

# Hesiod's Typhonomachy and the Ordering of Sound\*

---

OWEN GOSLIN

*University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

**SUMMARY:** I argue that Hesiod shaped his Typhonomachy with a particular interest in the relationship between sound, communication, and authority. Typhon's defeat results in the reordering of the sonic world of the *Theogony*, and as such is a necessary precursor to the birth of the Muses. Hesiod thereby shows how the conditions for song are not a natural element of the cosmos, but result from Zeus's suppression of Typhon. This victory is significant for the *Theogony* as a whole, in so far as it enables communication between gods and men, and thus renders the structure of the cosmos intelligible to mortals.

## I. INTRODUCTION

IN THE *THEOGONY* HESIOD CHARTS THE GRADUAL ARTICULATION AND mapping of the cosmos, as places and beings receive distinct names. The narrative of Zeus's rise to power proceeds from this organizing principle and brings the process to its completion. If, as Vernant has remarked, each victory of Zeus remakes the world and brings it more securely under his sovereignty, how specifically does the Typhonomachy (*Theog.* 820–80) contribute to this process?<sup>1</sup> The placement of the episode in the succession narrative, between

\* This paper has benefited from the comments and advice of Sarah Morris, whose seminar on Hesiod and the Near East at UCLA stimulated the ideas put forward here, as well as from audiences who heard an early version of this paper at Wellesley College and the 2008 APA meeting in Chicago (and in particular the panel presider Kathryn Morgan). At Chapel Hill, I received helpful suggestions on an earlier draft from Emily Baragwanath, Brendan Boyle, Sharon James, Lidewijde de Jong; Bill Race deserves special thanks for his careful reading and detailed comments. Finally, I would like to thank the editor, Katharina Volk, and the two anonymous readers for their suggestions on improving the text.

<sup>1</sup> "Each victory of Zeus is a creation of the world" (Vernant 1982: 108–9). Using the Titanomachy and Typhonomachy as examples, Vernant goes on to discuss how the battles

the Titanomachy and the distribution of the *timai*, has hindered a clear answer to this question.<sup>2</sup> There are two major reasons for this. First, the battle with Typhon appears to be a repetition of the threat faced by Zeus in the Titanomachy (617–719). Like the Titans, Typhon appears to be yet another strong-armed challenger, who is ultimately dispatched by Zeus’s thunderbolt. While few critics today would argue that the passage is an interpolation, even some who have defended the authenticity of the Typhonomachy are troubled by this apparent repetition.<sup>3</sup> A second difficulty arises in the narrative immediately following the Typhonomachy, when Hesiod describes the distribution of *timai* among the gods (881–85). Although Zeus has just defeated Typhon in the preceding lines, no mention is made of his challenge; rather, Hesiod says that after the Titans were defeated, *then* (τότε, 883) the gods urged Zeus to be king and he in turn divided the *timai* among them.<sup>4</sup>

So, why has Hesiod chosen this monstrous creature as Zeus’s final obstacle in his accumulation of power? And why does he place this battle at such a prominent moment in the poem, before the allotment of *timai* that will

---

lapse into a state of chaos and confusion, and end in the reaffirmation of an articulate order. Perhaps because he assumed that the passage was a seventh-century interpolation (1982: 109–10) Vernant did not fully distinguish what made the Typhonomachy distinctive from the Titanomachy.

<sup>2</sup>The arguments against the passage’s authenticity are succinctly summarized in West 1966: 381–83, whose defense of the passage has persuaded most critics that it belongs in Hesiod’s text. Solmsen 1982, however, remains unconvinced by some of West’s arguments, preferring to see in the “fantastic voices” of Typhon the interpolation of a later rhapsode. Saïd 1977 and Blaise 1992 have supplemented West’s arguments in defense of the passage. Ballabriga 1990 takes a different tack, arguing that the passage is the result of a rhapsodic tradition in which different epic traditions have been combined.

<sup>3</sup>Richard Hamilton, for instance, expresses a certain dissatisfaction with the episode, even while accounting for its placement as part of a series of digressions (1989: 23): “The most one can say is that the Typhoeus episode shows how Zeus kept supreme power, but one must admit that critics who complain that it simply duplicates the Typhonomachy seem to have a point.”

<sup>4</sup>Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσαν, / Τιτῆνεσσι δὲ τιμῶν κρίναντο βίηφι, / δὴ ῥα τότε ᾧτρυνον βασιλεύμεν ἢ δὲ ἀνάσσειν / Γαίης φραδομοσύνησιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν / ἀθανάτων· ὁ δὲ τοῖσιν ἐν διεδάσσατο τιμὰς (“So, when the blessed gods had brought their toil to fulfillment, and they had made a determination with the Titans about the privileges by means of force, then at that time, on the shrewd advice of Gaia, they urged Olympian Zeus, the far-voiced one, to be king and to rule the immortals; and he apportioned well the privileges to them,” *Theog.* 881–85).

establish Zeus's kingship?<sup>5</sup> One line of interpretation has focused on parallels with Near Eastern (particularly Hittite) succession myths, to which the Typhonomachy bears considerable resemblance.<sup>6</sup> Other interpretations of the passage have hinged on Gaia's problematic motivation in giving birth to Typhon.<sup>7</sup> The monster's hybrid and chaotic physical presence has also been well-noted, since he appears in so many ways to be a foil for Zeus's ordering of the cosmos.<sup>8</sup> In this paper I propose that Hesiod's attention to the sonic details of the battle provides an important avenue for interpreting the passage.<sup>9</sup> While the unusual nature of Typhon's voices has often been noted in

<sup>5</sup> The offer of kingship (βασιλεύμεν, 883) is formally made here for the first time, and Zeus is called θεῶν βασιλεύς (886) in the very first line after the allotment. In some other accounts Typhon's challenge comes later in the succession myth, when Zeus has already assumed the kingship. Hera, angered at Zeus's fathering of Athena, retaliates by giving birth to Typhon in Stesichorus fr. 62 and *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 305–55; in Epimenides fr. 8 Typhon succeeds briefly in seizing Zeus's palace on Olympus, while according to Apollodorus (1.6.3) the Olympian gods flee heaven at his approach (similarly Nonnus, *Dion.* 1.136–45).

<sup>6</sup> For arguments that Near Eastern parallels attest to the authenticity of the passage see: Said 1977: 207, West 1966: 379–80 (though qualified in West 1997: 300–1), Watkins 1995: 448–59. These parallels do not account for what is arguably most distinctive about Hesiod's narrative, which is the sound produced by the monster during the battle with Zeus.

<sup>7</sup> Bonnafé 1984: 209–12, Blaise 1992, and Clay 2003 all focus on the problematic role of Gaia—who gives birth to Typhon, though she is a crucial ally to Zeus elsewhere in the poem (both before and after the Typhonomachy). Blaise argues that while the Titanomachy is concerned with the organization of the upper world, the Typhonomachy is concerned with the world below (since Typhon is the child of Tartarus and Gaia; 1992: 357). Clay 2003: 25–26 argues that Gaia's role is consistent throughout the work, in that she sides with the last-born son (Kronos, Zeus, and finally Typhon); only when Typhon himself is defeated does Gaia end this pattern and form a permanent alliance with Zeus. Stokes argues weakly that since Gaia does not give explicit instructions to Typhon there is nothing to prove that she is opposed to Zeus here (1972: 33).

<sup>8</sup> Detienne and Vernant 1991 [1974]: 121: "In his arrogant brutishness the polymorphic monster can be seen as an anti-Zeus, the sovereign of disorder." This formulation is followed by Blaise ("Typhée est un anti-Zeus parfait," 1992: 362) and Clay ("*acosmia* incarnate," 2003: 26).

<sup>9</sup> Yun Lee Too also draws attention to this aspect of Typhon, noting that "the one feature that is central to the Hesiodic and subsequent depictions of Typhon is his vocality" (1998: 20). I differ from Too, however, in two significant ways: (1) I interpret Typhon's voices as a deliberate disordering of the processes of sound and communication in the *Theogony*, while Too focuses on the imitative nature of his voices (which "offer a simulacrum" of the divine, 1998: 21). And (2) I connect the description of Typhon's body and voices (821–38) in a more thorough-going way to the latter part of the Typhonomachy, and to its larger role in the *Theogony*.

passing, it has not been factored into a larger interpretation of the episode or its placement in the work.<sup>10</sup> What sets Typhon apart from the Titans—and from any other creature in the *Theogony*, for that matter—is the sheer range and hybridity of the sounds he produces. These include nearly every type of voice in Hesiod’s cosmos, including the “divine voice” (*ossa*) associated at the beginning of the poem with the Muses.

The multiplicity of voices takes on added significance when we consider that Hesiod uses the Typhonomachy as the concluding episode of Zeus’s rise to power. In effect, Hesiod’s narrative of succession is book-ended by the opening hymn of the Muses and the Typhonomachy, two episodes in which the organization of sound plays a crucial part. This placement, and the repetition of the vocabulary of divine voice in both episodes, can be understood as part of the progressive ordering of the cosmos that culminates in Zeus’s rule. As Vernant has observed in the context of divine bodies, this ordering process involves a movement from “the confusion of an original unity” to the separation of gods and goddesses into discrete bodies, places, and functions.<sup>11</sup> Typhon’s hybrid sounds, however, represent a different kind of threat from any other faced by Zeus: the monster’s victory would establish a different ordering of sound, with consequences for communication between god and man. In the Typhonomachy Hesiod imagines a world in which voice remains undifferentiated and communication between gods and man would be impossible. Both its placement in the larger work and the internal structure of the passage suggest that the Typhonomachy is symbolic of a larger ordering process related to divine voice, and an event that is necessary for Zeus’s imposition of civilized order.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The most relevant discussions of Typhon’s sounds are Kaimio 1977: 119–24, Blaise 1992: 361–63, Ford 1992: 190–91, Leclerc 1993: 43–45, Too 1998: 20–29, Collins 1999: 244–46.

<sup>11</sup> Vernant’s description of this process, in the context of divine bodies, is instructive for other categories of ordering (1991: 48): “Hesiod’s orthodox *Theogony* ... places the complete, perfect, and immutable not in the confusion of an original unity, in the obscure indistinctness of chaos, but rather in its opposite, in the differentiated order of a cosmos whose parts and constitutive elements have bit by bit become separate, delimited, and located ... If the gods possess plenitude, perfection, immutability, it is because at the end of the process that led to the emergence of a stable, organized, and harmonious cosmos, each divine person’s individuality is clearly fixed.”

<sup>12</sup> Detienne and Vernant 1991 [1974]: 116 assume that, as the child of primordial forces, Typhon arrives too late “into a universe already differentiated and ordered.” But since his appearance precedes the birth of the Muses Typhon’s sonic chaos, at least, is symptomatic of the disordered state of sound at this stage of the succession myth. His defeat serves to establish that very order from which the Muses issue.

## 2. THE TAXONOMY OF VOICE IN THE *THEOGONY*

As befits a poet who places himself within his own poem, and who gives an account of his authority to relate that poem, Hesiod's descriptive vocabulary of communication between gods and men is precise. The division between these two groups, which Hesiod traces to Prometheus's theft of fire, renders their ability to share knowledge all the more tenuous. The problematic nature of communication can be seen, for instance, in the separate languages that gods and men are said to employ—a difference to which Greek epic poetry often alludes.<sup>13</sup> How the Muses transmit this knowledge to Hesiod is therefore of critical importance for the authority of his song. Recent research into Hesiod's usage of words for "voice," and the distinctions between men and gods that these words observe and delineate, show the care with which the poet deployed them.<sup>14</sup> This vocabulary is used consistently in Hesiod's works (including the *Works and Days*), although I will refer in what follows primarily to the *Theogony* in order to show the Typhonomachy's context in the poem. Hesiod's taxonomy of voice can help us appreciate the significance of Typhon's sonic disorder later in the poem.

In the proem of the *Theogony*, which can be taken as programmatic for the deployment of voice throughout the work, the principal words for "voice" are \**ops*, *ossa*, and *audē*. Of these, \**ops* and *ossa* share a common derivation, as Chantraine shows, and Hesiod uses both words almost exclusively of the voice of the Muses.<sup>15</sup> In the proem, where we find the most concentrated appearance of these words, \**ops* is used twice and *ossa* four times for the voice of the Muses.<sup>16</sup> The only occasions where these words do *not* describe the voice of the Muses in the *Theogony* are in the description of Typhon, and a

<sup>13</sup> Cf. West 1966: 387 for the relevant Greek passages that note the disjunction between the language of gods and men.

<sup>14</sup> The principal words for voice in Hesiod are αὐδή, ὄσσα, \*ὄψ, and φωνή, on which see especially Clay 1974, Ford 1992, Leclerc 1993, and Collins 1999. I am indebted to Leclerc's detailed work on voice in Hesiod, especially for her delineation of those words Hesiod assigns to gods, men, and/or beasts (1993: 48). I aim to qualify Leclerc's conclusion, however, that the *Theogony* is silent on the origins of divine communication, and that speech is a "faculté native" of the gods (1993: 112). In contrast, the interplay of voice, sound, and physical force in the Typhonomachy demonstrates both the ideological underpinnings of communication in the *Theogony*, and Hesiod's interest in how Zeus's victory affects the poet's communicative context.

<sup>15</sup> Chantraine 1968–80 s.v. \*οψ. The noun occurs only in the genitive, dative, and accusative singular.

<sup>16</sup> \**ops*: 41, 68; *ossa*: 10, 43, 65, 67.

single use of *ossa* in 701 to describe the sound produced during the battle with the Titans.<sup>17</sup> As Collins has shown, Hesiod's usage of *ossa*—which always designates a divine, rather than human, voice—is essentially consistent with epic usage. Hesiod differs from the practice of Homeric epic, however, in his restrictive use of \**ops*. While in Homer \**ops* may refer to either a human or a divine voice (especially the singing voices of the Sirens and the Muses), in Hesiod this word is reserved for the voice of the gods.<sup>18</sup>

Whereas \**ops* and *ossa* refer specifically to divine voices in Hesiod, *audē* is used of both gods and men. Several commentators have recognized, however, that *audē* is used by the gods in epic only when communicating with men, and should be understood fundamentally as a human voice.<sup>19</sup> It is therefore a critical medium between the separate languages of gods and men. As Collins has observed, only when the Muses convert their divine *ossa* into *audē* are they able to communicate their divine knowledge to Hesiod. The Muses' *audē* allows this knowledge to become intelligible to the mortal poet, and ready material for the production of *kleos*. The Muses' inspiration of Hesiod suggests this chain of communication from *ossa* to *audē* and finally *kleos*: ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν / θέσπιν, ἵνα κλείομι τὰ τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα ("they breathed into me a divine voice, that I might celebrate in song the things which will be and the things that were before," 31–32). Hesiod's authority for the poem rests on this channel of communication with the Muses. Implicit in this arrangement, as Collins 1999: 260–61 shows, is a certain ambiguity in the poet's knowledge: since Hesiod has no direct experience of the things he reports, but knows only what the Muses convey to him when they convert their *ossa* into *audē*, he must trust the willingness of the Muses to provide a faithful translation of the information they possess.

<sup>17</sup> *Theog.* 701, which describes the sound made by Zeus's use of lightning against the Titans, is the only place where *ossa* cannot refer to a voice, but rather a sound. Collins 1999: 244 suggests that the passage represents Hesiod's effort to capture in words a sound that is unimaginably awesome: "Hence his usage of *ossa*, which conveys an auditory quality that mortals cannot comprehend."

<sup>18</sup> Used for singing voices in the *Odyssey*: of Calypso (5.61), Circe (10.221), the Sirens (12.52, 160, 185, 187, 192), the Muses (24.60); in the *Iliad*: of the Muses (1.604). Cf. also Hes. fr. 150.33 where it is used again of the Sirens. In *Hymn. Hom.* 27.18 the phrase ὅπ' ἰεῖσται is used of the Muses.

<sup>19</sup> See Fournier 1946: 229, who notes the word's particular connection with conveying meaning: "c'est la voix humaine, envisagée comme une faculté d'émettre un son harmonieux, puissant et surtout doué de sens." See also Clay 1974: 130–34, Ford 1992: 174, and Collins 1999: 243.

### 3. TYPHON'S SONIC AKOSMIA

Typhon's sounds are antithetical to the hierarchical communication between gods and mortals delineated in the proem, and so pose an obstacle to the ordered functioning of voice that Zeus will establish. Three elements of Hesiod's Typhonomachy narrative suggest that we should read this episode as part of a larger ring-structure with the proem to the Muses. First, as I will show in a detailed reading of the passage, Hesiod describes Typhon's sounds with precise phrasings that invite an intratextual reading with the voices of the Muses. Second, when the battle between Zeus and Typhon is finally engaged, sound plays a prominent role in mapping out the cosmic terrain of Zeus's realm. Finally, the narrative's placement within the larger structure of the *Theogony* suggests an important relationship with the programmatic opening hymn. As the concluding victory before Zeus's division of the *timai*, the Typhonomachy brings to an end the program outlined in 104–15.<sup>20</sup> Typhon's defeat, then, marks a transition in the poem: it concludes the violent establishment of Zeus's power and is followed by the marriages that solidify his rule, including with Mnemosune, mother of the Muses. This ring-composition suggests the transgressive nature of Typhon's sounds, for even though his birth chronologically *precedes* that of the Muses and the differentiation of voice in the proem, the opening hymn to the Muses suggests that his chaotic sounds are already “out of order”. As a result of this narrative *hysteron proteron* Typhon's defeat can be seen as delineating the boundaries of sound, and the conditions under which the Muses may then come into existence.

A detailed examination of Typhon's body and voices, and the correspondence with the opening hymn to the Muses, will show how sound is a particular focus of this episode. Hesiod introduces Typhon with a description first of the hybrid body of the creature (823–8), but quickly moves his narration from the limbs of the monster up to his multiple heads. This narrative progression emphasizes especially the sound of the monster, as Hesiod elaborates in great detail (823–35):

οὗ χεῖρες μὲν ἴῃσιν ἐπ' ἰσχύϊ ἔργματ' ἔχουσαι,  
καὶ πόδες ἀκάματοι κρατεροῦ θεοῦ· ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμων  
ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφις, δεινοῖο δράκοντος,  
γλώσσησι δνοφερῇσι λελιχμότες· ἐν δέ οἱ ὄσσε  
θεσπεσίης κεφαλῇσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι πῦρ ἀμάρυσσεν.

825

<sup>20</sup> On the significance of these lines as announcing the program of the *Theogony*, cf. Hamilton 1989: 14–19.

πασέων δ' ἐκ κεφαλῶν πῦρ καίετο δερκομένοιο·  
 φωναὶ δ' ἐν πάσῃσιν ἔσαν δεινῆς κεφαλῆσι,  
 παντοῖν ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον· ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ 830  
 φθέγγονθ' ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὔτε  
 ταύρου ἐριβρύχew μένος ἀσχέτου ὄσσαν ἀγαύρου,  
 ἄλλοτε δ' αὔτε λέοντος ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντος,  
 ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ σκυλάκεσσιν ἐοικότα, θαύματ' ἀκοῦσαι,  
 ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ ροίζεσχ' ὑπὸ δ' ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά. 835

[Typhon] whose hands are set upon deeds with their strength,  
 and the feet of the mighty god are untiring. And from his shoulders  
 were the hundred heads of a dread serpent, 825  
 flickering with dark tongues. The eyes in his  
 wondrous heads flashed fire from below his brows.  
 And fire burned from all of his heads as he looked on.  
 And there were voices (*phōnē*) in all of his dread heads,  
 emitting a manifold and boundless voice (*ops*): for sometimes 830  
 they made sounds (*phthongos*) in such a way as for the gods to perceive,  
 at other times they made the sound of a bellowing bull,  
 irresistible in his might, and haughty in his voice (*ossa*),  
 at other times the sound of a lion with a shameless heart,  
 at other times a sound like puppies, a wonder to hear,  
 at other times he hissed, and the lofty mountains echoed beneath. 835

Lines 826 and following offer the most concentrated occurrence of vocabulary related to voice in the *Theogony* outside of the proem: γλώσσησι (826), φωναὶ (829), παντοῖν ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον (830), φθέγγονθ' (831), ὄσσαν (832), ροίζεσχ' (835).<sup>21</sup> Although Typhon possesses more types of voice than any other single creature in the *Theogony*, he is unable to organize these into a form of communication. In emphasizing the vocal aspect of the monster Hesiod may be departing from the iconographic tradition, since at least one surviving archaic representation of Typhon depicts him as snake-like in his lower torso and human above; in the Typhonomachy, however, the serpentine nature is projected onto Typhon's upper torso and voice.<sup>22</sup> This difference

<sup>21</sup> Leclerc 1993: 43–44, Ford 1992: 190, and Gantz 1993: 49 similarly note Typhon's nearly complete catalogue of types of voice. The adjective θεσπεσίης (827) may also suggest the wondrous voices produced from his heads (see below for the derivation of this word).

<sup>22</sup> See LIMC s.v. "Typhon" and Gantz 1993: 50 on the Chalcidian hydra (Munich 596) which depicts Zeus on one side wielding his lightning-bolt and Typhoeus (named) on the other. Other representations of Typhon are difficult to identify securely because they are not named, and the iconography coincides with other mythological monsters. Hesiod explicitly refers to Typhon's πόδες ἀκάματοι (824), thus marking a difference from the snake-like lower torso of the visual representations.



in emphasis has a significant effect on the way we understand the monster's transgressive nature, for *glōssa* in Hesiod always refers to the capacity for speech, as when Hesiod describes how the Muses pour sweet dew on the tongue of those they love (ἐπὶ γλώσση γλυκερὴν χεῖουσιν ἔερσην, 83).<sup>23</sup> The black tongues (*glōssai*, 826) that flicker from his snake-heads, then, already prepare the way for the monster's hybrid voices. In Typhon's case, uniquely, the *glōssai* are nothing more than a physical attribute, which produce a "hissing" sound (ροῖζσχ', 835) but lack any communicative function.<sup>24</sup> Typhon is the only immortal to be described in Homer or Hesiod as possessing a tongue, a sign of his anomalous nature between god and beast at both a physical and communicative level.

Hesiod's use of the adjective *thespesios* in reference to the monster's heads (827, 856) further suggests the chaotic intermingling of the divine and the bestial at the level of speech. Although in epic the adjective often modifies words other than those designating a voice or sound, the etymology of the adjective and its use here to describe Typhon's "heads" are especially suggestive of the creature's voice.<sup>25</sup> Chantraine 1968–80 s.v. locates the etymology of the adjective in the root \*θεε-, or "god," and the verbal adjective \*σπετος (from a common root shared with the verb ἐννέπω, "to speak, to tell"), proposing a composite meaning for *thespesios* of "proclaimed, or inspired by a god."<sup>26</sup> It is true that the adjective *thespesios* and its shortened form *thespis* modify many different subjects in epic, including the din of battle, loud echoes, *charis*, and fire (as in line 862 of the Typhon episode). It is significant, however, that when the adjective is used of a specific individual in epic it invariably describes the voice of mortal singers or the Sirens.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, the only other use of this adjective to modify a voice in Hesiod occurs in the proem, where it appears

<sup>23</sup> Leclerc 1993: 43.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. West 1966: 388 on the use of the verb ροιζέω to refer to snake-like hissing elsewhere in Greek literature, and as suggestive of Typhon's serpentine nature. Likewise in the *Prometheus Bound* Typhon is described as "hissing fear" (σπιζων φόβον, 355).

<sup>25</sup> The adjective occurs in unusual concentration in the Typhonomachy (827, 856, 862). Hesiod uses it only one other time in the *Theogony*, when it modifies the flame produced during the Titanomachy (καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον, 700).

<sup>26</sup> Ford 1992: 181 similarly argues that the adjective designates those objects that go beyond the capacities of mortal speech: "in almost all cases the 'marvelous' objects denoted by *thespesios* are such as confound cognition and articulation: they are multitudes, mixtures, immensities in the literal sense. I think this word and *thespis* belong in a semantic field that preserves the concept of the unutterably large or the indescribably great."

<sup>27</sup> As a description of the voice of the Sirens, see *Od.* 12.158 (Σειρήνων ... θεσπεσιάνων); as that of the voice of singers, cf. *Il.* 2.600, *Od.* 1.328, 8.498, 17.385. Θέσπιν ἀοιδὴν is also what Hermes plays for Apollo at *Hym. Merc.* 442.

as the αὐδῆν / θέσπιν (31–32) that the Muses breathe into Hesiod.<sup>28</sup> Taken in isolation this adjective would hardly provoke a comparison between Typhon and the Muses; yet the accumulation of detail, as I will show, makes such a connection plausible and significant for the meaning of the passage.

The poet's physical description of Typhon, then, already suggests the nature of his voice, and provides a natural transition to the chaotic mixture of divine and bestial sounds that follow in the next six lines. Just as with *glōssai*, Hesiod uses the plural *phōnai* (829) in another striking usage, since it is the only appearance of the plural of this word in Hesiod. West notes the oddness of the larger phrase, in which one type of voice produces another (φωναὶ δ' ἐν πάσησιν ἔσαν δεινῆς κεφαλῆσι, / παντοίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον, 828–29).<sup>29</sup> To account for the line, West minimizes the significance of the repetition by understanding the phrase as a kind of pleonasm. Yet this formula (ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι or ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι), which is used elsewhere only of the Muses, suggests another point of similarity between Typhon and the Muses in the proem.<sup>30</sup> Both \**ops* and *ossa*, the two words that designate the Muses' voice in the proem, recur here in close proximity, but in ways that signal Typhon's transgression: even the formula ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι is dislocated from its normal position at line end.<sup>31</sup> This layering of different words for voice results in a deliberate category disruption, as Ford has noted, since the normally divine *ossa* must here be understood as the product of a voice that bellows like a bull.<sup>32</sup> The difficult syntax of this line mirrors Typhon's

<sup>28</sup> Similarly Hes. fr. 310 collocates this adjective with the voice of the singer who is inspired by the Muses: μουσῶν, αἳ τ' ἄνδρα πολυφραδέοντα τιθεῖσι / θέσπιον αὐδῆντα. The only other occurrences of either *thespis* or *thespesios* in Hesiod are in the *Shield* ("with a wondrous shout," ἀλαλητῶ / θεσπεσίῳ, 382–3), and in the *Titanomachy* ("wondrous fire," καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον, 700). There is a certain repetition between the *Typhonomachy* and the *Titanomachy* in terms of the sonic description of the battle (not only *thespesios* but also *ossa* in 701); but it should be clear by now that Hesiod uses this vocabulary for different effect here, in that these words for voice are applied to the monster himself and not just to the sounds produced in battle (as in the *Titanomachy*).

<sup>29</sup> West 1966: 386 remarks, "φωναὶ [...] παντοίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι is an odd expression; φωναὶ παντοῖαι would have sufficed."

<sup>30</sup> The formula ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι occurs four times in the proem, always at line end (10, 43, 65, 67). The phrase ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι is used of the Muses as they hymn Artemis at *Hym. Hom.* 27.18, and is found in the same analogous metrical position as the more common formula with *ossa*.

<sup>31</sup> The counterpoint between Typhon and the Muses is noted by Ford 1992: 191, who describes his voice as "a superhuman but infernal counterpart to the 'immortal' (or 'lovely,' etc.) *ossa* that the Muses 'send forth.'"

<sup>32</sup> Ford 1992: 190. My translation of this phrase follows the remarks by West 1966 ad loc.

resistance to easy taxonomy: he is a divine creature, to be sure, but one whose body and voice mingle the separate categories of animal and god.

The contrast between Typhon and the Muses is further developed in 835, when Hesiod sums up the effect of the monster's sounds on his immediate environment with the phrase "and the lofty mountains echoed (ἤχεν) beneath." The critical verb—"echo" (ἤχέω)—is used elsewhere only in the proem, where Hesiod describes how the snowy peaks of Olympus echo with the "scattering lily voice" of the Muses (γελᾷ δέ τε δώματα πατρὸς / Ζηνὸς ἐριγδούποιο θεᾶν ὀπί λειριοέσση / σκιδναμένη, ἤχεϊ δὲ κάρη νιφόνεντος Ὀλύμπου / δώματά τ' ἀθανάτων, "and the halls of father Zeus, the loud-thunderer, rejoice at the scattering lily voice of the goddesses, and the peaks of snowy Olympus and the halls of the immortals echo," 40–43). The reverberation produced by Typhon's sounds, when given this phrasing, once again mirrors the song of the Muses. Such intratextual echoes with the proem suggest that we read Typhon as a terrifying sonic counterpoint to the Muses. With Typhon, body and voice are combined in an undifferentiated mass, in contrast with the orderly movement and voice of the Muses. The distinction is developed in ways that implicitly suggest proper choral performance and its opposite: the Muses are separately named individuals, who nevertheless are "like-minded" (ὁμόφρονες, 60), and produce a single voice in harmony.<sup>33</sup> Typhon, on the other hand, is a single entity of confused bodily forms that commingles a divine voice with the animal sounds of the bull, lion, snakes, and even puppies.<sup>34</sup> While the song of the Muses offers pleasure (*terpsis*, 37, 51) to their listeners on Olympus, Typhon creates sheer awe and is described as a "wonder to hear" (θαύματ' ἀκούσαι, 834).<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> On the choral coordination of voice compare the Delian Maidens of *Hym. Hom. Ap.* 162–64, who "know how to imitate the voices (φωνάς) and dancing (κρεμβαλιαστύν) of all men. And each man might think that he himself is speaking."

<sup>34</sup> Similarly the monster Scylla, as described by Circe (*Od.* 12.85–87), produces a sound like a puppy's bark (ἔνθα δ' ἐνὶ Σκύλλῃ ναίει δεινὸν λελακυῖα. / τῆς ἥ τοι φωνὴ μὲν ὄση σκύλακος νεογιλῆς / γίγνεται, αὐτὴ δ' αὐτὴ πέλωρ κακόν, "there is the place where Scylla dwells, shrieking terribly. Her voice is as loud as a newly born puppy, though she herself is a terrible monster"). Yet Scylla's monstrosity differs from Typhon's in that her multiform nature—Homer refers to her twelve feet and six heads (*Od.* 12.89–90)—produces a single puppy-like voice that is out of proportion to her physical threat. Hesiod's monster, in contrast, is terrifying because of his chaotic mixing of normally separate sounds and voices.

<sup>35</sup> Hesiod uses *thauma* to describe the effect of Pandora's appearance on the mortal and immortal viewer (*Theog.* 575, 581, 588), another monstrous character with disastrous consequences for man. The plural, however, is used only here in Hesiod or Homer (West 1966: 388), drawing further attention to Typhon's multiplicity of voices.

This antithesis is significant for how we understand communication in the *Theogony*, since it appears that divine utterance by itself does not produce a communicative act. When the Muses send forth their voice (ῥῶσαν ἰεῖσαι) a song is invariably produced (*hymnos*, *molpē*, or *aoidē*), through which they transform the deeds of Zeus and other gods into *kleos*.<sup>36</sup> While Typhon, too, emits a divine voice, his utterances remain formless. When Hesiod recounts how “sometimes his voices speak as if for the gods to perceive” (ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ / φθέγγονθ’ ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, 830–31), the phrasing does not need imply a spoken language; rather, the line emphasizes that his voices can be heard by the gods, although they convey no particular message.<sup>37</sup> Through his disruption of categories for voice, Typhon demonstrates that divine voice will remain formless and inarticulate outside the order established by Zeus. Unlike the Muses, his voices aim primarily to terrify his enemies, and combine physical force and sound in a manner that defies articulation (indeed Hesiod draws attention to its “wondrous” nature at 834). By using Typhon as a negative *exemplum* of communication, Hesiod suggests the symbolic nature of his defeat, in which the voices of god and beast are shown to be incompatible when combined in one and the same being. The hierarchical relationship between divine and human speech, as it was delineated in the proem, is here reaffirmed.

Mortals of course have a vested interest in the outcome of this battle, for the Muses differ in one more critical respect from Typhon. The monster is given every word for voice in Hesiod’s vocabulary—*glōssa*, *phōnē*, *\*ops*, *phthongos*, and *ossa*—except for *audē*. This is a very telling absence since this is the one voice that mediates between the gods and mortals.<sup>38</sup> In this respect Typhon’s sonic threat is of a different type from the ominous voices of the *Odyssey*, since the Sirens, Circe, and Calypso all pose a challenge to the hero precisely because they are able to communicate with mortals and entice Odysseus with their song.<sup>39</sup> Typhon’s victory, on the other hand, would lead to a permanent rupture

<sup>36</sup> The following designations for song occur in the proem: *hymnos* (11), *molpē* (66), *aoidē* (44, 60). Song in turn produces *kleos* (32, 44, 67).

<sup>37</sup> This interpretation of the line turns on Hesiod’s use of the verb συνιέμεν, which, as Leclerc 1993: 47 notes, can often convey perception of a sound, and does not need imply comprehension of a verbal message (as West 1966: 386 would have it).

<sup>38</sup> On the intermediary role of *audē*, see Section 2 above. Leclerc 1993: 45 also notes the absence of *audē* in the Typhonomachy. She interprets this lack as a sign of Typhon’s inability to form communicative utterances, although she does not explain the significance of this fact for the larger role of the Typhonomachy in the work.

<sup>39</sup> The Sirens, like the Muses, send forth a beautiful voice (ἰεῖσαι ὅπα κάλλιμον, 12.192) that produces a song (unlike Typhon) that promises *terpsis* (12.188) and unlimited

of communication between gods and men, resulting in man's ignorance of his place in the cosmos.<sup>40</sup> Although the absence of *audē* may seem overly subtle, it is at this point that the narrative imagines the consequences that Typhon's victory would have for man. Hesiod's description of Typhon as a "wonder to hear" (θαύματ' ἀκοῦσαι, 834) draws attention to the strangeness of the monster's voices, and to the bravura performance of the poet in reproducing these sounds. As Kathryn Stoddard notes in her narratological study of the *Theogony*, the use of this phrase focalizes the divine conflict from the point of view of the mortal listener.<sup>41</sup> Hesiod again makes his presence known in the narrative when he shares his privileged understanding of what could have happened (836–38): "A thing past help would have come to pass that day, and he would have become king of mortals and immortals, had the father of gods and men not taken sharp notice." Coming as it does immediately after the description of Typhon's sounds, this counterfactual statement imagines the possibility of a differently configured world of sound. Without the alignment of voices within their proper hierarchical sequence, Hesiod would be unable to play the critical mediating role between the Muses and his mortal audience. It is a world in which the very information that Hesiod relates here would be unavailable, and man's place in the cosmos left unexplained.

Hesiod's brief thought experiment is short-lived, however, since—unlike in the Titanomachy—Zeus immediately, and without aid, takes action to quell Typhon's attempt to gain power. The role of sound in the battle has been underappreciated, but is part of the larger process of ordering and differentiation that I have been outlining here.<sup>42</sup> Hesiod's narrative shows how Zeus overwhelms the physical and sonic confusion of Typhon, whose sounds are not only disordered but also unlimited, as the adjective ἀθέσφατον (830)

---

knowledge to the mortal listener. Homer depicts both Circe and Calypso as singers who possess *audē* (suggested by the adjective *audēessa*, 10.136, 12.449).

<sup>40</sup> Too 1998 also notes that Typhon and the Muses share certain similarities, although she locates these in the *mimetic* power of their voices: "As a mimetic discourse which deceives by appearing to be what it is not, the Muses' own language has affinities with the voices of Typhon, which appear to suggest actual beings and objects that they are not" (27). Typhon's threat, however, lies not so much in his imitation of the divine (since he is already divine), as in the disordering of the voices required for communication. His lack of *audē* is an important sign of his difference from the Muses.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Stoddard 2004: 56–59 on the way the phrases θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι/ἀκοῦσαι function to indicate the implied author at work, and to emphasize the wide gulf between man and god in the *Theogony*.

<sup>42</sup> Kaimio 1977: 121–23 details the impressive sonic description of the battle, though he does not elaborate its significance.

suggests.<sup>43</sup> The etymology of this word is disputed, though it can be analyzed as the compound of an alpha-privative plus the root word \*θεσ-, or “god,” and the adjectival form -φατος, from the verb φημί.<sup>44</sup> As Benveniste 1969: 2.141–42 notes, the adjective most often modifies objects of unlimited quantity, such as fire, the sea, grain, and sound. His suggestion—that *athesphatos* designates that which is “unlimited, not delimited by the gods”—has been elaborated by Ford, who argues that speech is an important element of the word’s designation, and that the adjective describes “things that are beyond mortal articulation or exhaustive definition” (1992: 183). Zeus’s use of the thunderbolt cuts short Typhon’s limitless voice, and finally silences his adversary.

When the battle is finally joined between Zeus and Typhon in 839, it is first and foremost a confrontation of sounds, rather than physical violence. A thunderclap announces Zeus’s presence, the first and only time in the *Theogony* that sound introduces Zeus in this way.<sup>45</sup> The emphasis Hesiod places on the sound of this engagement is indicated by the verbs ἐβρόντησε (839) and κονάβησε (840)—the only use of either verb in the Hesiodic corpus, and one that Hesiod further amplifies with the adverbs σκληρόν ... καὶ ὄβριμον (839). The formulaic σμερδαλέον κονάβησε regularly occurs in epic poetry to register the effect of a powerful force, whether a voice or physical blow, on its environment.<sup>46</sup> Its use here nicely captures the nature of Zeus’s thunder, a sound that threatens violence and has a real effect on the world. When physical force is finally brought to bear, this is registered again through the sounds it produces in the cosmos, as the earth “groans” (ἐπεστονάχιζε, 843; στονάχιζε, 858) under the antagonists’ rushing feet and Zeus’s lashing of

<sup>43</sup> Similarly argued by Blaise 1992: 361, who notes that ἀθέσφατον “annonce d’emblée que la voix de Typhée excède toute norme, et la suite de la description, ponctuée de nombreux ἄλλοτε, en fait la démonstration.”

<sup>44</sup> See Kaimio 1977: 120 for a summary of previous explanations of the word’s etymology. He ultimately agrees with Chantraine 1968–80 and Frisk 1960–72, who interpret the alpha prefix as a pleonastic form (rather than an alpha-privative). The adjective would then be an intensive form of the adjective *thesphatos*. It is possible that the Greek audience could have interpreted the word in either sense, depending on the surrounding context.

<sup>45</sup> The lightning-bolt of course is used against Menoitius (514) and the Titans (689ff.), but only here does Hesiod have the thunder precede the lightning, and with such attention to the sound it produces.

<sup>46</sup> The formula occurs nine times in Homeric epic (including with the analogous verb κονάβιζε), but never as the reverberation of thunder. In the *Hym. Hom. Merc.* 419, the formula is used of the sound produced by the baby Hermes when he strikes his plectrum to the lyre, initiating a sung cosmology.

Typhon.<sup>47</sup> In a further amplification of the sound Zeus's thunder reverberates across a four-part division of the cosmos: the earth, the wide sky, the sea, and the underworld realm of Tartarus.<sup>48</sup>

I suggest that Hesiod introduces Zeus with this singular attention to sound for two reasons. (1) First, the reach of Zeus's thunder has the effect of upstaging Typhon at the level of sound. Unlike an articulate voice, which may communicate a complex message, thunder is a unique form of communication that signifies the lightning wielded by Zeus (the real source of his physical power).<sup>49</sup> In a very dramatic way, then, Zeus's thunder announces his possession of this weapon, which was given to him in the previous episode of the Titanomachy and closely associated in the epic tradition with the physical means of his hegemony. In contrast to Zeus's powerful signifier (thunder), Typhon's voices signify violent intention but fail to deliver on their threat. Despite the plurality of voices Typhon can produce, these have a limited impact on their environment. For not only do they prove unable to formulate a coherent message, but their geographic reach is insignificant, since they echo only from below the tall mountains (835).<sup>50</sup> Zeus's thunder, on the other hand, penetrates all corners of the cosmos and reflects the god's power in a clear and immediate way. The sound maps the cosmos as terrain under Zeus's sovereignty—including Tartarus, from which Typhon was produced (822). By asserting his authority over even this space, Zeus implicitly limits Typhon's reach and denies him a space outside of his ordered rule.<sup>51</sup> (2) A second reason for the emphasis is to

<sup>47</sup> See Watkins 1995 who argues that this phraseology of "lashing" (ἰμάσσειας, 857) is formulaic in the Typhon myth (occurring in the *Iliad* and *Hym. Hom. Ap.*), and that it is proof of a secure parallel with the Hittite myth of Illuyankas.

<sup>48</sup> As Kaimio 1977: 237–38 notes, the motif of sound echoing and rising to heaven is well-established in epic poetry as a means of characterizing loudness. What is unique about Hesiod's deployment of this motif here, however, is the way that the contrasting echoes produced by Typhon and Zeus suggests their relative power. Hesiod alludes to Zeus's impending victory even before physical violence is used.

<sup>49</sup> As Cook 1925: 829 remarks, for the Greeks "thunder was at most an ominous sound preceding divine speech," and never conceived as equivalent to the voice of Zeus. That Hesiod chose to have Zeus's thunder precede his use of the lightning-bolt (in a reversal of the natural sequence in which lightning always precedes thunder) is further indication of the prominence given to sound in the conflict.

<sup>50</sup> The direction of the contrasting sounds is also suggestive: thunder descends from high to low, while Typhon's sounds emanate from the bottom up. Thus Typhon's defeat signals the successful imposition of an Olympian order, over the forces of Gaia and Tartarus.

<sup>51</sup> Compare the five-part division given in the Titanomachy (*Theog.* 678–83): the din of battle causes the sea, earth, heaven, Olympus, and Tartarus to resound. In that passage, however, the emphasis is on the force of the battle (which is in doubt until the release



prepare for the division of the *timai* that follows the Typhonomachy. Zeus's thunder rumbles over the separate parts of the universe—sky, land, sea, and underworld—that will be partitioned among the gods, yet unified under Zeus's rule (839–41). The way that Hesiod describes this movement of sound suggests the necessary division of the spaces through which it travels. It is just such a merging of spaces, against Zeus, that gave birth to Typhon in the first place: Gaia and Tartarus were previously separate entities before their unexpected union at lines 821–22.<sup>52</sup> Thus Hesiod's description of the movement of thunder over a four-part division implicitly answers the original problem that gave rise to Typhon. The reverberation of the thunder demarcates the spaces of the cosmos as separate, and reorders them as part of a unified whole under Zeus's rule. Thus the extended description of thunder looks ahead to the final partition of the *timai*.

#### 4. TYPHON'S DEFEAT AND THE IMPOSITION OF CIVILIZING ORDER

Hesiod ends his account with the effect of the monster's defeat on the present day, in which he persists as a force of disorder and trouble for men. But if Zeus permits his enemy a circumscribed existence, this is because Typhon will serve as a useful negative *exemplum* of the benefits conferred by Zeus's rule on men. As Stoddard notes, the focalization at this point in the narrative shifts from the perspective of the divine struggle over Olympus, to the perspective of man.<sup>53</sup> This shift is marked by the poet's contrast at the end of the Typhonomachy between the excessive and chaotic nature of the monster and human *technē*. By making of Typhon a negative *exemplum*, Hesiod suggests that Zeus's victory is a civilizing act that has made possible a world in which man has some control over his environment through the use of *technē*; the lingering pockets of disorder, represented by Typhon's winds, are a lasting reminder that human *technē* is operable only in a cosmos under Zeus's sovereignty.<sup>54</sup> In this section I argue that the monster's defeat is contrasted

---

of the Hundred-Handers in 714), rather than on Zeus's overwhelming might expressed through sound.

<sup>52</sup> This is the only occasion in the *Theogony* where Tartarus is treated as a divinity and not a place. The Typhonomachy passage, then, ends with both Gaia and Tartarus reduced to designations for places that can be controlled by Zeus.

<sup>53</sup> “[I]t is striking that in a poem self-consciously concerned with divine affairs this battle between gods should be compared to the smith-work of men.” (2004: 158)

<sup>54</sup> For the sake of economy, I have limited my discussion of *technē* here to the *Theogony* and leave aside its role in the *Works and Days*.



with the emergence of human *technai* in the areas of metalworking, sailing, and—implicitly—song.

The narrator's shift to a more thoroughly anthropocentric perspective is signaled by the simile of the blacksmith (859–67). As the fire that engulfs Typhon begins to melt the earth, the monster's defeat is likened to an act of human creation.

φλὸξ δὲ κεραυνωθέντος ἀπέσσυτο τοῖο ἄνακτος	
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν αἰδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης	860
πληγέντος, πολλή δὲ πελώρη καίετο γαῖα	
αὐτμῇ θεσπεσίῃ, καὶ ἐτήκετο κασσίτερος ὥς	
τέχνη ὑπ' αἰζῶν ἐν ἐντρήτοις χοάνοισι	
θαλφθεῖς, ἥ ἐ σίδηρος, ὃ περ κρατερώτατός ἐστιν,	
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησι δαμαζόμενος πυρὶ κηλέω	865
τήκεται ἐν χθονὶ δὴ ὑφ' Ἡφαίστου παλάμησιν·	
ὥς ἄρα τήκετο γαῖα σέλαι πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο.	

And fire poured forth from the lord [Typhon] when he was hit  
by the lightning-bolt,  
struck in the dark and rugged glens of the mountain,  
and the monstrous earth was burned widely  
by the wondrous breath of fire, and just as when tin is melted,  
heated in perforated crucibles through the *technē* of laborers,  
or just as iron, which is the strongest of all,  
when it is subjected to blazing fire in the glens of a mountain,  
is melted in the good earth by the hands of Hephaistos,  
just so, then, the earth was melted by the blaze of burning fire.

Both Gaia and Typhon are assimilated to physical properties—earth and fire—that men and gods can wield productively through *technē*. The simile is especially striking, since this is the only occurrence of *technē* in Hesiod in the sense of a human “craft.”<sup>55</sup> Earlier in the work *technē* appears with a consistently negative connotation, in the sense of a “trick” used to subvert the sovereign deity. At each stage of the struggle for supremacy the would-

<sup>55</sup> Stoddard notes the bipartite nature of the simile, in which men handle tin (the weakest of metals), and a god handles iron (the hardest metal). She interprets the simile as emphasizing the disjunction between the divine and mortal realms; thus the Typhonomachy's effect on the earth “is both similar to the actions of mankind and immeasurably more powerful than they” (2004: 159). I differ from this interpretation in reading the simile as part of an implicit comment on the defeat of Typhon and the place of human *technē*. Zeus's mastery of chaos becomes paradigmatic for the everyday human mastery of nature (through *technē*), and its productive transformation into a cultural artifact.

be successor makes use of a *technē*: Kronos, Zeus, and Prometheus.<sup>56</sup> In the Typhonomachy, uniquely, *technē* is conceived of metaphorically as a tool in the service of the sovereign. The use of this word, then, follows a progression in the work, from a subversive and destabilizing function to an instrument in the production of order. Through the metalworking simile, Hesiod suggests that Zeus not only defeats Typhon but subsumes him into his order. While such a connection is implicit in Hesiod, this appropriation is made literal by the author of the *Prometheus Bound*. In retelling the story of the monster's defeat Prometheus remarks that Typhon is now contained beneath Mt. Aetna, spitting out the fire that Hephaestus uses to work metal.<sup>57</sup>

Typhon's defeat has real consequences for a second type of human *technē*: seafaring. Even after his defeat Typhon persists as a force of disorder in the form of the destructive winds that occasionally plague men on land and sea (869–80). These rush about in the form of an indistinct whirlwind (ἄλλη, 874), bringing pain (πῆμα, 874) to man. The monster's earlier alternation between different categories of voice is preserved in the randomness of the Typhonic winds, which “sometimes blow in one direction and at other times in another” (ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλη ἄεισι, 875).<sup>58</sup> The Typhonic winds blow “vainly” (μάψ, 872) across the sea, in contrast with the “divine” winds (ἐκ θεόφιν γενεήν, 871) that men are able to exploit through the *technē* of seafaring. Hesiod's use of the adverb μάψ captures the ambiguity of the perspective: the winds are “vain” from the point of view both of Typhon's futile resistance to Zeus, and of men who rely on the wind in order to sail across the sea.<sup>59</sup> Both perspectives overlap here, and thereby emphasize the dependence of human *technē* on the order created by Zeus. Typhon's winds operate as a kind of “black hole” in Zeus's order, an ungovernable and undifferentiated force that persists even into the present time.<sup>60</sup> The divine winds that bring benefit (ὄνειρα, 871) to

<sup>56</sup> On the role of cunning in the succession myth, cf. Detienne and Vernant 1991 [1974]: 57–92. Prometheus's use of *technē* makes him particularly dangerous, as the authors observe: “he is ... the only one who is equipped to duel in cunning with Zeus, the only one who can use *apatē* against him and challenge the *mētis* of the king of the gods with his own” (58).

<sup>57</sup> PV 351–72. Since Hephaestus was traditionally believed to produce the thunderbolt with the help of the Cyclopes, Typhon's fire would contribute to Zeus's capacity to punish his enemies.

<sup>58</sup> Compare the repetition of ἄλλοτε in the alternation of Typhon's voice at lines 833–35.

<sup>59</sup> Similarly the author of the *Prometheus Bound* refers to the “useless” (ἄχρεϊον, 363) body of Typhon, which is contained beneath Mt. Aetna.

<sup>60</sup> Detienne and Vernant 1991 [1974]: 118 note a further distinction: the orderly nature of the divine winds is a function of their genealogy, as the offspring of the Olympian

man, on the other hand, are named and separate divinities—Notus, Boreas, and Zephyr (870). They supply a structured order within which man's *technē* is able to operate. The Typhonic winds, far from posing a threat to Zeus, reaffirm man's fragile place in the world and dependence on Zeus's beneficial rule. By concluding his account of the Typhonomachy with the monster's continuing presence in the contemporary world, Hesiod suggests that man's *technē* is coterminous with the rule of Zeus.<sup>61</sup>

Finally, the civilizing nature of Zeus's victory is suggested by its consequences for a third type of human actor: the mortal singer. Like the sailor, whose *technē* depends on the regularity of the individual Olympian winds, the *aoidos* depends upon a similar differentiation of voice in order to find his place in a Zeus-ordered cosmos. Just as the divine winds represent a differentiated and ordered counterpart to the destructive Typhonic winds, so Hesiod—through the intratextual links and narrative progression outlined above—implies that the Muses provide an analogous counterpart to Typhon's voices. Although this analogy is left implicit, it is strongly suggested by Typhon's categorical mixing of voices earlier in the passage, which—like the Typhonic winds—alternate between one another in apparently random fashion.<sup>62</sup> Together with the blacksmith and the sailor, then, Hesiod himself represents a third type of mortal actor with a stake in Typhon's defeat. Since he gains his privileged knowledge through his relationship with the Muses, Hesiod can fulfill his role when these voices are assigned their proper place in Zeus's order. While Typhon lingers into the present day, he is voiceless and no longer threatens to destabilize the communication that extends from the Muses to mortal singers such as Hesiod.

---

gods (*Theog.* 378–80). Typhon's genesis from Tartarus, on the other hand, is appropriate since his chaotic nature and the winds that he produces resemble “the directionless space formed beneath the earth by Tartarus—an abyss of limitless wandering where there is no above or below and no right or left.”

<sup>61</sup> Here I would qualify Stoddard's reading of the human focalization of the passage, which she interprets as emphasizing the gulf between man and gods (2004: 152). In contrast I argue that the passage draws a contrast between Typhon and the Olympian wind gods, the latter of whom are a “great benefit” to man (*Theog.* 871). The gulf, then, is rather between Typhon, who lies outside of Zeus's order, and men who are still subject to his destructive winds.

<sup>62</sup> The poet as craftsman is a familiar metaphor in Greek poetry, and need not be in conflict with the scene of poetic inspiration that opens the *Theogony*. See the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*, for instance, and the construction of the first lyre there (39–51). Hesiod himself employs the analogy in *Works and Days* when he describes the effects of good *eris*: καὶ κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ κοτέει καὶ τέκτονι τέκτων, / καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονεῖ καὶ αἰοῖδος αἰοιδῷ (“so the potter vies with potter, the builder with builder, the beggar resents beggar, and the singer singer,” 25–26).

The division of the *timai*, which immediately follows the Typhonomachy, contains one telling reference to sound that alludes to Zeus's mastery of the sonic world and the significance of Typhon's defeat. When the gods, on Gaia's advice, call on Zeus to assume the kingship Hesiod uses the formulaic εὐρύοπα Ζῆν (884).<sup>63</sup> Although the derivation of this epithet is uncertain, the most likely etymology analyzes the word as a compound of *euru* and \**ops*—"wide-voiced."<sup>64</sup> As Chantraine 1968–80 s.v. observes, εὐρύοπα is often associated with people and things that imply sound: such as heralds, a shout or clamor (*kelados*), and Zeus's thunder. He concludes, "it is very probable that the original sense is "wide-voiced," spoken of Zeus's thunder." In the division of the *timai* the epithet εὐρύοπα would recall Zeus's recent use of thunder against Typhon and the sonic ordering of the cosmos that this use implied. While Typhon's name is absent in the division of the *timai*, the preceding Typhonomachy gives new meaning to Zeus's familiar epithet. "Wide-voiced Zeus" alludes to the recent victory over Typhon, at the same time as it points to the suppression of an alternative configuration of divine voice from the text.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The defeat of Typhon represents only the preliminary civilizing act that orders sound and voice. Zeus's suppression of Typhon succeeds in silencing his enemy's "boundless" voices, but it is essentially a negative action. The birth of the Muses, which follows closely on the Typhonomachy and the division of the *timai*, completes this civilizing process through a creative act of ordering. In contrast with Typhon, who commingled divine voice and the threat of violence, the new Olympian rule separates these two functions. Through his physical might Zeus establishes the proper conditions in which voice may be employed, while the Muses, in turn, transform voice into a song celebrating Zeus's rule. Song, furthermore, provides a medium for communicating man's place within this new—and beneficial—order. In short, physical violence and cunning may have brought Zeus to the throne, but song is necessary for rendering this new order intelligible.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>63</sup> The formula occurs in the *Iliad* at 8.206, 14.265, and 24.331. The epithet is used only once earlier in the poem (514), in the analogous formula εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς (which occurs 9 times in the *Iliad* and 7 in the *Odyssey*). There, too, the context is Zeus's use of the lightning-bolt as a form of punishment against the hubristic Menoetius.

<sup>64</sup> So Chantraine 1968–80 s.v. εὐρύοπα, and Frisk 1960–72 s.v. \*ῥψ. Pindar employs an analogous epithet of the thundering Zeus at *Pyth.* 6.24—βαρυόπας—in which the second element can only be derived from \*ῥψ.

<sup>65</sup> Pindar's *Hymn to Zeus* (now largely fragmentary) seems to have articulated this need for song to bring Zeus's succession to completion. According to the summaries of Choricus

Hesiod, then, presents the Typhonomachy as a necessary act of violence that paves the way for the birth of the Muses. There is both an aesthetic and a political dimension to the Muses' performance. Their song produces pleasure (*terpsis*) in the gods who hear them, but the Muses also bring clarity to the universe and legitimate Zeus's supremacy.<sup>66</sup> This latter function is carried out both by the content of their song, which commemorates the succession of Zeus, and by their very performance. For in the act of turning divine voice into song, and by communicating this song to mortal singers, they map out the cosmic boundaries of divine and human voice. The communication of their knowledge to privileged mortal singers would not even be possible without clear channels of speech, since *audē* provides the crucial mediating voice between god and man. Thus the act of singing attests to Zeus's harmonious rule, while also delineating the hierarchical structure that has often been seen to operate in the *Theogony*, in which man is defined as the middle term in the opposition between god and beast.<sup>67</sup> In this way the Muses make use of the same "sonic map" that Zeus created through his victory over Typhon.

By reading the Typhonomachy in dialogue with the proem of the *Theogony*—as two passages that frame the narrative of succession—we can see how this apparent digression on Typhon is part of a larger interest in the genealogy of song. Significantly, Hesiod suggests that sound can be turned into song only from within the order that Zeus establishes: the possession of divine voice is not sufficient on its own. Hesiod's self-consciousness about his own place within this order can explain the particular emphases that the poet gives the episode. As several studies have shown, Typhon's challenge of Zeus shows traces of an origin in Hittite mythology; but what is distinctive about Hesiod's account, when compared with the Near Eastern parallels that have been adduced, is the poet's attention to sound in the battle.<sup>68</sup> As a

---

and Aristides (fr. 31 Maehler), on the occasion of his wedding Zeus asked the other gods whether they had any special requests. In response they asked that he create other gods—presumably the Muses (cf. Snell 1960: 78)—who "would celebrate his deeds with words and music" (κοσμήσουσι λόγοις καὶ μουσικῇ). See Pucci 1980 for an interpretation of this passage, in which the Muses literally bring order to events through speech.

<sup>66</sup> Hesiod in *Theog.* 915–17 describes the birth of the Muses, "for whom festivities and the pleasure (*terpsis*) of song are a delight."

<sup>67</sup> See in particular Vernant 1996 [1974]: 183–201 ("The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod").

<sup>68</sup> Watkins 1995: 448–59 argues that the repetition of formulaic expressions for lashing in the Greek sources indicates an origin in the Hittite myth of Illuyankas. West 1997: 300–4, on the other hand, sees significant parallels with the Hittite myth of Ullikummi, but also with Mesopotamian and Canaanite succession myths. See also Detienne and Vernant 1991 [1974] and Saïd 1977.

performer who lays claim to his authority through a privileged relationship with the Muses, Hesiod seeks to align his performance with the structure of communication in the cosmos. Typhon's sonic disorder and ineffectual attempt at seizing Zeus's rule makes him an appropriate foil to the Muses, and an enemy of the order on which Hesiod depends.

#### WORKS CITED

- Ballabriga, A. 1990. "Le dernier adversaire de Zeus: le mythe de Typhon dans l'épopée grecque archaïque." *RHR* 207: 3–30.
- Benveniste, E. 1969. *Le Vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. I: *Économie, parenté, société*. II: *Pouvoir, droit, religion*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Blaise, F. 1992. "L'Épisode de Typhée dans la *Théogonie* d'Hésiode (v. 820–885): la stabilisation du monde." *REG* 105: 349–70.
- Bonnafé, A. 1984. *Poésie, nature et sacré. I: Homère, Hésiode et le sentiment grec de la nature*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient.
- Chantraine, P. 1968–80. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Clay, J. 1974. "Demas and aude: The Nature of Divine Transformation in Homer." *Hermes* 102: 129–36.
- . 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, D. 1999. "Hesiod and the Divine Voice of the Muses." *Arethusa* 32: 241–62.
- Cook, A. 1925. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.-P. 1991. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Trans. by J. Lloyd. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (French 1974).
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Fournier, H. 1946. *Les Verbes "dire" en grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Frisk, H. 1960–72. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Vol. 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hamilton, R. 1989. *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaimio, M. 1977. *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Leclerc, M.-C. 1993. *La Parole chez Hésiode: à la recherche de l'harmonie perdue*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Pucci, P. 1980. "The Language of the Muses." In Aycock, W. and Klein, T. eds. *Classical Mythology in Twentieth-Century Thought and Literature*. Lubbock: Texas Tech Press. 163–86.
- Saïd, S. 1977. "Les Combats de Zeus et le problème des interpolations dans la *Théogonie* d'Hésiode." *REG* 90: 183–210.

- Snell, B. 1960. *The Discovery of the Mind*. Trans. by T. Rosenmeyer. New York: Harper & Row (German 1946).
- Solmsen, F. 1982. "The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text." *HSCP* 86: 1–31.
- Stoddard, K. 2004. *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*. Leiden: Brill.
- Stokes, M. 1972. "Hesiodic and Milesian Cosmogonies—I." *Phronesis* 7: 1–37.
- Too, Y. L. 1998. *The Idea of Ancient Literary Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vernant, J.-P. 1982. *The Origins of Greek Thought*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (French 1962).
- 1996. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Trans. by J. Lloyd. New York: Zone Books (French 1974).
- 1991. "Mortals and Immortals: The Body of the Divine." In *id. Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*. Trans. by A. Wilson and F. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 27–49.
- Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

