Pagliaro, A. 1953. "Aedi e rapsodi," *Saggi di critica semantica.* Florence.
.....1956. *Nuovi saggi di critica semantica.* Florence.
Pasquali, G. 1968. "Pagine meno stravaganti," *Pagine Stravaganti* 1. Florence.
..... 1951. "Il proemio dell' *Odissea*," *Miscellanea G. Galbiati*, 1. *Fontes Ambrosiani*, 25-27. 1-3.
Pucci, P. 1977. *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry.* Baltimore.
..... 1979. "The Song of the Sirens," *Arethusa* 12.121-32.
..... 1980. "The Language of the Muses," in *Classical Mythology in Twentieth Century Thought and Literature* (edd. Aycock, W. and Klein, T.), 163-86. Lubbock.
Risch, E. 1947. "Namendeutungen und Wortererklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern," *Eumusia, Festgabe für E. Howald.* Erlenbach.
Rüter, K. 1969. *Odysseeinterpretationen.* Göttingen.
Schwabl, H. 1978. "Religiöse Aspekte der Odysee," *Wiener Studien* 91.12.5-28.
Segal, C. forthcoming. "*Kleos* and its Ironies in the *Odyssey.*"
Stanford, W. B. 1950. "Homer's Use of Personal πολυ-Compounds," *CP* 45.108-10.
Stewart, D. J. 1976. *The Disguised Guest.* Lewisburg.
Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Vivante, P. 1956. "Sulle designazioni omeriche della realtà psichica," *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 41.113-38.
von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1920. *Die Ilias und Homer*, 2nd ed. Berlin.
Warden, J. 1971. "*Psuchē* in Homeric Death-Descriptions," *Phoenix* 25.95-103.

CULTURAL STRATEGIES IN HESIOD'S *THEOGONY*: LAW, FAMILY, SOCIETY*

MARYLIN B. ARTHUR

The narrative sequence of Hesiod's *Theogony* is organized around the passage from the dominion of "Earth, the broad-bosomed seat of all the immortals" to that of "Zeus, king of gods." The first birth of the poem is an act of simple re-production: Gaia produces Ouranos to be "equal" to herself; the last major birth, that of Athena, produces a child whose resemblance to her father betokens legitimacy and hence the primacy of patriarchy: "she had strength and a wise counsel which was equal to that of her father."

We can discern two principal dimensions in these two birth-sequences: the redefinition of the family triad so as to achieve stasis through the hierarchy which subordinates female to male; and a moral evolution which makes the reign of Zeus homologous with the reign of justice. These two developments take place as one in the poem because the activities surrounding generation and birth in the three stages of the succession-myth occur within a morally charged context. This "context" is not merely a matter of explicit statement, that is, of the use of terms like *dikê* or its cognates (which are, in fact, noticeably absent from the poem); rather, the preoccupation with justice shows itself in the poem's attempt to develop an alternative to violence, to the *hybris, schetlia erga* and *biê* which in Homer and in Hesiod's *Erga* appear consistently as opposites of *dikê, aidôs,* and *dikaia.*

Thus, the question of justice in the *Theogony* is one of a broader and looser construct than, e.g., the abstract issues having to do with the formal institutions and formal administrative machinery of *polis* law. Developed as *practicum*, as a sequence of increasingly more sophisticated modes of interaction, the idea of justice in the *Theogony* has more affinity with Gernet's concepts of "prédroit" or "les formes archaïques du droit."[1]

In the *Theogony*, the narrative progression from *hybris* (Ouranos' violence) to *dikê* (the justice of Zeus) is developed as the evolution of a morally and socially complex model for regulating the interactions among the members of the cosmic family. Like the solutions of disputes which arise during the funeral games for Patroklos in *Iliad* 23, the progressive dissolution of hostilities in the *Theogony* takes forms which exemplify

certain aspects of *prédroit* and which, in turn, have their correlates in the institutionalized forms of later legal practice.[2] Specifically, Gaia's vengeance in the first stage of the succession-myth exemplifies primitive self-help; Rhea, in her punishment of Kronos in the second stage of the myth, makes use of both symbolic retribution and of an appeal which may be likened to voluntary arbitration. And finally, Zeus' consolidation of his rule is based on a system of "gift-exchange" similar to that which Finley has described in connection with the social world of the *Odyssey*,[3] and which, in one of its forms, is a principal feature of the political relationship between the *basileus* and his followers in the *Iliad*.

However, it is a peculiarity of the plot of the *Theogony* that the evolution of justice occurs within the same narrative "space" as that occupied by the power struggle within the family. Here there is no movement, as there is in the *Oresteia*, from family to civic and cosmic realms; in the *Theogony* the family, the cosmos, and the arena for the settlement of disputes are one and the same. Nor, as in the *Iliad*, are we concerned with the exclusively masculine realm of the battlefield and *agôn*; the first significant act of the *Theogony* has to do with the most basic and elementary form of interaction between male and female, that of sexual intercourse.

Rather, in the *Theogony*, as in many cultural "founding myths,"[4] there is a congruence between the sexual and the political spheres. Thus, the dualistic character of the poem's teleological goal — the patriarchal form of the family and the justice of Zeus — can be symbolically represented together in the birth of Athena because the problematic of the poem is articulated as a struggle between male (Ouranos) and female (Gaia) for both power *and* justice.

There are, then, two parallel axes of narrative movement in the poem which are separate only theoretically and for the purposes of poetic analysis. In each, however, Hesiod's poetic strategy entails the postulation of successively higher degrees of symbolization and sublimation. In the case of Zeus, the poem posits a progression from unbridled and violently retributive self-help, through self-help mitigated by voluntary arbitration and the use of symbolic retribution, to "balanced reciprocity"[5] through gift-exchange, which stablizes the reign of Zeus.[6] Along the other narrative axis, that having to do with the struggle between male and female in the family, the poet develops different principles of transformation for the male and female characters. The male characters are handled in what we shall designate the metaphoric mode, which in linguistic and rhetorical theory[7] is associated with identification, similarity and condensation. Thus, as the narrative moves forward, each of the male divinities is relegated

to a place in the cosmos beyond or below Olympos; at the same time, each of the major male figures in the succession-myth assimilates the characteristics of his predecessor (through a process of condensation) as he replaces him in the family struggle. The female in the poem is handled in the metonymic mode, which uses displacement and synecdoche (including synecdochic condensation), through which a new entity is built up out of a multiplicity of synedochic details. Thus, in the course of the poem a number of female characters are introduced, primarily through extended digressions, who survive as members of the Olympian order, and whose position and character are directly linked with the Olympian rule of Zeus. These characters are Aphrodite, Styx, Hekate, and Pandora. At the same time, the female figures of the succession myth are displaced from positions of dominance as their poetic characteristics are variously distributed among the goddesses of the Olympian order and the tribe of women descended from Pandora.

Thus, the different poetic treatment of the male and female characters mirrors the elementary social realities of Greek culture as we find them from Homer on. That is, the continuity of the *oikos* was predicated upon the replacement of the father by the son as *kyrios* and on the redistribution or exchange of the women. In this way, then, the literary and rhetorical technique of the *Theogony* both reflects and embodies the fundamental social processes which characterize the patriarchal order toward whose establishment it progresses. At the same time, the interactions which bring about these transformations develop modes of sublimation which constitute an alternative to violent strife and culminate in "the justice of Zeus."[8]

The first act of violence in the *Theogony* is also an act of concealment. Ouranos "keeps hidden away" all his children in the womb of Gaia, causing her to groan with the pain of her fullness. This violent antithesis to birth is construed as an outrage which demands retribution. In return, Gaia hides Kronos in ambush, from which he reaches forth to castrate his father. The descriptive context juxtaposes the evil deed of Kronos with the evil device of Gaia, and presents the latter as the most primitive kind of *tisis*, the *lex Talionis*, which demands an exact reciprocity.

The primacy of the female in this first era of creation is thus asserted as a successful alliance of mother with son against the father, an alliance betokened by the resemblance between mother and son, and played out as the triumph of craft, persuasion and violence. Gaia's delight in her revenge matches the pleasure that Ouranos takes in his "evil deed," and she claims her right to revenge on the basis of Ouranos' priority in outrage, a claim which Kronos accepts.

Gaia's exaction of revenge is an example of "self-help," the taking of *poinê* in the basic sense of the word, "harm returned for harm, violence for violence." *Poinê* could also mean "symbolic retribution," in the form of blood-money or *wergeld*, but in Greek there is no distinction of terminology, in the manner, for example, of some primitive societies which have different terms for "equivalent injury" and "compensation."[9] Needless to say, Ouranos' crime is unparalleled, but in the *Iliad* either rape or murder is involved, and the one example of *poinê* in the *Odyssey* refers to Odysseus' blinding of Polyphemos in return for his eating the companions (23.312). The continuation of the vendetta, which is only brought to an end through the employment of *poinê* in the sense of "symbolic retribution," is foreseen in line 210, where Ouranos predicts *tisis* for the μέγα . . . ἔργον (209 f.) of the Titans.

Retribution is not the only consequence of the castration of Ouranos. The crime produces two kinds of offspring: one from the blood and one from the genitals of the father. Aphrodite, primal daughter of the primal father, is the negative counterpart to Athena, just as Ouranos, the father as pure force, is the negative counterpart to Zeus, father of gods and men. Like Athena, Aphrodite is born from the male alone — but she is born from below rather than from above, a token of the father's defeat rather than his victory, his antithesis rather than his equal in character, the embodiment of the sexual attraction which overwhelms the male rather than of the authority and martial skill through which he asserts his prowess.

Aphrodite is nourished in the sea, the gestational element, which is here construed as a kind of primal male womb: the genitals of Ouranos, which are the stuff or matrix of generation, are carried along πολὺν χρόνον, a phrase which may in this context be interpreted as an equivalent to περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ. The sea-foam which "nourished" Aphrodite may be construed as the male equivalent to the menstrual blood which "nourishes" the child in the maternal womb.

Aphrodite is the first of the females of the *Theogony* to be handled metonymically. On the one hand, she is the symbol of female primacy, displaced from Gaia. For the narrative history of the first stage of the succession-myth is Aphrodite's genealogy; her birth is both the climax and recapitulation of the struggle between Gaia and Ouranos.

Just as Athena by her birth and character betokens the nature and quality of Zeus' victory, so does Aphrodite embody in a transvalued form the character of her father's defeat. For her attendants are Eros, primal force of the primal world order, and Himeros, the prelude to Ouranos' defeat. Her *moira* includes *philotês* and *apatê*, the sexual intercourse which Ouranos

desired and the snares by which he was entrapped. And at the end of the *Theogony*, the operation of sexual desire is signified by the Aphrodite-formula: διὰ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην. Thus, Aphrodite is in the *Theogony* as elsewhere in early Greek literature the symbol of the female force which lays men low; and through Aphrodite, Eros, the dynamic principle of this era, survives in "feminized" form — eros is now the attendent of the goddess, but the force which he represents is made gentler and sweeter, or "feminine."

In addition, Aphrodite's character is built up through synecdochic condensations of Gaia, Eros, and the Muses of the proemium, and in such a way as to anticipate both Pandora and Athena. Like Gaia she is a phenomenon of nature, and like her she masters the male through deceit and concealment. Like the Muses, she exerts her power through the charm of language and honey-sweetness. Through her birth, which is both natural and artificial, she resembles Pandora, who is similarly virginal.[10]

But, above all, Aphrodite embodies the principle of female sexuality construed as desire rather than fecundity. These two aspects of female sexuality are normally separate in Greek thought, and they are accordingly combined in Gaia as separate and distinct features: Gaia both generates ἄτερ φιλότητος ἐφιμέρου, and stimulates desire in the male: Οὐρανὸς . . . ἱμείρων φιλότητος. As Vernant remarks, "The allure of erotic seduction is a part of marriage . . . but it is neither its basis nor a constituent element in it. On the contrary, it remains, in principle, alien to the tie of marriage,"[11] whose fundamental object is the actualization of the woman's childbearing capacity, the realization of her fecundity.

The circumstances surrounding Aphrodite's birth in the *Theogony* both reveal the logic behind this contrast and explain the metonymic function of the goddess in the poem. For as symbol of sexuality construed as erotic desire with its attendant qualities of deceit and artifice, Aphrodite embodies the primacy of the female associated with the primal era. And the persistence of desire as a force is thus homologous with the act of castration, and with mastery of the male through craft and guile. Thus, while the fertility of the female continues to be manifested in the succession-myth, the element of erotic attraction is absent in the myth proper, and does not reappear until after Zeus swallows Metis. In the catalogue of births which take place outside the succession-myth, erotic desire continues to play a role.

At the same time, Aphrodite is the only one of the first generation of gods to find a place in the Olympic pantheon.[12] Thus, it is in Aphrodite that the Ouranian era reaches its culmination, and it is through her that it

achieves its permanence. In metonymic fashion, then, Aphrodite stands as *pars pro toto* for the first section of the poem, while her character itself is built up as a synecdoche of the attributes associated with Gaia and the struggle with Ouranos (cf. Quintilian [above, note 7] on synecdoche used to represent *parte totum, specie genus, praecedentibus sequentia*).

Ouranos, however, the principal male figure of this era, disappears from the narrative as a major character, and is replaced by his son Kronos. When the next stage of the succession-myth begins, Kronos is firmly in place as ruler in a substitution in the metaphoric mode, (cf. Quintilian [above, note 7] on metaphoric mode, which should, as Quintilian reminds us, *aut vacantem occupare locum aut, si in alienum venit, plus valere eo quod expellet*.)

The next stage of the succession-myth, the birth of Zeus, is the centerpiece of a significant triad of narratives: the hymn to Hekate, the birth of Zeus and the other Olympians, and the Prometheus and Pandora narrative. The Hekate story, with that of Prometheus/Pandora, frames the narrative of the birth of Zeus and is attracted into its orbit of meaning by its narrative quality, which sets it off from the catalogue of the preceding several hundred lines. Hakate's character is not established by the conditions of her birth alone, but is only finally fixed in relation to the reign of Zeus.

She is an only daughter (*mounogenês*) and she is singled out as the one deity to keep the *timê* which was hers ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning — from the period of the Titans. Further, her portion includes a share of everything from the former allotment. Like Aphrodite, Hekate belongs to both the old and the new generation of gods.

Thus, Hekate is in the first place honored above all by Zeus with a portion in each of the realms of the cosmos (412-14). As king of gods and men, Zeus' power subsumes that of all of the other divinities; Hekate is recognized by him as his female counterpart, exercising sway universally and generally. Second, as the deity with a share in the *timai* of all the Titans (421 f.), Hekate's *aisa* is the hypostatized representation of the divisions and allotments of the first order of the gods, the older generation. Zeus' confirmation of this goddess in her power is a symbol of his continuity with the older regime. Through Hekate, Zeus confirms the apportionment as it was "at first," "from the beginning." Hekate is thus both an old goddess and a new one. Poetically she is *Hekate Enodia*, at the crossroads of the old and new generations, pre-eminent among the older as well as among the younger gods.

Hekate is the first child of the *Theogony* born, as it were, in wedlock: her mother is called *akoitis*, a term otherwise used only of the wives of

Zeus' reign. "[Perses] led Asterie into his great home to be called his dear wife" (409 f.). Thus, Hekate, only daughter of legal and patrilocal marriage, is Athena's sociological equivalent: she is child of the social order which subordinates *genetrix* to *genitor*, as Metis is subsumed/consumed by Zeus.

Further, as *mounogenês* under the patriarchal order, Hekate is like an *epiklêros*,[13] the brotherless daughter whose special role as transmittor of the patrimony was contingent upon the absence of competing males. And indeed, Hekate acts in the poem as an *epiklêros* of the old order, transmitting its patrimony to Zeus, son of the new order, and receiving in turn special *timai* from Zeus. But in terms of the sociology of the poem, Hekate as *epiklêros* has no male context, no "brother to protect her interests." Zeus' over-valuation of this goddess should thus be understood as a compensation for her undervaluation in the patriarchal social order, and as an indication that the beneficence as well as the honor of the female are conceived in inverse proportion to female autonomy.

Hekate's social isolation, then, has as its complement the universality of her powers. And since they belong to the Olympian era, the Hymn to Hekate serves as a proleptic announcement of the beneficence of Zeus' reign. Hekate's power is a kindly one; she is no goddess of violence or revenge, but herself the dispenser of *timai* (428) and of all the blessings and prosperity which, in the *Erga*, attend upon the people watched over by the just *basileis* (225 ff.). Hekate is thus a sign as well of the positive pole of female potency, a precursor to Athena and the other kindly daughters of Zeus, and the antitype to Gaia who struggles for supremacy with the male, to Aphrodite who subdues him through *philotês* and *apatê*, and to Pandora "the incurable curse" (612; cf. 588).

Like Aphrodite, Hekate is defined metonymically. That is, her character in the poem is built up out of the redistributed features of other gods and goddesses. But she is the first of the major female figures in the poem who is presented in a wholly positive light, who, that is, poses no threat to the male. This is unquestionably linked to her special characterization as μουνογενὴς ἐκ μητρός. On the one hand, the matrilineal tracing of her descent and her lack of a male context isolate her in the patriarchal order. On the other hand, although she is like an *epiklêros*, she does not marry Zeus, but becomes more like one of his daughters. Indeed, elsewhere in the tradition Zeus is Hekate's father.[14] And Hekate, like all the kindly daughters of Zeus, remains a virgin; this is implied in the *Theogony*, and elsewhere virginity is one of her regular attributes.[15] Thus, instead of Aphrodite's "sweet joys of love" (*meilichiê*), Hekate offers sweet gentleness (μείλιχον αἰεί [406; cf. 408]); the *kratos* and *biê* which she fosters are

not Hekate's children, as they were of Styx in an earlier episode (383 ff.), but the skill of her favorite in the *agôn* (437); and finally, the metonymic redefinition of Hekate includes a revaluation of female generative potency to mean, in a more abstract and generalized way, the willing sponsorship of the activities of human life. Life-giving has become life-sustaining: see esp. *kourotrophos* (450, 452) — a form of sublimated female fertility which, inasmuch as it is not directly and literally expressed, poses no threat to the divine patriarchy.

Hekate, then, together with Aphrodite and Styx,[16] announce the new conception of the female role which belongs to the Olympian and patriarchal era. Each is built up metonymically out of a series of synecdochic condensations of the multiplicity of attributes which derive from the enactment of the struggle between Gaia, Ouranos, and Kronos.

Aphrodite, born from the father alone, is parallel to Athena; but as embodiment of sexual desire, with its duplicitous quality and power to overwhelm the male, she is Athena's polar opposite. Styx, representative of female fecundity in its most threatening form — its capacity to generate powerful and fearsome children — remains a dread goddess. But Hekate, the kindly goddess, is the first female whose pre-eminence derives from the patriarchal father. And she embodies female fecundity in a transmuted form, expressed generously, fully, and carefully, but *in abstracto* — as nurturance, tendance, fosterage, and not as the direct ex-pression of the child from her womb. The Hymn to Hekate is thus a narrative move which completes the polarization of the female and fixes the positive extreme in relation to the world of human activity. In this way Hekate becomes the figure through whom the transition to human concerns and to the present world order is effected; and her beneficent character, the ease, readiness, and spontaneity of her gifts, are constituted as positive not only in themselves, but in contrast to the withholding, harsh, and calculating nature of Pandora.

In the second stage of the succession-myth the narrative and physical bond between mother and child is ruptured; the children are attacked once they are born, not while they are part of the mother; the plan for revenge no longer involves an alliance between mother and son. Further, the final stage of the revenge is postponed until Zeus is grown (492 ff.), and is accomplished with the help of Gaia.

Rhea in this section is a very different figure from her mother and narrative antecedent, Gaia. She does not directly attack her oppressive mate, nor does she herself devise the plan for revenge. Instead, her role as actor in the poem is now directly tied to her position as daughter: she supplicates (469) and persuades (474) her parents; and she acts, not on her own behalf, but as instrument for the Erinys of her own father and of her children (472 f.) Further, the success of the plan involves her being sent away from the sphere of action and the transferring of authority over the child to Gaia. Finally, she is assimilated to the position of child in that both she and Zeus are hidden away in Crete.

We have seen how, at various points, the narrative anticipates its own outcome by privileging the role of daughter: Aphrodite, Styx, and Hekate are all, in negative and positive ways, figures whose pre-eminence in the Olympian realm is tied to their presentation as daughter (figurative or literal) of the father. And we have seen how this proliferation of daughters is part of a narrative strategy that seeks to come to terms with female potency as embodied in Gaia by displacing her threatening aspects onto different females who are then subordinated, as daughter-types, to the rule of Olympian Zeus.

In this intermediate section of the poem the mechanics of this transformative process are made more explicit through the figure of Rhea, whose displacement from wife to daughter is only partially accomplished. The female function is here divided into, as it were, "nature" and "nurture": Rhea, when she has given birth to the children, disappears from the action of the poem. Gaia assumes the maternal role, which is now redefined as child-rearing: she is, like Hekate, *kourotrophos* in this section of the poem. Rhea is entirely absent from the final stage of the revenge, for it is Zeus himself along with Gaia who accomplishes the final deception (429 ff.) and causes Kronos to vomit up the children. Therefore, Rhea's diminished potency has as its complement the displacement of the duplicitous aspect of the female onto Zeus and Gaia, and the displacement of female fecundity onto Kronos (see *nêdyn*—487) and, in its nurturant aspect, onto Gaia.

The weakening of female primacy in this section is thus tied to the elevation of the male (Kronos and Zeus) into the role of *genitor*: Kronos "hides" the children in his womb, and Zeus together with Gaia appear as the deliverers — both of the children and then of the other gods and forces (501). This reorganization of the action has a twofold effect: first, it allows Zeus to emerge as victor in his own right, in the direct and unmediated struggle between father and son, rather than on behalf of the mother and in the service of her rights over the children. Second, the struggle is now condensed so that withholding the child is homologous with withholding the βασιληὶς τιμή; to force Kronos to disgorge the children is at one and the same time to force him to yield up his *timê*. In this stage of the succession-myth, then, the right to rule is identified with control over procreation.

Similarly, the sign (*sêma*) of Zeus' right to rule becomes the stone which betokens his victory over Kronos in the generative struggle.

The homonymy between *gastêr* and *nêdys* allows the direct representation of the coincidence between the sexual and alimentary codes in the action of this section of the poem, and provides a clear link with the *Metisgeschichte*. At the same time, the ideas of hiding, concealing, binding and trickery, and of display, giving, releasing and prophecy are attracted into the same semantic field so as to provide the poetic means for resolving the struggle symbolically. Thus, the stone is a duplicitous gift, and the son who is left behind "instead of the stone" (ἀντὶ λίθου—489) sets up a cycle of exchange and reciprocity of whose termination the stone "fixed" (498) in the earth is a sign. No longer "hidden" (487), it is displayed for all to see, a *thauma* like Pandora (500; cf. 588), and like her a symbol of the intersection between natural and artificial creation, and between the divine and human realms. And just as Zeus and Gaia released the hidden children, now Zeus releases (501) the Cyclopes, whom Kronos had bound, and they, in return, give him the lightning and thunder which Gaia had hidden (504 f.).

The elaboration of the narrative in this stage of the succession-myth includes, then, not only the displacement of female functions onto male figures, but the symbolic resolution of the father/son struggle in the form of the *sêma*, and the introduction of a cycle of reciprocity (in the form of gift-exchange). Thus, the movement toward a higher degree of poetic complexity in the action of the narrative is paralleled by a movement toward more sublimated forms of interaction among the characters.

In the first stage of the succession-myth, the precise reciprocity between the two acts of violence, Ouranos' repression of Gaia and Kronos' castration of Ouranos, was expressed through the juxtaposition of the κακὸν ἔργον with the δολίη κακὴ τέχνη in the cycle of revenge. The continuation of the cycle was foreseen (209 f.) and is enacted in the second stage as a new form of violence, the eating of the children.

Rhea, as the wronged party, has the right to take vengeance, but she does not seek it directly. Rather, she turns to a third party, whom she supplicates, and who listen to her and advise her (471 ff.). Note that Rhea has no doubts about her right to vengeance; it is only the question of means (471 f.) that concerns her. And it is she who persuades her parents.

Rhea's appeal, as I have suggested, may be likened to self-help mitigated through voluntary arbitration. Even in the very late period of Athenian law, it was common practice to resort to a family member or friend in cases of private arbitration, and the situation could be resolved in a purely extra-judicial manner.[17] Rhea's parents, like the kings who deliver

"straight judgment" or the private arbitrator who takes an oath to judge the issue κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον, offer Rhea a prophecy — the divine equivalent of *dikê*, since it accords with the absolute order of things in the way that "straight judgments" in the human realm embody divine *dikê*. And they devise a *mêtis* in contrast to the *dolos* which was employed earlier, and which is linked with "crookedness."

Through their advice, Rhea adopts a plan which involves postponing the vengeance, and which is founded on the idea of substitution or replacement. This more subtle form of retaliation now introduces the notion of justice as symbolic exchange or reciprocity. And indeed, Kronos in the end is forced to "give back" what he has taken. The stone which he vomits up and which is taken up and established as a *sêma* by Zeus is like a *poinê*, albeit achieved through trickery, in that it stands as a symbol of recompense given.

The "internal order" which is made possible in this section of the poem is a stabilization of the cycle of violence achieved by substituting symbolic revenge for direct attack. As such, the narrative of this section represents directly a mode of interaction which, in earlier parts of the poem, has not only been associated with the reign of Zeus, but has emerged in the course of his dealings with the females of the poem. Thus, Hekate and Styx both enter the Olympic pantheon through a process of reciprocity and exchange in which Zeus "gives" them *timê* — which is etymologically related to *poinê* — in exchange for, on the one hand, the children of Styx and, on the other, the heritage of the Titans. This kindly and beneficent form of reciprocity is a positive and symbolic form of exchange, whose negative counterpart is the revenge of Gaia.[18] Thus, as in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus, the idea of exchange as punishment, as return of harm for harm, as *literal* reciprocity in the form of *tisis*, is posited as the female mode.[19]

The characterization of Zeus' rule as the reign of justice, then, has to do with the emergence of symbolic exchange and balanced reciprocity. The model for this mode of interaction evolves in the course of the narrative of the second stage of the succession-myth, and has already been anticipated by Zeus' relations with Styx and Hekate. Thus, it is intrinsically linked with the benign aspects of the female; these, in turn, are derived through a process of metonymic displacement and condensation whereby the threatening aspects of the female are re-distributed among goddesses who are only tangentially part of the Olympian order (Aphrodite), or else they are sublimated as nurturance (Hekate) and prophetic intelligence (Gaia).

The violent or repressive aspects of the male, first embodied in Ouranos, do not suffer any such transformation. Zeus, like Kronos, *plus*

valet eo quem expellet, and, in the course of the Titanomachy and in the *Metisgeschichte* he demonstrates his affinities with his more violent progenitors. The struggle between the males is continued in the next generation, where, however, Zeus' escape from the cycle was anticipated in his fixing of the *lithos* as a *sêma*, a sign of stabilization and resolution. The drama is now displaced downward, first into the heroic, and then into the human realm.

The human realm, which comes into existence in the next major episode of the poem, is thus a necessary condition of the development of "the justice of Zeus." And the Prometheus and Pandora narratives, in which the constitution of the human realm is developed as a series of gifts and counter-gifts, is therefore both an enactment of the justice of Zeus at the same time that it provides a *locus* for the displacement of those aspects of the divine world which prohibit the emergence of justice.

I shall not present a full discussion of this episode, which has been treated fully by Jean-Pierre Vernant and, in the case of Pandora, by Nicole Loraux and Pietro Pucci.[20] At this juncture I want only to point to certain features of the characterization of Pandora in the *Theogony* which distinguish her from the Pandora of the *Erga* and link her directly to the themes which we have been exploring.

First, she is not named Pandora in the *Theogony*. Bringer of fertility and of the principle of reproduction, she is herself, as reproduction, a static, voiceless, nameless creature. Here she does not receive the human voice (*audê*) and strength (*sthenos*) which bring her alive in the *Erga* (60 ff.). Here she lacks all that variety of attributes which she has in the *Erga*: a beautiful form, grace, skill at weaving, sexual seductiveness, a shameless mind and a wily character. In the *Theogony* she is only a semblance of a real thing, only an outer shell, endowed with no inner characteristics, only the "covering" of the silvery dress and veil in which Athena clothes her and the wrought crown which Hephaistos fashions for her. She brings into the world as her principal gift the insistence on belly, on life lived out at its most elemental and passive level. For from her comes the tribe of women who are the drones of the hive, sitting passively within and "reaping into their bellies the toil of others."

Through a series of subtle modulations of the descriptive sequence, the initial postulate of woman as belly yields as its logical consequence the whole of the human social order. For the drone-belly, insatiable, withholding, and unceasing in its demands, generates as its own particular structure the household which protects and contains it, and which is the sign of men's inscription within the cycle of human necessities. Repository for the harvested goods (see ἀμῶνται—599), it is also the scene of sexual reproduction. Hesiod's rendering of the pressure of sexual need is discreet (μέρμερα ἔργα γυναικῶν—603) and ambiguous; while the phrase ἔργα γυναικῶν suggests women's weaving, their contribution to the economy of the household, the context modulates a shift from the alimentary to the sexual code. The belly that consumes, like that of Kronos, brings forth the child as well, and the pressure of enslavement to the cycle of *trophê* and *tropheia*. The child is at the same time the sign of a wider circle of greed and hostility, that of the kinship network (606 f.). The marriage-act, inscribed within the social and economic context of its realization, is thus a token of the ambiguity of human existence. The insistent regularity of the succession-cycle has been translated into the human social order where its necessity is a condition of life. Zeus' escape from its pressure is thus predicated upon the displacement downward into the human world of the most threatening features of the cycle.

Through Pandora, the cycle of exchange and reciprocity is continued, for she embodies all of the ambiguous qualities of the duplicitous gift. Further, because in Pandora there are combined both the aspects of female sexuality associated with Aphrodite, and the fecundity of the primal goddesses, Pandora emerges as a kind of Gaia reborn, symbol of the primal power of the female, displaced from the divine onto the human realm. But she is also, like Aphrodite and Athena, a daughter born from the father, and with no mother. Fashioned by Hephaistos in obedience to Zeus' commands, her literary heirs are the statue beloved by Pygmalion and the image of Alkestis which Admetos promises to have fashioned by him by a "skilled craftsman," and which he will clasp to his heart and kiss. And the Moulded Woman of the *Theogony* is thus the negative counterpart to the golden statues who are the attendants of Hephaistos in the *Iliad*, who are like living young women, but who act only to carry out the will of their master Hephaistos. Alive among mortal men, the inner hollowness of the Pandora-statue betokens the incessant need for repletion, and thus she is "sheer trickery," δόλος αἰπύς, itself.

The whole of the Prometheus/Pandora sequence, then, is organized around the symbol of the *gastêr* which, as synecdoche for the human condition, betrays its ultimate divine origin in its movement from focus of strife among the gods to the womb/belly of the tribe of women who tie men to an elemental and elementary form of existence.

In the course of Zeus' struggle with the Titans, there are several reminiscences of earlier stages of the succession-myth. Like Gaia in the first episode, Zeus calls together an assembly of the ἀγλαὰ τέκνα (644 ff.). The

mode of reciprocity and exchange which was developed earlier is now acted out with the Hundred-Handers, who grant Zeus the use of their powers in memory of their release from bondage. Earlier, the Kyklopes had granted Zeus the lightning and thunder in a similar spirit. Thus, unlike Ouranos and Kronos, whose repressive strength was their characterizing feature, Zeus *acquires* the trait of force through a series of gift-exchanges.

The exchange of speeches between Zeus and the Hundred-Handers is replete with the language of mental action, which signals the subordination of force to intelligence, at the same time that the mode of acquisition legitimates the use of power. And it should be noted in this connection that, for all of Hesiod's similarity to Aischylos in the *Prometheus Vinctus*,[21] the justice of Zeus in the Hesiodic text does not emerge as a process of "softening" on Zeus' part;[22] rather, the primal strength of Zeus' power is asserted in all of its monstrous force when the Hundred-Handers cast forth a shower of rocks, and Zeus hurls the thunderbolt and lightning in the battle against the Titans. And like his father Kronos, Zeus binds his enemies beneath the earth "in harsh chains."

Zeus' emergence as ruler, then, is in many ways based on his similarity to his predecessors. At the same time, it is predicated upon his replacement of them as both paternal figure and as figure of force. Zeus' "neutralization" of the earlier threats consists in a bi-partite strategy whereby he "replaces" the male figures of force at the same time that he maintains an identity with them, while he "displaces" the various threatening aspects of the female forces and, at the same time, integrates them into his reign.

Thus, the metaphoric treatment of the male characters in the poem insists on a continuity in the characterizations of Ouranos-Kronos-the Titans-Zeus. The full force of Gaia's threatening aspect, by contrast, is reconstituted metonymically only in the figure of Pandora and the tribe of women who, in the patriarchal order, are subject to the male.

Therefore, the evolution of the mode of reciprocity and exchange by which Zeus acquires the means to power is paralleled by a narrative strategy which, through negative "gift-exchange," constitutes the human realm as the locus for displacement of the principle of cyclical temporality, of the principle of the succession-myth manifested as the *gastêr/nêdys* which concealed its own hollowness — its incessant need for replenishment which was at the same time its constant uncovering or revealing of the child.

Otherwise, the erotic aspect of the female force is, in the first place, associated with an Aphrodite who, by her birth, is dissociated from the Olympic order, or, in the second place (822 ff.), is accommodated to its

needs as the principle of heterosexual reproduction. The fecundity of the female is incorporated into the Olympian order through a metonymic process by which the control over the children is yielded to Zeus (Styx) or is expressed in sublimated form as generalized nurturance under the sponsorship of Zeus (Hekate) and maternal support (Gaia as the helper of Zeus). Finally, in the Metis-episode, the full and direct manifestation of female fecundity is appropriated by Zeus and transformed into the birth of a daughter rather than a son.

Zeus' swallowing of Metis is not so much a "next step" in the succession-struggle, which completes the pattern at its logical extreme, as it is an act of synthesis which by including the strategies of the earlier two stages and collapsing them into one, closes the pattern in upon itself. For, like Ouranos, Zeus suppresses the child in the mother's womb; and, like Kronos, he swallows the child itself, by consuming Metis when she is pregnant with Athena and about to give birth (cf. 468 f. with 888 f.). By contrast, in the fragment of Chrysippos which records an alternate version of the Hesiodic story (908 SVF [=fr. 343 M-W]),[23] Zeus swallows Metis (7) and thereupon she becomes pregnant with Athena (10 f.). By the same token, in the more anthropomorphized and rationalized version of Chrysippos, Metis retains a separate identity, hidden within the entrails of Zeus and named "mother of Athena" (13 f.), while in our text Metis is transformed into the function of prophecy for Zeus (900), and when Athena is born she is already her father's child: ἶσον ἔχουσαν πατρὶ μένος καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν (896).

In swallowing Metis Zeus also reverses the patterns of the earliest births of the *Theogony*: female is now born from male, in the context of a complete transformation of the cosmos; and, as in the birth of Aphrodite, daughter is born from father, but from above rather than below, and male reproductive capacity is redefined through a "displacement from phallos to head."[24] By swallowing Metis, Zeus not only appropriates the female sexual and generative power, but he eliminates female autonomy; the birth of Athena is thus an ideal paradigm of a social system in which the children are born from the mother but belong to the father. Nevertheless, the threat of a successor to Zeus is kept alive in the myths of Typhoeus who, in the *Hymn Hom.*3.311 ff. is brought forth from the earth by Hera as a contender for Zeus' power, and in the tradition that Thetis would bear a son to overthrow Zeus (Aischylos, *PV* 755 ff., 970 ff.). In the *Theogony*, however, the strife over succession is displaced backwards and assimilated to the Titanomachy, and Zeus defeats the monster who rises up to challenge his authority. Thus, the struggle resumes its original form as a contest between male and

female for control over procreation, and it is now acted out, not only as a defeat of Metis, but as a victory over Hera in childbearing capacity: for Zeus produces a daughter who is superior to the son of Hera, whom she bears in an atmosphere of anger and contention (928).

In the swallowing of Metis, the homology between *gastêr* and *nêdys* is expanded and transcended, for Athena is born from the head, seat of wisdom, rather than from the thigh, the mouth, or the genitals. At the same time, *nêdys* is redefined as the place of prophecy, since Metis remains within Zeus as his prophetic voice. Thus, the succession-cycle is transformed from the repetitive yielding of place to the future generation into a control over futurity through prophetic knowledge. At the same time, this transformation of pro-geny into pro-phecy is played out as the replacement of *dolos* by *mêtis*. For, in the succession-myth, the recurrent birth of the son was homologous with a continuous devising of a *dolos* to entrap the father and compel his insertion into the cycle. The mother was the sign of the insistence of the cycle, as the one who demanded that the belly/womb be allowed to disgorge its contents, that the child be revealed; and it was she who was master of the *dolos*, who controlled the principle of secrecy and hiding, who knew the *technê* of concealment. Now, Zeus escapes the cycle, not by resisting it, but by assimlating it in its entirety and controlling it. He both conceals and reveals the child; and he devises a *dolos* which is then "uncovered" in the form of the prophetic *mêtis*.[25]

Athena is the sign of "the justice of Zeus" revealed as a stasis through hierarchy in which female subordination to male is expressed benignly through the filial devotion of the daughter, and in which the principle of atemporality is guaranteed by the daughter's virginity. Against the background of the paradigmatic force of this construct there now proceeds an ordered proliferation of births which express female and male fecundity, and bring to completion the genesis of "the holy tribe of those who are forever."

Thus, the eternal liminality of the Olympian world includes the paradox of generation without succession, and of a divine ruler who embodies the tensions and struggles of the succession-myth while at the same time transcending them. Its complement, the human world, by contrast, is circumscribed by temporality and partiality, and written into a script which demands the continuous replaying of the struggle over succession. Men are tied to this condition by the γένος γυναικῶν, and by the insistence of the demands of the *gastêr/nêdys* which is their legacy from Zeus. Only in the cultural realm, in the world of the Muse, the bard, and the king do they have the possibility of constructing a fiction of a world

without women, a world freed from corporeality, a fiction of transcendence — in the words of Bachofen,[26] "the triumph of paternity brings with it the liberation of the spirit from the manifestations of nature, a sublimation of human existence over the laws of material life."

Wesleyan University

NOTES

• Readers familiar with Ditienne and Vernant's *Les ruses de l'intelligence: la mètis des grecs* (now translated into English, 1978) will recognize many points of similarity between this essay and Chapters 3 and 4 of that masterful work ("Les Combats de Zeus," "L'Union avec Mètis"). I offer my own essay as a tribute to the inspiration of that book and of its authors, and as an effort to extend the interpretation of the *Theogony* along some different paths. A longer and more fully annotated version of this essay will appear in *La Donna Antica*, edd. Lanza and Vegetti (Turin: forthcoming). Quotations from the *Theogony* are from the text of M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford 1966).

[1] Gernet 1955 isolates certain social and religious rituals, and the language and symbols of authority associated with them, which directly and indirectly foreshadowed the later, more formalized systems of the polis; see also Gernet 1976. I do not discuss here the important recent work on *dikê* in Hesiod by Gagarin, Latte, Krafft, and others, whose theories are treated in detail by Pucci 1977, and who are primarily concerned with *dikê* in the *Erga*; see also Clauss 1977.

[2] On the survival of self-help in the classical period see Wolff 1946.33, 49; on the survival of voluntary (i.e., not binding) private arbitration, see MacDowell 1978.203-06. Symbolic retribution is a looser concept, but on the connection between the *wergeld* of the Homeric period and the purificatory procedures of the classical period in Athens, see MacDowell 1978.109-13, and the same author's chapter, "Vengeance, Cleaning, and Deterrence," in MacDowell 1963.141-50.

[3] Finley 1978.64 ff., 95 ff., *et passim*.

[4] E.g., a recent study by Traube 1979.46 which discusses a pair of myths of the Mambai of East Timor: "one myth defines the proper relations between the human and natural worlds which are organized around economic production. The other [on the origin of the brother-sister incest taboo] defines the proper relationship between wife-taking and wife-giving groups, which are organized around sexual reproduction. The occurrence of the two narratives in a culturally recognized diptych emphasizes . . . the homology between the two creative activities."

[5] See Sahlins 1972, esp. 194 ff., where "gift-exchange" is subsumed under the category of "balanced reciprocity." See further page 220: "Balanced reciprocity is the classic vehicle of peace and alliance contracts, substance-as-symbol of the transformation from separate to harmonious interests."

[6] This progression, like that from matriarchy to patriarchy, has often been assumed to reflect an historical development. For a discussion of the errors involved in this assumption,

see Wolff 1946, Gernet 1976 and Harrison 1971.69 ff., who follows Wolff and Gernet. My employment of this scheme is intended to imply only its conceptual, not its historical, validity.

[7] For a fuller explanation of this contrast, see Jakobson 1956. However, it should perhaps be noted that these terms are employed in a manner which does not differ substantially from ancient practice (i.e., Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 8), and that the following remarks of Quintilian are particularly relevant to my use of metaphor, synecdoche, and metonymy:

> Metaphora enim aut vacantem occupare locum debet aut, si in alienum venit, plus valere eo quod expellet . . . . [Synecdoche] variare sermonem potest, ut ex uno plures intelligamus, parte totum, specie genus, praecedentibus sequentia, vel omnia haec contra (8.6.18 f.); nec procul ab hoc genere [i.e., synecdoche] discedit metonymia, quae est nominis pro nomine positio (8.6.23).

[8] As these introductory remarks imply, the focus of the following analysis of the poem is predicated upon a view which regards the text as a self-referential system, a structure of ideas and of narrative progressions which, as it evolves, generates the context for meaning. Further, the text of the *Theogony* is presumed to be a systematically structured whole, and the various motifs which appear, especially in connection with the succession-myth, are regarded as self-conscious literary devices and not as mere borrowings from the storehouse of cosmogonic myth. For a recent demonstration of the structural unity of the poem and of the genuineness of the text (with the exception of 576 f. and with the end of the poem remaining problematic), see Schwabl 1966. Recent Hesiodic scholarship has tended to proceed on the assumption of unity: e.g., Pucci 1977; and see the remarks of Blusch 1970.1 f.

[9] Among the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea, "the term *wel* means 'exact equivalent' . . . . If a man is killed in battle his side will immediately attempt to kill a man as *wel* from among those who killed him. . . . *Su* is not the return of an identical item but a 'compensation' in the form of an acceptable amount of valuables and implies settlement for a loss or injury" (Schieffelin 1976.109).

[10] Schwabl 1966.80 compares the two "creations."

[11] Vernant 1974.147.

[12] In all other genealogies, including that of the *Iliad*, Aphrodite is the daughter of Zeus. On Διὸς θυγάτηρ as the fixed epithet of Aphrodite, see Boedeker 1974.9 f. and 10, note 1.

[13] I do not, of course, intend to imply that this status existed in Hesiod's time as we see it in the classical period; all the same, it is evident that the epic notion of marriage and of the female role was not substantially different from that of the later period (see Lacey 1966). On the Homeric and other ancient antecedents of the epiclerate, see Gernet 1921, esp. 379.

[14] In Mousaios (fr. 16; see West *ad* 409) Perses is cuckolded by Zeus; in Kallimachos (*Hymn* 4.36-38) Asterie leapt from Olympos into the sea to escape Zeus.

[15] E.g., Kallimachos, Lykophron 1175; Pindar fr. 36 Bowra (*Paean* 2) 49 f.: παρθένος εὐμενὴς Ἑκάτα.

[16] Space does not permit a full elaboration here of Styx's role in the poem; it is discussed fully in the longer version of this paper (see Headnote). There, I argue that the fundamental family triad of father-mother-child(ren) is juxtaposed with another, namely, father-father's daughter-daughter's children (Okeanos-Styx-her children). This particular kin-grouping, the line traced back through the maternal side to the maternal grandfather, is typically

associated with dynastic quarrels, as it is here: Okeanos breaks with the Titans and makes an alliance with Zeus through his daughter and daughter's children. Thus, the alliance between male and female is re-cast in its more stable form, as a compact between male ego and father's brother's daughter. Finally, Styx, in offering her children to Zeus (397 ff.), anticipates the role of the wife in the *oikos* and the position of women under the patriarchal order. For just as the *gynē* in the *oikos* is entrusted with the duty and responsibility of producing the children who legitimate the father's position as *kyrios* and ensure the continuity of the *oikos*, Styx offers Zeus the children who symbolize the means of his victory and ensure the permanence of his reign. Like Athena and Hekate, then, Styx is explicitly associated with the Olympian rule of Zeus; but unlike them, she is the mother of powerful children. Thus, she represents female fecundity expressed, like that of Gaia, directly and in the form of children who are monstrous, fearsome, and dreadful in their aspect. And accordingly, she retains the dread aspect associated with the primal powers, and is relegated to the Underworld (776 ff.), a realm which is in some senses a reconstitution of primeval confusion: "Tartarus represents, in spatial terms, what Chaos does in temporal ones: the primordial indeterminacy from which the world will later be organized into regions and differentiated cosmic elements" (Detienne and Vernant 1974:1978.169, note 103).

[17] See MacDowell 1978.203-06, and his interpretation of a scene from the *Epitrepontes*; and cf. his remark (206): "In a privately arranged arbitration the disputants chose their arbitrators from among their own relatives or friends."

[18] See Sahlins 1972.195 on "negative reciprocity," which, by his definition, "ranges through various degrees of cunning, guile, stealth, and violence to the finesse of a well-conducted horse raid."

[19] See Zeitlin 1978.161 f.

[20] See Vernant 1974a, Loraux 1978 and Pucci 1977.

[21] See Solmsen 1949.157 ff.; and Detienne and Vernant 1974.91 ff.

[22] As it does in Aischylos; see Murray 1958.46 ff.

[23] For a detailed comparison of this passage with the Hesiodic text, see Erbse 1964.20 ff.

[24] Zeitlin 1978.169.

[25] On the threat to the established order of "les ruses de Mètis," see Detienne and Vernant 1974.104 ff.

[26] Bachofen 1973.109.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bachofen, J. J. 1973. *Myth, Religion, and Mother Right. Selected Writings of J. J. Bachofen* (tr. Manheim). Princeton.

Blusch, J. 1970. *Formen und Inhalt von Hesiods Individuellen Denken.* Bonn.

Boedeker, D. D. 1974. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic.* Leiden.

Clauss, D. 1977. "Defining Moral Terms in *Works and Days*," *TAPhA* 107.73-84.

Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.-P. 1974. *Les ruses de l'intelligence, la mètis*

des grecs. Paris. Eng. title, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, tr. J. Lloyd. Sussex 1978.
Dickie, M. W. 1973. "*DIKE* as a moral term in Homer and Hesiod," *CPh* 73.91-101.
Erbse, H. 1964. "Orientalisches und griechisches in Hesiods Theogonie." *Philologus* 108.2-28.
Finley, M. I. 1978. *The World of Odysseus*. New York.
Gernet, L. 1921. "Sur L'epiclérat," *REG* 34.337-79.
..... 1955. "Jeux et droit," in *Droit et société dans la Grèce ancienne*, 9-18. Paris.
..... 1976. "Droit et prédroit en Grèce ancienne," in *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique*, 176-260. Paris.
Harrison, A. R. W. 1971. *The Law of Athens: Procedure*. Oxford.
Jakobson, R. and Halle, M. 1956. *Fundamentals of Language*. The Hague.
Lacey, W. K. 1966. "Homeric *HEDNA* and Penelope's *KYRIOS*," *JHS* 86.55-68.
Loraux, N. 1978. "Sur la race des femmes et quelques-unes de ses tribus," *Arethusa* 11.43-87.
MacDowell, D. M. 1963. "Vengeance, Cleaning, and Deterrence," in *Athenian Homicide Law*, 141-50. Manchester.
..... 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens*. Ithaca.
Murray, R. D. 1958. *The Motif of Io in Aeschylus' Suppliants*. Princeton.
Pucci, P. 1977. *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*. Baltimore and London.
Sahlins, M. 1972. "On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange," in *Stone Age Economic*, 185-275. Chicago.
Schieffelin, E. L. 1976. *The Sorrow of the Lonely and the Burning of the Dancers*. New York.
Schwabl, H. 1966. *Hesiods Theogonie: Eine unitarische Analyse*. Vienna.
Solmsen, F. 1949. *Hesiod and Aeschylus*. Ithaca.
Traube, E. 1979. "Incest and Mythology: Timorese and Girardian Perspectives," *Berkshire Review* 14.37-53.
Vernant, J.-P. 1974. "Entre bêtes et dieux: Des jardins d'Adonis à la mythologie des aromates," in *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne*, 141-76. Paris.
.....1974a. "Le mythe prométhéen chez Hésiode," in *ibid.*, 177-94.
Wolff, H. J. 1946. "The Origin of Judicial Litigation among the Greeks," *Traditio* 4.31-87.
Zeitlin, F. I. 1978. "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*," *Arethusa* 11.149-84.

SACRED APOSTROPHE: RE-PRESENTATION AND IMITATION IN THE HOMERIC HYMNS

ANN L. T. BERGREN

I. GENRE AND HISTORY

From the beginning, the Homeric hymns mark both beginning and end. They come before the recitation of epic, but after Homeric epic has reached its peak. The evidence is scanty, but so far as we can tell, the works in this somewhat paradoxical category of 'Homeric hymn' represent an elaboration by the rhapsodes of the invocation that had always begun an epic song. Demodocus, at the start of his third song at Phaeacia, is said to "begin from the god" or "goddess" (*Od.*8.499).[1] Similarly, the Homeridae, according to Pindar *Nem.*2.1-3, "generally begin their woven epics with a *prooímion* to Zeus," the same term '*prooímion*' with which Thucydides (3.104) in our earliest explicit reference to the Hymns designates the *Hymn to Apollo*.[2] According to the scholiast on *Nem.* 2.1 (3.28.16-3.29.18 Drachmann), the Homeridae were "originally sons of Homer who sang by right of succession" and later rhapsodes who performed Homeric epic without claiming direct descent.[3] The Homeridae performed at such contests as those described in the *Contest between Homer and Hesiod*, local gatherings like the funeral at Chalcis where Hesiod triumphed (see also *WD* 654-59) and larger festivals like the *panêguris* at Delos (see also Hes. fr. 357 MW). While no doubt unreliable as biography, the *Contest* does seem to preserve an authentic picture of the process by which the works of the poets canonized as 'Homer' and 'Hesiod' were gradually disseminated and finally fixed in their Panhellenic form.[4] So we have this chain of evidence: Demodocus begins his song with an invocation of the deity; the 'sons of Homer' who recite epic at contests during the period of its progressive fixation begin with a *prooímion* to Zeus; and our earliest reference to an Homeric hymn is as a *prooímion*.

This evidence, to quote the commentary of Allen, Halliday and Sykes (1936.lxxxviii-lxxxix) seems "to show the 'Homeric hymn' in the light of a *párergon* of the professional bard or rhapsode, as delivered at an *agôn*, whether at a god's festival or in honor of a prince." The Homeric hymn is a *párergon* 'subordinate or secondary business' of the 'sons of Homer' in relation to their primary job of repeating the father's words. A *párergon*, yes, but not merely so, for as the major hymns of the corpus