

The Partnership of Zeus and Gaia in Hesiod's *Theogony*¹

Nancy Felson

In this essay I focus on Gaia's motivations in the course of Hesiod's *Theogony*. My study of Gaia takes off from a sentence in Jenny Strauss Clay's *Hesiod's Cosmos*, p. 26, where she writes:

Some have found the behavior of Gaia, as Hesiod describes it, paradoxical if not incomprehensible ... But her role as kingmaker among the gods and orchestrator of succession is perfectly consistent, and an understanding of her motivation is crucial to the *Theogony*.

I build, as well, on my own previous work in 'The Children of Zeus,'² where I set forth in a preliminary way the connection between the two sequential purpose clauses of lines 126-28, Gaia's regular epithet (πελώρη), and the prominent yet under-examined role that Gaia plays in the Succession myth. Based on my reading of these clauses, in conjunction with the repeated ascription of planning verbs and nouns to Gaia, I assign a 'psychology' to her character.

Gaia is a 'schemer', a prototype for her granddaughter Metis, whose name means 'Cunning Schemer'.³ Gaia's role in determining the plot-

¹ I am indebted to several colleagues for reading earlier drafts of this essay and suggesting useful improvements, in particular the co-editors (Lucia Athanassaki, Christopher Nappa, Athanassios Vergados), Seth Schein, Carolyn Dewald, Alex Loney, and Zoe Stamatopoulou, and to Alex Moskowitz and Sam O'Donnell for editorial and research assistance. Errors and infelicities are my own.

² Felson 2011, especially 257-61.

³ In Felson 1994: 5-6 I use 'schemer' as a quasi-technical narratological term to describe the goddess Athena, right hand of the poet; on 6 and 128-29 I assign some degree of agency to planning characters like Penelope *periphron* and Odysseus *polymētis/polytropos*.

line of the *Theogony's* Succession far exceeds the importance that most scholars have observed.⁴ In my consideration of Gaia's centrality, I acknowledge that Zeus is the star of the story that culminates in his election as king of the gods,⁵ but argue that, by the time that Gaia endorses him, Zeus is ready to incorporate and internalize Metis/μήτις and indeed to become 'μητίετα Ζεύς'. Because of her intrinsic commitment to terrestrial stability, Gaia will embrace him; to get Gaia to that point, the poem had to build a quest for such stability into her character from the start.

Syntagms from syntax, and the construction of Gaia's character

One finding of narratological interest is the fact that a syntactic feature, such as a purpose clause, can provide the initial entry for a chain of events or syntagm. Thus Gaia's desire to produce a stable seat for the immortal gods is gleaned primarily from reading the contents of the second purpose clause in a certain way, and linking it to her choice to give birth to Ouranos equal to herself. A second observation has to do with the role of an external audience (including readers such as myself) to construct a coherent character by connecting dispersed plot elements into a coherent whole. Drawing on R. Barthes and M. Bal, I apply this interpretive strategy in the case of Penelope (Felson 1994: 126-27):

Characters in Homeric epic do not unfold to an audience in an orderly, linear fashion; audiences, as they listen, reconstruct stories and reorder their developments. The proper name encourages the projection of an accomplished and singular named character onto previous textual elements that lead to the construction of that character. (126)

⁴ At several critical moments in Zeus's ascent, Gaia (alone or together with Ouranos) helps or obstructs him, thus determining his outcome. Zeus's rise to power depends upon Gaia's eventual acceptance of his kingship interaction. Gaia champions Zeus, after he defeats Typhaon, because his supremacy assures her own stability and the stability of the cosmos.

⁵ According to Lambertson 1988: 72-77, Gaia's stratagems and advice (sometimes in conjunction with Sky's) are 'crucial at every turn in Zeus's ascendancy to power: in tricking Cronus to swallow a stone instead of the infant Zeus (cf. 471, 475, and 494); in Zeus's liberating the Hundred-Handers as a means to Olympian victory over the Titans (cf. 626); in urging the Olympians to make Zeus king and lord (884); in advising Zeus to swallow Metis (891 and 892). Earth also kept the Cyclopes' thunder and lightning hidden before Zeus freed his uncles (505)'. According to Scully 2015, Zeus is named 62 times in the poem, more than any other character; second is Gaia (51 times), then Ouranos (34 times), then Nux (16 times).

In presenting Penelope, Homer includes isolated and descriptive 'character indicators'. Dispersed as these are throughout the text, they can nevertheless be brought together by an interpreter today, as they must have been in Homer's time by members of his live audiences, into an illusion of fullness. When listeners, ancient or modern, thus 'concoct' Penelope's character, this activity involves making sense of her psychologically in all her complexity. (126) Defined as a technical term, psychologizing means taking a character's figuration in a text as though it were real and as though it existed in a stable and unchanging, if fictive, ontology. Interpreters who speculate about the psychological viability of a fictional character and make inferences about that character's psyche from clues in the text can be said to 'psychologize'. (127)

*

The *Theogony* uses several strategies to bolster its own endorsement of Zeus as the one who will establish and maintain lasting order. Aside from explicit statements of praise, the poem uses a 'double time frame' that intersperses a synchronic present ('now-time') with a diachronic, unfolding narrative (from then to now; 'story-time'). Having Zeus in the narrative frame and intermittently occupy the position to which he aspires, affirms the permanence of his supremacy. Two additional narrative ploys, in story-time, coax Hesiod's audience to view Zeus's victory as the only desirable outcome: 1) when aligned with his male predecessors Kronos and Ouranos, Zeus appears uniquely suited for the position he already (now) holds,⁶ and 2) the poem avoids focalizing Zeus's actions through the consciousness of any of his adversaries (with the possible exception of Gaia). The first ploy has been well examined; the second, less so.

ZEUS: Distinctive Features

Zeus's strategy for becoming king of gods and men 'reiterates the first two episodes of the succession myth, but with a difference; in giving

⁶ Many scholars have written on Zeus's uniqueness, compared to Kronos and Ouranos, showing how, during his ascension, his actions echo those of his predecessors but with a difference that enables him, and him alone, to establish a new kind of just rule. Useful, as a starting place, is the Introduction in Brown 1953, which sets out parallels and differences in the sequential narrative structures of the three generations, and, more recently, Muellner 1996.

birth to Athena, he appropriates the female function of procreation; and in swallowing Metis, he permanently incorporates into himself the feminine principle of guile (*metis*) that had hitherto been the instrument of generational change.⁷ Amidst the many similarities, Zeus stands out as more enlightened than his predecessors, though not by any means an unflawed or non-violent leader.⁸ Whereas Ouranos repressed his offspring in Gaiā's womb and Kronos swallowed his children (with the exception of the youngest) as each emerged from Rhea's womb, Zeus cleverly swallows Metis, pregnant with Athena, *before* she conceives their second offspring, and he allows the birth of Athena to happen.

Zeus's use of violent force resembles the behavior of Ouranos and Kronos (and later that of Typhaon). He could appropriately be designated as δεινός, especially if he were focalized either by Kronos, whom he unseats, or by the challengers he thwarts. Nevertheless, though his actions during his ascent might earn him that designation, Hesiod refrains from placing him in the category of dreaded, terrifying monsters.

As often observed, Zeus combines two distinct roles in the Succession Myth: oppressive 'father' and unruly 'youngest son'. The descriptor ὀπλότατος is regularly collated in the poem with δεινός to mark an offspring as a threat to familial, civic, and/or cosmic order. Indeed, Zeus does create havoc for his father, once at birth and again in the Titanomachy. He also thwarts all the challengers to his authority, including Gaiā's last and youngest offspring, Typhaon.

Let us explore the semantics of the term that Hesiod applies to other disruptors of cosmic, civic, or familial order (but not to Zeus), δεινός,⁹

⁷ Clay 2003: 28.

⁸ Scully 2016: 6-7 provides an overview of the traits Zeus shares with his father and grandfather. Pucci 1992: 48 gives a full interpretation of the father/son relation in Lacanian terms; he reads oracles as the expression of the Father's voice—proleptically intimating the son's transgression, and analyzes the absence of that voice in the Succession Myth of the *Theogony*. It is fascinating that the unfathered Zeus becomes the quintessential father of gods and men.

⁹ The adjective δεινός derives from *dFeido, 'to fear', according to Chantraine 1999. An active adjective, it never means 'fearing'. Its cognates in Armenian and Sanskrit mean 'to hate' and Sanskrit has a noun, *dvesfi*, meaning 'persecution', 'hatred'. Related is Lat. *dīrus*, 'horrible'.

Typhaon combines the δεινός attribute of the hybrid offspring of Phorkys and Ceto and of the superlatively δεινότατος Kronos and Hundred-Handers. Against Typhaon, Zeus releases his μένος, as he had in his struggle vs. the Titans (cp. 853 and 687). Zeus thereby contains or restricts the qualities that the monstrous offspring embodies and, in a sense, purges these qualities from himself. This may suggest that, once he defeats his 'doublet' Typhaon, Zeus is no longer a menace to stability and order but reliably its defender, as if he has eliminated, or at least imprisoned, an unruly and unpredictable part of himself.

'dreaded', 'fearsome', 'inciting fear in'. Forms of δεινός occur 22 times in the *Theogony*, a disproportionate six for the offspring of Ceto and Phorcys (299, 307, 320, 324, 334, and 769); twice for Typhaon, a terrible dragon (825: δεινοῖο δράκοντος) and terrible monster (856: δεινοῖο πελώρου). The hybrid monster brood of Phorcys and Ceto culminates in the youngest, a 'dread serpent' (δεινός ὄφις) that guards the all-golden apples in the hidden places of the dark earth at its limits (333-36). All of these children are a menace to the human race (though not necessarily to their parents). As such, they become obstacles for heroes like Heracles, Bellerophon, and Theseus to overcome and thereby prove their heroism and win acclaim.

The *Theogony* designates several rebellious, disobedient sons, a few of them hybrids as well, as δεινός or δεινότατοι παίδων at birth, often in connection with verbs like τέκομαι and ἐκγίγνομαι and nouns such as τέκνα.¹⁰ The epithet δεινός, especially in the superlative and in collocation with 'youngest', describes several sons who threaten to overthrow their fathers (or whoever holds power): Kronos (135); the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers (155) (youngest and most hated sons of Ouranos and Gaia); and Typhaon (825 and 856) (youngest son of Gaia and Tartaros). The very existence of such a son triggers apprehension in the father, often accompanied by an explicit prophecy that his son will displace him.¹¹ Occasionally the poem uses the dative (of interest) to identify the entity affected, usually the parent or king (i.e. the established power). Whether the poet collocates δεινός or δεινότατοι παίδων with a formula like 'having an overbearing heart' or 'having overbearing manhood', an elaborate description of bodily excess (100 arms, 50 heads, etc.), or a piling-up of three or four adjectives indicating huge size and great power, the epithet reliably marks an entity as menacing and causing fear in a person (or thing) who is the target of the emotion, in whom the child invokes a δεινός response.

In two cases, those of Kronos and the Hundred-Handers, the superlative combines with a verb of hatred to indicate intergenerational male competition: the zero-sum Oedipal theme. The vigor or excess of

¹⁰ This emphasis on lineage is no surprise in a poem that builds its meaning from genealogies. Intergenerational hostility may begin with the son or with the father, each motivated by the perception of his competitor as excessively manly and vigorous, excessively large and mighty, or excessively arrogant.

¹¹ Most 2006: 15, n. 8.

either father or son is sufficient to trigger such hatred. Kronos hated his vigorous father Ouranos (138: θαλερόν δ' ἤχθηρε τοκῆα) and the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers were hated by their sire Ouranos from the start (155: ἤχθοντο). These two passages, with their verbal echoes, provide a kind of frame that sets Kronos off from his older siblings and lumps him instead with the two broods of monstrous hybrids.

When focalized by his father or by Gaia during the Titanomachy and the Typhaonmachy, Zeus is clearly a threat to cosmic order. In fact, until his negotiation, in direct speech, with the Cyclopes (643-63), Zeus is not a gentle figure at all. He is brutal to Typhaon, Gaia's youngest son (*Theog.* 819-68), who was excessively strong and noisy and 'would have come to reign over mortals and immortals, had not the father of men and gods been quick to perceive it' (836-38). He conquers this potential usurper, having lashed him with strokes, and then 'he hurled him, a maimed wreck, and huge Earth groaned'. Zeus is harsh as well to the unborn son of Metis (894-900), his own seed, whose depiction as 'having an over-lively spirit' (898: ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντα; cf. ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντας at 139 for the Cyclopes and βίην ὑπέροπλον ἔχοντες at 670 for the Hundred-Handers) marks him as a potential usurper, confirming the prophecy Zeus receives from Gaia and Ouranos that a son is destined to be born from Metis as a king of gods and men (897).¹² And yet, even though, within the story pattern, Zeus replicates many of the actions of his forebears and of his would-be displacers, Hesiod carefully represses this feature of his personality when he fashions Zeus as the hero of the Succession Myth.¹³

One circumstance Zeus shares with his predecessors is the absence of a paternal figure that will limit his youthful vigor. Ouranos has no father at all, ever. His relation with Gaia, his mother and bed-partner (133: εὐνηθεῖσα), is intimately dyadic, not triangular: no third term curbs his exercise of power or deprives him, as the male child, of full access to his mother. After engendering three sets of offspring—the Titans, the Cyclopes, and the Hundred-Handers, Ouranos reverses creation by pressing

¹² Zeus is ungentle to the four sons of Klymene and Iapetos, his cousins, who are also potential threats to his kingship. He undermines the hubristic Menoitios and especially Prometheus, who challenged his authority over humans—as if he and not Zeus were the far-seeing king (514) and the father of men and of the gods (542).

¹³ Cf. the contrast between ἦπιος and δεινός in the Tartaros section: Hypnos has one trait, Thanatos the other. The poem never uses ἦπιος for Zeus, as it does for Nereus, Old Man of the Sea, who is 'infallible and gentle' (235: νημερτής τε καὶ ἦπιος) and 'knows just and gentle plans' (236: δίκαια καὶ ἦπια δήνεα οἶδεν).

sexually overpowered (453: *ομηθείσα*), bears her six children, Kronos (in the absence of the function of the father) swallows each offspring at birth. By this repeated obliterating act, he transforms his own body into an infertile womb. To rescue Zeus, their last and youngest son, Rhea (following her parents' counsel) dupes Kronos into swallowing the swaddled stone as a substitute for the infant Zeus. This forces Kronos to regurgitate first the stone (a surrogate for Zeus) and then Zeus's five older siblings. Kronos's violence against his offspring disqualifies him—in the eyes of Zeus and his Olympian siblings and importantly of Gaia—as an authoritative and reliable king and father.

Zeus is the last one in his lineage to grow to manhood in the absence of a father. He learns, as Muellner puts it, 'metonymically' from the errors of his male forebears (Muellner 1996: 52-93). When, at puberty, he returns to the plains of Thessaly, he challenges Kronos's power in a ten-year struggle that has several phases.¹⁵ Once he is vanquished in the Titanomachy and is relegated to Tartaros with the other Titans, Kronos has no possibility of remaining king, no legitimate claim to kingship. Moreover, he can never re-claim Gaia's once cherished allegiance.

Kronos's absence from the upper world puts Zeus, for the second time, in the same fatherless position as his two male precursors. Who will save him from a tyrant's lawlessness and unbridled desire? This is one fundamental problem in the *Theogony*: can anyone limit the power of the victorious son? The cosmos seems to *require* an answer to this question before there can be cosmic stability. One answer is to 'andro-

¹⁴ Though the pronoun ὄσσοι at *Theog.* 154-56 could refer to all the children, it more likely designates only the children who are most dreaded: Kronos, the Cyclopes, and the Hundred-Handers (ὄσσοι γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο, | δεινότατοι παίδων, σφετέρῳ δ' ἤχθοντο τοκῆϊ | ἐξ ἀρχῆς).

¹⁵ Mondt 1984 sees the poem as combining the individual *aristeia* of Zeus against Typhaon with the communal battle between two generations in the Titanomachy.

gynize' Zeus, turning him into μητίετα Ζεύς. In a way, Zeus limits his own power whenever he enters into an agreement with other deities, many of which belong to earlier generations (e.g. Styx and her children, Hecate, the Hundred-Handers, the Cyclopes). In this way, Zeus shares with them power and honors, and at the same time secures everyone's compliance with his rule.

Hesiod's poem excludes the focalization of nearly all of Zeus's adversaries, from Kronos to the unborn son.¹⁶ It is pointedly silent as to how Kronos views his serial regurgitation of his Olympian offspring, his defeat in the Titanomachy, and his subsequent exile to Tartaros with his Titan allies, where he is imprisoned under the surveillance of the Hundred-Handers. It never represents Typhaon's view, much less that of the unborn son. As we shall see, the *Theogony* does not exclude but in fact features Gaia's changing perspective on Zeus.

*

GAIA'S STORY

Gaia's eventual endorsement is an additional, yet crucial, indicator of Zeus's fitness for the role of kingship. She is indeed 'kingmaker among the gods and orchestrator of succession' in the *Theogony* (Clay 27), but in what ways? To understand Gaia's motivations as a major character, I shall track her story as it unfolds, examining Zeus's accession to kingship as focalized by Gaia. Gaia perceives her male partner as someone who will tame her unbridled female exuberance, which expresses itself in the production of unruly, often monstrous offspring and in her frequent epithet, (Γαῖα) πελώρη. As an efficacious and deliberate planner, she seeks and highly values the everlasting stability of her domain, the earth, and, more broadly, of the entire cosmos. Her expectation that a partner will assure that stability explains why, after Ouranos enrages her, she champions a series of male figures who serially disappoint her and why the ecological effects of the Titanomachy push her to give birth to Typhaon.

An early passage describing Gaia when she comes into being illuminates her association with terrestrial stability, an association assigned to

¹⁶ Prometheus is an exception: the text assigns him direct discourse, wherein he expresses his perspective on Zeus's aggressive acts.

her proleptically at birth and one that she will grow into as time moves forward (see p. 76 below):

A. 116-19

ἦ τοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένητ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
 Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ,¹⁷
 ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,
 Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῶ χθονὸς εὐρουοδείης ...

Chaos, you know, first of all came into being, but next
**broad-breasted Earth the ever-unshakable seat of all
 the immortals, who hold the peaks of snowy Olympus,**
 and murky Tartaros in the recesses of the broad-pathed earth

Here Gaia is what she will be in her final state, at the end of the narrative, after Zeus's victory, namely, the ever-unshakable seat for all the gods. The use of πάντων resonates with the frequent association of Gaia with πᾶς-compounds, as in the opening lines of her *Homeric Hymn* (XXX):

γαῖαν παμμήτειραν αἰείσομαι, ἠυθέμεθλον,
 πρεσβίστην, ἣ φέρβει ἐπὶ χθονὶ πάνθ' ὀπόσ' ἐστίν,
 ἠμὲν ὅσα χθόνα διὰν ἐπέρχεται ἡδ' ὅσα πόντον
 ἡδ' ὅσα πωτῶνται, τάδε φέρβεται ἐκ σέθεν ὄλβου.

Earth I shall sing, **mother of all**, deep-rooted
 oldest, who nourishes **all** that exists on the earth,
 whatever goes upon the shining land, whatever moves in the sea,
 whatever flies, all these are nourished by your bounty.

Tr. Shelmerdine (adapted)

Shortly after she emerges, Gaia deliberately produces Ouranos equal to herself. Her purpose is two-fold:

¹⁷ Cf. West 1966 ad loc. for the possibility that 118 (ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου, 'of all the immortals who possess the peaks of snowy Olympus'), which was unknown to Plato and Aristotle, is spurious. Whether we atheticize 118 as spurious or simply follow West in taking Τάρταρα as a neuter plural nominative and thus as the third natural entity to come into being, we need not read any discrepancy between the gods for whom Gaia is an ever-unshakable seat and the blessed gods of 126-28. For a different reading of the gods in 118-19, see Judet de La Combe 2010: 178.

B. 126-28

Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγένετο ἴσον ἑαυτῇ
 Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ', ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα ἔργοι,¹⁸
 (first purpose clause)

ὄφρ' εἴη μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἔδος ἀσφαλῆς αἰεὶ.
 (second purpose clause)

Gaia first produced, equal to herself,
 starry Sky (Ouranos), that he might delimit her round on all sides,
 (first)

so that the blessed gods might have an ever-unshakable seat.
 (one translation)

or:

so that she might be an ever-unshakable seat for the blessed gods.
 (alternative translation)

The subject of the optative εἴη in the second purpose clause of passage B is left open. Scholars have translated it variously, most as Ouranos, a few as Gaia. Those who choose Ouranos have to explain the discrepancy between designating Ouranos as the 'ever-unshakable seat/ of all ...' eleven lines after using the same formula, in the same metrical position, for broad-breasted Gaia (117). Those few who choose Gaia as the subject of εἴη have to justify a change of subject from the first to the second purpose clause, which some see as impossible.¹⁹

The issues are admirably set forth in Judet de La Combe's 2010 essay dedicated to these two passages of the *Theogony*. Despite the ingenuity of his arguments for a continuity of subject, the parallels he cites from Homeric epic do not bolster his position, and in the end I find myself

¹⁸ Although both optative verbs make sense, I join Clay 2003: 15, n. 11, Solmsen 1954 and others in preferring *πάσαν ἔργοι over πάντα καλύπτοι*. Contra: Most 2006 ad loc.

¹⁹ Judet de La Combe 2010: 171 bases his choice of Ouranos on formulaic comparisons (171) and on the application of the same localized formula to Olympos (*Od.* 6.41-46). The passages he cites on continuity of subject in consecutive purpose clauses—specifically, *Il.* 3.163-66 (Priam addressing Helen) and *Il.* 15.31-32 (Zeus addressing Hera)—do not support his position: in both purpose clauses a speaker addresses a 'you' who is co-present. Under such circumstances, continuity of subject would be natural. In our passage B, however, both verbs are 3rd person singular, so that discontinuity is more natural, or at least more acceptable. Moreover, Judet de La Combe's examples of ἵνα in proximity to ὄφρα are not formulaic in any strict or even liberal sense. On criteria for identifying and classifying Homeric formulae, see espec. Russo 2011.

unconvinced. For one thing, he uses the elaborate description of Mt. Olympus in *Od.* 6.41-46 as an argument for the appropriateness of applying ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ to Ouranos in 128:

ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὡς εἰποῦσ' ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
 Οὐλυμπόνδ', ὅθι φασι θεῶν ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
 ἔμμεναι. οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρω
 δεύεται οὔτε χιῶν ἐπιπίλναται ...

So speaking, the grey-eyed Athene went up to Olympus, where they say is the ever-unshakable seat of the gods. Neither is it shaken by winds nor ever is it dampened by rain Nor does snow fall upon it ... (*Od.* 6.41-44)

The passage vividly depicts the steadfast endurance of Mt. Olympus by making it impervious to the elements (winds, rain, snow). But Olympus is not Ouranos, despite their occasional confusion in Homeric epic.²⁰ The other passages Judet de La Combe cites simply call Olympus the seat (ἔδος) of the gods without ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ and without elaboration. I conclude that taking Ouranos/*ouranos* as the subject of εἶη in 128 has no support from Homeric passages.²¹

Two alternatives to this common reading of the second purpose clause (128) are appealing. Either works as the ground for my interpretation of Gaia's partnership with Zeus, and in fact I welcome both, together. The first opts for an impersonal construction, while the second makes Gaia the subject of εἶη.²²

1) εἰμί + the dative μακάρεσσι θεοῖς²³

This usage is attested in Homeric epic, e.g. at *Od.* 4.583-84, where ἴν' introduces a purpose clause:

²⁰ Purves 2011 provides an overview of the depiction of Olympus in Homer, most commonly as a mountain and at times conflated with Ouranos; she draws on Sale 1984. See also West 1966 ad loc. In Hesiod, Olympus is often a snowy mountain, occasionally collocated and thus paired with Ouranos but not identical with it.

²¹ West 1966 ad loc. favors taking Ouranos as subject, but does not make a strong case.

²² This was proposed by Welcker 1865: 113 in his edition of the *Theogony*. Most 2006 takes Gaia as the subject of εἶη and translates accordingly.

²³ Cf. Smyth 1476 on the dative of possession with εἰμί as a special case of dative of interest.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατέπαυσα θεῶν χόλον αἰὲν ἑόντων,
 χεῦ Ἄγαμέμνονι τύμβον, ἵν' ἄσβεστον κλέος εἶη.

But when I had stopped the anger of the gods who exist forever,
 he poured a tomb for Agamemnon, so that *he* might have
 undying glory.

We can then translate the controversial second purpose clause in Passage B as follows: 'so that the blessed gods might have an ever-unshakable seat.'

2) Gaia as the subject of εἶη

The second alternative is to take the main verb, ἐγείνατο (126), with Gaia as its subject, as introducing both sequential clauses. The second, after ὄφρ', provides a fuller explanation for why Gaia gave birth to Ouranos. If Gaia is the subject of εἶη, the translation is: 'so that she might be an ever-unshakable seat for the blessed gods.' By Gaia's reckoning, such unshakability *requires* a male partner who will not only delimit and restrain her but also use planning and cunning to prevent future ecological calamities, which would undermine terrestrial (as well as cosmic) stability.

My foray into the interpretation of Passage B leads me to conclude that Hesiod has chosen to leave the subject of εἶη open. In both readings ('so that there may be...' and 'so that she may be...'), Gaia (as a mythological figure pre-dating the poem, or as the poem fashions her) has the utmost concern for terrestrial and hence cosmic sustainability.

Curiously, a passage from the *Cypria*, quoted by the A and D scholia on Homer *Il.* 1.5 as evidence for the last of three interpretations of Διὸς βουλή ('the plan of Zeus'), attests to Zeus's allegiance to Gaia as a reason for planning the Trojan War, an event that occurs much later in mythological chronology:

There was [a time] when countless races on earth were wandering
 [...] the expanse of deep-breasted earth (αἴης).
 And Zeus took pity when he saw it, and in his shrewd mind
 he decided †to relieve earth (παμβώτορα γαῖαν) of men,
 [namely,] to fan the great strife of the Trojan war
 in order to empty the burden of death. And the heroes in Troy
 were being killed, and the plan of Zeus was being accomplished.²⁴

²⁴ The myth appears in Stasinus, the author of the *Cypria* (fr. 1 Bernabé = fr. 1 West). The scholia equate the plan of Zeus to the plan of Thetis, saying:

Zeus's attempt to relieve Gaia's distress at the burden of over-population underscores his ongoing concern for her well-being, long after the cosmogonic struggles are resolved.

Gaia's intrinsic desire for the blessed gods to have, or for her to be an ever-unshakable seat makes her the central figure of a Gaia story, which we can reconstruct by gathering her scattered actions and plans into a cohesive narrative that is intricately intertwined with the story of the ascendancy of Zeus. Tracking the Gaia story helps us answer the familiar question: what distinguishes Zeus from his predecessors Kronos and Ouranos and from potential successors, in particular, Typhaon and Metis's unborn son.

Gaia's pivotal role as 'kingmaker among the gods and orchestrator of succession' requires purposefulness and diplomacy.²⁵ I focus on (1) her rationale for desiring a male partner, (2) her changing perspective on candidates for that position, and (3) her final decision to champion and align herself with Zeus. I give much weight to the explanation, in the second purpose clause, as to why she produced Ouranos equal to herself, and to the fact that she is broad-breasted and stable from the moment she appears (117: Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεῖ).

Gaia's plans emerge at critical moments in the narrative, to be eventually complemented (and in a way supplanted) by Metis's plans, which are to become, in time, the plans of μητίετα Ζεύς.²⁶ First, Gaia contrives (160: ἐπεφράσσατο) an evil deceit in retribution for Ouranos's evil deed, the repeated hiding in the Earth of (all or some of) their children, a deed in which he delights but which causes her to groan:

... ἦ δ' ἐντὸς στοναχίζετο Γαῖα πελώρη
 στεινομένη· δολίην δὲ κακὴν ἐπεφράσσατο τέχνην.
 αἴψα δὲ ποιήσασα γένος πολιοῦ ἀδάμαντος
 τεῦξε μέγα δρέπανον καὶ ἐπέφραδε παισὶ φίλοισιν. (159-62)

These are the stories about the plan of Zeus found in the later poets. But we say, in agreement with the opinion of Aristarchus and Aristophanes, that it is the plan of Thetis, who, [Homer] says below (1.508), begged Zeus to avenge the dishonor of her son, as the summary establishes in the beginning of the poem.

(Thanks to William R. Beck, private communication, for permission to use his unpublished translation of these passages.)

²⁵ Cf. Robert 1905, reprinted in Heitsch 1966: 180-93.

²⁶ For Scully 2015: 33, the quality of *metis* changes as the universe evolves, so that Zeus's *metis*, unlike Kronos's, will be straight rather than crooked.

But huge Earth groaned within, for she was constricted, and she devised a tricky, evil stratagem. At once she created an offspring of gray adamant, and she fashioned a big sickle and showed it to her own children.

Next, in response to Kronos's sequential swallowing of their grandchildren and to Rhea's anguished plea for help, Gaia and Ouranos devise another intricate plan (471: μήτιν συμφράσσασθαι).²⁷ Here Gaia joins Ouranos in turning against their youngest son, even though Kronos had once been her hero. They advise Rhea to give Kronos a great stone, wrapped in swaddling clothes (485-86), to swallow in place of the infant Zeus. Kronos, deceived by Gaia's very clever suggestions (494: πολυφραδέεσσι), swallows the emetic stone and, in the course of the year (493: ἐπιπλομένων δ' ἐνιαυτῶν—i.e. after a nine-month gestation) he regurgitates all of his children, in reverse order, making Zeus (who, alone of his siblings, has escaped Kronos's swallowing at birth), symbolically, the first-born. Rhea then transports her child, unnoticed, to Crete, where Gaia receives him, hides him in a cave in the earth,²⁸ and raises him to manhood.

When Zeus returns from Crete at the peak of youth, he initiates an intergenerational war, the Titanomachy. The Kronos-led Titans and the Zeus-led Olympians are locked in a stalemate until Zeus, by Gaia's commands (626: Γαίης φραδμοσύνησιν²⁹), releases the Hundred-Handers from their prison in Tartaros and persuades them to join the Olympian cause. With the help of these powerful hybrid creatures, designated earlier as δεινότατοι παιδῶν (155), the Olympians vanquish the Titans and imprison them within Tartaros, for their new allies to guard. Although Zeus used violent forces to win the battle, adding monstrosity to his team's effort, he somehow escaped becoming monstrous himself!

²⁷ Rhea wants to punish Kronos not only for swallowing their children as each was born, but also for his earlier castration of their father (471-73).

²⁸ The description of the cave as 'beneath the crevices of sacred earth' (484: ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης) invokes Gaia's domain.

²⁹ Cf. the isometric formula of 884: Γαίης φραδμοσύνησιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν.

In its second phase, beginning at 670, the war suddenly becomes ecologically menacing, in a manner clearly unanticipated by Gaia when she recommended that Zeus secure the Hundred-Handers as his allies.

...ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα φερέσβιος ἔσμαράγιζε
 καιομένη, λάκε δ' ἀμφὶ πυρὶ μεγάλ' ἄσπετος ὕλη.
 ἔξεε δὲ χθῶν πᾶσα καὶ Ὀκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα
 πόντος τ' ἀτρύγετος.

All around, the whole **earth** (γαῖα) **roared** as it burned,
 and all around the great immense forest **crackled**;
 the **whole earth** (χθῶν) **boiled**, and the streams of Ocean
 and the barren sea. (693-96)

The poem presents this devastation in searing detail, with an emphasis on sounds and, in a simile, on the collapse of Earth and Sky into an earlier, undifferentiated state:³⁰

καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν Χάος; εἶσατο δ' ἄντα
 ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν ἠδ' οὔασι ὄσσαν ἀκοῦσαι
 αὐτως, ὡς εἰ Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρύς ὕπερθε
 πίλνατο· τοῖος γάρ κε μέγας ὑπὸ δοῦπος ὀρώρει
 τῆς μὲν ἐρειπομένης, τοῦ δ' ὑψόθεν ἐξεριπόντος·
 τόσσοις δοῦπος ἔγεντο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων.

A prodigious conflagration took possession of Chasm; and
 to look upon it with eyes and to hear its sound with ears, it seemed
 just as when Earth and broad Sky approached
 from above: for this was the kind of great sound that would rise up
 as she was pressed down and as he pressed her down from on high—
 so great a sound was produced as the gods ran together in strife.
 (700-05)

³⁰ On the difficult simile at 702-705, cf. Most 2006: 59, n. 38, who sees the simile as an analogy 'not to some cataclysmic collapse of the sky onto the earth, but instead to the primordial sexual union between Sky and Earth'.

The intergenerational violence undermines cosmic stability in the Sky, the Sea, and the Ocean and causes the earth again to roar in anguish. Gaiā's response to the prolonged war echoes her earlier distress at Ouranos's evil deed of keeping their children within her womb (cf. 159: *στοναχίζετο Γαῖα πελώρη*);³¹ but now the distress is on a larger scale. Even though Zeus initiated the Titanomachy following her command, his execution of the war has undermined Gaiā's confidence in him. And so she turns against Zeus as she had earlier against Kronos.

At this stage, Gaiā's reaction is less entirely personal, less tied to her own domain, though the conflagration of γαῖα and the boiling of χθών contribute to her distress. She has evolved to become a guardian of cosmic stability! She is enraged not only at the assault on the earth but also at the reversal of the evolution of the cosmos, as indicated in the simile quoted above, 'as if Earth and wide Heaven above were colliding.'

Precisely this new desperation motivates Gaia to produce Typhaon as the next potential king over a tumultuous cosmos. In answer to a Titanomachy that spirals out of control, Gaia exercises her only weapon, her reproductive power. In union with Tartaros she gives birth to her youngest and last offspring—the monstrous Typhaon. This demonic figure from the underworld, a hybrid designated as 'youngest' and as 'most dreaded of the children,' is prophesied to one day become king of the gods:

καί νύ κεν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἀμήχανον ἤματι κείνῳ
καί κεν ὃ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἄναξεν,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὄξυ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

³¹ In similar language huge earth groans when Typhaon falls to the ground:

ποσσί δ' ὑπ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγας πελεμίζετ' Ὀλυμπος
ὄρνυμένοιο ἄνακτος: ἐπεστενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.

Great Olympos was shaken beneath the immortal feet
of the charging lord, and the earth groaned in response. (842-43)

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ μιν δάμασεν πληγῆσιν ἰμάσσας,
ἦριπε γυιωθεῖς, στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη.

But when Zeus had defeated him and lashed him with strokes,
maimed, he was hurled down, and huge earth groaned. (857-58)

Each of the three moments of Gaia groaning indicates her immediate bodily reaction to an ecological affront, to be followed by a new course of action.

And on that very day an intractable deed would have been accomplished, and he would have ruled over mortals and immortals, if the father of men and of gods had not taken sharp notice.

(836-38)

In choosing to mate with Tartaros and to give birth to Typhaon, Gaia is retaliating for the devastation from the Titanomachy.³² Typhaon combines the roles of potential usurper with monster-to-be-overcome. Her decision to bear him indicates that her confidence in Zeus has reached a nadir; or perhaps (it is hard to tell) she is giving Zeus one last chance to prove that he does deserve her approval.

Zeus's victory over Typhaon, in a battle with ecological repercussions reminiscent of the impact of the Titanomachy, puts an end to Gaia's production of monstrous offspring and thus curtails her indiscriminate and destabilizing birthing. He not only completes his own *aristeia* in his heroic defeat of Typhaon in one-to-one combat; he also eliminates Gaia's propensity, or perhaps her will, to procreate irresponsibly ever again. Moreover, his treatment of Typhaon replicates what Ouranos did to the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers, but instead of regarding it as an evil thing, the poem treats it as heroic.

Although the devastation of the earth during the Titanomachy is echoed and even elaborated in the Typhonomachy (853-68), Zeus's defeat of Typhaon has an altogether different effect on Gaia: she (mysteriously) resumes her support of him. Granted, both of these sequential conflagrations destabilize Gaia/γαῖα/χθών, so that she is not, or there is not, an 'ever-unshakable seat'. Nonetheless, when Zeus eliminates the last serious contender for the throne, his victory *changes* Gaia, who from now on gives him unqualified, unwavering support. Although Gaia, unlike Tiamat, survives with her body intact, she sacrifices her procreative function when she supports Zeus's assumption of the kingship.³³ And as Zeus begins to restore cosmic

³² Blaise 1992 argues against taking the Typhaon episode as spurious. Instead, he sees the coupling of Gaia and Tartaros through golden Aphrodite (821-22) as germane to the foremost theme of the *Theogony*, since the episode provides an opportunity for integrating the alterity of Tartaros, an entity not produced by Gaia, into the new cosmic order.

³³ Gaia's survival as an entity in the *Theogony* (and in Greek mythology in general) is in stark contrast to her counterpart, Tiamat. Both primordial females give birth to unruly or noisy offspring; both are eventually supplanted by a young male ruler (Zeus, Marduk). But whereas Marduk, once he defeats Tiamat, splits her into two parts and renders her inert, Zeus does no such thing to Gaia. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Hera, and not Gaia, gives birth to dreaded Typhaon as a plague

order, he is fulfilling the very role that she once envisioned for Ouranos.

The defeat of Typhaon, when focalized by Gaia, tames her unpredictable side, something she herself intended from the start. By subsequently endorsing Zeus's kingship (884-85), Gaia selects him (over Ouranos, Kronos, and Typhaon) as the one who will fulfill the second purpose clause of 128. Only he is up to that task.

In the *Theogony* and other archaic texts, *πελώριος* or *πελώρη*, 'monstrous', 'huge' (LSJ), is a frequent epithet for Gaia/*gaia* and for the chthonic hybrids she produces or with whom she associates.³⁴ Epithet + noun often occur at line end in the nominative (159, 173, 479, 821, 858), thrice in the nominative in other line-positions (505, 731, 861), and once in the genitive singular (731: *πελώρης ἔσχατα γαίης*). It appears once as a noun, *πέλωρον*, referring to Typhaon (856: *ἔπρεσε θεσπεσίας κεφαλὰς δεινοῖο πελώρου*, 'he burned all the dreaded monster's unspeakable heads'). At 179 the epithet is transferred from Gaia to her implement for castrating Ouranos: *δεξιτερῇ δὲ πελώριον ἔλλαβεν ἄρπην*. It is also used to describe serpents and other monsters (e.g. 295, 299, 845)³⁵ and is especially prominent in the episode of the Typhaonomachy, with three occurrences: 821, 858, and 861. These are the last instances of *Γαῖα* (or *γαῖα*) *πελώρη*.³⁶

to men, after praying to the Titans in Tartaros and lashing the earth with a strong hand (*Hymn Ap.* 334-52). Hera is punishing Zeus for giving birth to Athena apart from her, after her partheno-genetic birth of the cripple Hephaistos.

For comparisons between the two creation epics, and in particular between Gaia and Tiamat, the primordial mother in the Babylonian creation epic, *Enuma Elish*, see (West 1966) 25-30 and 379-83, Penglase 1994: 103-104 and 189-90, Walcot 1966: 27-54, Watkins 1995: 448-59 and Scully 2015: 55-63.

³⁴ Lamberton 1988: 72-73 calls the characteristically Hesiodic epithet *pelōr* 'the key to the characterization of Gaia'. It tends to describe gaia when a personified Earth is implied—in roughly one fifth of the instances. 'Aside from Gaia, adjectival forms describe the snake portion of Ekhidna and the sickle used to castrate Ouranos.' In Homer and in Hesiod, according to Lamberton, *pelōr* and its derivatives straddle several semantic fields largely distinct in English: 'that which is pelorios may be simply "huge" or it may be properly "monstrous" or again "prodigious". ... In Hesiod ... the pelor group is never used for things that are simply large.'

³⁵ Cf. Blaise 1992, Ballabriga 1990, and Clay 1993 on Gaia's motivation for giving birth to Typhaon. Most 2006 argues that the birth gives Zeus a chance at individual *aristeia*. From Gaia's perspective, only disappointment with her protégé Zeus would motivate her to sleep with Tartaros and engender such a monstrous rival for the throne as Typhaon.

³⁶ Gaia is prophetic in part because of her huge size, which suggests her ready presence at events. Yet as a character in story-time, she has limited foresight. Cf. Felson 2004 and 2009 on the limits of Apollo's foresight in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian*, where Chiron is amused at the innocence of the god of prophecy, and also in the *Hymn Ap.*, where Apollo is situated within story-time.

Was Gaia 'aware' of the monstrous tendencies in herself that needed a male figure in order that she might be an ever-unshakable seat, or that there might be such a seat? Did she produce Typhaon, the quintessential monster, after lying in love with Tartaros *in order that* he would rule over mortals and immortals (837: καὶ κεν ὁ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀναξεν), or was this birth purely an act of vengeance against Zeus? Did she want to undermine Zeus, or did she intend to give him a final opportunity to demonstrate his *menos*, energy, and to tame her? These important interpretive questions deserve our consideration even if we find no definitive answers.

Gaia finally accepts Zeus's reign as the best single pathway toward establishing an ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεί for the blessed gods. She understands that he is not δεινότητος παίδων and that his way of vanquishing or disarming his opponents is unique. E.g. he allows for the stormy winds to be released when he defeats and relocates Typhaon, whom he thus contains but does not fully obliterate, in contrast to Kronos and Ouranos, who do obliterate certain of their adversarial offspring. After his election, Gaia again gives Zeus counsel; as a result, he swallows the pregnant Metis but allows Athena to be born even while obstructing the conception of the menacing, unruly son. Gaia favors Zeus's new kind of justice.

In the Titanomachy and again in the Typhonomachy, Zeus comes close to wreaking permanent (ecological) havoc on earth, but in the end, Gaia remains alive and participatory, though stripped (it seems) of her reproductive powers once Zeus defeats Typhaon. Ultimately, Gaia is stabilized with boundaries and borders set by Zeus. Her position as counselor is supplanted by Metis, the other great 'planner' and 'deviser', and her granddaughter through her Titan mother, Tethys, and Titan father, Oceanos. Like Gaia, Metis is not 'dispatched' and made inert: she becomes part of the living, breathing cosmos, yet is contained (in her case, literally) within Zeus's body. And Gaia herself, unlike Babylonian Tiamat, becomes the permanent champion of order: not only did she participate in the evolving cosmos all along; it is she who makes the decisive move toward electing Zeus as king. Her steady and reliable support of Zeus's kingship can only happen after Zeus has eliminated her last and perhaps most violent offspring, the monstrous Typhaon.

Gaia, then, drives the narrative of the Succession Myth in Hesiod's *Theogony*. As a major character, she evolves in tandem with Zeus, whose reliable champion she eventually becomes. Gaia grows into the role that the poem assigns her (proleptically) at birth:

ἦ τοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένητ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
 Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
 ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,
 Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῶ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης ...

In truth, first of all Chasm came into being, but next
 broad-breasted Earth, the ever-unshakable seat of
the immortals, who hold the peaks of snowy Olympus,
 and murky Tartaros in the recesses of the broad-pathed earth ...
 (116-19)

Gaia has two distinct yet conflicting dispositions or tendencies: on the one hand, she is unpredictable and vindictive, and has a propensity for producing unruly offspring from her womb; on the other, she craves stability and is an advocate for the ordering of the universe. Lines 126-28 identify Gaia's desire for *stability* as the fundamental motivation for her earliest procreative act and for her later advocacies. This value motivates her production of Ouranos equal to herself (126-28) in her first attempt to achieve cosmic stability, which she does believe she can provide only with a male partner. In the end, Zeus is the god who will fill the role that Gaia originally intended for Ouranos. Zeus, in other words, will become Gaia's final 'partner'.

CONCLUSION

As a character in story-time, Gaia is not clairvoyant, despite her well-attested prophetic powers.³⁷ Thus, the series of male descendants that she champions repeatedly disappoint her. Finally, at 884, confident at last of his ability to keep the world, and her domain, secure and safe, she endorses the evolved Zeus. To mark Gaia's serial advocacies, culminating in the support of Zeus, Hesiod employs the formula 'by the plans of Gaia' (Γαίης φραδομοσύνησιν). The recurrence of such a phrase indicates her agency, which is reinforced by her primacy at the beginning of cosmogony and by her identification as, and her deliberate quest for there to be, a ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ. Indeed, only with Zeus at the helm can Gaia fulfill her destiny: to become what she was called at birth (118).

³⁷ Gaia and her female descendants together comprise a female presence in the evolved cosmos, as Arthur (Katz) 1983 points out in her analysis of the metonymic relations between female entities, in contrast to the metaphoric relations for male gods. In general, goddesses interact cooperatively rather than competitively and tend to accept Zeus-rule, with occasional resistance.

Zeus in his quest for a sustainable kingship over gods and men needs Gaia's wholehearted and irreversible support and secures it once he defeats Typhaon. She has come to recognize that he alone among the male figures in her lineage can contain her unruliness (embodied by Typhaon) and thus bring about a permanently stable seat for the blessed Olympian gods.

The poem is dedicated to supporting Zeus over his predecessors and potential displacers; it also supports male dominance over female rule. Within the constraints from both of these explicit concerns, Hesiod keeps Gaia in play as a partner to Zeus, a seat of prophetic wisdom for others, and an ancestress of Metis, who, as 'Cunning Strategist', manifests some of her grandmother's traits and indeed freely imparts to Zeus the clever counsel she 'inherited' from her grandmother. Once Zeus swallows her, he incorporates her traits into his expanded, in some sense androgynous self. Curiously, Zeus's swallowing of Metis affirms Gaia rather than offending and outraging her. Moreover, there is enough room in the cosmos for an evolved Gaia, who will produce no more monsters or hybrids, to co-exist with an evolved and androgynous Zeus.³⁸

M. Arthur (Katz)'s analysis of the metonymic relation between female entities, in contrast to the metaphoric relation for male gods, creates space for the coexistence of Zeus with an evolved Gaia, who will produce no more monsters or hybrids to undermine cosmic stability and will enjoy her own function as adviser transferred to (or at least shared with) Metis.³⁹

Gaia's active and deliberate approval of Zeus and the advice she offers him along his path to power are by no means incidental or tangential. Her advice reaches its full and final expression once Zeus swallows, and thus incorporates into his expanded, in some sense androgynous body, Metis, an entity who 'inherits' clever counsel from her grandmother.

Typhaon's defeat changes Gaia, as if a violent part of her selfhood has been expunged. From an unpredictable producer of fearsome monsters, she becomes the catalyst for Zeus's kingship. Her newly *reliable* advocacy of Zeus becomes institutionalized when all the Olympians urge Zeus to rule over the immortals by her plans (884-85). Those who would have opposed her counsel to enthrone him have already been banished to Tartaros, indefinitely bound and restricted, and in some cases even assigned tasks to keep them out of trouble. At this point, the community of gods on Mt.

³⁸ On the offspring (Athena and her unborn brother) of Zeus and Metis as potential disrupters of order, see Felson 2011.

Olympos coalesces; Zeus, who had earlier engaged in a reciprocal exchange with the Cyclopes, continues to use his cunning and his persuasive skills to attain stability, and continues to rely (as μητίετα Ζεύς) on the permanently incorporated, Gaia-like Metis. Zeus's ascendancy was not the only possible outcome of the Succession Story, even though the time frame guaranteed such an outcome. Indications of the possibility that he could be overthrown in turn appear, often as counterfactuals, up to the point when, by the plans of Gaia, the gods elect Zeus their king. By that time, the cosmic order is relatively fixed and relatively unshakable.

In conclusion, Hesiod, the narrative voice of the *Theogony*, channeling the song of the Muses,³⁹ endorses Gaiā's assessment of Zeus as a leader who differs in kind from his male predecessors and who is the only one capable of sustaining an ever-unshakable foundation for gods and (implicitly) for men and the entire cosmos. Zeus, having matured, has the power, the physical strength, and the intelligence and cunning not to overstep his bounds by abusing his power and thus violating what Gaia, having evolved, considers most sacred. Gaia traditions antedated Hesiod's refashioning of her in his poem celebrating Zeus. Quite possibly, what I am detecting through this focus on Gaiā's story and Gaiā's motivations is a *surplus* that survives Hesiod's refashioning efforts. It is as if Hesiod, so male-centered, so allegiant to Zeus-rule and to the transfer of political power from old to new, from female to male, from raw and primitive and violent to sophisticated and political, makes a concession to Gaia, leaving traces of her agency in Zeus's rise to kingship. Through the deliberateness of the double purpose clauses of 126-28 in conjunction with φραδ-language, Hesiod's *Theogony* gives us a Gaia whose commitment to sustainability endures through time.

³⁹ On the poet's self-presentation as a 'uniquely gifted poet, with a special relationship with the Muses', see Solmsen 1954: 1-16.

References

- Arthur (Katz), M. 1983. 'The Dream of a World without Women: Poetics and the Circles of Order in the *Theogony* Proem', *Arethusa* 16 (1): 97-116.
- Ballabriga, A. 1990. 'Le dernier adversaire de Zeus: Le mythe de Typhon dans l'épopée grecque archaïque', *RHR* 207: 3-30.
- Blaise, F. 1992. 'L'épisode de Typhée dans La Théogone d'Hésiode (v. 820-855): la stabilisation du monde', *REG* 105: 349-70.
- Brown, N. 1953. *Theogony*. 1st ed. New York and London.
- Chantraine, P. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Paris.
- Clay, J. S. 1993. 'The Generation of Monsters in Hesiod', *CP* 88: 105-16.
- Clay, J. S. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge and New York.
- Felson, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton.
- Felson, N. 2004. 'The Poetic Effects of Deixis in Pindar's Ninth *Pythian* Ode', *Arethusa* 37: 365-89.
- Felson, N. 2009. 'Epiniacian Apollo in Story Time: *Pythian* 9, *Olympian* 6 and *Pythian* 3', in L. Athanassaki, V. Karasmanis, R. Martin and J. Miller, eds. *Apolline Politics and Poetics*. Athens. 149-68.
- Felson, N. 2011. 'Children of Zeus in the Homeric Hymns: Generational Succession', in A. Faulkner, ed., *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford. 257-83.
- Heitsch, E., ed. 1966. *Hesiod (Wege der Forschung 44)*. Darmstadt.
- Judet de LaCombe, P. 2010. 'Hesiod, *Th.* 117 and 128: Formula and the Text's Temporality', in P. Mitsis and C. Tsagalis, eds., *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis*. Berlin. 169-85.
- Lamberton, R. 1988. *Hesiod*. New Haven and London.
- Mondi, R. 1984. 'The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*'. *GRBS* 25: 325-44.
- Most, G. W. 2006. *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Muellner, L. 1996. *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca and London.
- Penglass, C. 1994. *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influences in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod*. London.

- Pucci, P. 1992. *Oedipus and the Fabrication of the Father: Oedipus Tyrannus in Modern Criticism and Philosophy*. Baltimore.
- Purves, A. C. 2011. 'Olympos', in M. Finkelberg, ed. *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Oxford. 600-601.
- Robert, C. 1905. 'Zu Hesiods Theogonie', in *Mélanges Nicole. Recueil de mémoires de philologie classique et d'archéologie offerts à Jules Nicole, professeur à l'Université de Genève, à l'occasion du XXXe anniversaire de son professorat*. Geneva. 153-74.
- Russo, J. 2011. 'Formula', in M. Finkelberg, ed. *The Homer Encyclopedia I*. Malden, Mass. 296-98.
- Sale, W. M. 1984. 'Homeric Olympus and its Formulae', *AJP* 105.1: 1-28.
- Scully, S. 2015. *Hesiod's Theogony: From Near Eastern Creation Myths to Paradise Lost*. Oxford.
- Shelmerdine, S. 1995. *The Homeric Hymns*. Newburyport, Mass.
- Solmsen, F. 1954. 'The Gift of Speech in Homer and Hesiod', *TAPA* 85: 1-15.
- Walcot, P. 1966. *Hesiod and the Near East*. Cardiff.
- Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford.
- Welcker, F. G. 1865. *Die Hesiodische Theogonie*. Elberfeld.
- West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.