

ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS

Hesiod's Monsters
and the Limits of Etymological Signification

This paper explores the ways in which the presence of monstrous figures challenges etymologically 'correct' naming in Hesiod's Theogony. By examining the section on the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers (139-153), the catalogue of monsters (270-336), and the Typhonomachy (820-880), I argue that the Theogony's monstrous characters call into question the poet's ability to encapsulate adequately and clearly the hybrid essence of these beings by using a single, 'correct' name. Etymological 'correctness' increasingly recedes, the names of monsters sometimes capture only part of the nature of these characters, while some characters bear only generic names or no name at all. With the defeat of Typhoeus etymological 'correctness' returns to the narrative, thereby suggesting that Zeus's victory has both a political and a linguistic/cognitive effect.

L'articolo esplora i modi in cui, nella Teogonia di Esiodo, la presenza di figure mostruose sfida la denominazione etimologicamente 'corretta'. Esaminando la sezione sui Ciclopi e i Centimani (139-153), il Catalogo dei mostri (270-336) e la Tifonomachia (820-880), sostengo che i mostruosi personaggi della Teogonia chiamano in causa l'abilità del poeta nell'incapsulare in un nome, in modo adeguato ed evidente, l'essenza ibrida di questi esseri. La 'correttezza' etimologica si allontana progressivamente, i nomi dei mostri a volte esprimono solo una parte della natura di questi personaggi, mentre alcuni personaggi recano soltanto nomi generici o nessun nome. Con la sconfitta di Tifeo la 'correttezza' etimologica rientra nella narrazione, suggerendo così che la vittoria di Zeus ha un effetto sia politico sia linguistico-cognitivo.

Hesiod's etymologizing of proper names in the *Theogony* is well-known and has been the subject of numerous studies¹. In a recent monograph I argue that Hesiod's keen use of etymology is linked to his general vision of the nature of language and its potential to represent reality². The *Theogony* that systematizes divine genealogies and the succession of the generations of gods adopts a genealogical perspective on language, and it is no wonder that it is in this poem that we find the greatest number of Hesiod's etymologies. These etymologies imply the existence of a 'correct'³ or 'true' language whose words (names) effectively reflect something of great importance about the character named. To give just one example, in his

¹ On etymologising in Hesiod and early Greek literature see, for instance, Sulzberger 1926; Risch 1947; Rank 1951; Ferrante 1965; Gambarara 1984; Arrighetti 1987, 15-36; Kraus 1987; Salvatore 1987; Peradotto 1990; Curiazi 1994; Louden 1995; Tsitsimbakou-Vassalos 2007; Skempis and Ziogas 2009; Kanavou 2015; O'Hara 2015, 7-13; Sluiter 2015. See also the discussion in Genette 1976, 11-51.

² Vergados 2020.

³ I use inverted commas to signal that these names are not correct in terms of scientific etymology that observes the sound laws formulated by modern linguists. They are 'correct' inasmuch as the poet posits a reason behind their coinage as instruments that reveal something of profound importance about the character named. In other words, they are exegetically 'correct' in the verbal cosmos of the poem.

presentation of Aphrodite's conception and birth (188-206) Hesiod etymologizes her name from ἀφρός, thereby revealing the circumstances of her conception and birth: she was reared in the foam that was formed around the severed member of Ouranos, cast by Cronus into the sea. The poet also provides the etymological explanations of several of her standard epithets: κυπρογενής because she first appeared on Cyprus; Κυθήρεια because Cythera was the first place she approached in her journey; ἀφρογενής because she was born out of the foam; and φιλομμειδής/φιλομμηδής ('fond of genitals') because she was born from Ouranos' genitals (μήδεα)⁴. All these attributes turn out to reflect important moments of her divine biography: they are related to the places that she approached before her birth and first epiphany, or again to the circumstances of her conception. Anticipating later developments in the theory of language, the name, thus, turns out to be a micro-narrative, a condensed narrative, which, if properly understood and expanded, reveals a lot about the character named⁵.

This set of explicit etymological explanations achieves more than simply accounting for how Aphrodite acquired her name and epithets. They are also a strategy by which Hesiod justifies his choice of an alternative genealogy for the goddess. As we know from the *Iliad* (V 370-430) and the *Homeric Hymn* (V) dedicated to her, Aphrodite was also thought to be the daughter of Zeus, and in the *Iliad* Dione is said to be her mother⁶. Later authors will distinguish between two goddesses sharing the same name, one born of Ouranos, the other of Zeus⁷. For Hesiod, however, there is only one Aphrodite. Hesiod's Aphrodite is the daughter of Ouranos, and her birth and naming mark the conclusion of the first stage of the Succession Myth, soon to be punctuated by another explicit etymology, pronounced by Ouranos and concerning the name of the Titans (207-210). Aphrodite turns out to be older than Zeus and thus not immediately subject to his power, unlike the Aphrodite of the *Homeric Hymn*, the delimiting of whose power is one of the central issues in the *Hymn*⁸.

⁴ Hesiod plays here with the hexameter tradition: he adds a more traditional etymology of φιλομμειδής from φιλότης and μειδήματα at 205-206; see Vergados 2020, 83-84 with further bibliography.

⁵ The Stoics will later speak of ἀνάπτυξις, 'unfolding' of a name; cf. Quilligan 1979, esp. 35-37; Dawson 1992; Sluiter 1997, 200-203.

⁶ Note that Hesiod mentions Dione twice in the *Theogony* (17, 353) but does not associate her with Aphrodite.

⁷ Cf. Orphica Fr. 189, 260 Bernabé, and the distinction between Aphrodite οὐρανία and πάνδημος in Plat. *Symp.* 180e.

⁸ See Strauss Clay 1989, 152-201.

This is not to say, of course, that the *Theogony* provides us with a uniformly unambiguous view of the ability of human language to comprehend and explicate divine realities. Besides the explicit etymologies, which appear in the first third of the poem (Chrysaor and Pegasus are the last explicit etymologies), there are several implicit ones, whose perception depends on the audience's ability to grasp the connections established (or implied) by the poet. There is furthermore the much-discussed statement of the Muses in lines 27-28 in which the goddesses assert that they can tell many lies that resemble truths, but also truths, whenever they wish⁹. Significantly, they do not at any point claim to convey truths to Hesiod¹⁰. Thus, the truth status of his account of the creation of the divine cosmos and Zeus's ascending to power remains open: is it ἀληθές? or a ψεῦδος that resembles ἔτυμα? To these we should add the poet's claim to be unable to name all the river-gods and Oceanids in lines 362-370. There are three thousand of them, and only men who dwell near them are able to tell their names. Hesiod's *Theogony* is incomplete, then, as the opening of the *Works and Days* that introduces an additional goddess by the name Eris further confirms¹¹. All of this has a profound epistemological import: if names encapsulate the divine past and can be unfolded through etymological analysis so as to offer knowledge about this past, then the lack of complete knowledge of the divine names and the possibility for etymological mis-interpretation¹² mean that the knowledge that the mortal poet can hope to achieve is limited, while his ability to convey it to his audience cannot be taken for granted. The knowledge about the divine past that the poet's language conveys must be subjected to constant re-evaluation, as Hesiod himself does at the beginning of the *Erga* in his account of Strife.

The monsters that make their appearance in Hesiod's *Theogony*, the topic of this paper, pose a further challenge to etymologically 'correct' naming, as they call into question the poet's ability to capture adequately and clearly the hybrid essence of the beings named. As scholars have often pointed out, monsters straddle categories without fitting comfortably in any of them and thus defy our taxonom-

⁹ These lines have been heavily debated, and reproducing the entire discussion goes beyond the purview of this article. For an overview see West 1966 *ad l.*; Stroh 1976; Pucci 1977; Ferrari 1988; Strauss Clay 2003, 57-64; Pucci 2007 *ad l.*; Halliwell 2011, 13-15; Stamatopoulou 2017, 20-21; Tor 2017, 71-72; Ricciardelli 2018, XXX-XXXII and 105-108; Vergados 2020, 211-219.

¹⁰ A point emphasized by Strauss Clay 2003, 60 and Tor 2017, 72-73.

¹¹ Hes. *Op.* 11-26; cf. Vergados 2020, 151-160.

¹² Cf. the etymology of Pandora's name at Hes. *Op.* 80-82 that shows that even when the etymon of a name is transparent, multiple and sometimes contradictory interpretations are possible; cf. Vergados 2020, 115-137.

ic efforts¹³. Indeed, some of Hesiod's monsters combine immortality with bestial form (e.g., Kerberos, Echidna); others, both bestial and mortal (e.g., Gorgo Medousa, the Lernaian Hydra, the Nemean Lion, Orthos), are later killed by heroes (Bellerophon, Heracles, Perseus). Incidentally, this fact draws attention to another kind of anomaly in the section on monsters, its temporal displacement: in the arrangement of the material in the *Theogony*, the section on monsters anticipates the narrative of Zeus's birth (468-500)¹⁴; nevertheless, the king of the gods and his sons who free the world of some of these monsters feature proleptically in this part of the narrative¹⁵. Finally, in some cases we encounter features of more than one animal combined in a single monster (e.g., the Chimaera), or polycephaly (e.g., Cerberus, Hydra, Geryon)¹⁶. In terms of their placement in the narrative fabric of the *Theogony*, the majority of Hesiod's monsters are contained in the section of the poem that catalogues the offspring of Pontus and are, appropriately, fenced off through ring-composition (270 ~ 333-336)¹⁷. But this is not to say that the 'monstrous' is confined to these lines: early on in the *Theogony* Hesiod introduces the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers, who exhibit monstrous characteristics, while after the Titanomachy Zeus will have to face Typhoeus, the ultimate monster that combines characteristics of several earlier monsters.

The defining characteristics often proposed in modern 'monster studies' cannot be uniformly applied to Hesiod's monsters, and some scholars have denied the applicability of the modern concept of the 'monstrous' in early hexameter literature¹⁸. For instance, although the monstrous is sometimes said to be confined to the margins, and indeed some of the *Theogony's* monsters dwell in the margins of the world (e.g., the Gorgons who dwell ἐν ἔσχατιῇ νυκτός [275], the home of the Hesperides, or Geryon πέρην κλυτοῦ Ἰκεάνοιο [294]), in Hesiod's vision of the cosmos monsters and monstrosity are not entirely marginal: the Nemean Lion

¹³ On monsters in antiquity and modern 'monster studies', see Sperber 1975; Mainoldi 1995; Cohen 1996; Atherton 1998; Kearney 2003; Li Causi 2003; Murgatroyd 2007; Beta - Marzari 2010; Cherubini 2012; Gevaert - Laes 2013; Lowe 2015; Carpi 2019; Del Lucchese 2019; Godden - Mittman 2019; Gloyn 2020. On Hesiod's monsters, see Costa 1968; Strauss Clay 1993; Visintin 1997; Strauss Clay 2003, 150-161; Baglioni 2017.

¹⁴ Likewise, Orthos is killed at 293, but is born at 309.

¹⁵ See Stoddard 2004, 162-201; see also Strauss Clay 2003, 152-153 who draws our attention to the similar collapse of chronology in the Prometheus episode.

¹⁶ Cf. «Thesis III: The Monster is the Harbinger of Category Crisis» in Cohen 1996, 6-7.

¹⁷ Strauss Clay 1993, 115-116 highlights the significance of the fact that this section is enclosed in ring-composition and its placement relatively early on in the poem despite the problems in chronology.

¹⁸ Zanon 2016; Baglioni 2017.

and the Lernaean Hydra dwell in recognizable parts of the Greek landscape, and their presence vexes humans until they are dispatched by Heracles. On the other hand, the Hundred-Handers and the Cyclopes play a crucial role in supporting the poem's *telos*, the establishment of the reign of Zeus, with whom they engage in reciprocal exchange (655-663): they fight on his side in gratitude for his freeing them from the imprisonment imposed by Ouranos. The Hundred-Handers will later become guards of the imprisoned Titans in Tartarus, thus in a sense being relegated to the margins. But even so, they play an important role in Zeus's cosmos while one of them, Briareos, is given Kymopoleia as his wife and may no longer dwell in Tartarus with his brothers (817-819). This treatment of the Hundred-Handers is not reserved to 'monsters' alone: Styx, a powerful goddess who first joins the Olympian cause along with her children (383-403), is likewise honoured by Zeus by becoming the 'great oath of the gods,' which also means that she dwells in Tartarus as a river of the Underworld (775-806): while she assumes an important role in Zeus's arrangement of the divine cosmos, she dwells far away from Olympus, separated from her children, and thus cannot pose any challenge to Zeus¹⁹. We do not know where the Cyclopes dwell after Zeus frees them, but they too are integrated into Zeus's cosmos as the divine craftsmen who fabricate Zeus's weapon.

It is sometimes observed that monsters do not resemble their parents, an idea that derives from the use of Latin *monstrum*, which may designate offspring that markedly differs from their parents or any deformed or strange-looking being, and may even be used as a moral characterisation²⁰. But even this is not entirely true of the *Theogony's* monsters: for despite their abnormality, some of Hesiod's monsters do resemble their parents and inherit some of their characteristics (*cf.*, for instance, the repetition of canine or serpentine forms in the catalogue, or the quality of καλλιπάρης that is inherited by some female members of the monster line). It has also been noted that the monster challenges the cultural paradigm by being "a liminal creature embodying the very boundaries humans have overreached" whose "place [is] outside and beyond social norms and values". A monster refers to what a given culture conceives as 'abnormal' or 'other,' which by challenging existing categories reinforces collective or individual identity in

¹⁹ See Strauss Clay 2020a. Incidentally, Styx also straddles categories: while she is introduced as an Oceanid at Hes. *Th.* 361, she turns out to be a river of the Underworld in the *descriptio Tartari*.

²⁰ Cf. Gevaert - Laes 2013, 212-216; Lowe 2015, 11. On the basis of the assumed etymologies from *monere* and *monstrare* a *monstrum* could be a warning or sign from the gods that the religious order had been breached. Note that the birth of children that resemble their parents is a characteristic of the Just City at Hes. *Op.* 235.

opposition to that of the ‘foreign’ or ‘other’²¹. Whilst such definitions may make sense in modern cultures, they do not work entirely when we examine Hesiod’s monsters²². To be sure, these creatures depart from the anthropomorphism of the Olympian pantheon, often through their hybrid nature, but one cannot uniformly speak of all of them as promoters of chaos or transgression (*cf.* above, on the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers who conform to, rather than challenge, the normative divine society established by Zeus)²³. The point of reference when examining Hesiod’s monsters is the cosmos as created by Zeus and the poet’s own programme of systematizing mythological traditions, rather than the identity or ethical values of a particular society with which the monsters are in conflict (humans have only marginal presence in the *Theogony*: they are harmed by some of the monsters, *e.g.*, the Nemean Lion, but they do not appear as moral agents or represent particular values in the action of the poem).

This survey shows just how diverse Hesiod’s ‘monsterscape’ is, which makes it hardly surprising that a generic term that would designate them as a group, or at least reflect one of their chief shared characteristics, their hybridity, is absent. The terms that Hesiod sometimes uses to designate them (*e.g.*, πέλωρ) cannot be rendered ‘monster’ *tout court*. Echidna who resembles neither gods nor humans is called a πέλωρον (295), which is also the term used to describe one of her component parts, the snake (299). At 845 and 856 πέλωρον qualifies Typhoeus. Elsewhere in the *Theogony* πελώρη designates Gaia (159, 173, 479, 821, 858) and points to her prodigious size. Significantly, at 821 Γαῖα πελώρη gives birth to Typhoeus, a πέλωρον, which suggests a similarity between them in genealogical terms. Besides entities that we would characterise as hybrid²⁴ or monstrous²⁵, πέλωρ (and cognates) can refer to animals of different kinds²⁶, gods, heroes, or weapons, usually

²¹ Capri 2019, 1-2, from whom I quote in the previous sentence.

²² Cf. Thesis 2 in Cohen 1996, 4-6: «The monster always escapes». While monstrous creatures do return in retellings of their stories in literature and other artistic media, the *Theogony* gives a sense of closure and finality: Zeus and his heroic sons put an end to some of these monsters’ lives, while others continue to dwell at the margins, conveniently away from humans.

²³ This is the reason why a category of monsters that includes the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers as well as Typhoeus, as proposed by Cherubini 2012, 139-140 cannot be admitted for the *Theogony*.

²⁴ On hybrid creatures, see Li Causi 2003, 184-189 and 2010, where he argues against the existence of our general category of ‘hybridity’ in antiquity.

²⁵ *E.g.*, Medousa at *Il.* V 741, Polyphemus at *Od.* IX 257, 427, Scylla at *Od.* XII 85-88, Pytho at *h.Apol.* 374.

²⁶ For instance, a serpent *Il.* XXII 202, lions and wolves at *Od.* X 219, a goose at *Od.* XV

belonging to gods or associated with the divine²⁷. The term thus does not entirely overlap with what we might call 'monstrous' but designates entities or objects of enormous size²⁸, as well as signs sent from the gods, like the serpent that devours the nine fledglings of a sparrow as well as their mother before the serpent is transformed into a stone. Characteristically, this is viewed as a σῆμα (*Il.* II 308) but is later summed up as πέλωρα θεῶν (321) and subsequently designated as a τέρας by Calchas (324)²⁹ who interprets it.

What is important for our purposes is that these creatures are not just oddities of nature but represent an important political and cognitive challenge. By straddling categories through their mixed, hybrid nature, Hesiod's monsters challenge the progression of the cosmos which by the time of their appearance is already organised in clear lines of descent, with children that resemble their parents (*e.g.*, Night and her offspring, Nereus and the Nereids). The *Theogony* explains how the cosmos, the natural environment, comes into being, how individual gods emerge out of the general mass of natural forces at the initial stage, and their generations are organized, systematized, and hierarchized. Parthenogenesis yields to exogamous unions that produce offspring which, while different and individual, resembles its parents. Jenny Strauss Clay has argued that the monsters show us what a potential anti-cosmos might look like³⁰. While some members of the line of Pontus are integrated into the line descending from Ouranos and Gaia, the self-contained catalogue of monsters indicates that an anti-cosmos would be in-bred and populated by disastrous creatures that defy clear categories. The birth of Typhoeus poses a challenge to the cosmos as established by Zeus. At lines 836-838 the poet clearly states his fear, cast in form of a contrafactual: everything could have

161, but also a dolphin, the form that Apollo assumes when he appears to the Cretan sailors at *h.Apol.* 401.

²⁷ *Il.* XV 594, VIII 424, X439, XVIII 83; *Od.* XI 594: the rock that Sisyphus pushes.

²⁸ See the discussion in Baglioni 2017, 19–21; *Lfgre* s.v. πέλωρ, πέλωρον; πελώρη; πελώριος; and Lowe 2015, 8–14.

²⁹ For τέρας as a sign sent by Zeus, cf. Hom. *Il.* IV 76 (a star), XI 28, XII 209 (a serpent), XVII 548 (the rainbow); *Od.* III 173, XVI 320, XX 101, 113, XXI 415; more generally, cf. the phrase (θεῶν) τεράεσσι πιθήσας at Hom. *Il.* IV 398, 408, VI 183, XII 256. Medousa's head on Athena's aegis is Zeus's τέρας at *Il.* V 742. At *Od.* XV 168 τέρας is a sign from gods involving an eagle holding a πέλωρον goose (XV 161); see Baglioni 2017, 13–16 on τέρας as a sign sent from the gods to convey a message, positive or negative, in early hexameter; thus, the term should not be automatically assumed to point to something 'monstrous'. At Hom. *Od.* XII 194 τέραα designates the pieces of meat from Helios' cows that move and low. τέρας occurs at *Th.* 744 (bracketed by West) where it designates the χάσμα μέγ(α) in Tartarus. See *Lfgre*, s.v. τέρας, τεῖρ(ας).

³⁰ Strauss Clay 1993, 115–116, and 2003, 161.

been undone and Typhoeus would have become king, had Zeus not kept watchful guard. The monsters thus pose a political challenge to Zeus's cosmos and the way in which it has been unfolding, its differentiation and organisation, as well as to the unfolding of important events of the heroic past.

Hand in hand with this political challenge goes a cognitive difficulty: how does one describe such creatures, and in particular how does one name them effectively? If names reveal the essential characteristic of their bearer and are an instrument that enables us to define these beings and their place in the cosmos³¹, can ordinary names fully capture the mixed, confounded nature of these creatures? Just as with the names of Aphrodite discussed earlier, the names of the monsters are not Hesiod's invention: they belong to the mythological tradition and are found in other archaic texts. Yet Hesiod deploys them in a way that allows him to make an important point about the power and limits of 'correct' naming. Even though these creatures defy clear-cut categorization, Hesiod inserts them into his systematic understanding of language, as a sign that the system of etymologically 'correct' names reaches its limits when attempting to describe the monsters.

Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers

I begin my discussion not from the section of the *Theogony* that has the highest concentration of monsters (270-336), but from an earlier section in the *Theogony*, that concerning the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers. This passage emblematises well the tension between etymologically significant names and the poet's inability to name (which also means to define) the monsters adequately using the means with which language equips him (139-153):

γείνατο δ' αὖ Κύκλωπας ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντας,
 Βρόντην τε Στερόπην τε καὶ Ἄργην ὀβριμόθυμον 140
 οἱ Ζηνὶ βροντὴν τ' ἔδωσαν τεῦξάν τε κεραυνόν.
 οἱ δ' ἦτοι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιοι ἦσαν,
 μῦθος δ' ὀφθαλμὸς μέσσω ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ·
 Κύκλωπες δ' ὄνομα ἦσαν ἐπάνυμον, οὐνεκ' ἀρά σφραων
 κυκλοτερὴς ὀφθαλμὸς ἕεις ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ· 145
 ἰσχύς δ' ἠδὲ βίη καὶ μηχαναὶ ἦσαν ἐπ' ἔργοις.

ἄλλοι δ' αὖ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο
 τρεῖς παῖδες μεγάλοι <τε> καὶ ὄβριμοι, οὐκ ὀνομαστοί,

³¹ Philippon 1936, 9-10; cf. the definition of the word (ὄνομα) as διδασκαλικόν τι ὄργανον καὶ διακριτικὸν τῆς οὐσίας at Plat. *Crat.* 388c.

Κόττος τε Βριάρεώς τε Γύγης θ', ὑπερήφανα τέκνα.
 τῶν ἑκατὸν μὲν χεῖρες ἀπ' ὤμων αἰσσοντο, 150
 ἄπλαστοι, κεφαλαὶ δὲ ἐκάστω πενήκοντα
 ἐξ ὤμων ἐπέφυκον ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσι·
 ἰσχύς δ' ἀπλητος κρατερῇ μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἶδει.

Then again, she gave birth to the Cyclopes who have an exceedingly mighty heart, Brontes and Steropes and stout-hearted Arges, who gave Zeus the thunder and fashioned the thunderbolt for him. These were in every other respect similar to the gods, but a single eye was in the middle of their forehead; and they were called Cyclopes, a significant name, evidently because they had a single round eye on their forehead. Might and violence and contrivance were in their deeds.

Three other children were then born from Gaia and Ouranos, both great and mighty, not to be named, Kottos and Briareos and Gyges, overweening sons. One hundred arms moved mightily from their shoulders, untouchable, and fifty heads sprung out of their shoulders over their mighty limbs. An unassailable mighty strength was in their great form.

This section is marked off from the account of the children of Gaia and Ouranos, those who will later be named 'Titans', by means of ring-composition³². To be sure, the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers are similar to each other: both are monstrous, albeit in different ways; they are both imprisoned by Ouranos (and later kept imprisoned by Cronus) in the depths of Gaia; later they will be liberated by Zeus and they will both provide crucial aid in the Titanomachy. Their similarity is underscored by verbal parallels in their description: both groups introduced with the particle αὖ followed by a general comment about their might (ὄβριμος); then their names follow, the most important characteristics of their appearance, and a concluding verse that, while syntactically challenging, nevertheless presents similarities in both cases³³.

There are important differences, as well: the collective name of the first group is etymologized explicitly: the etymology is introduced through a naming formula (ἐπώνυμον, οὐνεκ' ἄρα)³⁴, and is repeated twice (first: ἔεις, then κυκλοτερής). Of the individual names Βρόντης is linked to βροντή, while Ἄργης is a proper name

³² 126-137 (A) Gaia's offspring → 138 (B) δεινότατος παίδων, θαλερὸν δ' ἤχθηρε τοκῆα = Cronus → 139-153 (C) Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers → 154-155 (B') δεινότατοι παίδων, σφετέρῳ δ' ἤχθοντο τοκῆι (all of the Ouranids) → 156-166 (A') Gaia, her offspring and her plan. On this, see Vergados 2013.

³³ See Kirk 1962, 78; West 1966 *ad l.*

³⁴ Cf. Hom. *Il.* IX 562; Hes. *Th.* 282; *Lfgre*, s.v. ἐπώνυμ(ος) B1; ἐπώνυμος is one of the standard 'etymological signposts', as the examples in O'Hara 2015 show.

derived from the adjective used to describe κεραυνός, a word that is mentioned in the following line. The collocation Βρόντην τε Στερόπην τε, furthermore, is found in Hesiod three times in the same metrical position with common nouns instead of proper names, (appropriately) when Zeus uses his weapons (286, 707, 854): these names are thus embedded in the formulaic fabric of the poem. Thus, whilst the collective name is etymologized explicitly, the individual names are semantically transparent and reflect natural phenomena.

In the case of the Hundred-Handers, while the name of Βριάρεως may be implicitly etymologised through an etymological wordplay with ὄβριμος which expresses a shared characteristic of all three gods³⁵, the other two names are not explained in any way. At the same time, we are missing the collective name, Ἐκατόγχειρες, though it is suggested by ἑκατὸν μὲν χεῖρες (150) and is not unknown in early hexameter poetry. At *Il.* I 401-405 Achilles reminds Thetis of how she once saved Zeus when the other Olympians revolted against him, by summoning the Ἐκατόγχειρος Αἰγαίωv.

ἀλλὰ σὺ τὸν γ' ἐλθοῦσα θεὰ ὑπελύσασο δεσμῶν,
 ὧχ' ἑκατόγχειρον καλέσασ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον,
 ὃν Βριάρεων καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δέ τε πάντες
 Αἰγαίωv, ὃ γὰρ αὐτε βίην οὐ πατρὸς ἀμείνων·
 ὅς ῥα παρὰ Κρονίωvι καθέζετο κύδει γαίωv. 405

But you, goddess, came and released him from his bonds, having quickly summoned to lofty Olympus the Hundred-Hander whom gods call Briareos but all men Aigaion, for he is superior to his father in strength. He, then, took his place next to the son of Cronus, exulting in his honour.

Interestingly, Αἰγαίωv, a name on which Homer introduces an etymological play with (κύδει) γαίωv, is the name humans use for Βριάρεως which belongs to the language of the gods. Hesiod seems to avoid using the collective name here and while he hints at it in very clear terms, he considers these characters to be οὐκ ὀνομαστοί (not to be named), an expression that has caused some discussion among scholars. Why does Hesiod refrain from using a name that so obviously arises etymologically out of his narrative? One possibility is that, as Kathryn Stoddard has suggested, the poet is in control of his narrative and decides which details to reveal and which to withhold³⁶. Through his use of οὐκ ὀνομαστοί, Hesiod, in Stoddard's view, draws attention to the act of naming, rather than on the mon-

³⁵ Cf. also 153 ἰσχύς δ' ἄπλητος κρατερή which could be regarded as an explanation of Βριάρεως/ὄβριμοι through synonyms.

³⁶ See Stoddard 2004, 48-49.

strous nature of the Hundred-Handers alone, with the intention of making his audience aware of his narrative control. While the poet is certainly in control of his material, I wonder why he would exercise his control by withholding a name that he reveals in such an obvious way, in a section of the narrative which has already primed the audience to expect etymological connections. M.-C. Leclerc, on the other hand, has suggested that οὐκ ὀνομαστοί retains its literal meaning and that for Hesiod naming is a serious and sacred affair³⁷. In her view, if Hesiod does not mention the collective name of these creatures, even though Homer applies ἑκατόγχειρον to one of them (Briareos) it is because the tradition has not disclosed it to him, and the poet does not hesitate to admit his lack of knowledge, as he does later at 362-370. But beside the fact that one cannot exclude Hesiod's knowledge of the term³⁸, the fact remains that the collective name is hinted at in line 150. A more plausible explanation might be that οὐκ ὀνομαστοί has two meanings: on a surface level, it points to creatures that are so monstrous that superstition requires that we avoid mentioning their name: in this sense, οὐκ ὀνομαστοί is an apotropaic expression³⁹. At the same time, this phrase also points to the poet's inability to name them adequately: a name like ἑκατόγχειρες reveals only part of their monstrosity, their having one hundred arms each, but it does not say anything about the other curious feature of this lot, their fifty heads. Rather than using an etymologically transparent name that ultimately fails to convey the totality of the Hundred-Handers' monstrosity, the poet then prefers at this point of the *Theogony* to abstain from attributing a collective name to the second set of Ouranian triplets.

These two divine groups, then, manifest a tension: on the one hand, the Cyclopes, *similar* to the gods in every other respect, receive a collective name that is explicitly etymologised. Their etymologically transparent name suffices as a collective designation that reveals the one characteristic that sets them apart from the gods. On the other hand, the Hundred-Handers are too monstrous to be captured by the term ἑκατόγχειρες, even though this name would have an etymologically transparent meaning and the poet uses its two components so that the name can be reasonably assumed to be triggered in the audience's mind. Hesiod, then, presents programmatically his first explicit etymology of the *Theogony* while si-

³⁷ Leclerc 1996, 263-266; cf. Arrighetti 1987, 29-30.

³⁸ Cf. my earlier remarks on Hesiod's distancing himself from other traditions on Aphrodite's parentage.

³⁹ Cf. West 1966 *ad l.* who concludes that «the belief [*sc.* that by naming such a deity one might conjure him up] has faded, as is shown by the fact that the names are given in the very next line». One of the anonymous readers suggests that «perhaps the use of periphrasis or etymological allusion is exactly a kind of euphemism and does not contradict οὐκ ὀνομαστοί as apotropaic expression».

multaneously expressing indirectly his reservations concerning the effectiveness of etymologically transparent names.

More monsters (270-336)

This idea is relevant for the entire section on monsters (270-336) in which the ‘correctness’ of names, *i.e.* their efficiency in capturing the monsters’ nature, appears limited. Among the monsters we find names that are etymologically accounted for adequately, others that are only partially correct, and others that are too generic to be of any use. Interestingly, the entry on the Harpies that precedes the section on monsters contains partial etymologizing (267-269):

ἠγκόμους θ' Ἄρπυίας, Ἄελλώ τ' Ὀκυπέτην τε,
αἶ ῥ' ἀνέμων πνοιῆσι καὶ οἰωνοῖς ἅμ' ἔπονται
ὠκείης πτερύγεσσι μεταχρόνιαι γὰρ ἴαλλον.

(she bore) the Harpies of the beautiful hair, Aello and Okypete, who as is known follow the blasts of wind and the birds with their swift wings; for they pounce as quickly as time.

The collective Ἄρπυιαι remains unexplained, but Okypete’s name is explained by being placed near its first component ὠκείης, while -πέτη is played upon through πτερύγεσσι⁴⁰. As for Ἄελλώ (the storm), this name is etymologised through a synonym (πνοιῆσι)⁴¹. The explanation of the collective name occurs in the case of the first set of offspring introduced in the section on monsters, the Graiai (270-273):

Φόρκυι δ' αὐ Κητώ γραιάς τέκε καλλιπαρήους 270
ἐκ γενετῆς πολιάς, τὰς δὴ Γραιάς καλέουσιν
ἀθάνατοί τε θεοὶ χαμαὶ ἐρχόμενοι τ' ἄνθρωποι,
Πεμφρηδῶ τ' εὐπεπλον Ἐννώ τε κροκόπεπλον,

Keto again bore to Phorkys old women with beautiful cheeks, grey-haired from their birth, which indeed both the immortal gods and the humans who walk on earth call Graiai (Old Women), Pempredo of the beautiful robe and Enyo with a yellow robe.

⁴⁰ In this context ἔπονται may be thought of as containing an anagram that supports the etymological wordplay.

⁴¹ A link to ἀρπάζω could be implied here, especially if one considers such passages as Hom. *Od.* I 241, XIV 371, XX 77 (Ἄρπυιαι ἀνθρώπων) or IV 727 (ἀνθρώπων θύελλαι).

The collective name of these entities is presented as accepted and used by both gods and men, which speaks to its validity and correctness⁴². The particle δὴ highlights that they are called Graiai *precisely* because they were born as old women⁴³. This brief entry, furthermore, concludes with a verse characterised by *Klangmalerei*. Even though the poet is not as explicit here as in other cases, there is still the impression that the name is well-chosen since it is descriptive of their main characteristic. Their name, however, cannot fully capture the contradiction inherent in their existence: first, even though the Graiai are born as old women, they still are said to have beautiful cheeks, a feature which is in conflict with their collective name. Second, their name does not hint at their having a shared eye and tooth⁴⁴. The individual names, as well, contribute to their contradictory existence: Περφορηδῶ may call to mind περφορηδῶν, a kind of wasp, while Ἐννώ is known elsewhere as a goddess related to war, especially with its most destructive aspects.

More promising are the names of Pegasus and Chrysaor. These two characters arise from the neck of the decapitated Medousa (280-283):

τῆς ὅτε δὴ Περσεὺς κεφαλὴν ἀπεδειροτόμησεν,
 ἐξέθορε **Χρυσάωρ** τε μέγας καὶ Πήγασος ἵππος.
 τῷ μὲν ἐπὶ ὤνυμον ἦν, ὅτ' ἄρ' Ὀκεανοῦ παρὰ πηγὰς
 γένθ', ὁ δ' ἄορ χρύσειον ἔχων μετὰ χερσὶ φίλησι.

When Perseus decapitated her, great Chrysaor and the horse Pegasus jumped out. The latter had a significant name, evidently because he was born by the springs of the Ocean, whereas the former (was born) with a golden sword in his hands.

In this last explicit etymology in the *Theogony* the etymological motivation of the proper names takes a different form for each character. Pegasus acquires a name that permanently points to the place of his birth beside the springs (πηγάς, which is embedded in Πήγασος) of the Ocean, whereas Chrysaor's name calls to mind the object which he was born holding, a golden sword. The same technique, then, can reveal salient characteristics but of a different nature: physical aspects (Cyclopes), circumstances of birth and conception (either place as in the case of Aphrodite and Pegasus or other attendant circumstances, such as Chrysaor), or, finally, an important action committed in the past with its consequences in the future (Titans).

⁴² Cf. Hes. *Th.* 195-197 on the universal use of the name Aphrodite.

⁴³ Cf. West 1966 *ad* 270 (p. 244).

⁴⁴ See Gantz 1996, 19-20 for the earliest evidence for this tradition (Aesch. *PV* 792-797, Pherec. fr. 11 *EGM*). It is likely that Hesiod was familiar with these stories, given that he immediately passes on to the Gorgons and Perseus' decapitating Medusa.

But with other monsters the situation is more complex. Take Echidna, for example, who makes her appearance at 295-300:

ἡ δ' ἔτεκ' ἄλλο πέλωρον ἀμήχανον, οὐδὲν ἑοικὸς
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐδ' ἀθανάτοις θεοῖσι,
 σπῆι ἐνὶ γλαφυρῶ, θείην κρατερόφρον' Ἐχιδναν,
 ἥμισυ μὲν νύμφην ἑλικώπιδα καλλιπάρηον,
 ἥμισυ δ' αὐτε πέλωρον ὄφιν δεινόν τε μέγαν τε
 αἰόλον ὠμηστήν, ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθει γαίης. 300

And she gave birth to another insurmountable monster, in no way similar to mortal men nor to the immortal gods, in a hollow cave, the divine stout-hearted Echidna, half a quick-glancing maiden with beautiful cheeks, and half on the other hand a monstrous snake, both frightening and large, of changing hue and a raw-eater, in the depths of divine earth.

Echidna's name is partially accounted for through a reference to her appearance, but again this explanation is not as effective as other etymologized names. The poet emphasizes the creature's dissimilarity to both gods and men (contrast the Cyclopes), and it is only through the description, rather than the name, that the monster's contradictory, hybrid nature that combines the appearance of beautiful maiden with that of a raw-eating serpent becomes clear. Echidna's name reveals only part of her nature: it is etymologised by recourse to a synonym (ὄφις), hence in a way it is correct. What is more, Echidna too is καλλιπάρης, a quality she shares with the Graiai and Keto who are members of the same line⁴⁵, as we saw earlier, but in her case this attribute seems to be more appropriate as she is, in part, a νύμφη ἑλικώπις.

Even less revealing is the name of the Chimaera (319-322):

ἡ δὲ **Χίμαιραν** ἔτικτε πνέουσαν ἀμαιμάκετον πῦρ,
 δεινήν τε μεγάλην τε ποδώκεά τε κρατερήν τε. 320
 τῆς ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί' μία μὲν χαροποῖο λέοντος,
 ἡ δὲ **χιμαίρης**, ἡ δ' ὄφις κρατεροῖο δράκοντος.

And she gave birth to Chimaera who breathes irresistible fire, frightening and great and swift-footed and mighty. She had three heads: one of a fierce lion, the other of a goat, and the other of a snake, of a mighty serpent.

The Chimaera has a 'true' name that relates to her having the head of a she-goat. But this is just *one* aspect of this monster's nature, and her name is likewise only *partially* 'true' or 'correct' because it leaves two-thirds of her nature unac-

⁴⁵ Cf. *Th.* 238, 270; Strauss Clay 2003, 153.

counted for. It does not express her serpentine form, which she shares with other members of Keto's brood, or the fact that she also possesses the head of a lion. The true nature of the Chimaera is reflected actually in the structure of line 319, dubbed by Wilamowitz as Hesiod's worst hexameter⁴⁶: with its metrical defects⁴⁷ it represents the tripartite nature of the Chimaera that combines elements of three different animals and breaths forth fire⁴⁸. Together, the Echidna and the Chimaera, two creatures that share the description *δεινός τε μέγας τε*, show that names can sometimes be only partially correct and therefore unable to convey the entire set of essential characteristics of the name bearer.

Other names in Hesiod's monster roster confirm this conclusion, and 'correctness' is uneven and increasingly recedes to namelessness. Cerberus' physical appearance is described but no explanation is given as to his name which does not seem to reflect the monster's appearance or any essential characteristic. Instead, he is described as being *οὐ τι φατειόν* (310), a phrase that in view of the hound's role has its apotropaic function, unlike *οὐκ ὀνομαστοί* used earlier of the Hundred-Handers. Other monsters bear generic names: at 314 Hesiod introduces the Hydra, whose name denotes only that it is a water-serpent. Nothing is said of its many heads from whose necks two heads sprung for each head that was decapitated and that had to be cauterised in order to prevent them from being regenerated, nor does the name convey any hint that she possessed an immortal head. All of these are essential characteristics of this monster's nature which must have been known to the poet who links the monster with Heracles' Labours at 316-318. The same is true of the Nemean Lion (327-332): this monster too is linked to Heracles' labours, but nothing is said about the quality that made this lion so noteworthy: its impenetrable hide⁴⁹. Finally, at 333-335 Keto and Phorkys give birth to another monster that Hesiod refers to simply as a frightening snake; this time the monster remains nameless, even though tradition knew of a name for it⁵⁰. To grasp what is essential about these creatures, the audience need to go beyond names and supply their own knowledge of myth.

⁴⁶ See Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921, 8 n. 1.

⁴⁷ These are: the violation of Meyer's Law in *Χίμαιραν*; the violation of Hermann's bridge at *πνέουσαν*; *πῦρ* creates one of the few examples of monosyllabic verse-ending following a violation of Hermann's bridge; the combination of mute and nasal of *πνέουσαν* does not lengthen the ultima of *ἔτικτε*.

⁴⁸ This point has been argued by Solomon 1985; on Hesiod's use of a kind of language that reflects the contents of what is being narrated, see Strauss Clay (forthcoming), a chapter that focuses primarily on 'verbal bonds' in the *Theogony*, and Vergados 2013.

⁴⁹ The modifying adjective 'Nemean' is accounted for twice, however, at 329 and 331.

⁵⁰ The snake will be named Ladon at A.R. IV 1396-1398.

The decline of the degree in which names reveal the monsters' nature in its entirety is not an isolated phenomenon in this section. Even though some elements remain constant (e.g. hybridity, the presence of serpentine elements; animal shapes), it is sometimes impossible to decide with certainty precisely in which part of the genealogical tree these monsters belong. This is brought about through the ambiguous use, at three places in the monster catalogue, of the feminine pronoun (ἡ δέ) whose referent has been an object of debate for ancient and modern scholars alike. At line 295 ἡ δέ designates the mother of Echidna, but leaves it open whether it refers to Callirhoe, mentioned at 288, or Keto of line 270, whose offspring the poet is now presenting⁵¹. Likewise, ἡ δέ of 319 (the mother of Chimaera) could be Echidna of 297 and 304 who is also mother of Orthos, Cerberus, and the Hydra, but it is conceivable that ἡ δέ may refer to the Hydra, the last creature mentioned immediately before the pronoun. Finally, the mother of the Sphinx at 326 (ἡ δέ again) could be Echidna, possibly implied at 319 and positively mentioned at 297 and 304: this would yield then another case of mother-son incest, a kind of union that was possible in the very early stages of the formation of the cosmos but has yielded to exogamous unions by now. But ἡ δέ of line 326 could also refer to Chimaera, a tripartite monster presented at 319ff. It is only at the end of the section on monsters that we return to certainty: at line 333 the mother of the last monster (the snake) is mentioned in unambiguous terms: Keto. Thus, in a neat ring-composition we begin and end with certain parentage, but within the section itself the ambiguity increases.

To this we should add another element with which the poet raises questions concerning his account in this section: at line 305 when Hesiod reports the mingling of Echidna with Typhaon, whose birth will not be narrated until line 820, he presents this part of the narrative as depending on φασί ('they say that . . .'). The use of φασί here may point to the existence of several traditions, of which the poet chooses to report only one. But it also implies that Hesiod does not commit himself to this version, but only reports what 'people say' without adding anything that confirms the validity of this idea⁵².

⁵¹ On the problem of the referents here see Strauss Clay 2003, 159-160 (and 1993, 113-114), and Ricciardelli 2018 *ad* 295, 319, 326 with earlier bibliography. As Strauss Clay 2003, 159-160 (and 1993, 113-114) observes, «Paradoxically, what is striking about all the proposed solutions is their reasonableness: in each case they depend on reasonable assumptions and normative rules [...] all these arguments rest on the unspoken assumption that the generation of monsters follows the patterns and norms laid out elsewhere in the *Theogony* and presupposed by its whole genealogical schema [...] It is, however, by no means clear whether, in the case of the monsters, such an assumption is warranted or whether the catalogue as a whole in fact presents such a progression».

⁵² Cf. de Jong 2004, 48, 237-238 on a similar expression at Hom. *Il.* II 783; Stoddard 2004, 49-52. Cf. above p. 61 on Hes. *Th.* 27-28.

Typhoeus

The presentation of Typhoeus, the final monster of the *Theogony*, is not unlike what we encountered so far:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Τιτῆνας ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐξέλασε Ζεὺς,
 ὀπλότατον τέκε παῖδα **Τυφωέα** Γαῖα πελώρη
 Ταρτάρου ἐν φιλότῃ διὰ χρυσοῖν Ἀφροδίτην·
 οὐ χεῖρες † μὲν ἕασιν ἐπ' ἰσχύϊ ἔργματ' ἔχουσαι, †
 καὶ πόδες ἀκάματοι κρατεροῦ θεοῦ· ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμων
 ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος δεινοῖο δράκοντος, 825
 γλώσσησι δνοφερῆσι λελιχμότες· ἐν δέ οἱ ὄσσε
 θεσπεσίης κεφαλῆσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσιν πῦρ ἀμάρυσσεν·
 [πασέων δ' ἐκ κεφαλῶν πῦρ καίετο δερκομένοιο·]
φωναὶ δ' ἐν πάσῃσιν ἕσαν δεινῆς κεφαλῆσι,
παντοίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον· ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ 830
φθέγγονθ' ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε
ταύρου ἐριβρύχῳ μένος ἀσχέτου ὄσσαν ἀγαύρου,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε λέοντος ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντος,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὐ σκυλάκεσσιν ἐοικότα, θαύματ' ἀκούσαι,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὐ ροίζεσχ', ὑπὸ δ' ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά. 835
 καὶ νῦ κεν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἀμήχανον ἤματι κείνῳ,
 καὶ κεν ὅ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀναξεν,
 εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὄξῃ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

Then, after Zeus had driven the Titans from the Heavens, monstrous Gaia gave birth to her youngest son, Typhoeus, in the embrace of Tartarus because of golden Aphrodite. His hands (?) performed deeds of might(?) and the feet of the mighty god were untiring; from his shoulders sprang one hundred heads of a snake, of a frightening serpent, flicking their dark tongues; on his divine heads fire sparkled in his eyes, underneath his eyebrows. [Fire burned from his glances, out of all his heads.] Sounds were produced in all of his terrible heads, emitting all sorts of portentous voices. For sometimes they uttered a voice for gods to understand, at other times (they uttered the sound) of a loud-roaring bull, proud of voice, whose strength is unstoppable, and at others again that of a lion whose spirit is shameless, and at others again they resembled that of puppies, a wonder to hear, and at others again he whistled, and the lofty mountains resounded. And truly a deed beyond remedy would have occurred on that day and he would have ruled it over mortals and immortals, had the father of gods and men not perceived it keenly.

Scholars have in recent years commented on the sonic effects prevalent in this section of the *Theogony*, and especially the mixture of different qualities of voice and

sound that Typhoeus utters⁵³. Owen Goslin has noted the multiplicity and confusing nature of the sounds produced by the monster, which he contrasts to the pleasant voice of the Muses who are ὁμόφρονες and sing in unison in the proem to the *Theogony* before the succession myth begins. Zeus's victory over Typhoeus does not only have political significance, in that he removes the last challenger and assumes his regal power, but also imposes order on the chaotic soundscape represented by Typhoeus: soon after his victory he will father the Muses whose delightful song the poet has made the centrepiece of the proem. Thus, Zeus's victory has a civilising effect as well, which is further underscored by the simile that punctuates the monster's destruction, comparing it with the art (τέχνη) of metallurgy (862-866).

Typhoeus' voice is a mix that confounds articulate with inarticulate sounds. He has one hundred serpentine heads that sometimes produce sounds that can be understood by gods (830-831), an important comment that implies the existence of a special divine language as opposed to that used by mortals. The existence of a separate divine and mortal language is known from Homer and other poetic traditions, but Hesiod has avoided any mention of such distinction in his poem (cf. above on Briareos). At times, however, Typhoeus bellows like a bull, a sound which Hesiod interestingly designates with the term ὄσσα, elsewhere reserved for the voice of the Muses⁵⁴. Likewise, when we are earlier (830) told that Typhoeus' heads emit all sorts of voices, the term ὄπα is used, again elsewhere used of the voice of the Muses⁵⁵. Besides the simultaneous presence of articulate and inarticulate sounds, that is, divine language and an admixture of animal sounds, the Typhoeus narrative confounds even the terms for voice⁵⁶. The sound of puppies, of a lion, and the hissing of the serpent add to the confused soundscape of Typhoeus that mixes different animal types but also age groups, a feature we observed earlier in the case of the Graiai. What's more, the Typhoeus narrative abstains from marking an obvious etymology, even though it concludes with an interesting piece of aetiology.

ἐκ δὲ Τυφώεος ἔστ' ἀνέμων μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων,
 νόσφι Νότου Βορέω τε καὶ ἀργεστέω Ζεφύροιο· 870
 οἳ γε μὲν ἐκ θεόφιν γενεήν, θνητοῖς μέγ' ὄνειαρ.
 αἱ δ' ἄλλαι μὰς αὔραι ἐπιπνεῖουσι θάλασσαν·
 αἱ δὴ τοι πίπτουσαι ἐς ἠεροειδέα πόντον,

⁵³ See Goslin 2010; further on the soundscape of the Typhoeus section see Brockliss 2018 and Passmore 2018. On the various terms for 'voice' in the proem and elsewhere in the *Theogony*, see Berlinzani 2002. On the Typhoeus episode, see Ricciardelli 2018, 174-176 and Strauss Clay 2020b.

⁵⁴ Hes. *Th.* 10, 43, 65, 67.

⁵⁵ Hes. *Th.* 41, 68; cf. the name Καλλιόπη at 79.

⁵⁶ A point argued by Goslin 2010.

πῆμα μέγα θνητοῖσι, κακῆ θυίουσιν ἀέλλη·
 ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλαι ἄεισι διασκιδνᾶσί τε νῆας 875
 ναύτας τε φθείρουσι· κακοῦ δ' οὐ γίνεται ἀλκή
 ἀνδράσιν, οἱ κείνησι συνάντωνται κατὰ πόντον.
 αἱ δ' αὖ καὶ κατὰ γαῖαν ἀπείριτον ἀνθεμόεσσαν
 ἔργ' ἔρατὰ φθείρουσι χμαιγενέων ἀνθρώπων,
 πιμπλεῖσαι κόνιός τε καὶ ἀργαλέου κολοσυρτοῦ. 880

And from Typhoeus descends the might of the winds who blow moist, except for Notus, Boreas and brightening Zephyrus. A great boon for mortals, they hail their origin from the gods. The other gusts blow over the sea in vain. They indeed fall upon the misty sea, a great suffering for mortals, and blow with evil storm. They blow at different times and scatter the ships and destroy the seamen; and men have no protection against this evil, those who chance upon them on the sea. And they again destroy the lovely works of earth-born humans throughout the boundless, flowery earth, filling them with dust and painful rubble.

In lines 869-880 Hesiod transmits that with the exception of the Notos, the Boreas, and the Zephyrus, who are a great boon for men, the stormy and destructive winds descend from Typhoeus and harm men both at sea and on land. What is particularly interesting here is that Hesiod omits the term that would drive home this aetiology, *i.e.* the designation of the of these winds, τυφῶν or τυφῶς, that is so close to Typhoeus' name⁵⁷. Is this a case of something ominous that ought not to be named, such as Cerberus, a creature that is οὐ τι φατειόν? Or is the absence of an etymology rather a sign of the linguistic challenge that Typhoeus poses (in addition to the cosmic and political ones)?

Be that as it may, etymology as an instrument by which the poet explains the true meaning of names and unpacks hidden narratives reappears after the defeat of Typhoeus. By subduing Typhoeus Zeus does not only impose order in a confused soundscape nor does he only remove the last challenger in his way to power. He also reintroduces in the *Theogony* the notion of 'correct' names that the account of Typhoeus and other monsters had subverted. Shortly after Zeus's assuming the kingship of the gods, the poet concludes the Succession Myth by showing how Zeus avoided the fate of his predecessors, *i.e.* to be deposed by a son who is stronger than his father.

Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεὺς πρώτην ἄλοχον θέτο Μῆτιν,

⁵⁷ Cf. 846 πρηστήρων ἀνέμων. English typhoon seems to derive from the confluence of Portuguese (1) *tufão* < Urdu, Persian, Arabic *ṭūfān* ('violent storm of wind and rain') < Arabic *ṭāfa* or Greek τυφῶν and (2) Chinese *tai fung* (big wind); see *OED*, s.v. *typhoon*. Hesiod's Τύφωεύς may be thought of as related to τυφω (τύφ- in other tenses), 'to raise a smoke': cf. 826-828 and 844-849.

πλείστα θεῶν εἰδυῖαν ἰδὲ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἄρ' ἔμελλε θεὰν γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην
 τέξεσθαι, τότ' ἔπειτα δόλῳ φρένας ἔξαπατήσας
 αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν ἔην ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν, 890
 Γαίης φραδμοσύνησι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος·
 τῶς γάρ οἱ φρασάτην, ἵνα μὴ βασιλιίδα τιμῆν
 ἄλλος ἔχοι Διὸς ἀντὶ θεῶν αἰειγενετῶν.
 ἐκ γὰρ τῆς εἴμαρτο περίφρονα τέκνα γενέσθαι·
 πρώτην μὲν κούρην γλαυκῶπιδα Τριτογένειαν, 895
 ἴσον ἔχουσαν πατρὶ μένος καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν,
 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἄρα παῖδα θεῶν βασιλῆα καὶ ἀνδρῶν
 ἤμελλεν τέξεσθαι, ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντα·
 ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν Ζεὺς πρόσθεν ἔην ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν,
 ὧς οἱ συμφράσσαίτο θεὰ ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε. 900

Zeus, king of the gods, made Metis his first wife, who knows most of the gods and mortal men. But when she was about to give birth to the goddess grey-eyed Athena, at that point he deceived her with trickery and, using wheedling words, he put her into his belly, following the advice of Gaia and starry Sky. For they had advised him in this way so that none of the other gods who are forever should have the kingly honour instead of Zeus. For it was fated that exceedingly clever children were to be born from her: first grey-eyed Tritogeneia whose might and thoughtful counsel were equal to her father's, but then she was destined to give birth to a son who would become king of gods and men, having an overweening heart. But Zeus put her down into his belly before that so that she can contrive with him both god and evil.

Instead of confining his children inside their mother (Ouranos) or swallowing them (Cronus), thus causing distress to the mother, Zeus ingests Metis who this 'contrives with him both good and evil'. In this way, the poet implicitly explains also the traditional epithet of Zeus μητίετα or μητιόεις, which Hesiod uses at *Th.* 56, 286, 457, 520, 904, 914: Zeus is truly full of Metis because he ingested the goddess Metis⁵⁸. Likewise, Zeus's second marriage to Themis at 901-903 is marked by an implicit etymology: the offspring of this marriage are the *Horai* who attend to (ὠρεύουσι) the deeds of men. The removal of Typhoeus thus immediately brings back the etymological 'correctness' of names.

⁵⁸ See Vergados 2020, 95-96.

Conclusions

In this paper I have looked at the section on the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers, the catalogue of monsters, and the Typhoeus narrative in Hesiod's *Theogony*. As I hope it has emerged, the use of an etymologically 'correct' language is called into question. In the case of the monsters, some names turn out to be etymologically 'correct' (e.g. Cyclopes, Pegasus), but others are partially correct (e.g. Echidna, Chimaera), generic (Hydra, Lion), opaque (Cerberus), or even absent (the snake). Even the use of pronouns can be ambiguous, as we saw, and thus the place of some of these monstrous characters within the genealogical tree is unclear. With Typhoeus language appears confused, mixing articulate with a range of inarticulate sounds, and the poet refrains from providing an etymological aetiology even when its use would be obvious. All of this is important in a poem that consists to a large extent of catalogues of names and genealogies. Names are the instrument with which the poet imposes order on the manifold divine cosmos by organising it into classes and categories. Crucial in his endeavour is understanding which group of gods (or creatures) belongs where (e.g. the Cyclopes as personifications of the thunderbolt are sons of Ouranos and are born early on in the history of the cosmos, when the natural environment is being formed), while parents and offspring share common characteristics. Names and genealogies thus have a taxonomic function, as we see, for instance, in the catalogue of Nereids, in which the names of the daughters of Nereus reflect the characteristic qualities of their father, both in relation to the sea and his intellectual and moral qualities (cf. *Th.* 233-264). By limiting the correctness of names, the section on monsters questions the extent to which the tools which Hesiod uses in order to organise the increasingly more complex divine world are effective. His return, finally, to implicit etymologising after the defeat of Typhoeus adumbrates that while his human language cannot capture and express monstrosity to its full extent, Zeus's victory restores a kind of language that is 'correct' and motivated. But in contrast to earlier parts of the *Theogony*, etymologies are implicit and presuppose that the audience are now capable of discerning the etymological 'correctness' of names even if they are not accompanied by an explicit meta-language.

Newcastle University
athanassios.vergados@newcastle.ac.uk

Keywords: Hesiod, monsters, etymologies

Parole chiave: Esiodo, mostri, etimologie

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Arrighetti 1987

G.Arrighetti, *Poeti, eruditi e biografi. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa 1987.

Atherton 1998

C.Atherton (ed.), *Monsters and Monstrosity in Greek and Roman Culture*. «Nottingham Classical Literature Symposium», Bari 1998.

Baglioni 2017

I.Baglioni, *Echidna e i suoi discendenti. Studio sulle entità mostruose della teogonia esiodea*, Roma 2017.

Berlinzani 2002

F.Berlinzani, *La voce e il canto nell'proemio della Teogonia*, «Acme» LV (2002), 189-204.

Beta – Marzari 2010

S.Beta – F.Marzari (ed.), *Animali, ibridi e mostri nella cultura antica*, Fiesole 2010.

Brockliss 2018

W.Brockliss, *Olympian Sound in the Theogony and the Catalogue of Women: Sweet Music and Disorderly Noise*, «The Classical Journal» CXIII (2018), 129-149.

Carpi 2019

D.Carpi, *Monsters and Monstrosity. From the Canon to the Anti-Canon: Literary and Juridical Subversions*, Berlin-Boston, 2019.

Cherubini 2012

L.Cherubini, *Mostri vicini, mostri di casa. Di alcune creature straordinarie del mito antico*, «I Quaderni del Ramo d'Oro» numero speciale (2012), 137-150.

Cohen 1996

J.J.Cohen (ed.), *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, Minneapolis-London 1996.

Costa 1968

C.Costa, *La stirpe di Pontos*, «Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni» XXXIX (1968), 61-100

Curiazi 1994

D.Curiazi, *L'etimologia' e i suoi presupposti arcaici (Omero, Esiodo, Inni 'omerici')*, «Museum criticum» XXIX (1994), 7-27.

Dawson 1992

D.Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley 1992.

de Jong 2004

I.J.F.de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, London 2004².

Del Lucchese 2019

F.Del Lucchese, *Monstrosity and Philosophy. Radical Otherness in Greek and Latin Culture*, Edinburgh 2019.

Ferrante 1965

D.Ferrante, *Immagini etimologiche nei poeti greci dell'età ionico-attica*, «Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo - Accademia di Scienze e Lettere» XCIX (1965), 453-489.

Ferrari 1988

G.Ferrari, *Hesiod's Mimetic Muses and the Strategies of Deconstruction*, in A.Benjamin (ed.), *Post-structuralist Classics*, London-New York 1988, 45-78.

Gambarara 1984

D.Gambarara, *Alle fonti della filosofia del linguaggio. 'Lingua' e 'nomi' nella cultura greca arcaica*, Roma 1984.

Gantz 1996

T.Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore 1996.

Genette 1976

G.Genette, *Mimologiques. Voyage en Cratylie*, Paris 1976.

Gevaert – Laes 2013

B.Gevaert – C.Laes, *What's in a Monster? Pliny the Elder, Teratology and Bodily Disability*, in C.Laes – C.F.Goodey – M.Lynn Rose (ed.), *Disabilities in Roman Antiquity. Disparate Bodies A Capite ad Calcem*, Leiden-Boston 2013, 211-230.

Gloyn 2020

L.Gloyn, *Tracking Classical Monsters in Popular Culture*, London 2020.

Godden – Mittman 2019

R.H.Godden – A.S.Mittman (ed.), *Monstrosity, Disability, and the Posthuman in the Medieval and Early Modern World*, London 2019.

Goslin 2010

O.Goslin, *Hesiod's Typhonomachy and the Ordering of Sound*, «Transactions of the American Philological Association» CXL (2010), 351-373.

Halliwell 2011

S.Halliwell, *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus*, Oxford-New York 2011.

Kanavou 2015

N.Kanavou, *The Names of Homeric Heroes. Problems and Interpretations*, Berlin-Boston 2015.

Kearney 2003

R.Kearney, *Strangers, Gods and Monsters. Interpreting Otherness*, London-New York 2003.

Kirk 1962

G.S.Kirk, *The Structure and Aim of the Theogony*, in K.v.Fritz et al. (ed.), *Hésiode et son influence*, Vandœuvres-Genève 1962, 63-107.

Kraus 1987

M.Kraus, *Name und Sache: Ein Problem im frühgriechischen Denken*, Amsterdam 1987.

Leclerc 1993

M.-C.Leclerc, *La parole chez Hésiode: à la recherche de l'harmonie perdue*, Paris 1993.

Li Causi 2003

P.Li Causi, *L'invasione dei mostri e il dibattito sull'esistenza dei centauri*, in F.Gasti – E.Romano (ed.), "Buoni per pensare." *Gli animali nel pensiero e nella letteratura dell'antichità*, Pavia 2003, 183-206.

Li Causi 2010

P.Li Causi, *Fra adulterio, eugenetica ed assimilazione: l'ibridazione animale nella cultura romana*, in Beta – Marzari 2010, 123-156.

Louden 1995

B.Louden, *Categories of Homeric Wordplay*, «Transactions of the American Philological Association» CXXV (1995), 27-46.

Lowe 2015

D.Lowe, *Monsters and Monstrosity in Augustan Poetry*, Ann Arbor 2015.

Mainoldi 1995

C.Mainoldi, *Mostri al femminile*, in R.Raffaelli (ed.), *Vicende e figure femminili in Grecia e a Roma*. «Atti del convegno di Pesaro, 28-30 aprile 1994», Ancona 1995, 69-92.

Murgatroyd 2007

P.Murgatroyd, *Mythical Monsters in Classical Literature*, London 2007.

O'Hara 2015

J.J.O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 2015² [1996¹]

Passmore 2018

O.Passmore, *Typhoeus and Ty-phonics in Pindar, Pythian 1.26 and Hesiod, Theogony 834*, «Mnemosyne» LXXI (2018), 733-749.

Peradotto 1990

J.Peradotto, *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*, Princeton 1990.

Philippson 1936

P.Philippson, *Genealogie als mythische Form. Studien zur Theogonie des Hesiod: Die Zeitart des Mythos*, Oslo 1936.

Pucci 1977

P.Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*, Baltimore 1977.

Pucci 2007

P.Pucci, *Inno alle muse: Esiodo, Teogonia, 1-115*, Pisa 2007.

Quilligan 1979

M.Quilligan, *The Language of Allegory: Defining the Genre*, Ithaca-London, 1979.

Rank 1951

L.Ph.Rank, *Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus*, Assen 1951.

Ricciardelli 2018

G.Ricciardelli, *Esiodo Teogonia*, Milano 2018.

Risch 1947

E.Risch, *Namensdeutungen und Worterklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern*, in *Eumusia. Festgabe für Ernst Howald zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, Erlenchbach/Zürich 1947, 72-91 [Reprinted in A.Etter – M.Looser (ed.), *Ernst Risch, Kleine Schriften zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Berlin-New York 1981, 294-313].

Salvadore 1987

M.Salvadore, *Il nome, la persona: saggio sull'etimologia antica*, Genoa 1987.

Skempis and Ziogas 2009

M.Skempis and I.Ziogas, *Arete's Words: Etymology, Ehoie-Poetry and Gendered Narrative in the Odyssey*, in J.Grethlein – A.Rengakos (ed.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin-Boston 2009, 213-240.

Sluiter 1997

I.Sluiter, *The Greek Tradition*, in W.van Bekkum – J.Houben – I.Sluiter – K.Versteegh (ed.), *The Emergence of Semantics in Four Linguistic Traditions: Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1997, 149-224.

Sluiter 2015

I.Sluiter, *Ancient Etymology: A Tool for Thinking*, in F.Montanari – S.Matthaios – A.Rengkalos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, II, Leiden/Boston 2015, 896-922.

Solomon 1985

J.Solomon, *In Defense of Hesiod's schlechtestem Hexameter*, «Glotta» CXIII (1985), 21-30.

Sperber 1975

D.Sperber, *Pourquoi les animaux parfaits, les hybrides et les monstres sont-ils bons à penser symboliquement?*, «L'Homme» XV (1975), 5-34.

Stamatopoulou 2017

Z.Stamatopoulou, *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry. Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE*, Cambridge 2017.

Stoddard 2004

K.Stoddard, *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*, Leiden-Boston 2004.

Strauss Clay 1989

J.Strauss Clay, *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*, Princeton, 1989.

Strauss Clay 1993

J.Strauss Clay, *The Generation of Monsters in Hesiod*, «Classical Philology» LXXXVIII (1993), 105-116.

Strauss Clay 2003

J.Strauss Clay, *Hesiod's Cosmos*, Cambridge 2003.

Strauss Clay 2020a

J.Strauss Clay, *How to Deal with Difficult Goddesses: Nyx, Styx and Hekate in Hesiod's Theogony*, in M.Tulli (ed.), *Graziano Arrighetti e la produzione letteraria dei Greci*, Roma 2020, 17-28.

Strauss Clay 2020b

J.Strauss Clay, *Typhoeus or Cosmic Regression*, in G.M.Chesi – F.Spiegel (ed.), *Classical Literature and Posthumanism*, London 2020, 133-140.

Strauss Clay (forthcoming)

J.Strauss Clay, *Ties that Bind: Verbal Fetters and Ring Composition in Hesiod's Theogony*, in J.Strauss Clay – A.Vergados (ed.), *Teaching through Images: Imagery in Greco-Roman Didactic Poetry*, Leiden-Boston (forthcoming).

Stroh 1976

W.Stroh, *Hesiods lügende Musen*, in H.Görgemanns – E.A. Schmidt (ed.), *Studien zum antiken Epos*, Meisenheim am Glan 1976, 85-112.

Sulzberger 1926

M.Sulzberger, ὄνομα ἐπώνυμον. *Les noms propres chez Homère et dans la mythologie grecque*, «Revue des Études Grecques» XXXIX (1926), 385-447.

Tor 2017

S.Tor, *Mortal and Divine in Early Greek Epistemology: A Study of Hesiod, Xenophanes, and Parmenides*, Cambridge 2017.

Tsitsibakou-Vasalos 2007

E.Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, *Ancient Poetic Etymology. The Pelopids: Fathers and Sons*, Stuttgart 2007.

Vergados 2013

A.Vergados, *The Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers in Hesiod "Theogony"* 139-53, «Hermes» CXLI (2013), 1-7.

Vergados 2020

A.Vergados, *Hesiod's Verbal Craft. Studies in Hesiod's Conception of Language and its Ancient Reception*, Oxford 2020.

Visintin 1997

M.Visintin, *Di Echidna e di altre femmine anguiformi*, «Mètis: Anthropologie des mondes grecs anciens» XII (1997), 205-221.

West 1966

M.L.West, *Hesiod, Theogony, Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*, Oxford 1966.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921

U.v.Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921.

Zanon 2016

C.A.Zanon, *Onde vivem os monstros: criaturas prodigiosas na poesia hexamétrica arcaica*, Diss. São Paulo, 2016.

