sky-God is undeniably similar, and yet the motivation and intention behind the actions is markedly different.

Unnatural Parenthood

Within both the *KiHC* and the *Theogony* there are cases of deities who are born in an atypical manner. It is fascinating that there are not more of these, and that the majority of gods are born to a goddess after a union between two deities of opposite genders. The suffering of Leto in her nine-day

[1034] Hesiod *Theogony*, 180.
[1035] Nilsson 1951, 122 and 124. Homer *Iliad*, 10.360 and 13.198.
[1036] Louden 2013, 196.
[1037] Van Dongen 2011, 196. Two of the surviving Orphic cosmogonies do feature a god ingesting a god, or their genitals and then giving birth to a god. This was considered scandalous by both later Greeks and modern scholars. Isocrates *Bus*, 38. Diogenes Laertius *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, 1.5. Meisner 2018, 71; West 1983, 85.

labour emphasises that even goddesses were not beyond the physical limitations of their gender.[1038] There are, however, births which are far from conventional within the poems. The most obvious of these in the *KiHC* is the enforced motherhood of Kumarbi. Kumarbi's use of his teeth to castrate Anu rather than a weapon brings him into direct contact with Anu's genitals and swallowing Anu's semen allows Kumarbi to be impregnated. In a moment Kumarbi goes from rejoicing at the overthrow of Anu to wailing at the prospect of impending motherhood. There are three motifs from this narrative which the *Theogony* appears to utilise: first, the last burst of fertility from the castrated Sky-god, second, the loss of power of an emasculated god, and third, the impregnation of a male deity through contact with the semen of another god.

The difference in the method of castration used has already been discussed in detail above, however, it is important that Anu's castration ends with his genitals inside Kumarbi whilst Kronos is able to dispose of Ouranos' genitals entirely externally. As a result of this Kumarbi is impregnated whilst Kronos is not. The emasculation of Ouranos is not without offspring as Gaia receives the drops of blood from the mutilation and produces the Melian Nymphs, the Giants and, fittingly, the Erinyes.[1039] This has been seen as an aspect of Gaia's extreme fertility; Gaia is so intimately connected with motherhood and eager to produce children that she can generate life even from the cast-off blood.[1040] However, this could also be considered from the opposite perspective, that Ouranos' blood is fertile enough to cause conception on contact. This may seem perverse, but the birth of Aphrodite suggests that there is merit to this view.

The Birth of Aphrodite

Aphrodite's birth is unusual in the *Theogony,* and has attracted significant interest.[1041] Aphrodite is one of only three goddesses to be born without a mother; the other two are Gaia and Nyx.[1042] Unlike Gaia and Nyx, who are amongst the first to emerge, Aphrodite is born into a world which already has goddesses who could potentially have been her mother; indeed, Homer gives Dione as her mother in alternative tradition.[1043] I suggest that Hesiod's version instead gives Aphrodite two fathers: Ouranos

[1038] *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 90-120.
[1039] Hesiod *Theogony*, 173-187.
[1040] Clay 1993, 108. See also West 1966, 220-221.
[1041] For a useful review of the scholarship on the birth of Aphrodite to 2003, see Budin 2003, 2-6. More recent works include Bachvarova 2016, 323-327; Breitenberger 2007, 19; Leitao 2012, 23; Smith and Pickup 2010.
[1042] Athena may be born from the head of Zeus, but Metis is explicitly listed as her mother. Hesiod *Theogony*, 885-900.
[1043] Homer *Iliad*, 5.370.

and Pontos. The possibility of Pontos as a second father to Aphrodite has been neglected previously as Pontos is a god, and a male deity conceiving a child is unheard of in Archaic Greek myth.[1044] However, if Hesiod is building from the *KiHC* then not only is there precedent for a god to conceive but there is also precedent for a male god to conceive after coming into contact with the semen of the castrated Sky-god. Significantly there is also an Egyptian myth in which Seth is impregnated by eating lettuce which Isis had contaminated with Horus' semen. The unwilling, or unwitting, impregnation of a male god is not unique to the *KiHC*.[1045]

When Kronos casts Ouranos' genitals into *pontos* it is not immediately apparent whether Hesiod is referring to Pontos, or to *pontos*, the sea. The Archaic Greeks do not distinguish between the deity and their domain using upper- and lower-case letters, nor do they differentiate using the gender of the noun or the case used.[1046] This is a problem which particularly effects the primordial deities such as Gaia, Ouranos and Pontos who often share a name with their domain and are envisaged as far more connected with the physicality of their domain than the later, more heavily anthropomorphised Olympians.[1047] The descriptions of the deities often incorporate features of their physical domain which highlights the strong connection between deity and aspect: Ouranos is described as 'starry' and Pontos is 'stirred by swell'.[1048] It is worth considering that this lack of a visual clue in the text places the modern reader in the same position as the audience of the oral poet, who would have to interpret whether Gaia meant the goddess or land from the context of the poem, if indeed they distinguished between the two as clearly as we tend to. In using *pontos* rather than *thalassa* or *pelagos*, both of which are used as alternatives for 'sea' within the *Theogony*, Hesiod is either allowing for ambiguity or, as I suggest, directing the audience to think of Pontos the deity.[1049]

One of the features of this passage which supports this view is the abundance of imagery relating to conception and pregnancy. This has been observed by previous scholars; Bonnafé refers to Aphrodite's development on the water as a pseudo-gestation, and Licht and Hanson both draw attention to the similarities between the foam on the water and the semen that would have been present in Ouranos' genitals.[1050] What is particularly notable is the close association between blood

[1044] Male pregnancy in myth is explored more fully in Leitao 2012.
[1045] Meltzer 1974, 156.
[1046] Stafford 2007, 71-72.
[1047] Stafford, 2007, 71. See also Nelson 1998, 44-45.
[1048] Hesiod *Theogony,* 126 and 132.
[1049] Uses of sea-words in the *Theogony*: *Pontos*: 107, 109, 132, 189, 233, 241, 252, 678, 696, 728, 737, 808, 841, 844. *Pelagos*: 131, 190. *Thalassa*: 413, 427, 728, 790, 847, 872, 931.
[1050] Bonnafé 1985, 32; Licht 1932, 182; Hanson 2000, 16.

and male fertility which is evident in the later medical texts,[1051] and Leitao suggests is also present in the *Agamemnon* when Clytemnestra speculates that being struck with Agamemnon's blood may have impregnated her.[1052] Whilst the medical writers and Aiskhylos are both significantly later than Hesiod, this idea is used within the *Theogony* when Ouranos' blood strikes Gaia causing her to give birth to more deities. When Ouranos bloody genitals are cast into Pontos, the male blood reacts with the fluid of the waves to conceive Aphrodite. The idea of pregnancy is further empasised by the use of *trepho* to describe the gestation of Aphrodite.[1053] As West and Demont have demonstrated, *trepho* is used to indicate gestation in later medical writings and encourages the audience to view Aphrodite's time developing in the waters of Pontos as a pregnancy.[1054]

By comparing Hesiod's account with the *KiHC*, it becomes evident that Hesiod is engaging with the idea of the unwilling impregnation of a male deity after the violent castration of the Sky-God, but takes pains to avoid Kronos swallowing Ouranos' genitals. Instead, Kronos casts Ouranos' bloody genitals into Pontos. The gestation of Aphrodite on the waves and her birth through her delivery to land mitigates the potential difficulties of a male god delivering a child, something which the *KiHC* appears to have revelled in. Kumarbi is an unwitting parent, who fails to fully comprehend the consequences of swallowing Anu's genitals until Anu gloatingly informs him of them. Anu is only too gleeful to deliberate which location the children will be born from given that Kumarbi lacks the appropriate organs for a natural delivery. The text itself is too fragmentary to allow for detailed analysis of the options available to Kumarbi, however enough survives to indicate that delivering the children would be a painful and humiliating experience for Kumarbi and perhaps the children themselves.[1055]

The Swallowed Stone

The next similarity to be discussed is the motif of the swallowed stone. In both the *Theogony* and the *KiHC* the current ruler is presented with a stone which he swallows, or attempts to swallow, in lieu of

[1051] For a more detailed discussion of the medical texts see Boylan1986; Cline Horowitz 1976; Dean-Jones 1994. Interestingly López-Ruiz highlights that the idea of white sperm from Anu and the red heart of Kumarbi also reflect a connection of sperm and menstrual blood and pregnancy. López-Ruiz 2014, 141.
[1052] Leitao 2012, 23.
[1053] Hesiod *Theogony*, 192.
[1054] Demont 1978, 325; and West 1966, 222.
[1055] López-Ruiz 2014, 141-142.

one of his children with the aim of maintaining his rule. Once Teššub is born, through the skull of Kumarbi, Kumarbi demands that Ea return the child to him so that he can devour him. Instead Ea presents Kumarbi with a lump of basalt which Kumarbi then bites into, damaging his mouth and teeth in the process.[1056] When reading this passage, it is difficult not to be reminded of Kronos' attempts to prevent his own loss of power through swallowing his own children. Rhea is eventually able to thwart her husband by presenting him with a rock wrapped in swaddling cloths in the place of her youngest child, Zeus. The attempt to restrain the power of a new god by consuming them is an interesting one and perhaps suggests a desire to undo their birth by returning them to the body of their parent. In both cases, the castrating deity seeks to consume their son, and is tricked into accepting a rock in their place. But, as has been demonstrated with the other points of comparison, there are clear differences despite this remarkable similarity. As West observes, these stories have a logic all of their own and neither can be fully derived from the other.[1057]

The primary difference between the situation of the two deities is that Kumarbi has just given birth to Teššub and is attempting to return him to his own interior, whilst Kronos is swallowing children that were not previously within his body. This means that Kumarbi's actions read as more of an attempt to undo the creation of his son, and his intention to 'smash him like a brittle reed' certainly demonstrates an urge for violence.[1058] This desire to harm his child is made even more obvious by the fact that Kumarbi bites down upon the stone and does so with enough force to damage his teeth. In contrast, the deception of Kronos relies on Kronos swallowing the babies whole and not noticing that he swallows the stone instead. Davidson suggests that by having the children swallowed whole Hesiod deliberately avoids any suggestion of cannibalism.[1059] This not only allows for the children to be born intact, but also avoids any overly gory imagery which would be out of place within the poem. There is one extremely obvious reason that Kronos must avoid biting his children and that is that if Kronos bites then the ruse with the stone will not work. In order for Zeus to pose a challenge to his father, he must have the opportunity to grow from the vulnerable infant into the mighty deity. The underlying difference between Kronos and Kumarbi is the distinction between the intention to contain and to consume. Teššub has already escaped his confinement within Kumarbi once, and Kumarbi now seeks to destroy him, whilst Kronos seeks to contain his offspring.

[1056] *Song of Emergence*, 14.29-38. Hoffner 1990, 44.
[1057] West 1966, 24 and 40.
[1058] *Song of Emergence*, 14.39-54.
[1059] Davidson 1995 363-364.

The concept of confining a deity is an extremely interesting one which was explored in more detail in the third chapter. It is important to note however, that there is a strong, recurrent theme of incarceration throughout the succession myth. The ability, or inability, of a deity to escape their confinement governs the exchanges of power and the continued pressure on the older generations to imprison their descendants reinforces the idea of inter-generational tension. The decision to confine the child is driven by a fear from the father that he will be replaced, and the resentment of the imprisonment unites mother and child against the father. Unlike the *Enuma Elish*, neither the *Theogony* or the *KiHC* engage with the idea of killing a god, thereby permanently removing them from the universe. This inability to dispose of a deity means that gods in conflict must attempt to contain their rivals and find ways to deter others from challenging their authority. The swallowed stone is symbolic of that desire in both poems.

The Birth of Athena

The swallowing of a child is not unique to Kronos, and when speaking of a child born from the skull of a god it is impossible to avoid the birth of Athena. Zeus is informed by Gaia and Ouranos that Metis will bear two children, a daughter and a son, both of which will have great power; the son of Metis is presented by Hesiod as the figure who will depose Zeus.[1060] Zeus does not wait for this unnamed son to be born, instead he places Metis into his stomach whilst she was already pregnant with Athena. This shows a level of forethought which Kronos does not, as by swallowing Metis whilst she was already pregnant not only prevents the son from being born, but prevents him from being conceived. The necessity of this is made evident by Athena's own escape from her confinement inside her father.

The dichotomy of Zeus is similar to that of Kumarbi, and to an extent echoes the discomfort of Gaia and Tiamat who both struggle with the physical difficulties of having fully grown deities within them. Athena's arrival as a fully developed goddess is striking as she emerges, bright-eyed and terrible, from the head of her father.[1061] Beaumont has highlighted that being born fully grown is not unusual for a goddess, and suggests that the avoidance of childhood serves to elevate goddesses above their mortal counterparts; Athena and Aphrodite are both born grown, and there is no surviving representation of Artemis as a child until the fourth Century BC.[1062] However, as Felson observes, there is something very threatening about the birth of Athena which is emphasised in the *Homeric Hymn to Athena* and is also alluded to by Hesiod.[1063] Athena's war-like attributes are stressed within

[1060] Hesiod *Theogony*, 886-900.
[1061] Hesiod *Theogony*, 924-926.
[1062] Beaumont 1998, 71 and 79.
[1063] Felson 2011, *passim*.

the *Theogony*, and Hesiod's description of Athena as *deinos* marks her as a potential danger, as the term is consistently used to show a child as threatening to their parent throughout the poem.[1064] Within the *Homeric Hymn*, Athena is not only described as *deinos* but is born fully armed, and her arrival is greeted with dread by the earth, the sea and Olympos much as the arrival of other challengers such as Typhoëos.[1065] It is only when Athena lays down her arms, which she does of her own volition, that the world is able to breathe easily again, and Zeus rejoices.[1066] Athena's birth reflects the failure of the paternal deity to suppress the birth of their children, and the importance of not allowing Metis to conceive her second child. As Zeus swallowed Metis whilst she was pregnant, it seems likely that the intention was to confine both mother and child. Athena's emergence from Zeus' body is a reminder that Zeus is not in complete control and is potentially vulnerable.

The Final Challenger

The final element which is present in all three of the poems is the final challenger; a figure who provides a physical threat which the Storm-God must overcome in order to cement their power. In the *Enuma Elish*, Marduk defeats Tiamat and Kingu, Zeus overcomes Typhoëos in the *Theogony*, and Teššub has to face a series of challengers fathered by Kumarbi to preserve his rule. The defeat of this final challenger demonstrates the Storm-God's ability to retain their power and highlights the role of physical and mental prowess in their survival. Whereas the similarities explored so far have been most pronounced between the *Theogony* and the *KiHC*, it is the *Enuma Elish* which bears the most striking resemblance to Hesiod's poem. In both the *Enuma Elish* and the *Theogony* the Storm-God comes into conflict with both the Earth goddess and her son, whereas in the *KiHC* the challengers are the children of Kumarbi.

The conflict within the *Enuma Elish* begins when Tiamat, the earth goddess, is accused of abandoning her partner and allowing him to be killed. In response Tiamat makes her son, Kingu, a general and gives him the tablet of destinies before declaring war against her other children for killing their father. Ea, the current ruler is afraid of conflict with Tiamat and Kingu, and Marduk agrees to fight Tiamat on the condition that he becomes ruler in Ea's stead. The antagonist of the situation is Tiamat rather than Kingu, and the conflict reflects that with Kingu being dispatched rather quickly whilst Tiamat poses a more significant threat. This is in contrast with Gaia and

[1064] Felson 2011, 260-1. Hesiod *Theogony*, 925.
[1065] *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 1-18. Hesiod *Theogony*, 842-853.
[1066] *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 16.

Typhoëos, where Gaia gives birth to the challenger and then recedes to the background of the story. There is no indication that Gaia is acting maliciously against Zeus when she gives birth to her youngest child, but Typhoëos certainly represents a very real threat to the order of the cosmos.[1067] There is no clear indication of Gaia's motivation at this point, this has been explored in detail by Clay who argues that Gaia is acting to further the interests of her youngest child.[1068] As Gaia herself takes no action after the birth of Typhoëos to aid her child, and, in contrast to Tiamat does not enter into conflict with the Storm-God directly, it is difficult to suggest that Gaia is actively supporting Typhoëos in this conflict. Gaia echoes terrifyingly when Typhoëos thunders, but so do Ouranos and Pontos, Okeanos and Tartaros.[1069] Gaia's role in the depositions of Kronos and of Ouranos is far more obvious and she is shown to be directly involved in the planning if not the action.[1070] There is no evidence of Gaia's involvement planning on giving birth to a child specifically to challenge Zeus.

I think it is notable that the union of Gaia and Tartaros is caused by 'golden Aphrodite', the first union attributed to Aphrodite in the poem.[1071] As a product of dynastic turmoil herself, Aphrodite seems well placed to threaten the security of the pantheon through her matchmaking. Aphrodite's role as a mischievous figure is emphasised in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, where Zeus attempts to prevent Aphrodite from causing dynastic carnage through her ability to cause gods to pursue inappropriate liaisons.[1072] Aphrodite's position as a child of Ouranos places her in the generation above Zeus, something which Homeric tradition firmly refutes by making her a daughter of Zeus and Dione.[1073] Hesiod's Aphrodite is far from a sinister figure, she is associated with maidenly whispers, smiles and gentleness,[1074] however she is also a powerful figure who can exercise her influence over other deities and is not allotted her domain by Zeus but claims it from the beginning.[1075] Aphrodite's power in Hesiod may be due to the Near Eastern influences drawing comparisons to extremely powerful goddesses such as Ishtar and Astarte who are not only heavily associated with love and lust, but with significant martial prowess.[1076] This connection was something which the Greeks themselves were aware of, as demonstrated by a bilingual dedication to Greek Aphrodite and

[1067] Hesiod *Theogony*, 838-841.
[1068] Clay 2003, 26-7.
[1069] Hesiod *Theogony*, 839-841.
[1070] Apollodorus lists a tradition where Gaia gives birth to Typhoëos in retaliation for the confinement of the Titans, however, this is not evident within the *Theogony*. Apollodorus *Lib.*, 1.6.
[1071] Hesiod *Theogony*, 822.
[1072] *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 45-52. Clay highlights the difficulties with dating this hymn, as well as its unusual nature. Clay 2006, 152-4.
[1073] Homer *Iliad*, 5.370.
[1074] Hesiod *Theogony*, 205-206.
[1075] Hesiod *Theogony*, 203-204.
[1076] For more discussion of these connections see Bachvarova 2016, 323; Breitenberger 2007, 7; Budin 2003, 1-3 and 2004; Farnell 1896, 618; Grigson 1976, 27; Kirk 1972, 79; Penglase 1994, 160; Pirenne-Delforge 2010, 12; Walcot 1966, 6.

Phoecian Astarte on Kos.[1077] Jackson explores the complex relationship between Zeus and his daughters in the *Iliad*, suggesting that Homer deliberately severs Aphrodite from her Near Eastern counterparts in an attempt to reduce her power and potential to threaten Zeus' authority.[1078] If this is correct, then Hesiod's poem with its clear Near Eastern influences may present Aphrodite as a far more dangerous goddess to Zeus than Homer.

Unlike Zeus and Marduk, Teššub comes into direct conflict with multiple aggressors who seek to depose him; two notable figures are Ullikummi and LAMMA. Ullikummi is born to Kumarbi and a rock, when Kumarbi is actively seeking to father a child to depose Teššub. The *Song of Ullikummi* begins with Kumarbi declaring his intentions, and this is emphasised again later in the poem when Kumarbi wishes for Ullikummi to go to heaven in kingship, suppress the city of Kummiya and strike Teššub.[1079] The very obvious ambitions of Kumarbi contrast sharply with the silence of Tartaros and Gaia on their child, and the fact that Kumarbi is able to produce children to threaten Teššub seems to run counter to the Greek pattern where a deposed ruler fathers no more children. Typhoëos is neither fathered by Kronos, nor is his father involved with any of the struggles for power within the *Theogony*. Aside from a rather oblique reference to Aphrodite, there is no clear motivation for Typhoëos' birth at all, and his ability to threaten the status quo appears to lie more in Typhoëos monstrous nature than in his own ambition or malicious intentions.[1080]

Like Typhoëos, Ullikummi is presented as physically distinct from the other gods. Ullikummi is described as the basalt rival,[1081] and his rock like nature, presumably from his mother, make him a formidable foe. Ullikummi grows rapidly and this excessive growth causes distress to the gods and he is repeatedly described as 'shooting up like a mushroom'.[1082] He is impervious to the charms of Sauska, as he is both blind and deaf,[1083] and is eventually defeated using the same copper tool used to separate heaven and earth.[1084] After his defeat, Ullikummi prophecies what will happen to his body, which López-Ruiz suggests could indicate that the myth reflects the establishment of baetyl, or stone based cult.[1085] In many ways the presentation of Ullikummi as a largely inert object of

[1077] Parker 2002, 147.
[1078] Jackson 2010, 153-163.
[1079] *Song of Ullikummi*, 2.5-8 and 12.15-25.
[1080] Yasumura 2011, 58. See also discussion in Brockliss 2018, 136; and Neslon 1998, 101.
[1081] *Song of Ullikummi*, 1.15.
[1082] *Song of Ullikummi*, 1.18, 3.Ai.2-24. 3.17. Aiii. 11-18.
[1083] *Song of Ullikummi*, 2.19.
[1084] *Song of Ullikummi*, 3.6. The use of this tool has drawn comparisons to the sickle used by Kronos to castrate Gaia and Ouranos, see López-Ruiz 2014, 153-4. There is also a reference to an adamantine sickle wielded by Zeus in his conflict with Typhoëos in Apollodorus, however, as this is a much later text this will not be discussed here. Apollodorus *Lib.*, 1.6.
[1085] López-Ruiz 2014, 162.

monolithic basalt stands in marked contrast with Typhoëos whose hundreds of serpent heads make a cacophony of animalistic noises and shoot forth fire.[1086] Typhoëos is a dynamic figure who even in defeat and incarceration in Tartaros retains a sense of movement as he is described as the origin point for the swirling winds which can scatter boats and cause sailors to drown.[1087] Later tradition places Typhoëos beneath Etna; Stoneman attributes this to Plutarch,[1088] but Hesiod clearly describes Zeus casting Typhoëos down into Tartaros. In confining Typhoëos in Tartaros Zeus achieves something no other deity manages, successfully returning a son to the body of his father.

6.3) Conclusion - The Importance of the Near Eastern Parallels

With the distinct similarities demonstrated between the cosmologies it is certain that there was engagement between these cultures.[1089] Whilst it is not impossible that these stories may have evolved organically, the specific details which repeat across these myths suggest that there is an underlying connection between them. Hesiod's *Theogony*, which falls late in the relative chronology, cannot have influenced the texts recorded long before its composition. This means that Hesiod must have been inspired by the Near Eastern poems, or through contact with those who were familiar with their content. Having acknowledged the influences are present, the question then becomes what is the significance of these influences? One aspect which I think is extremely important is in the differences between the poems and what this shows about how the individual cultures adapt and alter the pattern to suit their preferences. As demonstrated above, the poems utilise key details, but they all use them in different ways. It is significant that Kronos uses a toothed-sickle rather than his own teeth, just as it is significant that Gaia pushes Kronos to act whilst Tiamat does not oppose her partner. These differences are revealing as it highlights that there were opportunities for Hesiod to make different choices within his poem and reinforces the significance of his selections.

One other aspect, which a comparative approach encourages, is seeing these texts as part of a dialogue, not only between the Archaic Greek poets, but more broadly. If the poems are intended for a broader consumption then they must be able to communicate across cultures. One area which I

[1086] Hesiod *Theogony*, 823-835. For a discussion on Typhoëos sounds and the significance of them see Brockliss 2018 *passim*.
[1087] Hesiod *Theogony*, 869-880.
[1088] Stoneman 2020, 190.
[1089] These cultures are not the only cultures likely to be involved in this exchange. There is a broad range of scholarship which explores a broader range of cultures for some examples see: Bachvarova 2016; Collins, Bachvarova, Rutherford 2008, Faraone and Teeter 2004, López-Ruiz 2010 and 2014; Morris 2009; and West 2007.

think this is shown is in the depiction of Zeus as a ruler, and whether Zeus' political manoeuvrings are influenced by the Near Eastern cultures. As was demonstrated at the start of the chapter, there is no secure basis for a monarchic model in Archaic Greece, or even Mycenaean Greece. However, it is interesting to compare the behaviour of Zeus with that of the historical Hittite monarchs. Within Hesiod's *Theogony* the succession runs through one branch of the family which encourages the idea of an inherited position. López-Ruiz suggests that this may show a more realistic and complicated relationship between family and power than Hesiod's tidier model.[1090] Hesiod's presentation of power moving from father to son through the generations is an interesting one, which has encouraged the idea of a hereditary kingship. It is worth noting, again, that Ouranos is never called a king, and that both Kronos and Zeus are afraid of unborn sons due to a prophecy surrounding their birth rather than a more general threat of a new son.[1091] This suggests that the concept of inherited power is more complicated than might first be assumed from the sequence. It is also notable that Kronos and Zeus are the youngest children of their parents, which stands in sharp contrast with the idea of primogeniture which is frequently associated with European monarchies. However, an examination of succession in the Hittite Empire reveals some striking similarities with the pattern seen in the *Theogony*.

Succession in the Hittite monarchy is very different to a modern European monarchy. The Hittite king took multiple wives and was permitted to select his heir from amongst his sons.[1092] This meant that the eldest son was not guaranteed to inherit the title. The polygamous nature of the royal family was necessitated by the way in which they governed. The 'Great Family', which comprised of the king and his relations, occupied all of the key roles within the court.[1093] This meant that there was a tremendous amount of pressure on the King to produce enough children to occupy the roles within court, with the most important roles being reserved for the highest ranking children and that ranking depending on the mother they are born to.[1094] This need to produce enough children to fill diplomatic and military roles, and the absence of a pre-determined heir means that there is almost inevitably a situation where there are more children who might realistically aspire to the throne than can ever occupy it. This, as might be expected, leads to a not entirely unforeseeable side effect as different children attempt to secure their own position.

One example where we can see the pressures that this caused very clearly is in the so-called *Telipinu Edict*. The *Telipinu Edict* was issued by the eponymous king following his ascension to power after

[1090] López-Ruiz 2010, 93.
[1091] Hesiod *Theogony*, 463-465 and 891-893.
[1092] Collins 2007, 102.
[1093] Bryce 2002, 21.
[1094] Bryce 2002, 28.

what seems to have been a particularly bloody period of political history. Upon returning home from a successful military campaign, c. 1590 BC Mursili was assassinated by his brother-in-law and cup-bearer, Hantili, who then seized the throne. Hantili was succeeded by his son-in-law, who was then assassinated by his heir, Ammuna. After another period of bloodshed Huzziya became king, and when he plotted to have his sister and brother-in-law, Telipinu, murdered, Telipinu drove him into exile along with his brothers.[1095] The transitions of power between family members are frequently marked by bloodshed, and there appears to be a fluidity between the natural born sons and those sons who have married in, with both appearing as contenders for the throne. The significance of the daughters, or at least sons-in-law, is perhaps a consideration when Kronos devours his daughters along with his sons.

Upon coming to power Telipinu gives his edict, which contains this section:

> 'Let a prince, a son, of the first rank, become king. If there is no prince of the first rank, let one who is son of the second rank become king. If, however there is no prince, (no) son, let them take a husband for her who is a daughter of the first rank, and let him become king.'[1096]

There is an attempt here to restrict the potential contenders for the role which supports the suggestion that there was a range of eligible figures who could have originally ascended to the throne. This makes sense if we accept Collin's assertion that all male descendants of Hittite kings could be considered as princes and until the *Telipinu Edict* would have been eligible to succeed if selected as heir.[1097] This means that if the king is producing children with multiple wives through the generations then the number of eligible males would most likely be increasing as the generations progressed. It is also interesting that son-in-law is pushed out of the equation unless there are no sons born to the king's first or second wife. Given the ferocity of the competition in the years preceding Telipinu it is perhaps unsurprising that there might be a need to check the ambition of those marrying into the royal family.

Intermarriage with other ambitious families was, however, a necessary evil for the Hittite royal family. The Hittites ruled over an empire and they used a complex mixture of treaties and marriages to bind vassal states into the network. Through marrying a female relative of a Hittite king to a subject-ruler the Hittites were able to bind the ruler into the political order.[1098] The more important the connection, the more likely a high-ranking daughter or sister would be offered in marriage.

[1095] Finkelberg 2005, 76-77.
[1096] *Telipinu Edict II*, 36-9 (2 Bo TU, 23A =KBo III I); ed. Hoffman 1984.
[1097] Collins 2007, 102.
[1098] Kurht 1995, 267-8.

There are of course instances where this breaks down, and, as Macqueen points out, it is unlikely that these marriages were a blissful union, but they seem to have been effective in maintaining the loyalty of the subjected states.[1099]

If we use this outline to re-examine the Olympian pantheon, there are a few interesting parallels. Firstly, it would offer an explanation as to why Ouranos, Kronos and Zeus have quite so many children when each child is treated as a threat to their own position. If Hesiod, or the oral tradition before him, had associated ideas of power and authority with the Hittite monarchy then they may have emulated the extensive family for their pantheon to echo that model. Secondly, it would explain the polygamous nature of Zeus's marriages. Zeus is one of a very select number of gods in the *Theogony* who produce children with more than one partner. The other notable exception to this is Gaia who bears children with Ouranos, Pontos, Tartaros and through parthenogenesis. Zeus forms unions with his two unmarried aunts, and two of his sisters, amongst others. This means that Zeus makes a number of unions with goddesses who might otherwise be in the correct bloodline for succession. He also produces children with his all of his sisters, with the exception of Hestia who spurns male company entirely. Even amongst the gods, polygamy is unusual in the poetry of this period, and Zeus'. There is a sense of tying off loose ends of the family line, and perhaps preventing others who may attempt to marry into the family.

The Hittite Empire peaked c. 1200 BCE, significantly before Hesiod was composing, and suggesting that Hesiod was directly imitating the model would be unsupportable given the lack of direct evidence.[1100] It is, however, useful to consider the systems of government of these surrounding cultures and how they may have shaped the Greek attitudes towards rule both through imitation or though rejection. There are patterns in the way Zeus behaves which could be seen to echo the Hittite monarchy, and this might indicate that the model of power Hesiod was drawing on had its roots in the Near East rather than in Archaic Greece. It is an important reminder that the communities of the Ancient World were not insular or isolated, and that the influences of external cultures may have played a defining role in the way the Greeks conceived of their deities.

[1099] MacQueen 1986, 78.
[1100] López-Ruiz 2014, 135.

7) Bibliography

Abel, D. H. 1943. Genealogies of Ethical Concepts from Hesiod to Bacchylides. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 74**,** 92-101.

Adams, D. 2005. *The Hitchhikers Guide to the Galaxy.* London, Pan Macmillan.

Adcock, F. E. 1927. Literary Tradition and Early Greek Code-Makers. *The Cambridge Historical Journal,* 2**,** 95-109.

Adkins, A. W. H. 1960. 'Honour' and 'Punishment' in the Homeric Poems. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies***,** 23-32.

Adkins, A. W. H. 1960. *Merit and responsibility: a Study in Greek Values.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Adkins, A. W. H. 1970. *From the Many to the One*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Aikin, S. F. 2016. So What If Horses Would Draw Horse Gods? *Sophia,* 55**,** 163-177.

Alderink, L. J. 1982. Mythical and Cosmological Structure in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. *Numen,* 29**,** 1-16.

Allen, D. S. 2000. *The World of Prometheus: the Politics of Punishing in Democratic Athens,* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Allen, M. 1984. Elders, Chiefs, and Big Men: Authority Legitimation and Political Evolution in Melanesia. *American Ethnologist,* 11**,** 20-41.

Allen, W. S. 1987. *Vox Graeca: a Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, G. 2005. Before Turannoi Were Tyrants: Rethinking a Chapter of Early Greek History. *Classical Antiquity,* 24**,** 173-222.

Anderson, W. S. 1958. Calypso and Elysium. *The Classical Journal,* 54**,** 2-11.

Andolfi, I. 2017. An Ambiguous Literary Genre: The Origins of Early Greek Mythography. *Mnemosyne*, 70, 183-201.

Andrew, P. 2017. Human Fault and "[Harmful] Delusion" (ἄτη) in Homer. *Phoenix,* 71**,** 1-20.

Antonaccio, C. M. 1994. Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 98**,** 389-410.

Antonaccio, C. M. 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece.* Lanham, Md. London, Rowman & Littlefield.

Antonaccio, C. M. 2006. Religion, Basileus and Heroes. *In:* Deger-Jakotzy, S. and Lemos, I. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press. 381-396.

Arnheim, M. T. W. 1977. *Aristocracy in Greek Society.* London, Thames and Hudson.

Arthur, M. B. 1973. Early Greece: The Origins of the Western Attitude Toward Women. *Arethusa,* 6**,** 7.

Arthur, M. B. 1977. Classics and Psychoanalysis. *The Classical Journal,* 73**,** 56-68.

Arthur, M. B. 1982. Cultural Strategies in Hesiod's "Theogony:" Law, Family, Society. *Arethusa,* 15**,** 63-82.

Aruz, J., Benzel, K. & Evans, J. M. (Eds.) 2008. *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C,* New York, New Haven, Metropolitan Museum of Art; Yale University Press.

Asheri, D. 1963. Laws of Inheritance, Distribution of Land and Political Constitutions in Ancient Greece. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 12**,** 1-21.

Aston, E. 2009. Thetis and Cheiron in Thessaly. *Kernos,* 22**,** 83-107.

Aston, E. 2011. *Mixanthropoi: Animal-Human Hybrid Deities in Greek Religion.* Liége, Centre International d'étude de la Religion Grecque Antique.

Astour, M. C. 1968. Semitic Elements in the Kumarbi Myth: An Onomastic Inquiry. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 27**,** 172-177.

Atran, S. 2002. *In Gods we Trust: The Evolutionary Landscape of Religion.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Aura Jorro, F. 1993. *Diccionario Micénico*. Madrid: Consejo Superior De Investigaciones Cientificas.

Austin, M. M. & Vidal-Naquet, P. 1977. *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: An Introduction,* Berkeley. University of California Press.

Ayali-Darshan, N. 2014. The Role of Aštabii in the Song of Ullikummi and the Eastern Mediterranean "Failed God" Stories. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 73**,** 95-103.

Ayali-Darshan, N. 2015. The Other Version of the Story of the Storm-God's Combat with the Sea in the Light of Egyptian, Ugaritic and Hurro-Hittite Texts *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions,* 15**,** 20-51.

Bachofen, J. 1973. *Myth, Religion, and Mother Right. Selected Writings of J. J. Bachofen.*Preface by Boas, G. Introduction by Campbell, J. Translation by Monehim, R. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bachvarova, M. 2006. Divine Justice across the Mediterranean: Hittite Arkuwars and the Trial Scene in Aeschylus' Eumenides. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions,* 6**,** 123-153.

Bachvarova, M. 2012. From 'Kingship in Heaven' to King Lists: Syro-Anatolian Courts and the History of the World. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions,* 12**,** 97-118.

Bachvarova, M. 2016. Wisdom of Former Days: the Manly Hittite King and the Foolish Kumarbi,

Father of the Gods. *In:* Zsolny, I. (ed.) *Mapping Ancient Near Eastern Masculinities.* New York: Routledge.

Bachvarova, M. R. 2016. *From Hittite to Homer: the Anatolian background of Ancient Greek Epic.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 83-111.

Bakker, E. J. 2002. Remembering the God's Arrival. *Arethusa,* 35**,** 63-81.

Bakker, E. J. (ed.) 2014. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language.* Chichester, Wiley Blackwell.

Bal, M. 1983. Sexuality, Semiosis and Binarism: A Narratological Comment on Bergren and Arthur. *Arethusa,* 16**,** 117-135.

Balcer, J. M. 1994. Herodotus, the 'Early State,' and Lydia. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 43**,** 246-249.

Balot, R. K. (ed.) 2009. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought.* Malden, Mass; Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell.

Bamberger, J. 1974. The Myth of Matriarchy. *In:* Rosaldo, M. and Lamphere, L. (eds.) *Women, Culture and Society.* Stanford: Stanford University Press. 263-280.

Bardis, P. D. 1978. The Concept of Love in Homer. *Social Science,* 53**,** 220-231.

Barnett, R. D. 1945. The Epic of Kumarbi and the Theogony of Hesiod. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 65**,** 100-101.

Barrett, J. L. 2007. Cognitive Science of Religion: What is it and Why is it? *In: Religion Compass*. 6, 768-786.

Barrett, J. L. 2011. Cognitive Science of Religion: Looking Back, Looking Forward. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* 50**,** 229-239.

Barrett, J. L. & Keil, F. C. 1996. Conceptualizing a Nonnatural Entity: Anthropomorphism in God Concepts. *Cognitive Psychology,* 31**,** 219-247.

Barringer, J. 2010. Zeus at Olympia. *In:* Bremmer, J. N. and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 155-177.

Barron, J. A. E., P. 1998. Hesiod. *In:* Easterling, Easterling, P. E. and Knox, B. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 51-64.

Barron, J. E., P. and Kirk, G. 1998. The Epic Tradition After Homer and Hesiod. *In:* Easterling, P. E. and Knox, B. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 65-75.

Bazopoulou-Kyrkonidou, E. 1996. Myth and Logos in Hesiod's *Theogony*. *American Journal of Medical Genetics,* 62**,** 124-144.

Beall, E. F. 1989. The Contents of Hesiod's Pandora Jar: Erga 94-98. *Hermes,* 117**,** 227-230.

Beall, E. F. 1991. Hesiod's Prometheus and Development in Myth. *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 52**,**

355-371.

Beall, E. F. 2009. Once More on Hesiod's Supposed Tartaros Principle. *The Classical World,* 102**,** 159-161.

Beaulieu, M.-C. 2016. *The sea in the Greek imagination,* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Beaumont, L. 1998. Born Old or Never Young? Femininity, Childhood and the Goddesses of Ancient Greece. *In:* Blundell, S. and Williamson, M. (eds.) *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece.* London: Routledge. 71-95.

Beck, D. 2001. Direct and Indirect Speech in the Homeric "Hymn to Demeter". *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 131**,** 53-74.

Beck H. (ed.) 2013. A Companion to Ancient Greek Government. *Blackwell companions to the ancient world.* Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Beckman, G. 1982. The Hittite Assembly. *Journal of the American Oriental Society,* 102**,** 435-442.

Beckman, G. 1983. Inheritance and Royal Succession among the Hittites. *In:* Hoffner, H. and Beckman, G. (eds.) *Kaniššuwar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983.* Chicago, Il: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 13-22.

Beckman, G. 2009. Literary and Cultural Connection. *In:* Aruz, J. B., K. and Evans, J. (ed.) *Beyond Babylon: art, trade, and diplomacy in the second millennium B.C.* New York, New Haven: Metropolitan Museum of Art; Yale University Press. 192-193.

Beckman, G. and Arbor, A. 2011. Primordial Obstetrics. “The Song of Emergence”. *In:* von Manfred Hutter, H. and Hutter-Braunsar, S. (eds.) *Hethitische Literatur. Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken. Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn. Herausgegeben von Manfred Hutter und Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 391.* Münster: Ugarit-Verlag. 25-34.

Beckman, G. M. 2013. Hittite Religion. *In:* Salzman, M. and Sweeny, M. (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World. Vol 1: From the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic Age.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 84-101.

Beckwith, M. C. 1998. The 'Hanging of Hera' and the Meaning of Greek ἄκμων. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 98**,** 91-102.

Beidelman, T. O. 1989. Agonistic Exchange: Homeric Reciprocity and the Heritage of Simmel and Mauss. *Cultural Anthropology,* 4**,** 227-259.

Belfiore, E. 1998. Problematic Reciprocity on Greek Tragedy. *In:* Gill, C. P., N. and Seaford, R. (eds.) *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benedict, W. C. 1960. Urartians and Hurrians. *Journal of the American Oriental Society,* 80**,** 100-104.

Bennett, C. 1976. *God as Form: Essays in Greek Theology with Special Reference to Christianity and the Contemporary Theological Predicament.* Albany, State University of New York Press.

Bergren, A. 2008. *Weaving Truth: Essays on Language and the Female in Greek Thought.* Washington, D.C., Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University.

Bernabé, A. 2009. El Extraordinario Embarazo de Kumarbi. *In:* Barreyra-Fracaroli, D. and del Olmo Lete, G. (eds.) *Reconstryendo el pasado remoto: Estudis sobré el Proximo Oriente Antiguo en homenaje a Jorge R. Sivla Castillo.* Barcelona: Aula Orientalis Suppliente 25. 23-32.

Bernabé, A. A. S. C. A. 2014. Are the Orphic Gold Leaves Orphic? *In:* Edmonds, R. G. (ed.) *The "Orphic" Gold Tablets and Greek Religion: Further Along the Path.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 68-101.

Bernal, M. 1987. *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization.* London, Free Association Press.

Blickman, D. R. 1986. The Myth of Ixion and Pollution for Homicide in Archaic Greece. *The Classical Journal,* 81**,** 193-208.

Blickman, D. R. 1987. Styx and the Justice of Zeus in Hesiod's "Theogony". *Phoenix,* 41**,** 341-355.

Blondell, R. 2010. Refractions of Homer's Helen in Archaic Lyric. *The American Journal of Philology,* 131**,** 349-391.

Blundell, S. and Williamson, M. 1998. *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece.* London: Routledge.

Boardman, J. 2004. Unnatural Conception and Birth in Greek Mythology. *In:* Dasen, V. (ed.) *Naissance et petite enfance dans l'Antiquité, Fribourg et Göttingen (2004) V. Dasen, Jumeaux, Jumelles dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine, Zurich (2005).* Fribourg: Société des amis de la Bibliothèque Salomon Reinach. 103-113.

Bodkin, M. & Bodkin, M. 1927. Literary Criticism and the Study of the Unconscious. *The Monist,* 37**,** 445-468.

Bogucki, P. I. 1999. *The Origins of Human Society.* Malden, Mass.; Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Bolmarcich, S. 2001. ΟΜΟΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ in the "Odyssey". *Classical Philology*, 96, 205-213.

Bonnafé, A. 1985. *Eros et Eris: Mariages Divins et Mythe de Succession chez Hésiode.* Lyon, Presses Universitaires de Lyon.

Bonner, R. A. S., G. 1930. *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle.* Illinois, University of Chicago Press.

Bott, E. 1971. *Family and Social Network: Roles, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families.* London, Tavistock Publications.

Bouchard, E. 2015. Aphrodite "Philommêdês" in the *Theogony*. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 135**,** 8-18.

Boucher, H. 1922. Kaineus et les Centaures (Kélébé de la collection Saint-Ferriol). *Revue*

Archéologique, 16**,** 111-118.

Bowlby, J. 1988. *A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development.* New York, Basic Books.

Bowlby, R. 2007. *Freudian Mythologies. Greek Tragedy and Modern Identities.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Boyer, P. 2001. *Religion Explained: The Evolutionary Origins of Religious Thought.* New York, Basic Books.

Boylan, M. 1986. Galen's Conception Theory. *Journal of the History of Biology,* 19**,** 47-77.

Breitenberger, B. M. 2007. *Aphrodite and Eros: The Development of Erotic Mythology in Early Greek Poetry and Cult.* New York; London, Routledge.

Bremmer, J. 1983. The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik,* 50**,** 173-186.

Bremmer, J. 1987a. Oedipus and the Greek Oedipus complex. *In:* Bremmer, J. (ed.) *Interpreting Greek Mythology.* London: Croon Helm Ltd. 41-59.

Bremmer, J. 1987b. What is Greek Myth? *In:* Bremmer, J. (ed.) *Interpretations of Greek Myth.* London Croon Helm Ltd. 1-9.

Bremmer, J. 2010. Hephaistos Sweats or How to Construct an Ambivalent God. *In:* Bremmer, J. N., and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 193.208.

Bremmer, J.N. and Erskine, A. (eds). 2010. *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations. Edinburgh Leventis studies.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bremmer, J. N. 1987. *Interpretations of Greek Mythology.* London, Croom Helm.

Bremmer, J. N. 2008. *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East.* Leiden, Brill.

Bremmer, J. N. 2010. Introduction: The Greek Gods in the Twentieth Century. *In:* Bremmer, J. N. and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bremmer, J. N., and Erskine, A. (eds) 2010. *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations. Edinburgh Leventis studies.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brock, R. 2013. *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle.* London, Bloomsbury.

Brockliss, W. 2018. Olympian Sound in the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue of Women*: Sweet Music and Disorderly Noise. *The Classical Journal,* 113**,** 129-149.

Brody, A. 2008. The Specialized Religions of Ancient Mediterranean Seafarers. *Religion Compass,* 2/4**,** 444-454.

Brown, A. S. 1997. Aphrodite and the Pandora Complex. *The Classical Quarterly,* 47**,** 26-47.

Brown, N. O. 1952. The Birth of Athena. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 83**,** 130-143.

Bryce, T. 2002. *Life and Society in the Hittite world,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bryce, T. 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites. New ed*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Budelmann, F. (ed). 2001. *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P.E. Easterling,* London, Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

Budin, S. 2003. *The Origin of Aphrodite.* Bethesda, CDL Press.

Budin, S. L. 2004. A Reconsideration of the Aphrodite-Ashtart Syncretism. *Numen,* 51**,** 95-145.

Bungard, C. 2012. Reconsidering Zeus' Order: The Reconciliation of Apollo and Hermes. *The Classical World,* 105**,** 443.

Burgess, J. 2015. Coming Adrift: The Limits of Reconstruction of the Cyclic Poems. *In:* Fantuzzi, M. A. T., C. (ed.) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 43-58.

Burkert, W. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual.* Berkeley, Calif.; London, University of California Press.

Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth.* Berkeley; London, University of California Press.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical.* Oxford, Blackwell.

Burkert, W. 1987. Oriental and Greek Mythology: The Meeting of Parallels. *In:* Bremmer, J. N. (ed.) *Interpretations of Greek Mythology.* London: Croom Helm. 10-40.

Burkert, W. 1992. *The Orientalizing revolution: Near Eastern influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age.* Cambridge, Mass.; London, Harvard University Press.

Burkert, W. 2001. *Savage Energies: Lessons of Myth and Ritual in Ancient Greece.* Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press.

Burkert, W. 2007. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture.* Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, Harvard University Press.

Burkert, W. 2009. Pleading for Hell: Postulates, Fantasies, and the Senselessness of Punishment. *Numen,* 56**,** 141-160.

Burton, D. 2001. The Death of Gods in Greek Succession Myths. *In:* Budelmann, F. A. M., P. (ed.) *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P.E. Easterling.* London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.43-56.

Bussanich, J. 1983. A Theoretical Interpretation of Hesiod's Chaos. *Classical Philology,* 78**,** 212-219.

Buxton, R. G. A. 1987. Wolves and Werewolves in Greek mythology. *In:* Bremmer, J. (ed.) *Interpretations of Greek Mythology.* London: Croon Helm Ltd. 60-79.

Buxton, R. G. A. 1994 *Imaginary Greece: Contexts of Mythology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buxton, R. G. A. 2009. *Forms of Astonishment: Greek Myths of Metamorphosis.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Buxton, R. G. A. 2010. Metamorphosis of Gods into Animals or Humans. *In:* Bremmer, J. N. and Erskine, A. (eds) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 81-91.

Buxton, R. G. A. 2013. *Myths and Tragedies in their Ancient Greek Contexts.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Cairns, D. L. 1993. *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature,* Oxford, Clarendon.

Calame, C. 2007. Greek Myth and Greek Mythology. *In:* Woodard, R. D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.259-285.

Caldwell, R. 1989. *The Origin of the Gods: A Psychoanalytic Study of Greek Theogonic Myth.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Calhoun, G. M. 1935. Zeus the Father in Homer. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 66**,** 1-17.

Campbell, D. 2013. On the theory of Hesiod and the Hurrians: An Exploration of the Dual Nature of Tessub and Kumarbi. *In:* Scurlock, J. A. B., R. (ed.) *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaos Kampf Hypothesis.* Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns. 26-43.

Campbell, J. 1992. The Greek Hero. *In:* Peristiany, J. A. P.-R., J. (ed.) *Honor and Grace in Anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 129-150.

Canevaro, M. 2017. The Rule of Law as the Measure of Political Legitimacy in the Greek City States. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law,* 9**,** 211-236.

Canteralla, E. 2011. Greek Law and the Family. *In:* Rawson, B. (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 333-345.

Carlier, P. 1984. *La Royaute en Grèce Avant Alexandre.* Strasburg, AECR.

Carlier, P. 2006.Ἄναξ and βασιλεύς in the Homeric epics. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos, I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 101-110.

Carpenter, T. H. 1991. *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece: A Handbook.* London, Thames and Hudson.

Carter, L. B. 1986. *The Quiet Athenian.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Casadio, G. 2003. The Failing Male God: Emasculation, Death and Other Accidents in the Ancient Mediterranean World. *Numen,* 50**,** 231-268.

Casey, J. 1989. *The History of the Family.* Oxford, Blackwell.

Cawkwell, G. L. 1995. Early Greek Tyranny and the People. *The Classical Quarterly,* 45**,** 73-86.

Chadwick, N. K. 1939. The Distribution of Oral Literature in the Old World. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,* 69**,** 77-94.

Chappell, M. 2006. Delphi and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. *The Classical Quarterly,* 56**,** 331-348.

Christensen, J. P. & Barker, E. T. E. 2011. On Not Remembering Tydeus: Agamemnon, Diomedes and the Contest for Thebes. *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici***,** 9-43.

Clark, M. 2001. Was Telemachus Rude to His Mother? "Odyssey" 1.356-59. *Classical Philology,* 96**,** 335-354.

Clark, N. 2015. *Aphrodite and Venus in Myth and Mimesis.* Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Clarke, H. 1981. *Homer's Readers: A Historical Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey.* London Newark, Associated University Presses; University of Delaware Press.

Clarke, M. 1997. Gods and Mountains in Greek Myth and Poetry *In:* Lloyd, A. B. (ed.) *What is a God?: Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity.* London: Duckworth. 65-80.

Claus, D. B. 1975. Aidôs in the Language of Achilles. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 105**,** 13-28.

Clay, J. S. 1981. Immortal and Ageless Forever. *The Classical Journal,* 77**,** 112-117.

Clay, J. S. 1984. The Hekate of the *Theogony*. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.,* 26**,** 27-38.

Clay, J. S. 1993. The Generation of Monsters in Hesiod. *Classical Philology,* 88**,** 105-116.

Clay, J. S. 1997. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey,* Lanham, MD.; London, Rowman & Littlefield.

Clay, J. S. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos,* Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Clay, J. S. 2004. What the Muses Sang: Theogony 1-115. *Greek,* 29**,** 323-333.

Clay, J. S. 2006. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns,* London, Bristol Classical Press.

Clay, J. S. 2020. Typhoeus or Cosmic Regression. *In:* Chesi, G. M. & Spiegel, F. (eds.) *Classical Literature and Posthumanism.* 1 ed. London: Bloomsbury Academic. 133-140.

Clay, J.S. Forthcoming. Ties that Bind: Verbal Fetters and Ring Composition in Hesiod's *Theogony.*

Clay, J.S. Forthcoming. How to Deal with Difficult Goddesses: Nyx, Styx and Hekate in Hesiod's *Theogony.*

Clay, J. S. & Gilan, A. 2014. The Hittite "Song of Emergence" and the Theogony. *Philologus: Zeitschrift für Antike Literatur Und Ihre Rezeption,* 158**,** 1-9.

Clifford, R. J. 1990. Phoenician Religion. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research***,** 55-64.

Cline, E. 1991. A Possible Hittite Embargo against the Mycenaeans. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 40**,** 1-9.

Cline, E. H. 1991. Hittite Objects in the Bronze Age Aegean. *Anatolian Studies,* 41**,** 133-143.

Cohen, A. 2012. Mythic Landscapes of Greece. *In:* Woodard, R. D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-5-330.

Cohen, B. 1995. *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey.* New York; Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Cohen, D. 1991. *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, D. 2005. Introduction. *In:* Gagarin, M. A. C., D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-28.

Cohen, P. 1969. Theories of Myth. *Man*, 4.3. 337–353.

Cohn-Haft, L. 1995. Divorce in Classical Athens. *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 115**,** 3.

Cole, S. G. 1984. Greek Sanctions against Sexual Assault. *Classical Philology,* 79**,** 97-113.

Cole, S. G. 2004. *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience.* Berkeley, University of California Press.

Coleman, J. 1996. Did Egypt Shape the Glory that was Greece. *In:* Lefkowitz, M. and Maclean Rogers, G. (eds.) *Black Athena Revisited.* London: University of North Carolina Press.

Collins, B. J., Bachvarova, M. R. & Rutherford, I. (eds.) 2008. *Anatolian interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours: Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-cultural Interaction, September 17-19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA,* Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Collins, B. J. 2007. *The Hittites and their World.* Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature.

Colvin, S. 2007. A Historical Greek Reader Mycenaean to the Koiné. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Conradie, P. J. 1977. The Literary Nature of Greek Myths: A Critical Discussion of G. S. Kirk's Views. *Acta Classica,* 20**,** 49-58.

Cook, A. B. 1925. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cook, E. F. 2003. Agamemnon's Test of the Army in *Iliad* Book 2 and the Function of Homeric *Akhos*.

The American Journal of Philology, 124**,** 165-198.

Cook, R. M. & Hemelrijk, J. M. 1963. A Hydria of the Campana Group in Bonn. *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen,* 5**,** 107-120.

Corti, C. 2007. The So Called 'Theogony' or 'Kingship in Heaven': The Name of the Song. *In:* ARCHI, A. A. F., R. (ed.) *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.* Rome: CNR - Istituto di Studi Sulle Civiltà Dell'egeo e del Vicino Oriente.

Cox, C. A. 1998. *Household Interests: Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens.* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Cox, C. A. 2011. Marriage in Ancient Athens. *In:* Rawson, B. (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 231-244.

Creed, G. W. 2000. "Family Values" and Domestic Economies. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 29**,** 329-355.

Croon, J. H. 1955. The Mask of the Underworld Daemon-Some Remarks on the Perseusgorgon Story. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 75**,** 9-16.

Csapo, E. 2005. *Theories of Mythology.* Malden, Massachusetts; Oxford, Blackwell.

Cummings, E. M., C. and Ward George, M. 2010. Fathers, Marriages and Families. *In:* Lamb, M. E. (ed.) *The Role of the Father in Child Development.* Hoboken, NJ.: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. 154-176.

D'Amico, D. J. 2010. The Prison in Economics: Private and Public Incarceration in Ancient Greece. *Public Choice,* 145**,** 461-482.

D'Arms, E. F. & Hulley, K. K. 1946. The Oresteia-Story in the Odyssey. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 77**,** 207-213.

Dasen, V. 2004. *Naissance et Petite Enfance dans l'Antiquité, Fribourg et Göttingen (2004) V. Dasen, Jumeaux, Jumelles dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine, Zurich (2005),* Fribourg, Société des amis de la Bibliothèque Salomon Reinach.

Davidson, J. 1995. Two Substitutions in Greek Myth. *L'Antiquité Classique,* 64**,** 205-210.

Davidson, J. 1995. Zeus and the Stone Substitute. *Hermes,* 123**,** 363-369.

Davies, J. 1997. The Moral Dimension of Pythian Apollo. *In:* Lloyd, A. B. (ed.) *What is a God?: Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity.* London: Duckworth.

Davies, M. 1986. Alcaeus, Thetis and Helen. *Hermes,* 114**,** 257-262.

De Ville, J. 2011. Mythology and the Images of Justice. *Law & Literature,* 23**,** 324-364.

Deacy, S. 2008. *Athena.* London, Routledge.

Deacy, S. 2012. The Vulnerability of Athena. *In:* Deacy, S. Peirce, K. and Arafat, K. (ed.) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* London: Bristol Classical Press.

43-64.

Deacy, S., Pierce, K. and Arafat, K. (eds) 2012. *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* London, Bristol Classical Press.

Deacy, S. and Villing, A. 2009. What was the Colour of Athena's *Aegis*? *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 129**,** 111-129.

Dean-Jones, L. 1996. *Women's Bodies in Classical Greek Science.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos, I. S. 2006. *Ancient Greece: from the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Delcourt, M. 1953. La Légende de Kaineus. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions,* 144**,** 129-150.

Demetriou, D. 2010. Τῆς πάσης ναυτιλίης φύλαξ: Aphrodite and the Sea. *Kernos,* 23**,** 67-89.

Demont, P. 1978. Remarques sur le Sens de τρέφω. *Revue des Études Gracques,* 91**,** 358-384.

Depew, M. & Obbink, D. 2000. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society.* Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, Harvard University Press.

Depew, M. A. O., D. 2000. Introduction. *In:* Depew, M. & Obbink, D. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society.* Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press. 1-12.

Detienne, M. 1989. Culinary Practices and the Spirit of Sacrifice. *In:* Detienne, M. and Vernant, J-P. (eds.) *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1-20.

Detienne, M. & Jones, E. 2001. The Art of Founding Autochthony: Thebes, Athens, and Old-Stock French. *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics,* 9**,** 46-55.

Detienne, M. & Vernant, J-P. 1981. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society.* Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press.

Detienne, M. A. Vernant, J-P. 1989. *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Dicenso, J. 1999. *The Other Freud: Religion, Culture, and Psychoanalysis.* London, Routledge.

Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Dickinson, O. 1997. *The Origins of Mycenaean Civilisation.* Göteborg, Åström.

Dickinson, O. 2005. The "Face of Agamemnon". *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens,* 74**,** 299-308.

Dickinson, O. 2016. The Will to Believe: Why Homer Cannot be 'True' in any Meaningful Sense. *In:* Sherratt, S. and Bennet, J. (eds.) *Archaeology and the Homeric Epic.* Havertown, United

States: Oxbow Books, Limited. 10-19.

Dickinson, O. 2006. *The Aegean from Bronze Age to Iron Age: continuity and change between the twelfth and eighth centuries BC.* London, Routledge.

Dickinson, O. 2006. The Mycenaean Heritage of Early Iron Age Greece. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos, I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 115-122.

Dietrich, B. C. 1962. The Spinning of Fate in Homer. *Phoenix,* 16**,** 86-101.

Dietrich, B. C. 1964. The Judgement of Zeus. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie,* 107**,** 97-125.

Dietrich, B. C. 1979. Views of Homeric Gods and Religion. *Numen,* 26**,** 129-151.

Dietrich, B. C. 1997. From Knossos to Homer. *In:* Lloyd, A. B. (ed.) *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity.* London: Duckworth. 1-13.

Dillon, J. 2004. *Salt and Olives: Morality and Custom in Ancient Greece*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dodson-Robinson, E. 2010. Helen's 'Judgment of Paris' and Greek Marriage Ritual in Sappho 16. *Arethusa,* 43**,** 1-20.

Doherty, L. E. 1992. Gender and Internal Audiences in the Odyssey. *The American Journal of Philology*, 113, 161-177.

Doherty, L. E. 2005. Theory and the Teaching of Mythology. *The Classical World,* 98**,** 193-197.

Donlan, W. 1985. The Social Groups of Dark Age Greece. *Classical Philology,* 80**,** 293-308.

Donlan, W. 1998. Political Reciprocity in Dark Age Greece: Odysseus and his *Hetairoi*. *In:* Gill, C. Postlethwaite., N. and Seaford, R. (eds.) *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 51-72.

Donlan, W. 2007. Kin-Groups in the Homeric Epics. *The Classical World,* 101**,** 29-39.

Dougherty, C. 2006. *Prometheus.* London, Routledge.

Douglas, L. C. 1996. Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 116**,** 1-32.

Dowden, K. 2006. *Zeus.* London, Routledge.

Dowden, K. 2007. Olympian Gods, Olympian Pantheon. *In:* Ogden, D. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion.* Maldon, MA.: Blackwell Pub. 41-55.

Downing, C. 2007. *The Goddess: Mythological Images of the Feminine.* New York, Authors Choice Press.

Drews, R. 1972. The First Tyrants in Greece. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 21**,** 129-144.

Drews, R. 1983. *Basileus: The Evidence for Kingship in Geometric Greece.* New Haven, (Conn.); London, Yale University Press.

Duban, J. M. 1980. Poets and Kings in the "Theogony" Invocation. *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica,* 4**,** 7-21.

Duffy, J. 1947. Homer's Conception of Fate. *The Classical Journal,* 42**,** 477-485.

Easterling, P. E. & Knox, B. M. W. (eds.)1989. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Volume 1 Part 1, Early Greek poetry.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Ebbinghaus, S. 2005. Protector of the City, or the Art of Storage in Early Greece. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 125**,** 51-72.

Edmonds, R. G. 2004. *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the 'Orphic' gold Tablets.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Edmonds, R. G. (ed.) 2014. *The "Orphic" Gold Tablets and Greek Religion: Further Along the Path.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Edmonds, R. G. 2014. Who are you? A Brief History of the Scholarship. *In:* Edmonds, R. G. (ed.) *The "Orphic" Gold Tablets and Greek Religion: Further Along the Path.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 3-14.

Edmunds, L. 1990. *Approaches to Greek Myth.* Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ehrlich, C. S. 2009. *From an Antique Land: An Introduction to Ancient Near Eastern Literature.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Eidinow, E., Kindt, J. & Osborne, R. (eds) 2019. *Theologies of Ancient Greek religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ekroth, G. 2002. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods.* Liége, Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique.

Eliade, M. 1958. *Patterns in Comparative Religion.* London, Sheed and Ward.

Eller, C. 2011. *Gentlemen and Amazons: The Myth of Matriarchal Prehistory, 1861-1900.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fantham, E. 1994. *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. (eds.) 2015. *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. 2015. Introduction: Kyklos, the Epic and Cyclic poetry. *In:* Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. (ed.) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-42.

Faraone, C. A. 1991. Binding and Burying the Forces of Evil: The Defensive Use of "Voodoo Dolls" in Ancient Greece. *Classical Antiquity,* 10**,** 165-220.

Faraone, C. A. 2010. Kronos and the Titans as Powerful Ancestors: A Case Study of the Greek Gods in

Later Magical Spells. *In:* Bremmer, J. and Erskine., A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 388-405.

Faraone, C. A. 2011. Magical and Medical Approaches to the Wandering Womb in the Ancient Greek World. *Classical Antiquity,* 30**,** 1-32.

Faraone, C. A. & Teeter, E. 2004. Egyptian Maat and Hesiodic Metis. *Mnemosyne,* 57**,** 177-208.

Farnell, L. R. 1896. *The Cults of the Greek States.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Faulkner, A. 2008. The Legacy of Aphrodite: Anchises' Offspring in the "Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite". *The American Journal of Philology.* 129**,** 1-18.

Feldman, L. H. 1996. Homer and the Near East: The Rise of the Greek Genius. *The Biblical Archaeologist,* 59**,** 13-21.

Felson, N. 2011. Children of Zeus in the Homeric Hymns. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Felton, D. 2007. The Dead. *In:* Ogden, D. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion.* Maldon, MA.: Blackwell Pub. 86-99.

Fernández Camacho, P. 2016. El pilar del cielo. Aproximación al estudio de la imagen del Extremo Occidente en las fuentes grecorromanas a través de la figura mítica de Atlas. *Emerita,* 84**,** 205-228.

Ferrara, S. 2010. Mycenaean Texts: The Linear B Tablets. *In:* Bakker, E. J. (ed.) *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.9-24.

Finch, C. E. 2010. Evolving views of Ageing and Longevity from Homer to Hippocrates: Emergence of Natural Factors, Persistence of the Supernatural. *Greece and Rome,* 57**,** 355-377.

Finkelberg, M. 1990. A Creative Oral Poet and the Muse. *The American Journal of Philology.* 111**,** 293-303.

Finkelberg, M. 1991. Royal Succession in Heroic Greece. *The Classical Quarterly,* 41**,** 303-316.

Finkelberg, M. 2005. *Greeks and Pre-Greeks: Aegean Prehistory and Greek Heroic Tradition.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Finley, J. H. 1978. *Homer's Odyssey.* Cambridge, Mass.; London, Harvard University Press.

Finley, M. I. 1991. *The World of Odysseus.* London, Penguin.

Finley, M. I., Shaw, B. D. & Saller, R. P. (eds.) 1983. *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece.* Harmondsworth, Pelican Books.

Fisher, N. R. E. 1992. *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece.* Warminster, Aris & Phillips.

Fisher, N. R. E., Wees, H. V. & Boedeker, D. D. (eds.)1998. *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence.* London, Duckworth, with The Classical Press of Wales.

Fitton Brown, A. 1954. Niobe. *The Classical Quarterly,* 4**,** 175-180.

Flower, M. A. 2009. *The Seer in Ancient Greece.* Berkeley, California; London, University of California Press.

Floyd, E. D. 1989. Homer and the Life-Producing Earth. *The Classical World,* 82**,** 337-349.

Foley, H. P. 1975. Sex and State in Ancient Greece. *Diacritics,* 5**,** 31-36.

Foley, H. P. 1994. *The* Homeric Hymn to Demeter*: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays.* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Foley, J. (ed.) 2005. *A Companion to Ancient Epic.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Fontenrose, J. 1971. Gods and Men in the Oresteia. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 102**,** 71-109.

Forbes Irving, P. M. C. 1990. *Metamorphosis in Greek myths.* Oxford, Clarendon.

Fordsdyke, S. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece.* Princeton, New Jersey; Oxford, Princeton University Press.

Fowler, R. L. 1988. ΑΙΓ in Early Greek Language and Myth. *Phoenix,* 42**,** 95-113.

Fowler, R. 1998. Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue, and the Creation of the Hellenes. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society***,** 1-19.

Fowler, R. L. 2010. Gods in Early Greek Historiography. *In:* Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 318-334.

Fowler, R. L. 2011. Mythos and logos. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 131**,** 45-66.

Fowler, W. W. 1891. Frazer's Golden Bough. *The Classical Review,* 5**,** 48-52.

Fowler, W. W. 1891. Frazer's Golden Bough - The Golden Bough; A Study in Comparative Religion. By J. G. Frazer, M.A. *The Classical Review,* 5**,** 48-52.

Franco, M., Tsagalis, C. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) 2009. *Brill's Companion to Hesiod.* Leiden, The Netherlands, Brill.

Franz, M.-L. V. 1972. *Creation Myths.* Dallas, TX, Spring Publications Inc.

Franz, M.-L. V. 1986. *Patterns of Creativity Mirrored in Creation Myths,* Dallas, Spring Publications.

Freud, S. 1913. *Totem and Taboo.* Abingdon, Routledge.

Friedrich, P. 1978. *The Meaning of Aphrodite.* Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press.

Friedrich, R. 1989. Zeus and the Phaeacians: Odyssey 13.158. *The American Journal of Philology,* 110**,** 395-399.

Gagarin, M. 1981. *Drakon and Early Athenian Homicide Law.* New Haven; London, Yale University Press.
Gagarin, M. 1987. Morality in Homer. *Classical Philology,* 82**,** 285-306.

Gagarin, M. 1989. The First Law of the Gortyn Code. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* 29**,** 335-343.

Gagarin, M. 2005. Early Greek Law. *In:* Gagarin, M. and Cohen, D. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 82-96.

Gagarin, M. 2006. The Unity of Greek Law. *In:* Gagarin, M. and Cohen, D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 29-40.

Gagarin, M and Cohen, D. (eds.) 2005. The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law. *Cambridge Companions to the Ancient World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gagné, R. and Herrero de Jáuregui, M. 2019. Introduction: Sauver les dieux. *In:* Gagné, R. and Herrero de Jáuregui, M. (eds.) *Les dieux d'Homére II: anthropomorphismes.* Liége: Centre International d'étude de la Religion Grecque Antique: Presses Universitaires de Liége. 7-42.

Gagné, R. and Herrero de Jáuregui, M. (eds,) 2019. *Les dieux d'Homére II: anthropomorphismes,* Liége, Centre International d'étude de la Religion Grecque Antique: Presses Universitaires de Liége.

Gantz, T. N. 1978. Pindar's Second Pythian: The Myth of Ixion. *Hermes,* 106**,** 14-26.

Garcia Jr., L. F. 2013. Homeric Durabililty: Telling Time in the *Iliad*. Hellenic Studies Series 58. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

García, J. V. & Ruiz, A. 2013. *Poetic Language and Religion in Greece and Rome.* Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publisher.

Garet, R. R. 1983. Arthur and President Kennedy: The Myth of Kingship. *RAIN***,** 5-8.

Gazis, G. A. 2018. *Homer and the Poetics of Hades.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Giannakis, G. K. 2000. On Greek ἄντρον. *Glotta,* 76**,** 192-198.

Gill, C., Postlethwaite, N. & Seaford, R. (eds.) 1998. *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Gilleard, C. 2007. Old Age in Ancient Greece: Narratives of Desire, Narratives of Disgust. *Journal of Aging Studies,* 21**,** 81-92.

Gish, D. 2010. Nascent federalism and political crisis in the *Iliad*. *The History of Political Thought*, Vol. 31, 1, 1-32.

Glenn, J. 1977. Pandora and Eve: Sex as the Root of All Evil. *The Classical World,* 71**,** 179-185.

Goffman, E. 1956. Embarrassment and Social Organization. *American Journal of Sociology,* 62**,** 264-

271.

Gold, D. 2003. Interpreting Together: The Cambridge Ritualists' Affair of the Intellect. *Aesthetics and Analysis in Writing on Religion.* 1 ed.: University of California Press.

Golden, L. 1962. Zeus the Protector and Zeus the Destroyer. *Classical Philology,* 57**,** 20-26.

Golden, M. 2009. Oedipal Complexes. *In:* Hübenr, S and Ratzan, D. (eds.) *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 41-60.

Golden, M. 2011. Other People's Children. *In:* Rawson, B. (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 262-275.

Golden, M. 2012. The Future of the Ancient Greek Family. *In:* Laurence, R. and Strömberg, A. (eds.) *The Family in Antiquity.* London: Continuum. 179-192.

Gonda, J. 1960. Some Observations on Dumézil's Views of Indo-European Mythology. *Mnemosyne,* 13**,** 1-15.

Goodison, L and Morris, C. (eds.) 1998. *Ancient Goddesses: The Myths and the Evidence.* Madison, Wis., University of Wisconsin Press.

Goodison, L and Morris, C. 1998. Introduction *In:* Goodison, L and Morris, C. (eds.) *Ancient Goddesses: The Myths and the Evidence.* London: British Museum Press. 6-21.

Goodnick Westenholz, J. 1998. Goddesses of the Ancient Near East 3000-1000 BC. *In:* Goodison, L and Morris, C. (eds.) *Ancient Goddesses: The Myths and the Evidence.* London: British Museum Press. 63-82.

Gordon, R. L. & Detienne, M. 1981. *Myth, Religion and Society: Structuralist essays.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Gorny, R. L. 1989. Environment, Archaeology, and History in Hittite Anatolia. *The Biblical Archaeologist,* 52**,** 78-96.

Gorny, R. L. 1995. Hittite Imperialism and Anti-Imperial Resistance as Viewed from Alişar Höyük. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research***,** 65-89.

Gould, J. 1980. Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 100**,** 38-59.

Gouldner, A. W. 1967. *Enter Plato: Classical Greece and the Origins of Social Theory.* London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Graf, F. 1996. *Greek Mythology an Introduction,* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Graf, F. 2009. *Apollo.* London, Routledge.

Graf, F. 2014. Text and Ritual: The Corpus Eschatologicum of the Orphics. *In:* Edmonds, R. G. (ed.) *The "Orphic" Gold Tablets and Greek Religion: Further Along the Path.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 53-67.

Graziosi, B. 2016. Theologies of the Family in Homer and Hesiod. *In:* Eidinow, E., Kindt, J. & Osborne, R. (eds.) *Theologies of Ancient Greek Religion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 35-61.

Greenberg, N. A. 1993. The Attitude of Agamemnon. *The Classical World,* 86**,** 193-205.

Greene, E. S. 2005. Revising Illegitimacy: The Use of Epithets in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes. *The Classical Quarterly,* 55**,** 343-349.

Greene, W. C. 1935. Fate, Good, and Evil, in Early Greek Poetry. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 46**,** 1-36.

Greenhalgh, P. A. L. 1972. Aristocracy and Its Advocates in Archaic Greece. *Greece & Rome,* 19**,** 190-207.

Griffin, J. 1977. The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 97**,** 39-53.

Griffith, M. 1998. The King and Eye: The Rule of the Father in Greek Tragedy. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society***,** 20-84.

Griffith, R. D. 2016. Cannibal Demeter (Pind. *Ol.* 1.52) and the Thesmophoria Pigs. *The Classical Journal,* 111**,** 129-139.

Griffiths, E. M. 2002. Euripides' "Herakles" and the Pursuit of Immortality. *Mnemosyne,* 55**,** 641-656.

Grigson, G. 1978. *The Goddess of Love: The Birth, Triumph, Death and Rreturn of Aphrodite.* London, Quartet Books.

Grimm, R. E. 1962. Pindar and the Beast. *Classical Philology,* 57**,** 1-9.

Güterbock, H. G. 1948. The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners of Hesiod. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 52**,** 123-134.

Güterbock, H. G. 1984. Hittites and Akhaeans: A New Look. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* 128**,** 114-122.

Guthrie, W. K. C. 1950. *The Greeks and their Gods.* London, Methuen.

Hackstein, O. 2010. The Greek of Epic. *In:* Bakker, E. J. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Greek Language.* Chichester: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 401-423.

Hainsworth, B. & Kirk, G. S. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hall, E. 1996. When is a Myth not a Myth? Baal's 'Ancient Model'. *In:* Lefkowitz, M. and Maclean Rogers, G. (eds.) *Black Athena Revisited.* London: University of North Carolina Press. 333-348.

Hall, J. 2013. The Rise of State Action in the Archaic Age. *In:* Beck, H. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government.* Chichester: John Wiley and Sons. 38-50.

Hall, J. M. 2002. *Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture.* Chicago; London, The University of Chicago Press.

Hall, J. M. 2007. *A History of the Archaic Greek World, ca. 1200-479 BCE.* Malden, Massachusetts; Oxford, Blackwell.

Hall, J. M. 2007. Polis, Community and Ethnic Identity. *In:* Shapiro, H. A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 40-60.

Halm-Tisserant, M. 1986. Le Gorgonéion, Embléme d'Athéna Introduction du Motif sur le Bouclier et l'égide. *Revue Archéologique,* 1986**,** 245-278.

Halverson, J. 1986. The Succession Issue in the 'Odyssey'. *Greece & Rome,* 33**,** 119-128.

Hammer, D. 1998. Homer, Tyranny, and Democracy. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.,* 39**,** 331-360.

Hansen, W. 2000. Foam-Born Aphrodite and the Mythology of Transformation. *The American Journal of Philology,* 121**,** 1-19.

Harrall, S. 1991. Apollo's Fraternal Threats: Language of Succession and Domination in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* 32**,** 307-329.

Harris, R. 1991. Inanna-Ishtar as Paradox and a Coincidence of Opposites. *History of Religions,* 30**,** 261-278.

Harrison, J. E. 1908. Helios-Hades. *The Classical Review,* 22**,** 12-16.

Harrison, J. E., Murray, G. & Cornford, F. M. 1963. *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion,* London, Merlin Press.

Harrison, T. 2012. Herodotus and the Ancient Greek Idea of Rape. *In:* Deacy, S. Pierce, K. F. Arafat, K. W. (eds.) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* London: Bristol Classical Press. 185-209.

Hartswick, K. J. 1993. The Gorgoneion on the Aigis of Athena: Genesis, Suppression and Survival. *Revue Archéologique,* 1993**,** 269-292.

Hassan, F. 1998. The earliest goddesses of Egypt: divine mothers and cosmic bodies. *In:* Goodison, L. and Morris, C. (eds.) *Ancient Goddesses: The Myths and the Evidence.* London: British Museum Press. 98-112.

Havelock, C. M. 1981. Cycladic Sculpture: A Prelude to Greek Art? *Archaeology,* 34**,** 29-36.

Hawley, R. and Levick, B. 1995. *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments.* London, Routledge.

Heath J. 2005. Blood for the Dead: Homeric Ghosts Speak Up. *Hermes,* 133**,** 389-400.

Heath, M. 1985. Hesiod's Didactic Poetry. *The Classical Quarterly,* 35**,** 245-263.

Heidel, A. and Maxwell-Hyslop, R. 1951. *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation.* Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press.

Helm, J. J. 2004. Aeschylus' Genealogy of Morals. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 134**,** 23-54.

Henderson, J. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hendrix, L. 1975. Nuclear Family Universals: Fact and Faith in the Acceptance of an Idea. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* 6**,** 125-138.

Henrichs, A. 2003. Writing Religion. Inscribed Texts, Ritual Authority and the Religious Discourse of the Polis. *In:* Yunis, H. (ed.) *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 38-59.

Henrichs, A. 2010. What is A Greek God? *In:* Bremmer, J. and Esrkine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece. Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 20-39.

Hewlett, B. A. M., S. 2010. Father's Roles in Hunter-Gatherer and other Small Scale Cultures. *In:* Lamb, M. E. (ed.) *The Role of the Father in Child Development.* Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley. 413-434.

Hoffner, H. 1968. Birth and Name-Giving in Hittite Texts. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 27**,** 198-203.

Hoffner, H. and Beckman, G. (eds.) 1983. *Kaniššuwar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983,* Chicago, Il., The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Hoffner, H. and Beckman, G. 1998. *Hittite myths.* Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press.

Hogan, J. C. 1976. The Temptation of Odysseus. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 106**,** 187-210.

Holt, P. 1992. Ajax's Burial in Early Greek Epic. *The American Journal of Philology,* 113**,** 319-331.

Horowitz, M. C. 1976. Aristotle and Woman. *Journal of the History of Biology,* 9**,** 183-213.

Hübner, S. R. & Ratzan, D. M. (eds.) 2009. *Growing up Fatherless in Antiquity,* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Hübner, S. R. & Ratzan, D. M. 2009. Fatherless Antiquity: Perspectives on 'Fatherlessness' in the Ancient Mediterranean. *In:* Hübner, S. R. & Ratzan, D. M. (ed.) *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-28.

Hughes, D. D. 1991. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece.* London, Routledge.

Humphreys, S. C. 1988. The Discourse of Law in Archaic and Classical Greece. *Law and History Review,* 6**,** 465-493.

Hundley, M. 2014. The God Collectors: Hittite Conception of the Divine. *Altorientalische Forschugen,* 41**,** 176-200.

Hunter, V. 1997. The Prison of Athens: A Comparative Perspective. *Phoenix,* 51**,** 296-326.

Hurst, I. 2012. 'Love and blackmail': Demeter and Persephone. *Classical Receptions Journal,* 4**,** 176-189.

Hurwit, J. M. 1995. Beautiful Evil: Pandora and the Athena Parthenos. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 99**,** 171-186.

Ilan, P. 2015. Crime and Sexual Offense in Hatti. *Near Eastern Archaeology,* 78**,** 286-293.

Jackson, K. 2010. Father-Daughter Dynamics in the Iliad: The Role of Aphrodite in Defining Zeus' Regime. *In:* Smith, A. P., S. (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite.* Leiden: Brill. 151-163.

Jacobson, H. 2015. Asherah and Aphrodite: A Coincidence? *The Classical Quarterly,* 65**,** 355-356.

Janko, R. 1981. The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre. *Hermes,* 109**,** 9-24.

Jeffrey, B. 2013. And Now for Something Completely Different: Addressing Assumptions about Myth. *The Classical Journal,* 109**,** 114-122.

Jensen, M. 2005. Performance. *In:* Foley, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epic.* Oxford: Blackwell. 45-54.

Johnson, D. M. 1999. Hesiod's Descriptions of Tartarus ("Theogony" 721-819). *Phoenix,* 53**,** 8-28.

Johnston, S. I. 2013. *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece.* Berkeley; London, University of California Press.

Jones, C. P. 1999. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World,* Cambridge, Mass.; London, Harvard University Press.

Joyal, M. A. 1991. Hesiod's Heracles: Theogony 526, 950. *Glotta,* 69**,** 184-186.

Kamen, D. 2007. The Life Cycle in Archaic Greece. *In:* Shapiro, H. A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karen, R. 1994. *Becoming Attached: First Relationships and how they Shape our Capacity to Love.* New York; Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Katz, M. 2003. Ideology and "the Status of Women" in Ancient Greece. *In:* Golden, M. and Toohey, P. (eds.) *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Edinburgh University Press. 30-43.

Kerényi, K. 1975. *Zeus and Hera: Archetypal Image of Father, Husband, and Wife,* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kerényi, K. and Cameron, N. 1951. *The Gods of the Greeks.* London, Thames & Hudson.

Keuls, E. C. 1980. Niobe's and Tantalus' Associates. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik,* 38**,** 43-45.

Killan, J. 2006. The Subjects of the Wanax: Aspects of Mycenaean Social Structure. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos, I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 87-100.

Kirk, G. S. 1970. *Myth: its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and other Cultures,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, G. S. 1972. Greek Mythology: Some New Perspectives. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 92**,** 74-85.

Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: a Commentary.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, G. S. 1989. Homer. *In:* Easterling, P. E. and Knox, Bernard M. W. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Volume 1 Part 1, Early Greek Poetry.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.1-50.

Kirk, G. S. 1990. *The Nature of Greek Myths,* London, Penguin.

Kitts, M. 1994. Two Expressions for Human Mortality in the Epics of Homer. *History of Religions,* 34**,** 132-151.

Knox, B. 1985. The Enduring Myths of Ancient Greece. *The Classical Outlook,* 62**,** 118-121.

Kohlmeyer, K. 2009. The Temple of the Storm God in Aleppo During the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages. *Near Eastern Archaeology,* 72**,** 190-202.

Kölligan, D. 2013. Τάρταρος. In García, J. V. and Ruiz, Á. (eds.), *Poetic Language and Religion in Greece and Rome*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 118-126

Konstant, D. 1986. Comparative Methods in Mythology. *Arethusa,* 19**,** 87-99.

Konstan, D. 2000. οἰκίαδ' εστί τις Φιλία: Love and the Greek Family. *Syllecta Classica,* 11**,** 106-126.

Konstan, D. 2001. To Hellenikon Ethnos: Ethnicity and the Construction of Ancient Greek Identity. *In:* Malkin, I. (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity.* Washington, D.C. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Centre for Hellenic Studies. Distributed by Harvard University Press. 29-51.

Konstan, D. 2003. Shame in Ancient Greece. *Social Research,* 70**,** 1031-1060.

Konstan, D. 2015. Wit and Irony in the Epic Cycle. *In:* Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. (eds.) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: a Companion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 164-177.

Kosman, A. 2010. Male and Female in Aristotle's Generation of Animals. *In:* Lennox, J. G. & Bolton, R. (eds.) *Being, Nature, and Life in Aristotle: Essays in Honor of Allan Gotthelf.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 147-167.

Kotsonas, A. 2016. Politics of Periodization and the Archaeology of Early Greece. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 120**,** 239-270.

Kragerud, A. 1972. *The Concept of Creation in Enuma Elish.* Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Kristiansen, K. and Larsson, T. B. 2005. *The Rise of Bronze Age Society: Travels, Transmissions and Transformations.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kuhrt, A. L. 1995. *The Ancient Near East: c. 3000-330 B.C.* London, Routledge.

Kullmann, W. 1985. Gods and Men in the Iliad and the Odyssey. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 89**,** 1-23.

Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy.* Ithaca; London, Cornell University Press.

Lampe, K. Obeying Your Father: Stoic Theology between Myth and Masochism." Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self. *In*: Zajko, V. and O'Gorman, E. 2013. *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self,* Oxford, Oxford University Press. 183-198.

Lévi-Strass, C. Bell, J. H. Von Sturmer, R. and Needham, R. (eds.) *The Elementary Structure of Kinship: (Les Structures Élémentaires de la Parenté),* London, Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Lacey, W. K. 1968. *The Family in Classical Greece.* London, Thames & Hudson.

Laiou, A. E. 1993. *Consent and Coercion to Sex and Marriage in Ancient and Medieval Societies.* Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

Lamb, M. E. 2010. *The Role of the Father in Child development. 5th ed.* Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.

Lambert, W. G. 2013. *Babylonian Creation Myths.* Winona Lake, Indiana, Eisenbrauns.

Lamberton, R. 1988. *Hesiod.* New Haven; London, Yale University Press.

Lane Fox, R. 2009. *Travelling Heroes: Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer,* London, Penguin Books.

Lapatin, K. 2010. New Statues for Old Gods. *In:* Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 126-151.

Lardinois, A. and Mcclure, L. 2001. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society.* Princeton, N.J.; Oxford, Princeton University Press.

Lardinois, A. 2016. Eastern Myths for Western Lies: Allusions to Near Eastern Mythology in Homer's *Iliad*. *Mnemosyne*, 4, 895-919.

Larfargue, P. 2017. Le P*ais Amphithalês*: l'autre Enfant d'Athéna. *Metis***,** 203-229

Larson, J. 2007. *Ancient Greek cults: a guide.* New York, NY; London, Routledge.

Larson, J. 2007. A Land Full of Gods: Nature Deities in Greek Religion. *In:* Ogden, D. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion.* Maldon, MA: Blackwell Pub. 56-70.

Lawler, A. 2008. Who Were the Hurrians? *Archaeology,* 61**,** 46-52.

Lee, G. R. 1982. The Family: Origins and University. *Family Structure and Interaction.* NED - New edition ed. Philadelphia: University of Minnesota Press. 51-72.

Lefkowitz, M. 1993. Seduction and Rape in Greek Myth. *In:* Laiou, A. E. (ed.) *Consent and Coercion to Sexual Marriage in Ancient and Medieval Societies.* Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection. 17-38.

Lefkowitz, M. 1996. Introduction. *In:* Lefkowitz, M. and Rogers, G. M. (eds.) *Black Athena Revisited.* London: The University of North Carolina Press. 3-23

Lefkowitz, M. 2003. *Greek Gods, Human Lives,* New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

Lefkowitz, M. R. 1987. The Heroic Women of Greek Epic. *The American Scholar,* 56**,** 503-518.

Lefkowitz, M. R. 1989. Mythology: The Powers of the Primeval Goddesses. *The American Scholar,* 58**,** 586-591.

Lefkowitz, M. R. 2002. "Predatory" Goddesses. *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens,* 71**,** 325-344.

Lefkowitz, M. R. 2007. *Women in Greek Myth,* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lefkowitz, M. R. & Rogers, G. M. (eds.) 1996. *Black Athena Revisited.* London, University of North Carolina Press.

Legarra Herrero, B. 2016. An Elite Infested Sea: Interaction and Change in Mediterranean Paradigms. *In:* Molloy, B. (ed.) *Of Odysseys and Oddities: Scales and Modes of Interaction between Prehistoric Aegean Societies and their Neighbours.* Oxford: Oxbow Books. 29-51.

Leitao, D. 2012. *The Pregnant Male as Myth and Metaphor in Classical Greek Literature.* New York, Cambridge University Press.

Lennox, J. G. and Bolton, R. (eds.) 2010. *Being, Nature, and Life in Aristotle: Essays in Honor of Allan Gotthelf,* Cambridge, UNITED KINGDOM, Cambridge University Press.

Lev Kenaan, V. 2008. Pandora's Senses: The Feminine Character of the Ancient Text. *Wisconsin Studies in Classics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Levi, M. A. 1975. *Political Power in the Ancient World,* Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press.

Levine, D. B. 1987. "Flens Matrona et Meretrices Gaudentes": Penelope and Her Maids. *The Classical World,* 81**,** 23-27.

Lévi-Strauss, C. 1978. *Myth and Meaning.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lexton, R. 2011. Kingship in Malory's Morte Darthur. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* 110**,** 173-201.

Lilley, I. 1985. Chiefs without Chiefdoms? Comments on Prehistoric Socio-political Organization in

Western Melanesia. *Archaeology in Oceania,* 20**,** 60-65.

Lincoln, B. 1976. The Indo-European Cattle-Raiding Myth. *History of Religions,* 16**,** 42-65.

Lindsay, H. 2011. Adoption and Heirship in Greece and Rome. *In:* Rawson, B. (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 346-360.

Lintott, A. W. 1982. *Violence, Civil Strife and Revolution in the Classical City, 750-330 BC,* London, Croom Helm.

Littleton, C. S. 1969. Lévi-Strauss and the "Kingship in Heaven": A Structural Analysis of a Widespread Theogonic Theme. *Journal of the Folklore Institute,* 6**,** 70-84.

Littleton, C. S. 1980. The Problem that was Greece: Some Observations on the Greek Tradition from the Standpoint of the New Comparative Mythology. *Arethusa,* 13**,** 141-159.

Liverani, M. & Tabatabai, S. 2014. *The Ancient Near East: History, Society and Economy.* London, Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Lloyd, A. B. 1997. From Epiphany to Cult Statue. *In:* Lloyd, A. B. (ed.) *What is a God?: Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity.* London: Duckworth. 15-34.

Lloyd, A. B. (ed.) 1997. *What is a God?: Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity.* London, Duckworth.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. *The Justice of Zeus.* Berkeley; London, University of California Press.

Lombardi, M. 2012. Chaos e Ade in Hes. "TH". 720-819. *Hermes,* 140**,** 1-24.

Long, A. (ed.) 1999. *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lonsdale, S. H. 1989. Hesiod's Hawk and Nightingale (Op. 202-12): Fable or Omen? *Hermes*, 117, 403-412.

López-Ruiz, C. 2006. Some Oriental elements in Hesiod and the Orphic Cosmogonies. *The Journal of Near Eastern Religion,* 6**,** 71-104.

López-Ruiz, C. 2010. *When the Greeks were Born. Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East.* London, Harvard University Press.

López-Ruiz, C. 2014. *Gods, Heroes, and Monsters. A Sourcebook of Greek, Roman and Near Eastern Myths in Translation.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

López-Ruiz, C. 2014. Greek and Canaanite Mythologies: Zeus, Baal, and their Rivals. *Religion Compass,* 8**,** 1-10.

Loraux, N. 2000. *Born of the Earth: Myth and Politics in Athens,* Ithaca; London, Cornell University Press.

Louden, B. 2005. The Gods in Epic or the Divine Economy. *In:* Foley, J. M. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epic.* Oxford: Blackwell. 90-104.

Louden, B. 2013. Iapetus and Japheth: Hesiod's *Theogony*, *Iliad* 15.187-93, and Genesis 9-10. *Illinois*

Classical Studies, 1-22.

Louis, C.-H. 1995. Divorce in Classical Athens. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 115, 1-14.

Lowenstam, S. 2000. The Shroud of Laertes and Penelope's Guile. *The Classical Journal,* 95, 333-348.

Luraghi, N. 2013. One Man Government: the Greeks and monarchy. *In:* Beck, H. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. 164-179.

Lyons, D. J. 1997. *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult,* Princeton, N.J, Princeton University Press.

Lyons, D. 2003. Dangerous Gifts: Ideologies of Marriage and Exchange in Ancient Greece. *Classical Antiquity,* 22, 93-134.

Lyons, D. 2020. Family and Marriage in Homer. In: Pache, C. O. (ed.) *The Cambridge Guide to Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maccormack, S. 1984. Magic and the Human Mind: A Reconsideration of Frazer's "Golden Bough". *Arethusa,* 17, 151-176.

Mack, W. J. B. G. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Mackenzie, M. M. 1981. *Plato on Punishment.* Berkeley, University of California Press.

Mackie, C. J. 1998. Achilles in Fire. *The Classical Quarterly,* 48, 329-338.

Mackowiak, K. 2010. De Moira aux Moirai, de l'épopée à la généalogie. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne,* 36/1, 9-49.

Maclean, R. 1996. Multiculturalism and the Foundations of Western civilisation. *In:* Lefkowitz, M. and Maclean, R. (ed.) *Black Athena Revisited.* London: University of North Carolina Press. 428-443.

Macqueen, J. G. 1959. Hattian Mythology and Hittite Monarchy. *Anatolian Studies,* 9, 171-188.

Macqueen, J. G. 1986. *The Hittites and their contemporaries in Asia Minor.* London, Thames and Hudson.

Maffi, A. 2016. The Laws of Gortyn and their Cretan Context. *In:* Harris, E. and Canevaro, M. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law.* Available at https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199599257.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199599257-e-9?print=pdf. (Accessed 06/01/2020)

Malcolm, H. W. 2013. 'Minding the Gap' Gaps, Destructions, and Migrations in the Early Bronze Age Aegean. Causes and Consequences. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 117, 581-592.

Malinowski, B. 1926. Myth in Primitive Psychology. Read Books Ltd.

Malkin, I. (ed.) 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity,* Washington, D.C. Cambridge, Mass.; London, Centre for Hellenic Studies. Distributed by Harvard University Press.

Malkin, I. 2001. Introduction. *In:* Malkin, I. (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity.* Washington, D.C. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Centre for Hellenic Studies Distributed by Harvard University Press. 1-28.

Maran, J. 2006. Coming to Terms with the Past: Ideology and Power in Late-Helladic III C. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos. I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 123-150.

Marcovich, M. 1996. From Ishtar to Aphrodite. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* 30**,** 43-59.

Marinatos, N. 2009. The So-called Hell and Sinners in the Odyssey and Homeric Cosmology. *Numen,* 56**,** 185-197.

Marinatos, N. 2013. Minoan Religion. *In:* Salzman, M and Sweeny, M. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 237-255.

Marks, J. 2005. The Ongoing Neikos: Thersites, Odysseus, and Achilleus. *The American Journal of Philology,* 126**,** 1-31.

Marquardt, P. A. 1982. Hesiod's Ambiguous View of Woman. *Classical Philology,* 77**,** 283-291.

Martin, R. P. 1984. Hesiod, Odysseus, and the Instruction of Princes. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 114**,** 29-48.

Marx, P. A. 1993. The Introduction of the Gorgoneion to the Shield and Aegis of Athena and the Question of Endoios. *Revue Archéologique***,** 227-268.

Matsushina, E. 2014. Ištar and Other Goddesses of the So-Called "Sacred Marriage" in Ancient Mesopotamia. *In:* Sugimoto, D. (ed.) *Transformation of a Goddess: Ishtar - Astarte - Aphrodite.* Fribourg: Academic Press. 1-14.

Mccallum-Barry, C. 2000. Myth under Construction. *Classics Ireland,* 7**,** 99-115.

McGlew, J. F. 1993. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece,* Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

McHardy, F. 2008. *Revenge in Athenian Culture.* London, Duckworth.

McInerney, J. 2001. Ethnos and Ethnicity in Early Greece. *In:* Malkin, I. (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity.* Washington, D.C. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Centre for Hellenic Studies. Distributed by Harvard University Press. 51-74.

McInerney, J. 2010. *The Cattle of the Sun: Cows and Culture in the World of the Ancient Greeks.* Princeton, N.J.; Oxford, Princeton University Press.

McKay, K. J. 1963. Ambivalent Aidws in Hesiod. *The American Journal of Philology,* 84**,** 17-27.

McMahon, G. 1989. The History of the Hittites. *The Biblical Archaeologist,* 52**,** 62-77.

Meier, C. 2011. *A culture of freedom: ancient Greece and the origins of Europe.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Meier-Brügger, M. 2006. The Rise and Descent of the Language in the Homeric Poems. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos. I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 417-426.

Meisner, D. A. 2019. *Orphic Tradition and the Birth of the Gods.* New York, NY, Oxford University Press.

Meltzer, E. S. 1974. Egyptian Parallels for an Incident in Hesiod's Theogony and an Episode in the Kumarbi Myth. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 33**,** 154-157.

Menget, P. 2008. Kinship Theory after Lévi-Strauss': "Elementary Structures". *Journal De La Société Des Américanistes,* 94(2), 29-37.

Merrillees, R. S. 1986. Political Conditions in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age. *The Biblical Archaeologist,* 49**,** 42-50.

Metcalf, C. 2015. *The Gods Rich in Praise: Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Meyer, M. W. 1999. *The Ancient Mysteries: A Sourcebook of Sacred Texts,* Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Michael, D. P. 2012. (Pytho)Gaia in Myth and Legend: The Goddess of the Ekron Inscription Revisited. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research***,** 1-25.

Michael, J. M. 2006. Speaking to Kings: Hesiod's AinoΣ and the Rhetoric of Allusion in the Works and Days. *The Classical Quarterly,* 56**,** 363-373.

Miller, A. M. 1986. *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo,* Leiden, E.J. Brill.

Minton, W. W. 1970. The Proem-Hymn of Hesiod's Theogony. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 101**,** 357-377.

Mitchell, L. G. 1997. *Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435-323 B.C.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, L. G. 2013. *The Heroic Rulers of Archaic and Classical Greece,* London, Bloomsbury Academic.

Molloy, B. 2016. Introduction: Thinking of Scales and Modes of Interaction in Prehistory. *In:* Molloy, B. (ed.) *Of Odysseys and Oddities: Scales and Modes of Interaction between Prehistoric Aegean Societies and their Neighbours.* Oxford: Oxbow Books. 9-28.

Molloy, B. (ed.) 2016. *Of Odysseys and Oddities: Scales and Modes of Interaction Between Prehistoric Aegean Societies and their Neighbours,* Oxford; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Oxbow Books.

Mondi, R. 1984. The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's "Theogony. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* 25**,** 325.

Mondi, R. 1989. Χαοσ and the Hesiodic Cosmogony. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 92**,** 1-41.

Mondi, R. 1990. Greek and Near Eastern Mythology. *In:* Edmunds, L. (ed.) *Approaches to Greek Mythology.* Baltimore, MA: Johns Hopkins University Press. 141-198.

Moorhouse, A. C. 1940. Greek ΓΥΝΗ, English Kin. *The Classical Review,* 54**,** 187-187.

Morgan, D. H. J. 1996. *Family Connections: An Introduction to Family Studies,* Cambridge, Polity.

Morgan, J. 2011. Families and Religion in Classical Greece. *In:* Rawson, B. (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 447-464.

Morgan, K. 2003. Introduction *In:* Morgan, K. A. (ed.) *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece.* Austin, TX.: University of Texas Press.

Morgan, K. A. (ed.) 2003. *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece,* Austin, United States, University of Texas Press.

Morison W. S. 2019. Pherekydes of Athens. *In:* Worthingon, I. (ed.) *Brill's New Jacoby.* Brill.

Morpurgo Davies, A. 1979. Terminology of Power and Terminology of Work in Greek and Linear B. *In:* Risch, E. & Mühlestein, H. (ed.) *Colloquium Mycenaeum. Actes du VI^e^ Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel du 7 au 13 septembre 1975.* Genève: Droz. 87-108.

Morris, I. 1989. Attitudes toward Death in Archaic Greece. *Classical Antiquity,* 8**,** 296-320.

Morris, I. 1990. The Gortyn Code and Greek Kinship. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* 31**,** 233-254.

Morris, S. 1996. The Legacy of Black Athena. *In:* Lefkowitz, M. and Maclean Rogers, G. (eds.) *Black Athena Revisited.* London: University of North Carolina Press. 167-176.

Morris, S. 2003. Imaginary Kings: Alternatives to Monarchy in Early Greece. *In:* Morgan, K. A. (ed.) *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece.* Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press. 1-24.

Morris, S. 2009. Bridges to Babylon: Homer, Anatolia and the Levant. *In:* Aruz, J. Benzel, K. and Evans, J. (eds.) *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.* New York. New Haven: Metropolitan Museum of Art; Yale University Press. 435-445.

Morris, S. P. 1984. Hollow Lakedaimon. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 88**,** 1-11.

Morris, S. P. 1992. *Daidalos and the origins of Greek art,* Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Mossman, J. M. 1996. Chains of Imagery in Prometheus Bound. *The Classical Quarterly,* 46**,** 58-67.

Most, G. 2013. Eros in Hesiod. *In:* Sanders, E. Thumiger, C. Carey, C. and Lowe, N. (eds.) *Erôs in ancient Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 163-174.

Muich, R. 2011. Focalization and Embedded Speech in Andromache's Iliadic Laments. *Illinois Classical Studies***,** 1-24.

Müller-Karpe, A. 2009. The Hittite Empire. *In:* Aruz, J. Benzel, K. and Evans, J. (ed.) *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.* New York, New Haven: Metropolitan Museum of Art; Yale University Press. 170-184.

Munn, M. H. 2006. The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia: A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion. Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California Press, Ltd.

Murgatroyd, P. 1995. The Sea of Love. *The Classical Quarterly,* 45**,** 9-25.

Murnaghan, S. 1992. Maternity and Mortality in Homeric Poetry. *Classical Antiquity,* 11**,** 242-264.

Murray, M. 1915. Royal Marriages and Matrilineal Descent. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,* 45**,** 307-325.

Myers, T. 2011. *Hermathena*. 123-126.

Mylonas, G. E. 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian mysteries.* Princeton, N.J. London, Princeton University Press; Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry.* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nagy, G. 2007. Lyric and Greek Myth. *In:* Woodard, R. D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology.* Cambridge Cambridge University Press. 52-82.

Nagy, G. 2015. Oral Traditions, Written Texts, and Questions of Authorship. *In:* Fantuzzi, M. A. T., C. (ed.) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 59-77.

Neal, T. 2006. Blood and Hunger in the Iliad. *Classical Philology,* 101**,** 15-33.

Nelson, S. 1997. The Justice of Zeus in Hesiod's Fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale. *The Classical Journal*, 92, 235-247.

Nelson, S. A. 1998. *God and the Land: The Metaphysics of Farming in Hesiod and Vergil,* New York; Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Nelson, S. A. 2005. Hesiod. *In:* Foley, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epic.* Oxford: Blackwell. 330-343.

Neville, J. W. 1977. Herodotus on the Trojan War. *Greece & Rome,* 24**,** 3-12.

Newell, W. R. 1987. Superlative Virtue: The Problem of Monarchy in Aristotle's 'Politics'. *The Western Political Quarterly,* 40**,** 159-178.

Nicholas, G. B. 2014. Making the Lion Gate Relief at Mycenae: Tool Marks and Foreign Influence. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 118**,** 451-488.

Nikoloudis, S. 2011. Multiculturalism in the Mycenaean World. *In:* Collins, B. Backvarova, M, and Rutherford, I. (ed.) *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours.* Oxford: Oxbow Books. 45-56.

Niles, J. D. 1979. On the Design of the "Hymn to Delian Apollo". *The Classical Journal,* 75**,** 36-39.

Nilsson, M. P. 1932. *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology,* Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press.

Nilsson, M. P. 1951. The Sickle of Kronos. *The Annual of the British School at Athens,* 46**,** 122-124.

Noegal, S. 2007. Greek Religion and the Near East. *In:* Ogden, D. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion.* Maldon, MA: Blackwell Pub. 21-38.

Noga, A.-D. 2013. Baal, Son of Dagan: In Search of Baal's Double Paternity. *Journal of the American Oriental Society,* 133**,** 651-657.

Notopoulos, J. A. 1960. Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry. *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens,* 29**,** 177-197.

Notopoulos, J. A. 1964. Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 68**,** 1-77.

Oakley, J. H. & Sinos, R. H. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens.* Madison, Wis.; London, University of Wisconsin Press.

O'Connor, D. 1996. Egypt and Greece: The Bronze Age Evidence. *In*: Lefkowitz, M. and Maclean Rogers, G. (ed.) *Black Athena.* London: University of North Carolina Press. 49-61.

Ogden, D. 1996. *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Ogden, D. 1997. *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece.* London, Duckworth.

Ogden, D. (ed.) 2007. A Companion to Greek religion. *Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Literature and Culture.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Ogden, D. 2009. Bastardy and Fatherlessness in Ancient Greece. *In:* Hübner, S. and Ratzen D (eds.) *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 105-119.

Ogden, D. 2010. *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: the Hellenistic Dynasties.* Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.

Olson, S. D. 1990. The Stories of Agamemnon in Homer's Odyssey. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 120**,** 57-71.

Omitowoju, R. 2002. *Rape and the Politics of Consent in Classical Athens.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Orchard, A. 2012. The Aegis and the Armour of Achilleus. *Melbourne Historical Journal,* 40**,** 87-104.

Ormand, K. 2004. Marriage, Identity, and the Tale of Mestra in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. *The American Journal of Philology,* 125**,** 303-338.

Ormand, K. 2014. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women and Archaic Greece.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Otto, W. F. 1954. *The Homeric Gods: The Spiritual Significance of Greek Religion.* New York, Pantheon.

Pache, C. O. 2004. *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece.* Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

Palaima, T. 1995. The Nature of the Mycenaean Wanax. *In:* Rehak, P. (ed.) *The Role of the Ruler in the Prehistoric Aegean: Proceedings of a Panel Discussion Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, 28 December 1992, with additions.* Austin: University of Texas at Austin, Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory. 119-139.

Palaima, T. 2006. Wanaks and Related Power Terms in Mycenaean and Later Greek. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos, I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: from the Mycenaean palaces to the age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 53-72.

Palmer, D. 1993. 'The Curse of Kronos'. *Prudentia,* Supplementary Number: Multarum Artium Scientia.

Pàmias, J. 2017. Coon or Cimon?: Pherecydes' Homer: The Mythographic Possession of an Epic Past. *Mnemosyne,* 70**,** 131-139.

Panourgiá, N. 2008. Fragments of Oedipus Anthropology at the Edges of History. *In:* Panourgiá,, N. and Marcus, G. E. (eds.) *Ethnographica Moralia.* New York: Fordham University Press. 97-112.

Pantelia, M. C. 2002. Helen and the Last Song for Hector. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 132**,** 21-27.

Papadopoulou, C. 2010. Aphrodite and the Fleet in Classical Athens. *In:* Smith, A. Pickup, S. Robins, A. (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite.* Leiden: Brill. 217-234.

Park, A. 2014. Parthenogenesis in Hesiod's *Theogony*. *Preternature: Critical and Historical Studies on the Preternatural,* 3**,** 261-283.

Parke, H. W. 1981. Apollo and the Muses, or prophecy in Greek verse. *Hermathena***,** 99-112.

Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Parker, R. 1991. The Hymn to Demeter and the Homeric Hymns. *Greece and Rome,* 38**,** 1-17.

Parker, R. 1998. Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion. *In:* Gill, C. Postlethwaite, N. and Seaford, R. (ed.) *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 105-126.

Parker, R. 2002. The Cult of Aprhodite Pandamos and Pontia on Cos. *In:* Horstmanshoff, H. Singor, H. Van Straten, F. and Strubbe. J. (eds.) *Kykeon Studies in Honour of H.S. Versnel.* Leiden: Brill. 143-160.

Parker, R. 2011. *On Greek religion.* Ithaca; London, Cornell University Press.

Parker, R. 2017. *Greek Gods Abroad: Names, Natures and Transformations.* Oakland, University of California Press.

Patterson, C. 1998. *The Family in Greek History.* Cambridge, Mass; London, Harvard University Press.

Patterson, C. B. 1990. Those Athenian Bastards. *Classical Antiquity,* 9**,** 40-73.

Pease, A. S. 1925. Prometheus and Tityos. *Classical Philology,* 20**,** 277-278.

Penglase, C. 1993. Pandora's Rise from the Earth. *Supplementary Number: Multarum Artium Scientia***,** 153-155.

Penglase, C. 1994. *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod.* London, Routledge.

Peristiany, J. G. & Pitt -Rivers, J. A. (eds.) 1992. *Honor and Grace in anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petridou, G. 2016. *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Pirenne-Delforge, V. 1994. *L'Aphrodite Grecque,* Liége, Presses universitaires de Liège.

Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2007. "Something to do with Aphrodite": Ta Aphrodisia and the Sacred. *In:* Ogden, D. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion.* Maldon, MA: Blackwell Pub. 311-324.

Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2010. Flourishing Aphrodite: An Overview. *In:* Smith, A. Pickup, S. Robins, A. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite.* Leiden: Brill. 3-16.

Pironti, G. 2010. Rethinking Aphrodite as a Goddess at work. *In:* Smith, A. Pickup, S. Robins, A. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite.* Leiden: Brill. 111-130.

Pironti, G. 2019. Questions Homériques : des Dieux Personnels et de l'Anthropomorphisme (Im)moral. *In:* Gagné, R. and Herrero de Jáuregui, M. (eds.) *Les dieux d'Homére II: anthropomorphismes.* Liége: Centre International d'étude de la Religion Grecque Antique: Presses Universitaires de Liége. 43-65.

Podlecki, A. J. 1984. *The Early Greek Poets and Their Times.* Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.

Podlecki, A. J. 2003. Reciprocity in Prometheus Bound. *Greek,* 10**,** 287-292.

Pomeroy, S. B. 1995. Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity. New York: Schocken Books.

Pontani, F. 2011. Bronze Heaven in Archaic Greek Poetry. *L'Antiquité Classique,* 80**,** 157-162.

Pope, M. W. M. 1963. The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition. *Acta Classica,* 6**,** 1-21.

Popko, M. 1995. Towards a history of Hittite religion. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*. 90: 5–6, 469–483.

Postlethwaite, N. 1988. Thersites in the 'Iliad'. *Greece & Rome,* 35**,** 123-136.

Pratt, L. 2000. The Old Women of Ancient Greece and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 130**,** 41-65.

Pratt, L. 2007. The Parental Ethos of the Iliad. *Hesperia Supplements,* 41**,** 25-40.

Pratt, L. 2009. Diomedes, the fatherless hero of the *Iliad*. *In:* Hübner, S. R. and Ratzan, D. M. (eds.) *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 25-40.

Price, T. H. 1973. Hero-Cult and Homer. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 22**,** 129-144.

Pryke, L. 2017. *Ishtar.* Abingdon, Routledge.

Qviller, B. 1981. The Dynamics of the Homeric Society. *Symbolae Osloenses,* 56**,** 109-155.

Raaflaub, K. 2006. Historical Approaches to Homer. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos, I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 449-462.

Raaflaub, K. 2009. Early Greek Political Thought in its Mediterranean Context. *In:* Balot, R. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 37-56.

Raaflaub, K. 2016. The Newest Sappho and Archaic Greek-Near Eastern Interactions. *In:* Bierl, A. and Lardinois, A. (eds.) *The Newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, Frs. 1-4.* Brill. 127-147.

Rabinowtitz, N. 2011. Greek Tragedy: A Rape Culture. *EuGeStA,* 1**,** 1-21.

Radulescu, R. 2003. Malory and Fifteenth-Century Political Ideas. *Arthuriana,* 13**,** 36-51.

Raffalovich, D. C. 1988. The Deaths of Sisyphus: Structural Analysis of a Classical Myth. *Anthropologica,* 30**,** 87-93.

Rawson, B. (ed.) 2011. *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds,* Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell.

Rawson, B. 2011. Introduction: Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds. *In:* Rawson, B. (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ready, J. 2007. Homer, Hesiod and the Epic Tradition. *In:* Shapiro, H. A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rehak, P. (ed.) 1995. *The Role of the Ruler in the Prehistoric Aegean: Proceedings of a Panel Discussion Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, 28 December 1992, with Additions,* Austin, University of Texas at Austin, Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory.

Renz, U. 2011. From Philosophy to Criticism of Myth: Cassirer's Concept of Myth. *Synthese,* 179**,** 135-152.

Rexine, J. E. 1993. Review: Reviewed Work: The Origins of the Gods: A Psychoanalytic Study of Greek Theogonic Myth by Richard Caldwell. *Vergilius (1959-),* 39**,** 81-83.

Reyhan, E. 2009. The Missing God Telipinu Myth: A Chapter from the Ancient Anatolian Mythology.

Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi, 28**,** 85-106.

Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Oxford, Clarendon.

Richardson, N. J. 2012. *Three Homeric Hymns: to Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite: Hymns 3, 4, and 5.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Riedinger, J. 1976. La τιμή chez Homère. *Revue des Études Gracques,* 89. 244–264.

Riemschneider, K. K. 1977. Prison and Punishment in Early Anatolia. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient,* 20**,** 114-126.

Rinon, Y. 2006. Tragic Hephaestus: The Humanized God in the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey". *Phoenix,* 60**,** 1-20.

Robb, K. 1991. The Witness in Heraclitus and in Early Greek Law. *The Monist,* 74**,** 638-676.

Robcis, C. 2013. Lévi-Strauss's Structuralist Social Contract. *Yale French Studies***,** 145-165.

Robson, J. 2012. Bestiality and Bestial Rape in Greek Myth. *In:* Deacy, S. A. P., K. (ed.) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* London: Bristol Classical Press. 65-96.

Robson, J. 2013. *Sex and Sexuality in Classical Athens.* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Roisman, H. M. 2005. Nestor the Good Counsellor. *The Classical Quarterly*, 55, 17-38.

Romilly, J. D. 1985. *A Short History of Greek Literature.* Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press.

Rose, P. W. 2012. *Class in Archaic Greece.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, P. W. 2019. *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece.* Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

Roth, C. P. 1976. The Kings and the Muses in Hesiod's Theogony. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 106**,** 331-338.

Roudinesco, E. 2011. Freud and Regicide. *American Imago,* 68**,** 605-623.

Rowe, C. J. 1983. 'Archaic Thought' in Hesiod. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 103**,** 124-135.

Rubarth, S. 2014. Competing Constructions of Masculinity in Ancient Greece. *Athens Journal of Humanities and Arts,* 1**,** 21-32.

Rubin, N. F. and Deal, H. M. 1980. Some Functions of the Demophon Episode in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica,* 5**,** 7-21.

Rudhardt, J. 1994. Concerning the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. In: Foley, H. (ed.) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Chichester: Princeton University Press.

Rutherford, I. 2000. Formulas, voice, and death in Ehoie-poetry, the Hesiodic Gunaikon Katalogos, and the Odysseian Nekuia *In:* Depew, M. and Obbink, D. (eds.) *Matrices of Genre: Author, Canon and Society.* Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press. 81-96.

Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey on the Genre.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Rutherford, I. 2009. Hesiod and the Literary Traditions of the Near East. *In:* Montanari, F., Tsagalis, C., and Rengakos, A. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Hesiod.* Leiden: Brill. 9-35.

Rutherford, I. 2010. Canonising the Pantheon: The Dodekatheon in Greek Religion and its Origins. *In:* Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Rutherford, I. 2013. Mycenaean Religion. *In:* Salzman, M and Sweeny, M. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 256-279.

Rutherford, R. 1996. *Homer*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Ryan, G. J. 1965. Helen in Homer. *The Classical Journal,* 61**,** 115-117.

Sahlins, M. D. 1963. Poor Man, Rich Man, Big-Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 5**,** 285-303.

Sale, W. 1961. Aphrodite in the Theogony. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 92**,** 508-521.

Sale, W. 1965. The Dual Vision of the "Theogony". *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics,* 4**,** 668-699.

Salzman, M and Sweeny, M. 2013. *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, E. 2013. Erôs in ancient Greece. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sasson, J. 2005. Comparative Observations on the Near Eastern Epic Traditions. *In:* Foley, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epic.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Scheidel, W. 2003. The Greek Demographic Expansion: Models and Comparisons. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 123**,** 120-140.

Schlesinger, A. C. 1924. Draco in the Hearts of His Countrymen. *Classical Philology,* 19**,** 370-373.

Schmidt, M. 2006. Some Remarks on the Semantics of ἄναξ in Homer. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Lemos, I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 439-447.

Schmitt, R. 2013. Astarte, Mistress of Horses, Lady of the Chariot: The Warrior Aspect of Astarte. *Die Welt des Orients,* 43**,** 213-225.

Schneider, T. 2013. Assyrian and Babylonian Religion. *In:* Salzman, M and Sweeny, M. (eds.) *The*

Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 54-83.

Schulman, A. R. 1979. Diplomatic Marriage in the Egyptian New Kingdom. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 38**,** 177-193.

Scodel, R. 2002. *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience,* Ann Arbor, United States, University of Michigan Press.

Scodel, R. 2008. *Epic Facework: Self-Presentation and Social Interaction in Homer.* Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.

Scott, J. A. 1912. Patronymics as a Test of the Relative Age of Homeric Books. *Classical Philology*, 7, 293-301.

Scott, M. 2010. *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods,* Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Scott, M. 2014. *Delphi: A History of the Centre of the Ancient World.* Princeton, NJ; Oxford, Princeton University Press.

Scully, S. 1987. Doubling in the Tale of Odysseus. *The Classical World,* 80**,** 401-417.

Scully, S. 2015. *Hesiod's* Theogony: *from Near Eastern Creation Myths to* Paradise Lost. New York, Oxford University Press.

Seaford, R. 1986. Immortality, Salvation, and the Elements. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 90**,** 1-26.

Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State.* Oxford, Clarendon.

Seaford, R. 1998. Introduction. *In:* Gill, C. Postlethwaite, N. and Seaford, R. (eds.) *Reciprocity and Ritual in Ancient Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-12.

Seaford, R. 2010. Zeus in Aeschylus: The Father of Monetization. *In:* Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 178-192.

Seaford, R. 2004. Money and the Early Greek Mind: Homer, Philosophy, Tragedy. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sealey, R. 1994. *The Justice of the Greeks,* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Segal, C. 1971. Andromache's Anagnorisis: Formulaic Artistry in Iliad 22.437-476. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 75**,** 33-57.

Segal, C. 1974. The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: A Structuralist Approach. *The Classical World,* 67**,** 205-212.

Segal, R. A. 1980. The Myth-Ritualist Theory of Religion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,*

19**,** 173-185.

Sels, N. 2013. The Untold Death of Laertes. Revaluating Odysseus's Meeting with His Father. *Mnemosyne,* 66**,** 181-205.

Sewell-Rutter, N. J. 2007. *Guilt by Descent: Moral Inheritance and Decision Making in Greek Tragedy. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

Shapiro, H. A. (ed.) 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Shapiro, H. A. 2007. Introduction. *In:* Shapiro, H. A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-10.

Sheer, I. 2004. *Kingship in the Mycenaean World and its Reflections in the Oral Tradition.* Philadelphia, INSTAP Academic Press.

Sheleff, L. S. 1976. Beyond the Oedipus Complex: A Perspective on the Myth and Reality of Generational Conflict. *Theory and Society,* 3**,** 1-44.

Shelmerdine, C. W. 1997. Review of Aegean Prehistory VI: The Palatial Bronze Age of the Southern and Central Greek Mainland. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 101**,** 537-585.

Shepartz, L. Miller, A. and Murphy, J. 2009. Differential Health among the Mycenaeans of Messenia: Status, Sex, and Dental Health at Pylos. *Hesperia Supplements,* 43**,** 155-174.

Sherratt, S. & Bennet, J. 2016. *Archaeology and the Homeric Epic.* Havertown, United States, Oxbow Books, Limited.

Sillitoe, P. 1978. Big Men and War in New Guinea. *Man,* 13**,** 252-271.

Slater, P. E. 1992. *The Glory of Hera: Greek Mythology and the Greek Family.* Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Slatkin, L. M. 1986. The Wrath of Thetis. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-),* 116**,** 1-24.

Smith, A. C. 2011. Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art. *Monumenta Graeca et Romana; v. 19.* Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Smith, A. Pickup, S. and Robins, A. (eds.) 2010. *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite.* Leiden, Brill.

Smith, P. 1980. History and the Individual in Hesiod's Myth of Five Races. *The Classical World,* 74**,** 145-163.

Snodgrass, A. 2016. Homer, the Moving Target. *In:* Sherrett, S. and Bennet, J. (eds.) *Archaeology and the Homeric Epic.* Havertown, UNITED STATES: Oxbow Books, Limited. 1-9.

Solmsen, F. 1982. The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 86**,** 1-31.

Solmsen, F. 1989. The Two Near Eastern Sources of Hesiod. *Hermes,* 117**,** 413-422.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1986. Crime and Punishment: Tityos, Tantalos and Sisyphos in *Odyssey* 11. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies***,** 37-58.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1996. *"Reading" Greek Death: to the End of the Classical Period,* Oxford, Clarendon.

Spretnak, C. 1978. *Lost Goddesses of Early Greece: A Collection of Pre-Hellenic Myths,* Boston, Mass., Beacon Press.

Stafford, E. 2007. Personification in Religious Thought and Practice. *In:* Ogden, D. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion.* Maldon, MA: Blackwell Pub. 71-85.

Stafford, E. 2009. Visualising Creation in Ancient Greece. *In:* Merolla, D. (ed.) *Creation Myths and the Visual Arts: an ongoing dialogue between word and image.* Leiden: Brill. 419-447.

Stafford, E. 2012. *Herakles.* London, Routledge.

Starr, C. G. 1961. The Decline of the Early Greek Kings. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 10**,** 129-138.

Starr, C. G. 1977. *The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800-500 B.C.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Steiner, D. 2001. *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought.* Princeton, N.J.; London, Princeton University Press.

Stevenson, T. R. 1992. The Ideal Benefactor and the Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought. *The Classical Quarterly,* 42**,** 421-436.

Stone, L. 2000. *Kinship and Gender: an Introduction.* Boulder, Colo; Cumnor Hill, Westview Press.

Stoneman, R. 2020. Giants or Science: Cosmic Strife, Mount Etna and Aetna. *In:* Reid, H. L., Serrati, J. and Sorg, T. (eds.) *Conflict and Competition: Agon in Western Greece.* Parnassos Press – Fonte Aretusa.187-202.

Strauss, L. 1947. *Social Research,* 14**,** 125-128.

Strutynski, U. D. O. 1980. Ares: A reflect of the Indo-European War God? *Arethusa,* 13**,** 217-231.

Stuurman, S. 2004. The Voice of Thersites: Reflections on the Origins of the Idea of Equality. *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 65**,** 171-189.

Synodinou, K. 1987. The Threats of Physical Abuse of Hera by Zeus in the Iliad. *Wiener Studien,* 100**,** 13-22.

Talalay, L. E. 2003. A Feminist Boomerang. The Great Goddess of Greek Prehistory. *In:* Golden, M. and Toohey, P. (eds.) *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Edinburgh University Press. 307-318.

Taratron, T. F. 2008. Aegean Prehistory as World Archaeology: Recent Trends in the Archaeology of

Bronze Age Greece. *Journal of Archaeological Research,* 16**,** 83-161.

Tatišvili, I. 2019. Transformations of the Relationship between Hittite Kings and Deities. *In:* Süel, A. (ed.) *Acts of the IXth International Congress of Hittitology Çorum, September 08-14, 2014.* Çorum. 1047-1074.

Thomas, C. G. 1966. The Roots of Homeric Kingship. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 15**,** 387-407.

Thomas, C. G. 1988. Penelope's Worth: Looming Large in Early Greece. *Hermes,* 116**,** 257-264.

Thomas, C. G. & Conant, C. 1999. *Citadel to City-State: The Transformation of Greece, 1200-700 B.C.E.* Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press.

Thomas, R. 2005. Writing, Law and Written Law. *In:* Gagarin, M. and Cohen, D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 41-60.

Thompson, R. 2010. Mycenaean Greek. *In:* Bakker, E. J. (ed.) *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language.* Oxford.: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 189-199.

Thomson, G. D. 1978. *The Prehistoric Aegean.* London, Lawrence and Wishart.

Tindall, R. and Bustos, S. 2014. The Intensified Trajectory of Consciousness in Odysseus' Vision in Hades. *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics,* 22**,** 107-130.

Tracy, C. 2014. The Host's Dilemma: Game Theory and Homeric Hospitality. *Illinois Classical Studies*, 1-16.

Trendall, A. D. 1972. The Mourning Niobe. *Revue Archéologique***,** 309-316.

Trépanier, S. 2010. Early Greek Theology: Gods as Nature and Natural Gods. *In:* Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. (eds.) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 273-317.

Trigger, B. G. 2003. *Understanding Early Civilizations: A Comparative Study.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Trithe, L. 1996. Black Athena: Vision or Dream of Greek Origins. *In:* Lefkowitz, M. and Maclean Rogers, G. (eds.) *Black Athena Revisited.* London: University of North Carolina Press. 303-330.

Tsantsanoglou, K. 2015. Νηρεύς, A Contraversial Water God. *In:* Tziatzi, M. Billerbeck, M. Montanari, F. Tsantsanoglou, K. (eds.) *Lemmata: Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 5-15.

Turkeltaub, D. 2007. Perceiving Iliadic Gods. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 103**,** 51-81.

Ulf, C. 2009. The World of Homer and Hesiod. *In*: Raaflaub, K. and van Wees, H. *A Companion to Archaic Greece*. Chichester: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 81-99.

Unal, A. 1989. The Power of Narrative in Hittite Literature. *The Biblical Archaeologist,* 52**,** 130-143.

Ustinova, Y. 2002. 'Either a Daimon, or a Hero, or Perhaps a god' Mythical Residents of Subterranean Chambers. *Kernos,* 15**,** 267 - 288.

Ustinova, Y. 2009. *Caves and the Ancient Greek Mind: Descending Underground in the Search for Ultimate Truth.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Van Dongen, E. 2011. The 'Kingship in Heaven' Theme of the Hesiodic *Theogony*: Origins, Function, Composition. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* 51**,** 180-201.

Van Dongen, E. 2012. The Hittite "Song of Going Forth" (CTH $_{344}$): A Reconsideration of the Narrative. *Die Welt des Orients,* 42**,** 23-84.

Van Nortwick, T. 1980. "Apollonos Apate": Associative Imagery in the Homeric "Hymn to Hermes" 227-292. *The Classical World,* 74**,** 1-5.

Van 'T Wout, P. E. 2006. Amphiaraos as Alkman: Compositional Strategy and Mythological Innovation in Pindar's "Pythian" 8.39-60. *Mnemosyne,* 59**,** 1-18.

Van Wees, H. 1993. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History.* Amsterdam, Gieben.

Van Wees, H. 1998. Law of Grattitude: Reciprocity in Anthropological Theory. *In:* Gill, C. Postlethwaite, N. and Seaford, R. (ed.) *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 13-50.

Van Wees, H. 2003. The Invention of the Female Mind: Women, Property and Gender Ideology in Archaic Greece. In: Lyons, D. (ed.) *Women and Property in Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean Societies.* 1-26. Accessed online at: https://chs.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/women_property_vanwees.pdf on 20/07/2021.

Van Wees, H. 2006. From Kings to Demigods: Epic Heroes and Social Change c. 750-600 BC. *In:* Deger-Jalkotzy, S, and Lemos, I. S. (eds.) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 363-380.

Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek.* Cambridge, University Press.

Verhoeff, H. and Hijkoop, F. 1984. Does Oedipus Have His Complex? *Style,* 18**,** 261-283.

Vermeule, E. 1964. *Greece in the Bronze Age,* Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press.

Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry.* Berkeley; London, University of California Press.

Vermeule, E. 1996. The World Turned Upside Down. *In:* Lefkowitz, M. and Maclean Rogers, G. (ed.) *Black Athena Revisited* London: University of North Carolina Press. 269-279.

Vernant, J-P. 1971. Mètis et les Mythes de Souveraineté. *Revue de l'histoire des religions,* 180**,** 29-76.

Vernant, J-P. 2006. *Myth and Thought Among the Greeks.* New York, Zone Books.

Vernant, J -P. 1989. At Man's Table: Hesiods Foundation Myth of Sacrifice. *In:* Detienne, M. and Vernant, J-P. (eds.) *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 21-86.

Venrant J-P. & Dubois, P. 1982. From Oedipus to Periander: Lameness, Tyranny, Incest in Legend and History. *Arethusa,* 15**,** 19-38.

Vernant, J-P. & Zeitlin, F. 2011. Semblances of Pandora: Imitation and Identity. *Critical Inquiry,* 37**,** 404-418.

Vernant, J-P. & Zeitlin, F. I. 1991. (eds.) *Mortals and immortals: collected essays,* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Vernsel, H. S. 1987. Greek Myth and Ritual: The Case for Kronos. *In:* Bremmer, J. N. (ed.) *Interpretations of Greek Mythology.* London: Croom Helm. 121-187.

Vernsel, H. S. 1998. *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion.* Leiden, Brill.

Versnel, H. S. 2011. *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology,* Leiden; Boston, Brill.

Vickery, J. 1973. *The Literary Impact of "*The Golden Bough*".* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Visigalli, P. 2016. Technologies of Self-immortalisation in Ancient Greece and Early India. *In:* Seaford, R. (ed.) *Universe and Inner Self in Early Indian and Early Greek Thought.* Edinburgh University Press. 104-117.

Voela, A. 2017. *Psychoanalysis, Philosophy and Myth in Contemporary Culture: After Oedipus.* London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Wachter, R. 1991. The inscriptions on the François Vase. *Museum Helveticum,* 48**,** 86-113.

Walcot, P. 1956. The Text of Hesiod's Theogony and the Hittite Epic of Kumarbi. *The Classical Quarterly,* 6**,** 198-206.

Walcot, P. 1966. *Hesiod and the Near East.* Cardiff, University of Wales Press.

Walcot, P. 1984. Greek Attitudes towards Women: The Mythological Evidence. *Greece & Rome,* 31**,** 37-47.

Walcot, P. 1996. Continuity and Tradition: The Persistence of Greek Values. *Greece & Rome,* 43**,** 169-177.

Wanner, K. J. 2009. Cunning Intelligence in Norse Myth: Loki, & Ódinn, and the Limits of Sovereignty. *History of Religions,* 48**,** 211-246.

Wardman, A. E. 1960. Myth in Greek Historiography. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte,* 9**,** 403-413.

Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics,* New York, United States, Oxford University Press, Incorporated.

Watkins, C. 2002. Homer and Hittite Revisited II. *In:* Yerner, K, Hoffner, H and Dhesi, S. (eds.) *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History: Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock.* Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns. 167-176.

Watson, P. A. 1995. *Ancient Stepmothers: Myth, Misogyny and Reality,* Leiden, E.J. Brill.

Webster, T. B. L. 1964. *From Mycenae to Homer*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Weineck, S.-M. 2010. The Laius syndrome, or the ends of political fatherhood. *Cultural Critique***,** 131-146.

West, M. L. 1966. *Theogony.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

West, M. L. 1978. *Works & Days.* Oxford, Clarendon.

West, M. L. 1983. *The Orphic poems.* Oxford, Clarendon.

West, M. L. 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: its Nature, Structure, and Origins,* Oxford, Clarendon.

West, M. L. 1985. Hesiod's Titans. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 105**,** 174-175.

West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.* Oxford, Clarendon.

West, M. L. 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

West, M. L. 2011a. Homer's Meter. In *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

West, M. L. 2011b. *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

West, M. L. 2013. *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Westbrook, R. 1992. The Trial Scene in the Iliad. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 94**,** 53-76.

Whitley, J. 1991a. *Style and Society in Dark Age Greece: The Changing Face of a Pre-literate Society 1100-700 BC.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Whitley, J. 1991b. Social Diversity in Dark Age Greece. *The Annual of the British School at Athens,* 86**,** 341-365.

Wickkiser, B. L. 2010. Hesiod and the Fabricated Woman: Poetry and Visual Art in the "Theogony". *Mnemosyne,* 63**,** 557-576.

Wilgaux, J. 2011. Consubstantiality, Incest and Kinship in Ancient Greece. *In:* Rawson, B. (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 217-230.

Willcock, M. M. 1964. Mythological Paradeigma in the Iliad. *The Classical Quarterly,* 14**,** 141-154.

Willms, L. 2010. On the IE Etymology of Greek (w)anax. *Glotta,* 86**,** 232-271.

Wilson, D. F. 2002. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the* Iliad*.* Cambridge, UK; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, J. 2007. Homer and the Will of Zeus. *College Literature,* 34**,** 150-173.

Witzel, M. 2012. *The Origins of the World's Mythologies.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Wohl, V. 2013. The Mythic Foundation of Law. *In:* Zajko, V. and O'Gorman, E. (eds.) *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self.* 168-182.

Wohl, V. 2010. *Law's Cosmos: Juridical Discourse in Athenian Forensic Oratory.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wöhrle, G. 2009. Sons (and Daughters) without Fathers: Fatherlessness in the Homeric Epic. *In:* Hübner, S. R. and Ratzen D (eds.) *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 162-174.

Wolkow, B. M. 2007. The Mind of a Bitch: Pandora's Motive and Intent in the Erga. *Hermes,* 135**,** 247-262.

Woodard, R. D. (ed.) 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Woodard, R. D. 2007. Hesiod and Greek Myth. *In:* Woodard, R. D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 83-165.

Wormell, D. E. W. 1941. Walls of Brass in Literature. *Hermathena***,** 116-120.

Wright, J. 1995. From Chief to King in Mycenaean Greece. *In:* Rehak, P. (ed.) *The Role of the Ruler in the Prehistoric Aegean: Proceedings of a Panel Discussion Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, 28 December 1992, with additions.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas at Austin.63-80.

Yamagata, N. 1997. ἄναξ and βασιλεύς; in Homer. *The Classical Quarterly,* 47**,** 1-14.

Yasumura, N. 2013. *Challenges to the power of Zeus in early Greek poetry,* London, Bloomsbury.

Yener, K. A. Hoffner, H. A. and Dhesi, S. 2002. *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History: Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock,* Winona Lake, Ind, Eisenbrauns.

Young, P. 2005. The Cypriot Aphrodite Cult: Paphos, Rantidi, and Saint Barnabas. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 64**,** 23-44.

Yu, A. C. 2009. New Gods and Old Order: Tragic Theology in *Prometheus Bound*. *Comparative Journeys.* Columbia University Press.

Yunis, H. 2003. Introduction: Why Written Texts? *In:* Yunis, H. (ed.) *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-14.

Yunis, H. 2003. *Written texts and the rise of literate culture in ancient Greece.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Zajko, V. 1995. Speaking myth. *Arethusa,* 28**,** 21-38.

Zajko, V. and O'Gorman, E. 2013. *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Zanker, A. T. 2013. Decline and Parainesis in Hesiod's Race of Iron. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie,* 156**,** 1-19.

Zanker, G. 1988. τιμη in Hesiod's 'Theogony'. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies***,** 73-78.

Zeitlin, F. I. 1978. The dynamics of misogyny: myth and mythmaking in the Oresteia. *Arethusa,* 11**,** 149-184.

Zeitlin, F. I. 1996. *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Zuntz, G. 1971. *Persephone*: *Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.