3. The order of events in cosmogony

(a) Hesiod, Theogony 116ff.

A necessary preliminary to the analysis of this cosmogony is the discussion of a difficult point of interpretation and textual criticism.

The point concerns Theogony 118-9, which with the immediate context appear in the MSS. as follows:

\[ \begin{align*}
116 & \quad \text{"Ἡ τοι \ μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα"} \\
117 & \quad \text{"Γαί' εὐρύστερος, πάντων ἠδὸς ἀσφαλὲς αἰει"} \\
118 & \quad \text{"ἄθανάτων, οἱ ἔχουσι κάρη νεφελώτος Ὀλύμπου"} \\
119 & \quad \text{"Τάρταρα τ' ἡφέστα μυχῶ χθονὸς εἰρυμοδείχης, ἡδ' "Ερος..."} \\
\end{align*} \]

There were already doubts in antiquity about the authenticity of 118 and 119, and these doubts have been taken up by many of the moderns. There are obviously four logical possibilities in the matter; either (i) one accepts both lines, or (2) one rejects both lines, or (3) one rejects 118 alone, or (4) one rejects 119 alone. The fourth and last named view is represented by only one possible ancient source, to wit Chalcidius, is adopted in no recent work, and will therefore be ignored here: the justification for this high-handedness is that the question of most importance for present purposes is whether Tartarus is or is not a separate entity in this cosmogonical passage, and it is obvious that if solution (4) be adopted then Tartarus is not even mentioned. If both lines are to be rejected (solution (2) above), then the same conclusion follows. If one adopts solution (3), then Tartarus is, \( μυχῶ χθονὸς \), manifestly subordinate to Earth, and, whatever the force of the particle τ' of 119, should not be taken as a separate entity on a par with Earth and Eros. It is probable that the same conclusion should be drawn from solution (1), the acceptance of both the disputed lines; but not all critics would necessarily agree with this view, and it may therefore be useful to give the question another airing.

The indirect tradition for the text is instructive, but not probative.\(^3\) Schwabl\(^4\) has recently pointed out that the older ancient authorities differ from the younger, except their followers, not certainly in text, but either in text or in interpretation. Acusillaus, Plato\(^5\) and Zeno of Citium\(^6\) may either have adopted the rendering of Schoe-
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1 I regret that W.K.C. Guthrie's History of Greek Philosophy Vol. I, the Fondation Hardt's Hésiode et son Influence, and H. Schwabl's RE article 'Welt schöpfung' were not accessible to me before proof-stage. See p. 134 n. 1.
2 In Timaeum 122, 123; cf. Waszink ad, loc.
5 Symposium 178b.
mann,¹ taking Τάρταρος as object of ἔχουσιν and co-ordinate with κάρην, or have omitted 118-9; if the latter then this may have been either because they were not interested,² or because they did not find them in their Mss., or because they did so find them and deliberately rejected them. What is certain is that if, as is also just possible, the earlier ancient citations were from a text containing 119 but not 118, then these authors subordinated Tartarus to earth as I have above. The authors who treat the passage as containing four original beings, Chaos, Earth, Tartarus and Eros,³ all belong to the Christian era, and it is a reasonable hypothesis that they did so in error, finding both the disputed lines in their text, and being so misled by the Homeric formula of ἔχουσι κάρην νυφόντος Όλυμπον as to take Tartara/Tartarus⁴ as a separate entity. The idea that Tartarus made a fourth was probably responsible for the athetization of 118, as being on this interpretation somewhat inappropriate.⁵ The Homeric formula however is not adequate reason for ending a sentence at the end of 118.⁶ Hesiod indeed makes use of Homeric formulae, as Hoekstra⁷ has shown, as formulae, and not by 'literary' borrowing, but Hoekstra does not prove him incapable of treating the formula as he wished; the genesis of Boeotian epic is obscure in detail.

Sundry arguments brought against 118 may be briefly dismissed. Scherling⁸ thought that the omissions of the line from the text by Plato and other writers were conclusive against it. But even if they did omit the line, it may have been through Plato's limited interest in the passage, and later aping of Plato, that these omissions took place.⁹ Kirk and Raven add that the line is inorganic; but this does nothing to prove that it is unauthentic, only that it is not impossible so to regard it. In any case it is doubtful whether it is truly inorganic, if by that is meant that it is unnecessary to the sense. That the line

cosmogony, but that does nothing to show that he did not translate the lines as we have them in the manner of Schoemann.

¹ Opuscula Academica II, p. 66 n. 7, and elsewhere, Die Hesiodische Theogonie (Berlin 1868) pp. 86ff.; the same view was taken by Van Lennep, Hesiodi Theog. (Amsterdam 1843), and to the names cited by Schwabl, op. cit. (p. 1 n. 4) p. 30 should also be added that of Mair in his translation (Oxford 1908).
² Plato's interest in this passage is mainly in Eros, and Zeno is concerned in the fragments with some extremely forced analogies between Hesiod's teaching and his own.
³ Cornutus, Plutarch, Pausanias, Damascius, and others; see Rzach, ed. maior (Leipzig 1902) ad loc.
⁴ The Mss. of Plutarch have the unmetrical Τάρταρον τ'. It is difficult to tell which form is the older; no help is given by the examples in Kühner-Blass Vol. I pp. 499ff; it is not clear whether the plural is vaguer in sense than the masculine, or whether the sense differs in any other way.
⁵ This may be the sense of the extremely obscure Scholium on Theog. 117 (or 118). The reference of δεν is not clear, and it is not necessary to suppose that it refers back to the remarks of Zeno Citieus, SVF. I, 105. If it does so refer, then 119 may have been athetized in late antiquity on the basis of Zeno's theory, bound to have a wide influence. 118 by itself would be felt incongruous — though perhaps read by Chalcidius — and doubt thus cast on it.
⁶ Despite an oral objection to this effect by Mr. M. L. West.
⁸ RE. s.v. Tartaros, 2e Reihe, 8er Halbband (1932) col. 1443.