

Typhoeus and Etna in Hesiod, Pindar, and (Pseudo-)Aeschylus

Bruno Currie

University of Oxford, UK

Abstract This paper discusses the suspected reading τᾱιδνῆς in Hes. *Theog.* 860 and proposes the emendation οὐρεος ἐν βήσσης, <ε>ἰν Αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση. The interpretative consequences of thus introducing into the text a reference to Mount Etna are then explored. The immediately following passage, ll. 861-867, is reinterpreted in the light of a preceding reference to the Sicilian volcano. Not only Hesiod, but also Homer is argued to have knowledge of volcanism. Hesiod's simple, unelaborated reference to Typhoeus' defeat at Mount Etna implies that the association of Typhoeus with Mount Etna was made by Greeks before Hesiod; it can plausibly be connected to Greek colonising or proto-colonising activity in the eighth century BCE. The Typhonomachy would be only one of several mythological episodes in early Greek hexameter poetry to be localised in the West. Finally, the arguable presence of the Typhoeus-Etna link in Hesiod's *Theogony* significantly increases the likelihood that the closely related descriptions of Typhoeus in passages of Pindar (from *Pyth.* 1, *Pyth.* 8, *Ol.* 4, and *frr.* 92-3 Maehler) and the (Pseudo-)Aeschylean *Prometheus Bound* do not depend on each other, but on a lost early hexameter account of the Typhonomachy (perhaps, but not necessarily, the Cyclical *Titanomachy*) that had attained canonical status by the fifth century BCE. Thus also one popular argument for a late dating of the *Prometheus Bound*, and for its non-Aeschylean authorship, would need to be discarded.

Keywords Hesiod. Typhonomachy. Mount Etna. Volcanism. Sicily. The Greek West. Pindar. Prometheus Bound.

Summary 1 Hes. *Theog.* 860: A Textual Crux. – 2 Immediate Interpretative Consequences. – 3 Wider Interpretative Consequences.



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari

Antichistica 31 | Filologia e letteratura 4

e-ISSN 2610-9344 | ISSN 2610-8828

ISBN [ebook] 978-88-6969-548-3 | ISBN [print] 978-88-6969-549-0

Peer review | Open access

Submitted 2021-05-17 | Accepted 2021-06-23 | Published 2021-12-16

© 2021 | Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution alone

DOI 10.30687/978-88-6969-548-3/004

1 Hes. *Theog.* 860: A Textual Crux

Hesiod's 'Typhonomachy' (*Theog.* 820-880) contains a textual crux at the point where the narrative evidently intended to localise Typhoeus' incineration by Zeus's thunderbolt, line 860:

οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν ταῖδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης

in the glens of the mountain, † [...] rugged.¹

The verse as transmitted in the direct tradition (including already the second-century CE papyrus *PSI* 1086 = Π¹² West) presents an impossible congruence, for αἰδνῆς and παιπαλοέσσης are feminine adjectives, while οὔρεος is a neuter noun. Two remedies have been tried.

(i) For the genitive singulars αἰδνῆς and παιπαλοέσσης, read dative plurals, agreeing with βήσσησιν:

οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν αἰδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης

in the concealed, rugged glens of a/the mountain.

This reading is presupposed in the scholia, who offer the glosses ἀφανέσι, 'out of sight', and τραχείαις, 'rugged', both dative plural, evidently for αἰδνῆς and παιπαλοέσσης respectively.² It is approved by many modern editors and scholars.³ But it is not an ideal solution. The adjective αἰδνός, 'unseen, concealed', is not otherwise found in early Greek epos; its first attestation in hexameter poetry is Ap. Rhod., *Argon.* 1.389.⁴ Moreover, the two adjectives qualifying βήσσησιν weakly furnish vague descriptive details,⁵ when a specific geographical localisation is expected. It would be more natural for the adjective

1 The obelus is due to West 1966, 143. For a defence of the authenticity of *Theog.* 820-80, see Schwabl 1966, 106-23; West 1966, 381-3 (differently, e.g. Solmsen 1982, 11-12; Ballabriga 1990, 23, 28-9). I have normalised the name of Zeus's adversary as 'Typhoeus' (rather than 'Typhon', 'Typhaon', 'Typhos'). It is a great pleasure to dedicate this paper to Willy Cingano, in recognition both of his scholarship (not least, of course, on Hesiod and Pindar) and of his friendship for many years. I am indebted to Jurek Danielewicz for many helpful comments and references.

2 Schol. *Th.* 860, in di Gregorio 1975, 108.

3 e.g. Mazon 1947, 62; Vasta 2004, 58; Most 2006, 72 = 2018, 70 (whose text reads οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν αἰδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης, but the translation indicates that οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν αἰδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης is meant: cf. Debiasi 2008, 80 fn. 19); Stamatorpoulou 2017, 61-3; Ricciardelli 2018, 80; etc. (see Debiasi 2008, 81 fn. 20 for further references).

4 Philipp 1955.

5 Debiasi 2008, 81.

παιπαλόεις to qualify a named mountain, rather than the common noun βῆσσαι.⁶

(ii) For the adjective ἰαῖδνῆς, we may read a feminine noun in the genitive case, in apposition to οὔρεος, specifying the name of the mountain with παιπαλοέσσης in agreement. The reading αἰτνης for αῖδνῆς is attested (though not unequivocally) in the indirect tradition, in two manuscripts of Tzetzes' commentary on Lycoph. *Alex.* 688. Thus, some earlier editors (Flach; Rzach)⁷ read:

οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν Ἀίτνης παιπαλοέσσης

in the glens of the mountain, rugged Etna.

This reading found some support,⁸ and was recently championed by Debiasi.⁹ Its chief difficulty lies in the diaeresis Ἀίτνης, which is otherwise unattested.¹⁰ Lane Fox, following Wilamowitz, proposed reading Ἀῖδνῆς (or perhaps rather Αἶδνης, paroxytone?), seeing Ἀῖδνή (Αἶδνη) as Hesiod's "own attempt to render 'Aitna'", sc. Αἶτνη.¹¹ This is a fanciful way of finding a reference to Etna and it would leave the diaeresis unaccounted for. (Note that the native form putatively encountered by Hesiod or other early Greeks would not have had a diaeresis if Αἶτνη is correctly etymologised as a Sicel name presenting the same Proto-Indo-European root **h₂eid^h-*, 'burn', as is found in Greek αἶθω).¹² West supposed a reference to an otherwise unknown mountain Aitna that was not to be identified with Etna, preferring a location in the Lydian-Mysian-Phrygian *Katakekaumene*.¹³ But so casual a reference by Hesiod to an obscure and unfamiliar mountain seems unlikely.

A specific geographical localisation is desirable, and there is much in favour of seeing not merely an indirect or distorted reference to

⁶ Compare West 1966, 393.

⁷ Flach 1878, 30; Rzach 1902, 106; cf. 1912, 1192.1-31.

⁸ Christ 1888, 355-8; *LSJ* s.v. "παιπαλόεις"; Spoerri 1955, 390.36-37; Dräger 1997, 20, with references in fn. 91.

⁹ Debiasi 2000, 232 fn. 24; 2008, 79-94.

¹⁰ See West 1966, 393.

¹¹ Lane Fox 2008, 366; Wilamowitz 1921, 194 fn. 2; cf. 1922, 225 "Die Typhonepisode der hesiodischen Theogonie [...] [nennt] den Berg Ἀῖδνή [...], also auf eine unklare Kunde des sikelischen Namens [...] hin"; [1931] 1955: i.261. Ballabriga 1990, 22 proposed that we may see in Ἀῖδνή "une sorte de projection mythique de l'Etna/Aitnè". See further Debiasi 2008, 86 fn. 45.

¹² Simkin 2012, 173. For Greek αἶθω, cf. Beekes 2010, i.37.

¹³ West 1988, 70-1, cf. 1966, 383; Marg 1970, 73, 281.

Etna, but also some form of the name Αἴτνη.¹⁴ The cumulative force of the following points is considerable.

1. The epithet παιπαλόεσσα is borne by Etna at ‘Hesiod’ fr. 150.25 M.-W.: [Αἴτν]ην παιπαλόεσσαν. Although the reading is an editorial supplement, it seems to be secured by Eratosthenes’ statement (in Strabo 1.2.14 C23) that Hesiod mentioned Etna and Ortygia; the following line of the papyrus (fr. 150.26 M.-W.) reads [Ο]ρτυγίην.¹⁵ The epithet παιπαλόεσσα is found with various mountainous islands in early Greek epic; it is clearly suitable for Etna.¹⁶
2. Later-attested mythological tradition locates Typhoeus at Etna: notably, Pind. *Pyth.* 1.20, *Ol.* 4.6-7, fr. 92.1-2 M., (Pseudo-)Aesch. *PV* 365. Of course, this is not the only tradition: the *Iliad* situated Typhoeus ‘among the Arimoι’ (or ‘in Arima’; *Il.* 2.783), a tradition known also to the *Theogony* (304-306); and the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield* seems to presuppose a tradition attaching Typhoeus to a Boeotian mountain named ‘Typhaonion’ (*Sc.* 32).¹⁷ We do not know that the link between Typhoeus and Etna goes back as far as (or further than) Hesiod.¹⁸ But in the absence of arguments to the contrary,¹⁹ it is reasonable to prefer one of the attested specific geographical localisations of Typhoeus to an unattested one, or to no specific geographical localisation at all.
3. αἰτνης is an attested variant in the indirect tradition (Tzetzes on Lycoph. *Alex.* 688).
4. αἰδνης is very close to αἰτνης, both palaeographically and acoustically; a corruption would be very easy to explain.²⁰

There is, then, much to be said for reading οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν Ἀίτνης παιπαλόεσσης. The remaining awkwardness is the diaeresis in Αἴτνης.²¹ Comparable prosodic awkwardnesses are tolerable, and if Αἴτνης were the reading of the paradosis, we could simply reconcile ourselves to the prosody by instancing, say, πᾶϊς alongside παῖς,

¹⁴ Differently, e.g. Mazon 1947, 62 fn. 2; Lewis 2020, 155 fn. 53 (a derivative and inaccurate discussion).

¹⁵ Debiasi 2008, 77-9.

¹⁶ Debiasi 2008, 83-4.

¹⁷ See further below for other localisations.

¹⁸ Cf. West 1966, 393.

¹⁹ One argument to the contrary concerns the relative dates of the composition of Hesiod’s *Theogony* and the Greek colonisation of Sicily; see below.

²⁰ See further below.

²¹ Compare the dilemma of Wilamowitz 1921, 194 fn. 2: *quippe Aetnam respici probabile, Αἴτνης ex αἰδνης facere et temerarium est et formam procreat inauditam.*

or Ἀΐδης alongside Ἄιδης.²² Yet it remains problematic to accept an unexampled prosody in an insecurely attested word.

The situation is such as to warrant small-scale textual intervention. The regular prosody of Αἴτνη can be purchased at the acceptable price of a small departure from the paradosis on the following route of emendation.

(iii) For τὰιδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης, read Αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση, and insert ἐν (or an equivalent form) to make a second prepositional phrase in apposition to οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν. We may take our pick of the following emendations, all yielding the meaning, 'in the glens of the mountain, in rugged Etna':

- a. οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, ²³ <ε>ἰν Αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση
- b. οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν, <ἐν> Αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση
- c. οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, Αἴτνη <ἐνι> παιπαλοέσση.

Such doubled prepositional phrases are common in early hexameter poetry: Hes. *Theog.* 971 νεῖϕ ἔνι τριπόλῳ, Κρήτης ἐν πίοιι δῆμῳ, *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 26-7 κранаῖ ἔνι νήσῳ, | Δῆλῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, and *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 280 ἐν καλῇ βήσση, Κηφισίδος ἐγγύθι λίμνης (this last with ἐν [...]) βήσση in the first colon).²⁴ In particular, we should compare the sentential structure of *Theog.* 859-861 with *Theog.* 969-972:

- 1 φλόξ δὲ κεραυνωθέντος ἀπέσσυτο τοῖο ἄνακτος
 - 2 οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, εἰν Αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση,
 - 3 πληγέντος, κτλ.,
- (*Theog.* 859-61)

- 1 Δημήτηρ μὲν Πλοῦτον ἐγείνατο διὰ θεάων,
 - 1a Ἴασίῳ ἥρωι μιγεῖσ' ἐρατῇ φιλότῃ
 - 2 νεῖϕ ἔνι τριπόλῳ, Κρήτης ἐν πίοιι δῆμῳ,
 - 3 ἐσθλόν, κτλ.
- (*Theog.* 969-72).

These sentences are parallel in structure in the following respects. **1** (859, 969) is a syntactically and metrically complete main clause.

²² Debiasi 2008, 87-8.

²³ In early Greek epros, οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης (e.g. Hes. *Op.* 510) and οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν (e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 865) are used indifferently.

²⁴ Cf. also Hes. *Theog.* 290 βουσι παρ' εἰλιπόδεσσι, περιρρύτῳ εἰν Ἐρυθείῃ, 294 σταθμῶ ἐν ἠερόεντι, πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὀκεανοῖο, 483-484 ἀντρῶ ἐν ἠλιβάτῳ, ζαθείς ὑπὸ κεῦθεσι γαίης, | Αἰγαίῳ ἐν ὄρει πεπυκασμένῳ ὕληεντι, 499 Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, γυάλοις ὕπο Παρνησσοῖο, 'Hes.' fr. 59.3 M.-W. Δωτίῳ ἐν πεδίῳ, πολυβότρουος ἀντ' Ἀμύροιο. Cf. *Il.* 2.461, 2.549, 2.783a (verse attested in Strabo 13.4.6 C626), 3.244, 5.397, 8.385, 20.385; *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 269; *Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 100.

2 is a self-contained verse with two appositional prepositional phrases (860 ἐν... <εἰν>... ~ 971 ἔνι... ἐν...), of which the first offers a generic localisation (860 οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης ~ 971 νεῖϕ ἔνι τριπόλῳ), the second a specific one (860 <εἰν> Αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση ~ 971 Κρήτης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ). **3**, in adding enjambment, picks up the syntax of the opening clause with an oblique-case participle or an adjective agreeing with a head noun in **1** (859-861 ἄνακτος [...] πληγέντος ~ 969-972 Πλοῦτον [...] ἐσθλόν). The proposed emendation would thus be fully conformable to Hesiodic style.

All three postulated corruptions are easy to account for palaeographically. On (A), either etacism or a simple copying error would explain the change of βήσσης εἰν into βήσσησιν, especially under the influence of οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησιν in line 865. On (B) and (C), simple omission of ἐν or ἔνι is envisaged. Following any of these postulated corruptions (which would have to antedate the second century CE, on the evidence of *PSI* 1086 = Π¹² West), αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση could readily have been altered into an appositional genitive αἴτνης παιπαλοέσσης (as attested in two manuscripts of Tzetzes' commentary on Lycophron) once the disappearance of εἰν / ἐν / ἔνι left the dative unmotivated, the dative ending -ηι, with iota adscript, being easily misread as the genitive ending -ης; the unmetrical βήσσησιν αἴτνης may subsequently have been corrected into βήσσησιν αἰδνῆς or αἰδνῆς. The attestation of both αἰδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης and αἰδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης implies alternative attempts to interpret the syntax of the line.

Option (A) appears the most satisfactory reading of *Theog.* 860. With the smallest palaeographical concessions, it meets the key desiderata of effecting a reference to Etna and employing a form of Αἴτνη without unparalleled diaeresis, and it introduces a doubled prepositional phrase ἐν... εἰν... that is idiomatic for early Greek epos and is in keeping with Hesiod's style. Accordingly, we should consider emending the text at *Theog.* 860 to read:

οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, εἰν Αἴτνη παιπαλοέσση

in the glens of the mountain, in rugged Etna.

2 Immediate Interpretative Consequences

A reference to Etna in 860 requires us to look afresh at the immediately following lines, 861-867.

...
πληγέντος, πολλή δὲ πελώρη καίετο γαῖα
αὐτμῆ θεσπεσίῃ, καὶ ἐτήκετο κασσίτερος ὡς
τέχνη ὑπ' αἰζηῶν ὑπὸ τ' εὐτρήτου χοάνοιο
θαλφθεῖς, ἢ ἐ σίδηρος, ὃ περ κρατερώτατός ἐστιν,
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησι δαμαζόμενος πυρὶ κηλέῳ 865
τήκεται ἐν χθονὶ δῖῃ ὑφ' Ἡφαίστου παλάμησιν·
ὡς ἄρα τήκετο γαῖα σέλαι πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο.

... as he was struck; and the huge earth was being burned in
abundance
by the wondrous heat and was being melted, like tin
heated by means of the craft of men and by the well-perforated
furnace
or as iron, which is strongest,
being mastered by the burning fire in the glens of the mountain,
is melted in the divine ground by the hands of Hephaistos:
so was the land being melted by the blaze of the burning fire.

Some have found this passage – and Hesiod’s Typhonomachy as a whole – evocative of volcanic activity.²⁵ Others have argued that these lines are incompatible with a reference to a volcano. There is, first, the objection that if Typhoeus is relegated to Tartarus (868), he cannot be conceived as being situated under Etna in 860.²⁶ The objection is weak: we get the same combination of Tartarus and Etna with Typhoeus in Pindar’s *Pyth.* 1, where Typhoeus ‘lies in Tartarus’ (15), but is still situated beneath Etna and Cyme (18-19).²⁷

A second objection is that Typhoeus is situated *on* the mountain (860), whereas an allusion to Typhoeus’ confinement in the volcano

25 Stamatopoulou 2017, 55: “abounds in volcanic imagery”, 61: “imagery dominated by fire that can be interpreted as volcanic”; cf. Ballabriga 1990, 22; Debiasi 2004, 106, 2008, 93. See also the references given below (Paley 1883, 261; Morgan 2015, 316; Pietro Bembo in Williams 2017, 29).

26 Marg 1970, 281; Colabella 2016, 20; Williams 2017, 29; cf. Severyns 1928, 171; West 1966, 393; Stamatopoulou 2017, 55.

27 Ballabriga 1990, 22; Debiasi 2004, 106; 2008, 92 and fn. 71. Williams 2017, 29 argues that Pindar signals adherence to Hesiodic tradition with the reference to ‘he who lies in dread Tartarus’ (*Pyth.* 1.15; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 868), but pointedly departs from it by then placing him under ‘snow-covered Aetna’ (*Pyth.* 1.20); in fact, in both details Pindar may be indebted to Hesiod or other early epic: see further below on the question of Pindar’s innovation.

Etna would require him to be situated *under* it.²⁸ However, the development of the ideas of the narrative in the ensuing simile suggests that Hesiod is indeed thinking of Typhoeus as being *inside* the mountain: note in particular 866 ἐν χθονὶ δίῃ.

It is not a serious objection either that Hesiod's narrative makes Typhoeus an *aition* for winds (869-880), rather than a volcano.²⁹ Atmospheric winds, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions were all closely connected in ancient Greek thought.³⁰ Notably, the famously volcanic Aeolian islands (see Thuc. 3.88.1-3; Verg. *Aen.* 8.416, 454) are named after the mythical keeper of the winds.

West commented: "Hesiod seems not to be thinking of a volcano, but a bare, scorched region".³¹ But Hesiod may very well have been thinking of a volcano. *Theog.* 861-7, describing the melting of the earth at the time of Typhoeus' defeat, suggest an *aition* for molten rock (lava).³² The interpretation of the metalworking simile, 862-866, is vexed. The meaning of χόανος in particular is unclear (as is the reading of 863).³³ It is evidently etymologically connected to χέω, 'pour', which generates many cognates in χόαν- and χών-. Suggested meanings are: '(s)melting furnace', 'crucible', 'funnel', or 'tuyere'.³⁴ If χόανος here conveys either a furnace with holes for bellows or a tuyere,³⁵ working in conjunction with bellows,³⁶ then the image could

²⁸ West 1966, 393.

²⁹ Cf. Stamatopoulou 2017, 55 "Typhos is confined in Tartarus [...], leaving behind him only a legacy of destructive winds".

³⁰ Sigurdsson 1999, 35: "The association of winds and volcanoes was to become a fundamental aspect of Greek ideas regarding volcanic activity"; Hine 2002, 72-4; Glauthier 2018, 257-60. Cf. e.g. Strabo 13.4.11 C628. See further below on winds and volcanoes.

³¹ West 1966, 393, preferring to see a reference to the *Katakekaumene* (cf. Xanthus of Lydia *BNJ* 765 F13).

³² Paley 1883, 261: "[sc. at *Theog.* 861] the burning of the wood is meant, and the melting of the earth (into lava) is described as consequent on it, just as below [sc. at *Theog.* 862-866] the fire of the charcoal furnace and the melting of the tin or iron are adduced in comparison". Morgan 2015, 316: "Hesiod's account of the melting of iron in mountain glens by the arts of Hephaistos could easily be (mis)read as an account of volcanic activity and could thus suggest the eruption of Aitna that Pindar narrates". Cf. already the humanist Pietro Bembo, *De Aetna* 39 (Williams 2017, 29).

³³ Peppmüller's emendation ἐν ἐυτρήτοις χόανοισι, 'in well-perforated furnaces', is accepted by Rzach 1902, West 1966, and Most 2006; in which case, Emped. fr. 96.1 D-K ἐν εὐτύκτοις (v.l. εὐστέρνοις) χόανοισι would be a reworking of the Hesiodic line (Sider 1984, 15-16).

³⁴ Sider 1984, 20; Edwards 1991, 209-10; Nordheider 2010, 1226.42 'Tiegel, Schmelzofen?', cf. Forbes 1967, 18 and fn. 90. Key occurrences are: *Il.* 18.470; Emp. fr. 96.1 D-K, with Simplicius on Arist. *De anima* 410a1 'χόανον' [...] ἐν οἷς ἡ τῶν μυχνυμένων γίνεταί κρᾶσις, ἀγγεῖα.

³⁵ Edwards 1991, 210.

³⁶ For ancient furnaces, see Forbes 1950, 122-33 (esp. 127, citing Hes. *Theog.* 864); and 113-19 on the production of blast-air. Marg 1970, 281 "Das Eisenerz wird in Schmelz-

aptly suggest the workings of a volcano.³⁷ Strabo mentions three craters in the volcanic *Katakekaumene* which he says were given the name ‘Bellows’, φῦσαι (13.4.11). Likewise, the Roman poets speak of Etna’s ‘furnaces’ (*fornaces*: Lucr. 6.681; Verg. *G.* 1.472; Ov. *Met.* 15.340; [Verg.] *Aetna* 1, 37).

Ἡφαίστου (866) has variously been understood metonymically.³⁸ Ἡφαιστος in the *Iliad* is a metonymy for ‘fire’ (*Il.* 2.426), but can hardly be so here, for that would create a superfluity with fire being mentioned in the preceding line (865 πυρί). West avoided a reference to Hephaistos by translating ὑφ’ Ἡφαίστου παλάμησιν as ‘by Hephaestus’ craft’, i.e. by the craft of metal-working.³⁹ West saw a reference to the practice of smelting of iron ore in the ground, a practice for which he cites parallels from various ‘primitive peoples’.⁴⁰ These parallels are too remote. There are more immediate parallels, linguistic and mythological, from ancient Greece, which point in a quite different direction.

First, the linguistic parallels. In Hesiod and other early hexameter poetry, the phrase ‘the hands of Hephaistos’ intends a reference to the personalised smith-god, Hephaistos, and ‘hands’ are meant literally. We may note: Hes. *Theog.* 578-580 ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ στεφάνην χρυσεῖν κεφαλῆφιν ἔθηκε, | τὴν αὐτὸς ποίησε περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυεῖς | ἀσκήσας παλάμησι, χαριζόμενος Διὶ πατρί; [Sc.] 219 τὼς γάρ μιν παλάμαις τεῦξεν κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυεῖς, 319-320 Ἡφαιστος ποίησε σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε, | ἄρσάμενος παλάμησι. Compare also ‘Hesiod’ fr. dub. 343.2-3 M.-W. Ἡφαιστος [...] | ἐκ πάντων παλάμησι κεκασμένον Οὐραניῶνων (where, however, παλάμησι could be taken as ‘hands’ or ‘craft’; compare *Theog.* 929, where the line recurs with τέχνησι for παλάμησι, and note that †τέχνησι appears to have intruded in fr. 343.2 as a gloss on παλάμησι in the following line).⁴¹

Second, the mythological parallels. The image of Hephaistos working metal in the earth evokes mythological traditions abundantly

elzöfen [cf. ἐν [...] χόανοισι] ausgeschmolzen, die gutverteilte Löcher [cf. ἐντρήτοις] für den Zutritt der eingeblasenen Luft und Austritt der Flammen haben”.

37 Hine 2002, 69, on the ancient theory “that volcanoes are like great furnaces, where flammable materials are ignited often by the force of wind”. Cf. Sigurdsson 1999, 5: “Anaxagoras proposed that eruptions were caused by great winds stored inside the earth. When these winds were forced through narrow passages or emerged from openings in the Earth’s crust, the friction between the compressed air and the surrounding rocks generated great heat, leading to the melting of the rocks and the formation of magma. To anyone who has observed an explosive volcanic eruption, this is a perfectly logical idea”, cf. 36. Cf. Lucr. 6.680-93; Ov. *Met.* 15.346-9.

38 Mader 1987, 950.41-4 tentatively considers seeing a reference to volcanic fire or to smiths subservient to Hephaistos.

39 West 1988, 28.

40 West 1966, 395; 1988, 71.

41 See further Beck 2000, 939.6-23.

attested from the fifth century BCE onwards, according to which Hephaistos smithied in a forge in a volcanic mountain, typically Etna or one of the Aeolian Islands off Sicily. The earliest references are these.⁴² First, Thuc. 3.88.3 νομίζουσι δὲ οἱ ἐκείνη ἄνθρωποι ἐν τῇ Ἴερᾷ ὡς ὁ Ἥφαιστος χαλκεύει, ὅτι τὴν νύκτα φαίνεται πῦρ ἀναδιδοῦσα πολὺ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν καπνὸν ('the people of that region consider that Hephaistos smithies in Hiera [sc. Roman Vulcania, modern Volcano], because it is conspicuous at night for sending up much fire and smoke during the day').⁴³ Second, (Pseudo-)Aesch. *PV* 366-369:

καὶ νῦν ἀχρεῖον καὶ παράορον δέμας
κεῖται στενωποῦ πλησίον θαλασσίῳ
ἰπούμενος ρίζαισιν Αἰτναίαις ὕπο. 365
κορυφαῖς δ' ἐν ἄκραις ἤμενος μυδροκτυπεῖ
Ἥφαιστος, ἔνθεν ἐκραγήσονταί ποτε
ποταμοὶ πυρὸς δάπτοντες ἀγρίαις γνάθοις
τῆς καλλικάρπου Σικελίας λευροῦς γύας.

And now he [Typhoeus] lies, a useless and witless body, near the strait of the sea, being squeezed beneath the fundament of Etna. Hephaistos strikes his anvil sitting in the uppermost summits, from where at some time rivers of fire will break out, devouring the smooth fields of fertile Sicily with savage jaws.

Such traditions are of course vestigial in our noun 'volcano' (< *Vulcanus*). It is impossible to say how far back they go, but there is no reason *a priori* to deny them to Hes. *Theog.* 865-866. Possibly there was a pre-Greek legend which already pointed in the same direction, perhaps in connection with Adranos, who was identified with Hephaistos and was 'probably an indigenous god of fire with war-like attributes, or a personification of Etna, where his cult was centred'.⁴⁴

It is reasonable to wonder to what extent, if any, the Homeric epics link Hephaistos' smithying with volcanism.⁴⁵ Both poems depict Hephaistos smithying in his home on Olympos (*Il.* 18.369-383; *Od.* 8.268, 273-277), necessarily divorced, therefore, from any connection with volcanism on the earth. But the *Iliad* also has Hephaistos recall a nine-year period in which he smithied under the sea, in the

⁴² Notable later references include: Callim. *Hymn* 3.46-50 (Lipare), *Hymn* 4.141-6 (Etna); Verg. *Aen.* 8.416-25, *G.* 4.170-5 (Vulcania); [Verg.] *Aetna* 29-32 (Etna).

⁴³ For ἐν τῇ Ἴερᾷ placed before the ὡς-clause, see Classen 1897, 180.

⁴⁴ Leighton 1999, 268. For the identification of Adranos with Hephaistos, see Wernicke 1894; Canciani 1981.

⁴⁵ Note Hennig 1939, 241 "Homer kennt noch keine Beziehung des Hephaistos zu den Vulkanen".

company of the Okeanid Eurynome and Thetis (18.400-405). Especially interesting for us are verses 402-403:

[sc. χάλκευον δαίδαλα πολλά]
 ἐν σπηϊ γλαφυρῶ· περὶ δὲ ῥόος Ὠκεανοῖο
 ἀφρῶ μορμύρων ῥέεν ἄσπετος

[sc. I [Hephaistos] smithied many ingenious things]
 in a hollow cave; and all around the current of Okeanos
 boiling with froth flowed unspeakably.

Although the commentators do not say so,⁴⁶ this would be an apt evocation of a submarine volcano.⁴⁷ We may compare Strabo's description of submarine volcanism at the island of Prochyta (5.4.9 C247-248): ἀναφυσμάτων πυρὸς καὶ θαλάττης καὶ θερμῶν ὑδάτων ('spoutings-up of fire, sea, and hot waters'), and τὰς φλόγας ἀναφυσᾶσθαι καὶ τὰ ὑδάτα, ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ νησιδᾶς ἐχούσας ζέον ὕδωρ ('the flames and the waters, and sometimes even small islands with boiling water, spout up'). However, if Homer is thinking of the effects of a submarine volcano, then he is conspicuously not at pains to localise it.⁴⁸ Homeric epic also knows Lemnos (perhaps a volcanic island) as one of Hephaistos' favourite haunts, but unlike later authors Homer does not indicate that Lemnos was a site of Hephaistos' forge (or of one of his forges).⁴⁹ It may be that we are seeing here an example of Homer's 'Panhellenisation' (we should rather say: 'Olympianisation') of local religious practices.⁵⁰

Another Homeric passage that is relevant for the link, not between Hephaistos and volcanism, but between Typhoeus and volcanism, is *Il.* 2.780-785, especially lines 782-783 ὅτε τ' ἀμφὶ Τυφωεῖ γαῖαν ἰμάσση | εἰν Ἄριμοις ('whenever [Zeus] lashes the land around Typhoeus, among the Arimoi'). This links Zeus's defeat of Typhoeus aetiologically with some ongoing meteorological and/or geological phenomenon located 'among the Arimoi', whether that phenomenon is lightning, earthquake, volcanic eruption, or some combination of

⁴⁶ Edwards 1991, 194; Coray 2016, 167-8; Rutherford 2019, 180.

⁴⁷ With this use of μορμύρω, cf. *Il.* 5.599, 21.325, esp. *Od.* 12.238 (ἀναμορμύρω).

⁴⁸ Schein 2013, 8 sees a reference to Lemnos. However, this story of Hephaistos' fall is distinct from that given by Hephaistos at *Il.* 1.590-4, which is explicitly located at Lemnos. See e.g. Gantz 1993, i: 74-5.

⁴⁹ Cf. Hainsworth on *Od.* 8.283. On the status of Lemnos as a volcanic island, see Forsyth 1984; cf. Burkert 1970, 5-6 = 2000, 232-4. For Hephaistos' forge on Lemnos, see Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.55; for other references, see Malten 1912, 316.37-43.

⁵⁰ Rhode 1925, i: 39-40.

these.⁵¹ At least by the time of Xanthus of Lydia in the fifth century BCE (*BNJ* 765 F13a-b), these ‘Arimoi’ were being situated in, among other locations, the (once) volcanic so-called ‘burnt-up country’ (*Katatakaumene*), which Strabo (12.8.18-19 C579, 13.4.11 C628) depicts as susceptible to earthquakes, lightning, hurricanes, and volcanic eruptions. Many volcanic eruptions are accompanied by volcanic lightning.⁵² Neither the emphasis on winds (see above) nor that on lightning in the Hesiodic and Homeric descriptions respectively of Typhoeus are at all incompatible with an evocation of volcanism.⁵³ On the contrary, the combination of volcanic eruption and volcanic lightning can very aptly suggest the image of ‘Zeus’ ‘lashing’ the land around ‘Typhoeus’ in a targeted, seemingly retaliatory, fashion.⁵⁴ In short, the Homeric epics may have been conscious of a link both between Hephaistos’ smithing and volcanism and between Typhoeus’ blasting by Zeus and volcanism, though these links cannot be said to emerge with any great clarity.

The case for seeing a reference to Etna in the *Theogony* passage is thus strengthened by the immediately following lines, 861-67; the simile which seems to describe Hephaistos smithing in an underground setting is crucial. This extraordinary simile, however, calls for further comment. It is a very organic simile. It starts out as an ‘extended short simile’ (862-864).⁵⁵ The first, simple comparison, κασσίτερος ὦς (862), gets extended by the enjambed participial phrase θαλφθείς (864), with two preceding ὑπό-clauses (863) depending on it. But it then develops into a ‘multiple-term simile’ (864-866), with the addition of the disjunctive clause ἢ ἔ σίδηρος, ὃ περ κρατερώτατός ἐστιν (864).⁵⁶ There is anacoluthon in 865-866.⁵⁷ The indicative verb τίκεται (867) suits a ‘long simile,’ as if it had been introduced not by κασσίτερος ὦς [...] θαλφθείς [...] ἢ ἔ σίδηρος, ὃ περ

51 See esp. Jones 2003, 79 “Zeus hit [Typhoeus] with a thunderbolt and buried him deep in the earth, where he causes earthquakes - the point of this image”; cf. West 1966, 380; Willcock 1978, 212; Brügger; Stoevesandt; Visser 2003, 254, with references. Cf. schol. *D II*. 2.782.

52 For a modern scientific perspective on volcanic lightning, see McNutt, Williams 2010; McNutt, Thomas 2015. For an ancient perspective, Sen. *QNat*. 2.30.1 *quidam, inter quos Asclepiodotus est, iudicant sic quorundam quoque corporum concursu tonitrum et fulmina excuti posse. Aetna aliquando multo igne abundavit, ingentem uim harenae urentis effudit, inuolutus est dies puluere, populosque subita nox terruit. aiunt tunc plurima fuisse fulmina et tonitrua quae concursu aridorum corporum facta sunt, non nubium, quas uerisimile est in tanto feruore aeris nullas fuisse*. Cf. West 1969, 7.

53 Pace Hine 2002, 58-9, cited below.

54 Compare Greene 1992, 62-3.

55 Edwards 1991, 25-6: the criterion of the ‘short simile’ is that there is no (indicative) verb expressed.

56 For ‘multiple-term’ similes, Edwards 1991, 37.

57 Compare West 1966, 394.

κρατερώτατός ἐστιν, but by the usual formula for long similes, *ὥς δ' ὅτε [...] σίδηρος [...] τήκεται.⁵⁸ It is important to notice how this second comparison builds on the first. Men smelting tin in a crucible (first vehicle) made an apt comparison to the earth around Typhoeus (first vehicle) made an apt comparison to the earth around Typhoeus being melted by Zeus's thunderbolts (tenor), this comparison relating, as one would expect, to the time of the Typhonomachy narrative. However, Hephaistos smithing underground (second vehicle) implies an aetiology for *ongoing* volcanism, and thus relates to the time of the narrator and narratee rather than that of the narrative. In other words, the second comparison suggests a proleptic aspect to the narrative of the Typhonomachy: Typhoeus' incineration on Etna by Zeus's thunderbolt will result in volcanic activity in Etna lasting into the present. (It follows that the defeated Typhoeus is not *just* an *aition* for the winds: 869.) Tenor and vehicle are unusually closely related through this second comparison: not merely analogically, but causally or aetiologically. It is important to note, too, that Typhoeus' imprisonment under Etna following the battle with Zeus is linked with Hephaistos' smithing in Etna also in (Pseudo-)Aesch. *PV* 366-369 (quoted in full above). That (Pseudo-)Aeschylean passage is thus clearly a reception of the Hesiodic passage or something very like it (see below), a reception which confirms both the presence already in Hesiod of the link between the Typhonomachy and volcanism at Etna and the dependence of (Pseudo-)Aeschylus on the Hesiodic account, or a very close relative of it (see further below). This, therefore, is a remarkable simile.⁵⁹ We may note, finally, that similes with deities as their vehicles are themselves a relative rarity in extant early hexameter poetry.⁶⁰

3 Wider Interpretative Consequences

The case for seeing a reference to Etna in 860-867 is strong enough for it to be worth exploring some of the wider interpretative consequences, of which there are several.

58 Edwards 1991, 26: the criterion of the 'long simile' is that there is at least one (indicative) verb expressed.

59 See also Hamilton 1989, 28. For a different analysis of the simile than that offered here, see Rood 2007.

60 See e.g. *Il.* 2.780-785 (Zeus lashing Typhoeus among the Arimoi: see above); 13.298-305 (Ares and Phobos going from Thrace into battle with the Ephyri or Phlegyae); 16.384-392 (Zeus visiting destruction on evil-doers); *Od.* 6.102-108 (Artemis hunting boar or deer on the mountains of Taygetos or Erymanthos with the nymphs); 18.193-194 (Aphrodite beautifying herself before going to the dancing-place of the Charites). See Edwards 1991, 37 fn. 45. On the absence of Zeus (but not other gods) from the *tenor* of similes in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, see further Ready 2012.

One concerns the Greeks' awareness of volcanoes. According to one authoritative view, Greece at the time of Homer and Hesiod had no knowledge of volcanoes.⁶¹ It is clear that the adjudication of this question depends on the interpretation of just a couple of controversial epic passages.⁶² We have seen reason to think that Homer and Hesiod reflect a reasonably developed knowledge of volcanism, perhaps extending to the observation (whether first- or second-hand) of submarine volcanism and volcanic lightning.

Another implication concerns the Greeks' knowledge specifically of Etna as an active volcano. The preceding discussion presupposes that Etna was known as an active volcano prior to *Theog.* 860-867. Thucydides (3.116.2) records an opinion (λέγεται)⁶³ that there was only one (major?) eruption of Etna in the period from the 730s BCE (the first Greek colonisation of Sicily) to 475 BCE.⁶⁴ This suited Thucydides, who was interested in the idea that 'portents' (volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, tidal waves, eclipses, plagues) occurred with increased frequency during the Peloponnesian War, the eruption of 425 BCE being only the third.⁶⁵ But it would be erroneous to suppose that Etna was *wholly inactive* for a period of more than 250 years:⁶⁶ whether or not there were any large-scale eruptions in the

61 Hine 2002, 58-9. Cf. Wilamowitz 1922, 225 fn. 2.

62 Further to the passages considered here, the Cyclops episode of *Odyssey* book 9 is fancifully read as an allegory of an eruption of Mt Etna by Scarth 1989. Likewise, Greene 1992, 46-72 sees the Titanomachy and the Typhonmachy of Hesiod's *Theogony* as allegories of, respectively, eruptions on Thera (Santorini) of ca. 1470 BCE and of Etna in '735 BCE' (on the dating of this eruption of Etna, see further below). Cf. Henning 1939, 241 "die Schilderungen Hesiods von der Titanomachie und vom Kampf zwischen Zeus und Typhoeus sind offensichtlich durch Ätna-Ausbrüche inspiriert worden".

63 See Westlake 1977, esp. 357-8.

64 On the Thucydidean passage, see Debiasi 2000 (who, however, is mistaken in his assumption that the dates recorded in ancient sources have found scientific corroboration: see the following footnotes below).

65 See especially Thuc. 1.23.3, cf. 3.87.4, 3.89.4-5. Hornblower 1991, 317. Compare Hdt. 6.27.1.

66 Note Chester, Duncan, Guest, and Morgan 1985, 2: "To a greater or lesser extent it is in an almost continual state of activity"; Sigurdsson 1999, 39: "Rarely dormant, [Etna] has been almost continuously active for over the 2500-year period that historical records cover [...] About twenty eruptions of Etna were known in antiquity"; Flintoff 1986, 90: "The fact is, as anyone who takes the trouble to read the newspaper (or, better still, is acquainted with the area) knows, that whilst Etna has only a comparatively few really major eruptions, it is a very active volcano whose milder eruptions, so far from being rare, are almost indeed continuous"; Scarth 1989, 89: "It produces relatively few violently explosive eruptions, which always come from the central crater. Instead, its typical, oft-repeated eruptions are moderately or weakly explosive emissions from vents arranged on fissures that radiate from the summit". For dates of eruptions of Etna, see Chester et al. 1985, 96-116, esp. 96; Scarth, Tanguy 2001, 229-31 (list compiled from historical written documents, except for ca. 1100 BCE and ca. 3300 BCE); Siebert, Simkin; Kimberly 2010, 52-5 (eruptions dated by scientific dating techniques, mainly radiocarbon, before the first millennium BCE, and by historical eruption reports thereafter).

later eighth or early seventh centuries BCE,⁶⁷ Greeks must have been keenly aware of Etna as an active volcano from at least the earliest colonisation of Sicily.

A third issue is the question of how early Greek mythological and poetic traditions began to associate Typhoeus with Etna. Greeks had colonised volcanic Pithecussae (Ischia) by ca. 759 BCE, and at some point began to associate Typhoeus with that region. The earliest extant source to do so is 'Pherecydes', presumably Pherecydes of Athens of the fifth century BCE, rather than Pherecydes of Syros of the sixth.⁶⁸ From the 730s BCE, Greeks were colonising the east coast of Sicily, including Naxos (ca. 734 BCE) and Katane (ca. 728 BCE), both sites that are dominated by Etna's towering presence.⁶⁹ The smoking mountain can hardly have failed to pique the colonists', and proto-colonists', immediate interest.⁷⁰ They may have found it already the subject of indigenous Sicel legend, perhaps involving Adranos.⁷¹ The story of the Zeus-Typhoeus conflict is ultimately of Near Eastern origin, which pre-Homeric and pre-Hesiodic hexameter tradition had situated 'among the Arimoi (?)', perhaps in Cilicia-Syria.⁷² Acquaintance with the volcanic geography, and perhaps the indigenous mythology, of the eastern coast of Sicily and the coast of Campania may have encouraged new, creative, localisations of the story. (In due course, there were to be lots of other creative localisations of the

67 Despite Debiasi 2000, 230-1 (similarly, Greene 1992, 56-8, with 168 fnn. 10-14), the eruption dates of 735 BCE ('uncertain') and 695 (±2) BCE given by Siebert; Simkin; Kimberly 2010, 52 appear not to be scientifically derived (not being prefaced by any of the letter-codes detailed on pp. 20-4), but to derive from 'historical eruption reports' (cf. p. 24). In this case, 'historical eruption reports' presumably means, precisely, a reading of Thuc. 3.116.2 and Hes. *Theog.* 859-867, the latter taken as reflecting an eruption of Etna. Scarth and Tanguy 2001, 231 indicate only *one* putative eruption in '? 695 BCE' (presumably, their dating of either Hes. *Theog.* or of the 'pious brothers') intervening between the scientifically-identified eruption of ca. 1100 BCE and the eruption of 479-475 BCE, known from the Marmor Parium (*BNJ* 239.A52) and Thucydides (3.116.2). Similarly, Chester, Duncan, Guest, and Morgan 1985, 96 and 118-19 (fig. 3.18); for their use of 'patchy' historical accounts, see p. 91. The identification (by Chester, Duncan, Guest, and Morgan 1985, 96) of an eruption of ca. 693 BCE with the eruption presupposed in the popular story of the 'pious brothers' (οἱ εὐσεβεῖς), Amphinomos and Anapias (in Lycurg. *Leoc.* 95-6; cf. Strabo 6.2.3 C269; Paus. 10.28.4-5; *et alia*; see Arnold-Biucchi 1981 for the numismatic evidence) is fanciful.

68 Pherec. '*Theogony*' fr. 54 Fowler, *apud* schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.1209-1215a; see Dolcetti 2004, 21; Fowler 2013, 715 and fn. 23; cf. Hine 2002, 71. Prof. R.L. Fowler points out to me (personal communication) that Pherecydes of Syros is not cited in the scholia to Apollonius, but Pherecydes of Athens repeatedly. Later sources: Lycoph. *Alex.* 688-690; Strabo 5.4.9 C248 (referring to 'the myth' that Typhoeus lies beneath the island of Prochyta, off Pithekoussai); Verg. *Aen.* 9.715-16. Hornblower 2015, 286.

69 Colonisation of Sicily: Thuc. 6.3.1-3.

70 Cf. Dräger 1997, 21 with fn. 96.

71 For Adranos, see above.

72 See Currie 2016, 203.

Zeus-Typhoeus conflict, for instance, in Lake Serbonis by ‘Mt Kasi-os’ in Egypt, Hdt. 3.5.3; the task of synthesising all the various competing localisations would fall to later poets and mythographers.)⁷³ Even if we suppose that this development must postdate the colonisation activities of the 730s BCE, and discount voyages of reconnaissance and Greek trading interests in Sicily in the pre- or proto-colonial period,⁷⁴ that would still leave sufficient time for the tradition to be taken up in the *Theogony* of ca. 700 BCE. The story of Kronos vomiting up the stone that was substituted for Zeus and its being placed at Delphi (*Theog.* 498-500) is in origin a Near Eastern story most familiar to us in its Hurrian-Hittite version (the Kumarbi myth) that may not have been attached to Delphi before the later eighth century BCE (when Delphi began to acquire national or ‘Panhellenic’ standing), likewise then only decades at most before the likely composition of the *Theogony*.⁷⁵ Needless to say, these scenarios have implications for the speed at which new traditions could spread across the Greek world and could be taken up in a supra-regional epic poetry, such as Hesiod’s.⁷⁶

We are embroiled now in the question of the interest taken by early Greek epic in what we think of as the Greek West. The casualness of Hesiod’s localisation of Zeus’s defeat of Typhoeus on Etna implies dependence on an existing tradition.⁷⁷ That inference becomes inescapable if we accept that Hesiod himself never went to Sicily (compare *Op.* 650-651). This would not be the only place where Hesiodic epic would draw on epic traditions with Western localisations.⁷⁸ The *Theogony* (1011-1016) draws on a tradition that set Odysseus’ wanderings in Western Greece, naming one of his sons with Kirke as

⁷³ Fowler 2013, 29. For this synthesising process, compare Currie 2016, 244-5.

⁷⁴ Dräger 1997, 18 “die Gründung von Kolonien [...] [muß] nicht schon erfolgt sein; Erkundungsfahrten werden vorhergegangen sein”. Cf. Heubeck 1992, 383; Crielaard 1995, 231-2; Leighton 1999, 223-5.

⁷⁵ Morgan 1990, 127, 147, 203-4. Compare Griffin 1995, 124, commenting on *Il.* 9.405; Dickie 1995, 37. Contrast West 1966, 28-9 (despite p. 41: Delphi “did not rise to any national importance before c. 750”). Note that other sites than Delphi laid claim to the ‘Zeus-stone’: Arcadian Methydriion: Paus. 8.36.3; Boeotian Chaironeia: Paus. 9.41.6 (for Delphi’s claim, see Paus. 10.24.6).

⁷⁶ In general on the spread of news in the Greek world, see Lewis 1996. Dräger 1997, 17-19 indicates possible avenues for the “Ausbreitung von Nachrichten”, emphasising Boeotian Hesiod’s links with Euboean Chalcis (cf. *Op.* 650-655), and the role of Chalcis and Euboea in colonising the West; compare already Christ 1888, 357-8. Cf. Lane Fox 2008, *passim*, esp. 182-4, 314-15.

⁷⁷ Tsagalis 2013, 21 fn. 11: “In my view, the various idiosyncrasies of the Hesiodic version [sc. of the Typhonomachy, *Theog.* 820-880] testify to the fact that it presupposes a fuller version from which it has been adapted”.

⁷⁸ See, on *Theog.* 1011-1016 and ‘Hes.’ fr. 150.25-26 M.-W.; Braccisi 1993, 13-14.

'Latinos' and having him rule the 'Tyrsenoi' (Etruscans).⁷⁹ Congruently, the *Catalogue* (fr. 150.25-26 M.-W.) takes for granted the localisation of the Laestrygonians in Sicily.⁸⁰ Regardless of questions of authenticity,⁸¹ there is no obvious reason why such traditions should not go back to the later 8th century BCE.⁸² Although the *Odyssey* does not situate Odysseus' wanderings in the West,⁸³ it shows a notable familiarity with the West, making reference to 'Sikeloi' (20.383), an old woman from Sicily (her name is perhaps 'Sikele')⁸⁴ who cares for Laertes (24.211, 366, 389), and apparently to the Italian cities Temese (1.184) and Alybas (24.304; note 307 ἀπὸ Σικανίης).⁸⁵

Finally, the argument has indirect implications for the debate about the authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound*. One strand of that debate concerns the relationship between the descriptions of Typhoeus at Etna in (Pseudo-?)Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* and in various poems of Pindar: *Pyth.* 1 and 8, *Ol.* 4, and fr. 92 M.⁸⁶ The problem concerns how to account for the similarities in the following passages.

- *Pyth.* 1.15-20 ὅς τ' ἐν αἰνᾷ Ταρτάρῳ κείται, θεῶν πολέμιος, | Τυφῶς ἑκατοντακάρανος· τόν ποτε | Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον· νῦν γε μάν | ταί θ' ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιερκέες ὄχθαι | Σικελία τ' αὐτοῦ πιέζει στέρνα λαχνάεντα· κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει, | νιφόεσσ' Αἴτνα.
- *Pyth.* 8.15-18 βία δὲ καὶ μέγαλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῳ. | Τυφῶς Κίλιξ ἑκατόγκρανος οὐ νιν ἄλυξεν, | οὐδὲ μὰν βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων· δμᾶθεν δὲ κεραυνῶ | τόξοισί τ' Ἀπόλλωνος.
- *Ol.* 4.6-7 ἀλλὰ Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς Αἴτναν ἔχεις | ἵππον ἀνεμόεσσαν ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶνος ὄβριμου.
- Pind. fr. 92.1-2 M. κείνῳ μὲν Αἴτνα δεσμὸς ὑπερφιάλος | ἀμφίκειται. Pind. fr. 93.1-3 M. ἀλλ' οἷος ἄπλατον κερᾶίττε θεῶν | Τυφῶνα

⁷⁹ With Hesiod's knowledge of 'Tyrsenoi', compare, in the 7th century BCE, Alcman's knowledge of 'Enetoi' (fr. 1.51 *PMGF*), perhaps the *Veneti* from the northern Adriatic, roughly modern Veneto: so, recently, Budelmann 2018, 73-4; differently, Calame 1983, 328.

⁸⁰ Cf. Thuc. 6.2.1 See Hirschberger 2004, 326.

⁸¹ In support of the authenticity of the end of the *Theogony*, see Edwards 1971, 198-9.

⁸² Braccesi 1993, 13-14; Dräger 1997, 13-23; Malkin 1998, 182-3; Cingano 2004: xxi-xxii; Debiasi 2008, 49. Differently, dating the Latinos and Etruscans passage of *Theogony* to the 6th century BCE: West 1966, 398, 436; Lane Fox 2008, 183.

⁸³ Heubeck 1989, 4-5, 52; Saïd 2011, 158-62; Currie 2020, 32-9.

⁸⁴ For 'Sikele' as the woman's name, see Poccetti 2012, 51, cf. 53; Currie 2020, 29-31 (*pace* Cerri 2007, 24 fn. 32).

⁸⁵ See Currie 2020, 9-28; Dräger 1997, 16; cf. Phillips 1953, 54; Crielaard 1995, 231-3; Antonaccio 2011; West 2014, 38.

⁸⁶ The importance attached to this strand of the debate will depend on one's confidence in the statistical-stylistic approach (see, sceptically, e.g. Flintoff 1983, 5; Lloyd-Jones 2003, 54).

πεντηκοντοκέφαλον (Τυφῶν' ἑκατοντακάρανον: Hermann, followed by Turyn)⁸⁷ ἀνάγκη Ζεὺς πατήρ | ἐν Ἀρίμοις ποτέ. Pind. fr. 92 and 93 M., both quoted by Strabo, may or may not be from the same poem.⁸⁸

- (Ps.?)Aesch. *PV* 351-354 τὸν γηγενῆ τε Κιλικίων οἰκίτορα | ἄντρων ἰδῶν ὄικτιρα, δάιον τέρας, | ἑκατογκάρανον πρὸς βίαν χειρούμενον, | Τυφῶνα θοῦρον, 364-365 κείται στενωποῦ πλησίον θαλασσίου | ἰπούμενος ρίζαισιν Αἰτναίαις ὑπο. Note also P. 1.21-22 ἀπλάτου πυρὸς [...] παγαί, 22 ποταμοί ~ [Ps.?]Aesch. *PV* 368 ποταμοί πυρός, 371 ἀπλάτου [...] πυρπνόου ζάλης.⁸⁹

Scholars are agreed that either (1) there is direct dependence between these passages, or (2) the passages are indirectly connected, each depending on a lost common source.⁹⁰

Option (1) has led scholars to advocate various rigid models of specific allusion: that *Pythian* 8 (ca. 450/446 BCE) alludes to *Pythian* 1 (ca. 474/470 BCE);⁹¹ *Olympian* 4 (ca. 452 BCE?)⁹² alludes to *Pythian* 1;⁹³ and Pseudo-Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound* alludes to *Pythian* 1 and *Olympian* 4 – this last entailing the inauthenticity of the *Prometheus Bound*, on the grounds that *Olympian* 4 postdates Aeschylus' death in 456/5 BCE.⁹⁴ It is also possible to posit influence, in one direction or the other, between *Pythian* 1 and the *Prometheus Bound*, and to see each of these as also being dependent on Hesiod's *Theogony*.⁹⁵ Such tight nexuses of intertextuality are possible, but vulnerable in each of their assumptions. It is not obvious, for instance, why (Pseudo-)Aeschylus would allude to (or imitate) separate Pindaric odes, including the relatively insignificant *Olympian* 4; or why Pindar in all of *Olympi-*

⁸⁷ Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 825 ἑκατὸν κεφαλαί (of Typhoeus), cf. 311-312 Κέρβερον [...] | πεντηκοντακέφαλον. Nowhere else is Typhoeus depicted as having 50 heads: Gerber 1987, 15.

⁸⁸ Wilamowitz 1922, 225 fn. 1.

⁸⁹ Griffith 1978, 135 fn. 98, 136 fn. 100; Debiasi 2008, 90-1; Stamatopoulou 2017, 146-7.

⁹⁰ For the two options, cf. Griffith 1977, 9; 1978, 118; Bees 1993, 18; Cingano 1995, 13; Watkins 1995, 455; Debiasi 2004, 105.

⁹¹ Krischer 1985, followed by followed by Robbins 1997, 276; Morrison 2007, 116-17; 2010, 250-1. Cf. Burnett 2005, 227-8.

⁹² On the date of *Ol.* 4, see Gerber 1987, 7-8; Lomiento 2013, 99-101 (differently, Barrett 2007).

⁹³ Morrison 2007, 110; Nicholson 2011.

⁹⁴ Griffith 1978, 118-20; Garner 1990, 228 fn. 37; West 1990, 65; Lefèvre 2003, 148-9; cf. Morrison 2007, 110 with fn. 125; Nicholson 2011: esp. 95 fn. 8; Stamatopoulou 2017, 56 and fn. 15, cf. 146-7; Glauthier 2018, 263-6.

⁹⁵ Debiasi 2008, 89-91, with references in 91-2 fn. 70. For influence of Hes. *Theog.* on *PV*, see also Flintoff 1986, 90-1.

an 4, fr. 92 S-M, and *Pythian* 8 should want to allude to *Pythian* 1. In general, it is easier to feel happy about arguments for intertextuality between works whose chronological relationships are known than it is about arguments for the relative chronology of works based on their assumed intertextual relationships.

Option (2) has also had its advocates, notably von Mess in 1901.⁹⁶ According to Griffith, “the biggest objection to [von] Mess’ theory of close imitation of a particular poem by both Pindar and Aeschylus is that it requires us to believe that a post-Hesiodic epic described in detail an eruption of Aetna, and linked it with Typhos”.⁹⁷ But we have seen reason to believe that already Hesiod’s *Theogony* (presumably with epic precedent) evoked in detail Etna’s volcanism and linked it with Typhoeus. The inference that Hesiod was here drawing on earlier hexameter tradition makes it much easier to imagine that a post-Hesiodic epic (one ‘canonical’ enough to serve as a hypotext for both Pindar, in several poems, and for [Pseudo-?]Aeschylus in the *Prometheus Bound*) also described in detail an eruption of Aetna and linked it with Typhoeus. On the basis of our knowledge it is easiest to suppose that that hexameter poem was the Cyclical *Titanomachy* usually attributed to Eumelus.⁹⁸ However, there can have been more than one such early epic treatments.⁹⁹

On this view, certain specific words or phrases common to Pindar, (Pseudo-)Aeschylus, and Hesiod can be taken to derive from the epic account(s). This goes for some form of the adjective Κιλίκιος/Κίλιξ, probably referring to Typhoeus’ cave (Pind. *Pyth.* 1.17, 8.16; [Ps.?-]Aesch. *PV* 351; cf. [Ps.?-]Hes. fr. dub. 388 M.-W.); some form of the adjective ἑκατοντακάρηνος referring to Typhoeus (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 825; *Pyth.* 1.16, 8.16, *Ol.* 4.7, perhaps Pind. fr. 93.2 M.; [Ps.?-]Aesch. *PV* 353); some form of the noun ἴπος, ‘weight’, or the cognate verb ἰπῶω, ‘to press’, conveying Typhoeus’ imprisonment (*Ol.* 4.7; [Ps.?-]Aesch. *PV* 354); and mention of Αἴρνη as the place where Typhoeus was defeated and/or confined (Hes. *Theog.* 860; Pind. *Pyth.* 1.20, *Ol.* 4.6; [Ps.?-]Aesch. *PV* 354). There may have been a separate epic tradition that

⁹⁶ Von Mess 1901; Schroeder 1922, 6-7; Burton 1962, 98; Fraenkel 1994, 7. Cf. Debi-asi 2008, 89 and fn. 61.

⁹⁷ Griffith 1978, 119. Griffith’s argument is hailed by Stamatopoulou 2017, 56 fn. 16 as “a thorough refutation of von Mess’ arguments” (similarly, Glauthier 2018, 263 fn. 34; Lewis 2020, 151 fn. 45); the following discussion aims to show that it is nothing of the sort.

⁹⁸ On the question of attribution, see D’Alessio 2015, 203-4 fn. 19; an attribution to Hesiod emerges from Nic. *Ther.* 8-12 = ‘Hes.’ fr. spur. 367 M.-W. (Cazzaniga 1975). On the question of the presence of the Typhonomachy in the *Titanomachy*, see Severyns 1928, 171; Debiasi 2004, 104-7, 2008, 89 fn. 61; Tsagalis 2013 (qualified: Tsagalis 2017, 81-2); D’Alessio 2015, 209 fn. 48. See also Currie 2021, 295-6, 324.

⁹⁹ For the Typhonomachy in a Pseudo-Hesiodic poem (cf. ‘Hes.’ fr. dub. 388 M.-W.), see von Mess 1901, 173-4.

identified 'the Arimoi' as the locality where the defeated Typhoeus resided (*Il.* 2.783; Hes. *Theog.* 304, 306; Pind. fr. 93.3 M.: see above).

On this scenario, the *Theogony* presupposes hexameter poetry on the Typhonomachy that had already attained some degree of textual fixity. Similarly, the *Theogony* must be taken to presuppose hexameter poetry that was possessed of a degree of textual fixity on the rape of Persephone (*Theog.* 912-14: cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 1-3), on the love-affair of Aphrodite and Anchises (*Theog.* 1008-1010: cf. *Il.* 2.820-821, *Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 54), featuring a Catalogue of Nereids (*Theog.* 243-264: cf. *Il.* 18.39-49), and, perhaps, on Prometheus' deception of Zeus (*Theog.* 535-616: cf. *Op.* 47-89).¹⁰⁰ A canonical post-Hesiodic hexameter treatment of the Typhonomachy (perhaps the Cyclical *Titanomachy*) would, on this scenario, have shared several words and phrases with the earlier hexameter treatment(s); and Pindar and Aeschylus will each have engaged with the canonical poem. For neither the epinician nor the tragic poet is this assumption especially difficult. In general, Pindar's verbal debts to epic are clear.¹⁰¹ Also clear is tragedy's capacity to redeploy phraseology from epic.¹⁰² Thus, *pace* Lloyd-Jones, it does not seem easier to suppose that one of (Pseudo-)Aeschylus or Pindar depended on the other than that each depended on a common epic source.¹⁰³ Tragedy's intertextuality with epic is a well-documented phenomenon, and interaction specifically of *Prometheus Bound* with Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Cyclical *Titanomachy* is very likely.¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, tragic intertextuality with epinician in general is a much murkier phenomenon.¹⁰⁵ Similarly, epi-

100 Rape of Persephone, love affair of Anchises and Aphrodite: Currie 2016, 80, 84-5, 153 and fn. 36, 156-7, 158. Nereids: Edwards 1991, 149; Nieto Hernández 2011. Prometheus narratives: Heitsch 1963, 7-8, 9-10 (differently, Blümer 2001, i: 11-12; ii: 135 and fn. 201, cf. ii: 85).

101 See Sotiriou 1998: *passim*. Note esp. *Nem.* 10.61-3 and *Cypria* fr. 15 Bernabé; *Ol.* 6.17 and *Thebais* fr. 8 Bernabé; *Isthm.* 6.37 and 'Hes.' *Megalai Ehoiai* fr. 250 M.-W.; *Pyth.* 3.27-29 and 'Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 60.1-3 M.-W. Cf. also Bacchyl. 13.151-153 and *Il.* 15.715. Currie 2021, 292-8. *Pace* Griffith 1978, 136 fn. 102: "It is also surely true that Pindar is not elsewhere observed to follow an epic predecessor with such slavish closeness as is suggested here?"

102 See e.g. Goldhill 1997, 129-30; Rutherford 2012, 47; Davidson 2012, 247-8. Two particularly striking examples are, first, *Soph. Aj.* 1164-5 and *Il.* 24.797 (Easterling 1988, 96-7; cf. 1984, 1-8) and, second, *Eur. Hel.* 36-37, 39-40 and *Cypria* fr. 1.1-7 Bernabé (Kannicht 1969, ii: 29).

103 The quotation is from Lloyd-Jones 2003, 55. Contrast e.g. Fraenkel 1994, 7.

104 E.g. Herington 1985, 128-9; Stamatopoulou 2017, 122-50, with 150 fn. 72.

105 See e.g. Irigoin 1952, 11-12; Bagordo 2003, 234-5. Swift 2010, 104-72 and Carey 2012 explore tragic allusions to the genre of epinician, to its distinctive topoi, its favoured dactylo-epitrite metre, and its favoured diction; but not specific allusion - intertextuality - of the kind in which we are interested. Sfyroeras 2018 argues for intertextuality between the first and third *stasima* of *Soph. OC* and *Pind. Ol.* 3 and 2 respectively; the argument is unconvincing. *Soph. Ant.* 100 ἀκρις ἄελίου surely does al-

nician's intertextuality with Homeric, Hesiodic, and Cyclical epic is relatively easy to demonstrate, while intertextuality between one epinician and another epinician or between epinician and tragedy are more doubtful propositions.¹⁰⁶

Finally, this has implications for the scope of Pindaric invention. What in all this should we lay at Pindar's door? In the introduction to his commentary on *Pythian* 1, Cingano wrote:

Pindaro è il primo autore a collocare il sepolcro di Tifone nell'Occidente Greco [...], collegando tra loro due aree - l'Etna (la Sicilia) e Cuma (negli altri autori sostituita da Pithecussa) - che nelle fonti posteriori si escludono reciprocamente quale sede del mostro. È possibile che le due tradizioni esistessero, separate, già in epoca arcaica, ma il collegamento di Tifone con entrambe le aree è molto probabilmente opera di Pindaro. Il poeta ha 'costruito' una versione del mito appropriata al committente e all'occasione unificando due tradizioni che rinviano all'area siculo-campana, recente teatro delle imprese di Ierone: la fondazione di Etna e la vittoria sugli Etruschi a Cuma.¹⁰⁷

lude specifically to Pind. *Pae.* 9.1 ἀκτίς ἀελίου (both the opening words of a choral song by Thebans); this specific allusion is extremely well motivated, but does not involve an epinician. (Ps.-)Aesch. *PV* 768, 921-925 has also been argued to depend on Pind. *Isthm.* 8.33-35 (Farnell 1930-32, i: 287-8; ii: 379-80; Köhnken 1975, 33-4 fn. 19; Bagordo 2003, 199-201); but see the sober remarks of Carey 1981, 195-6; further, Burnett 2005, 114-15; Rutherford 2015, 455-6.

106 On epinician's extensive intertextuality with epic and on the absence of convincing evidence of intertextuality between epinicians, see Currie 2021 (*pace* e.g. Morrison 2007). On epinician's supposed intertextuality with tragedy, specifically the relationship between Pind. *Pyth.* 11 and Aeschylus' *Oresteia* see Finglass 2007, 11-16. Kurke 2013 (after Herington 1984 and others) maintains that *P.*11 alludes to tragedy, and in particular to the *Oresteia*. The grounds, however, are weak. The alternative motivations mooted for Klytaimestra's killing of Agamemnon at *Pyth.* 11.24-25 find their closest parallels in later fifth-century historiography (e.g. Hdt. 1.86.2; Currie 2018, 309-10 with fn. 66). There is no need to posit tragic influence here on Pindar (*pace* Herington 1984, 140-1, 144-5; Kurke 2013, 113-14, 124-5), any more than on Herodotus. Even if this doubtful instance of epinician intertextuality with tragedy were granted, it would remain a splendidly isolated case (*pace* Kurke 2013, 146-9). Pfeijffer 1999, 51-5 argues that Bacch. 16 (a dithyramb) is intertextual with Soph. *Trach.*; the argument is questionable, and seen by its author (p. 55) as an isolated case.

107 Cingano 1995, 14: "Pindar is the first author to situate the resting-place of Typhon in the Greek West [...], connecting with each other two areas - Etna (Sicily) and Cyme (in the other authors, replaced with Pithecussae) - which in the subsequent sources exclude one another as the location of the monster. It is possible that the two traditions existed, as distinct traditions, already in the archaic period; but the connection of Typhon with both areas is very probably Pindar's doing. The poet has 'constructed' a version of the myth appropriate to the patron and to the occasion, uniting two traditions which relate to the Sicel-Campanian area, recent theatre of Hieron's achievements: the foundation of Aitna and the victory over the Etruscans at Cyme".

According to Cingano, Pindar may not have invented either the tradition that Typhoeus was buried under Etna or the tradition that he was buried under Ischia, but he may very well have been responsible for the combination of the two traditions.¹⁰⁸ The fundamental correctness of this position is borne out by my argument. But I believe we can be more definite about the first claim. Pindar did not invent the tradition that Typhoeus was buried under Etna; the tradition did indeed exist – in hexameter poetry – in the archaic period. As regards the tradition of Typhoeus’ burial at Pithecussae: this was known to Pherecydes of Athens (fr. 54 Fowler), presumably also from archaic poetic tradition.¹⁰⁹ Cingano’s second claim – that the linking of the Etnan and Cuman traditions is very probably Pindar’s doing – also seems highly plausible. The casualness with which Pindar connects Etna and Cyme as abodes for Typhoeus need not imply that others made the connection before Pindar.¹¹⁰ Rather, the coincidence of volcanic activity at both Etna (Thuc. 3.116.2; cf. *BNJ* 239.A52) and Cyme (Strabo 5.4.9 C247-8) in the 470s BCE would have offered Pindar both sufficient motivation and a very topical justification for making the link. It should be pointed out that Cingano’s statement that ‘Pindar is the first [sc. extant] authority to situate the burial of Typhoeus in the Greek West’ has given rise to frequent misunderstandings.¹¹¹ Basing themselves on this statement,¹¹² scholars have written, for instance, “Pindar may well have been the first to locate Typhon in the Greek west” (Morgan) or “Pindar, in *Pythian* 1, was the first poet to locate Typhos under Etna” (Nicholson).¹¹³ Such statements go beyond the evidence. They will be flatly contradicted by the evidence, if we allow the evidence to include Hesiod’s *Theog.* 860, emended to read some form of Αἴτρη.¹¹⁴

The question of Pindar’s invention has also entered into the discussion of the authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound*, or rather into the argument about the likelihood of the existence of a common epic source for the Pindaric poems and the *Prometheus Bound*. Against the likelihood of a common epic source, Griffith has objected: “It would seem to be too great a coincidence that Pindar, when he came to tell a story

108 Cf. Hine 2002, 71-2.

109 See above; here too I am indebted to Prof. Fowler.

110 So Hine 2002, 72.

111 Cingano’s position is correctly interpreted by Bonanno 2010, 159, 160; Stamatopoulou 2017, 55 fn. 13.

112 Often, however, misattributed as “Gentili 1995, 14”, rather than ‘Cingano 1995, 14’, e.g. by Bonanno 2010, 160 fn. 105; Morgan 2015, 317 fn. 23; Lewis 2020, 151 fn. 45.

113 Morgan 2015, 317; Nicholson 2011, 95. Cf. Williams 2017, 29; Lewis 2020, 151-2.

114 Christ 1888, 358 had already concluded that, in connecting Typhoeus with Aetna, Pindar and (Pseudo-)Aeschylus “keine neue [sic] Gedanke in die Poesie einführten, sondern nur den Fußstapfen des alten Dichters Hesiods folgten”.

immediately after the 479/5 eruption of Aetna, found a ready-made epic version".¹¹⁵ Yet such coincidences do occur, and when they did, it would be the mark of a good poet to take advantage of them. The placement of the Argonauts' sojourn on Lemnos on the return leg of Argonauts' journey in *Pythian* 4 (not, as in Apollonius, on the outward voyage) so obviously suited Pindar's poetic purposes that it seemed to scholars to be obviously Pindar's innovation.¹¹⁶ Yet iconographical evidence (an Etruscan vase of the later seventh century BCE) suggests that this may have been a mythical variant long predating Pindar.¹¹⁷ In general, it is clear that poets embrace existing stories as well as inventing them, and an ancient Greek poet's ability to exploit coincidences could be at least as important as his capacity for pure invention.

Abbreviations

HE = Finkelberg, M. (ed.) (2011). *Homer Encyclopedia*, vols i-iii. Malden (MA).
LfrgE = Snell, B. et al. (Hrsgg) (1955-2010). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, Vols i-xxv. Göttingen.
LIMC = *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae* (1981-2009), vols i-viii. Zurich; Munich.
LSJ = Liddel, H.G.; Scott, R.; Jones, H.S.; Mackenzie, R. (eds) (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford.
RE = Wissowa, G. et al. (eds) (1894-1980). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vols i-xxiv. Stuttgart.

Bibliography

Antonaccio, C.M. (2011). s.v. "Sicily". *HE*, iii, 797.
Arnold-Biucchi, C. (1981). s.v. "Amphinomos et Anapias". *LIMC*, i.1, 717-18.
Bagordo, A. (2003). *Reminiszenzen früher Lyrik bei den attischen Tragikern: Beiträge zur Anspielungstechnik und poetischen Tradition*. München. Zetema-ta 118.
Ballabriga, A. (1990). "Le dernier adversaire de Zeus: Le mythe de Typhon dans l'épopée grecque archaïque". *RHR*, 207, 3-30.
Barrett, W.S. (2007). "Pindar and Psaumis: *Olympians* 4 and 5". Barrett, W.S., *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism*. Ed. by M.L. West. Previously unpublished paper, written in 1969. Oxford, 38-53.
Beck, W. (2000). s.v. "παλάμη". *LfrgE* xviii, 937-9.
Bees, R. (1993). *Zur Datierung des Prometheus Desmotes*. Stuttgart.
Beekes, R. (2010). *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden; Boston.

115 Griffith 1978, 119.

116 Braswell 1988, 347-8; see Dräger 1993, 246-7 fn. 293 for further references.

117 Giannini 1995, 107 fn. 1, 497-8, after Rizzo, Martelli 1993, esp. 35-40; cf. Smith 1999, 199. For the Etruscan vase in question, see also Schmidt 1992, 388 (no. 1), 395-6.

- Blümer, W. (2001). *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung: Die mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods*. 2 Bde. Münster.
- Bonanno, D. (2010). *Ierone il Dinomenide: Storia e rappresentazione*. Pisa; Roma.
- Braccesi, L. (1993). "Gli Eubei e la geografia dell'Odissea". *Hesperia: studi sulla greicità di occidente*, 3, 11-23.
- Braswell, B.K. (1988). *A Commentary on the Fourth "Pythian Ode" of Pindar*. Berlin; New York.
- Brügger, C.; Stoevesandt, M.; Visser, E. (2003). *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar)*. Bd. 2, *Zweiter Gesang (B)*. München; Leipzig.
- Budelmann, F. (2018). *Greek Lyric: A Selection*. Cambridge.
- Burkert, W. (1970). "Jason, Hypsipyle, and New Fire at Lemnos". *CQ*, 20, 1-16. Reprinted with Addenda in Buxton, R.G.A. (ed.) (2000). *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*. Oxford, 227-49.
- Burnett, A.P. (2005). *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aegina*. Oxford.
- Burton, R.W.B. (1962). *Pindar's "Pythian Odes". Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford.
- Calame, C. (1983). *Alcman*. Rome.
- Canciani, F. (1981). s.v. "Adranos". *LIMC*, i.1, 229-30.
- Carey, C. (1981). *A Commentary on "Five Odes" of Pindar*. New York.
- Carey, C. (2012). "The Victory Ode in the Theatre". Agócs, P.; Carey, C.; Rawles, R. (eds), *Receiving the Komos: Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode*. London, 17-36. BICS Suppl. 112.
- Cazzaniga, I. (1975). "Per Nicandro Colofonio la Titanomachia fu opera autentica di Esiodo". *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo: Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche*, 109, 173-80.
- Cerri, G. (2007). "L'Oceano di Omero: un'ipotesi nuova sul percorso di Ulisse". Greco, E.; Lombardo, M. (a cura di), *Atene e l'Occidente: I grandi temi: Le premesse, i protagonisti, le forme della comunicazione e dell'interazione, i modi dell'intervento ateniese in Occidente = Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Atene, 25-27 maggio 2006)*. Athens, 13-51.
- Chester, D.K.; Duncan, A.M.; Guest, J.E.; Kilburn, C.R.J. (1985). *Mount Etna: The Anatomy of a Volcano*. London.
- Christ, W. (1888). "Der Aetna in der griechischen Poesie". *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: philosophisch-philologische und historische Classe*, 3, 349-98.
- Cingano, E. (1995). "Pitica I"; "Pitica prima: commento". Gentili, B.; Cingano, E.; Giannini, P.; Bernardini, P.A. (a cura di), *Pindaro: Le Pitiche*. Milano, 9-23; 327-64.
- Cingano, E. (2004). "Introduzione". Cingano, E.; Vasta, E. (a cura di), *Esiodo. Teogonia*. Milano, v-xxxiii.
- Classen, J. (1897). *Thukydides*, vol. 1. Berlin.
- Colabella, S. (2016). "La terra e l'εὐρητος del fuoco nella Grecia Antica". *Humanitas*, 68, 11-30.
- Coray, M. (2016). *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar)*. Band XI: Achtzehnter Band (Σ). Berlin.
- Crielaard, J.P. (1995). "Homer, History and Archaeology". Crielaard, J.P. (ed.), *Homeric Questions*. Amsterdam, 201-88.
- Currie, B.G.F. (2016). *Homer's Allusive Art*. Oxford.
- Currie, B.G.F. (2018). "Pindar and Bacchylides". De Temmerman, K.; van Emde Boas, E. (eds), *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, vol. 4. Leiden; Boston, 293-314.

- Currie, B.G.F. (2020). "Sicily and Italy in the *Odyssey*". *Hesperia: Studi sulla greccità di occidente*, 36, 9-39.
- Currie, B.G.F. (2021). "Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry: The Special Case of Epincian". *Trends in Classics*, 13(2), 289-362.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2015). "Theogony and Titanomachy". Fantuzzi, M.; Tsagalis, C. (eds), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*. Cambridge, 199-212.
- Davidson, J.F. (2012). "The Homer of Tragedy: Epic Sources and Models". Markantonatos, A. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles*. Leiden; Boston, 245-61.
- Debiasi, A. (2000). "Le tre eruzioni dell'Etna in Tucidide". *Hesperia: studi sulla greccità di occidente*, 12, 227-33.
- Debiasi, A. (2001). "Esiodo fr. 150, 25 M.-W". *Hesperia: studi sulla greccità di occidente*, 14, 37-40.
- Debiasi, A. (2004). *L'epica perduta: Eumelo, il Ciclo, l'occidente*. Roma. Hesperia 20.
- Debiasi, A. (2008). *Esiodo e l'occidente*. Roma. Hesperia 24.
- Dickie, M. (1995). "The Geography of Homer's World". Andersen, Ø.; Dickie, M. (eds), *Homer's World: Fiction, Tradition, Reality*. Bergen, 29-56.
- di Gregorio, L. (1975). *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam*. Milan.
- Dolcetti, P. (2004). *Ferecide di Atene. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Alessandria.
- Dräger, P. (1993). *Argo Pasimelousa: Der Argonautenmythos in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*. Teil 1, *Theos aitios*. Stuttgart.
- Dräger, P. (1997). *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods*. Stuttgart.
- Easterling, P.E. (1984). "The Tragic Homer". *BICS*, 31, 1-8.
- Easterling, P.E. (1988). "Tragedy and Ritual: 'Cry Woe, Woe, but May the Good Prevail'". *Mètis*, 3, 87-109.
- Edwards, G.P. (1971). *The Language of Hesiod in Its Traditional Context*. Oxford.
- Edwards, M.W. (1991). *The "Iliad": A Commentary*. Vol. 5, *Books 17-20*. Cambridge.
- Farnell, L.R. (1930-32). *The Works of Pindar*. Vol. 1, *Translation*; vol. II, *Critical Commentary*. London.
- Finglass, P.J. (2007). *Pindar "Pythian" Eleven*. Cambridge.
- Flach, H. (1878). *Hesiodi quae feruntur carmina*. Leipzig.
- Flintoff, E. (1983). "Aristophanes and the *Prometheus Bound*". *CQ*, 33, 1-5.
- Flintoff, E. (1986). "The Date of the *Prometheus Bound*". *Mnemosyne*, 39, 82-91.
- Forbes, R.J. (1950). *Metallurgy in Antiquity: A Notebook for Archaeologists and Technologists*. Leiden.
- Forbes, R.J. (1967). *Bergbau, Steinbruchtätigkeit und Hüttenwesen*. Göttingen. *Archaeologia Homerica* Bd. 2, Kapitel K.
- Forsyth, P.Y. (1984). "Lemnos Reconsidered". *Echos du monde classique*, 28, 3-14.
- Fowler, R.L. (2013). *Early Greek Mythography*. Vol. 2, *Commentary*. Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. [1967] (1994). "Pindaro: Pitica prima". Roncali, R. (a cura di), *Pindaro, Sofocle, Terenzio, Catullo, Petronio*. Roma, 3-9.
- Gantz, T. (1993). *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore; London.
- Garner, R. (1990). *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. London; New York.
- Gerber, D.E. (1987). "Pindar's *Olympian Four*: A Commentary". *QUCC*, 25(1), 7-24.
- Giannini, P. (1995). "Pitica IV"; "Pitica quarta: commento". Gentili, B.; Cingano, E.; Giannini, P.; Bernardini, P.A. (a cura di), *Pindaro: "Le Pitiche"*. Milano, 103-15; 426-510.

- Glauthier, P. (2018). "Playing the Volcano: *Prometheus Bound* and Fifth-Century Volcanic Theory". *CPh*, 113, 255-78.
- Goldhill, S. (1997). "The Language of Tragedy: Rhetoric and Communication". Easterling, P.E. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, 127-50.
- Greene, M.T. (1992). *Natural Knowledge in Preclassical Antiquity*. London.
- Griffin, J. (1995). *Homer: "Iliad" IX*. Oxford.
- Griffith, M. (1977). *The Authenticity of "Prometheus Bound"*. Cambridge.
- Griffith, M. (1978). "Aeschylus, Sicily, and Prometheus". Dawe, R.D.; Diggle, J.; Easterling, P.E. (eds), *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry Presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday*. Cambridge, 105-39.
- Griffith, M. (1983). *Aeschylus "Prometheus Bound"*. Cambridge.
- Hainsworth, J.B. (1988). "Books V-VIII". Heubeck, A.; West, S.R.; Hainsworth, J.B., *A Commentary on Homer's "Odyssey"*. Vol. 1, *Introduction and Books I-VIII*. Oxford, 249-385.
- Hamilton, R. (1989). *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry*. Baltimore; London.
- Heitsch, E. (1963). "Das Prometheus Gedicht bei Hesiod". *RhM*, 106, 1-15.
- Henning, R. (1939). "Altgriechische Sagen gestalten als Personifikation von Erdfeuern". *JDAI*, 54, 230-46.
- Herington, J. (1984). "Pindar's Eleventh Pythian Ode and Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*". Gerber, D.E. (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*. Chico, 137-46.
- Herington, J. (1985). *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London.
- Heubeck, A. (1989). "Books IX-XII". Heubeck, A.; Hoekstra, A. (eds), *A Commentary on Homer's "Odyssey"*. Vol. 2, *Books IX-XVI*. Oxford, 3-143.
- Heubeck, A. (1992). "Books XXIII-XXIV". Heubeck, A.; Russo, J.; Fernandez-Galiano, M. (eds), *A Commentary on Homer's "Odyssey"*. Vol. 2, *Books XVII-XXIV*. Oxford, 313-418.
- Hine, M.H. (2002). "Seismology and Vulcanology in Antiquity?". Tuplin, C.J.; Rihll, T.E. (eds), *Science and Mathematics in Ancient Greek Culture*. Oxford, 56-75.
- Hornblower, S. (1991). *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1. Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. (2015). *Lycophron Alexandra*. Oxford.
- Jones, P.V. (2003). *Homer's "Iliad": A Commentary on Three Translations*. Bristol.
- Kannicht, R. (1969). *Euripides "Helena"*. 2 Bde. Heidelberg.
- Köhnken, A. (1975). "Gods and Descendants of Aiakos in Pindar's Eighth *Isthmian Ode*". *BICS*, 22, 25-36.
- Krischer, T. (1985). "Pindars achte Pythische Ode in ihrem Verhältnis zur ersten". *WS*, 98, 115-24.
- Kurke, L. (2013). "Pindar's *Pythian 11* and the *Oresteia*: Contestatory Ritual Poetics in the 5th c. BCE". *CA*, 32, 101-75.
- Lane Fox, R. (2008). *Travelling Heroes. Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer*. London.
- Lefèvre, E. (2003). *Studien zu den Quellen und zum Verständnis des Prometheus Desmotes*. Göttingen.
- Leighton, R. (1999). *Sicily before History: An Archaeological Survey from the Palaeolithic to the Iron Age*. London.
- Lewis, S. (1996). *News and Society in the Greek Polis*. London.
- Lewis, V.M. (2020). *Myth, Locality, and Identity in Pindar's Sicilian Odes*. Oxford.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (2003). "Zeus, Prometheus, and Greek Ethics". *HSCP*, 101, 49-72.

- Lomiento, L. (2013). "Olimpica IV". Gentili, B.; Catenacci, C.; Giannini, P.; Lomiento, L. (eds), *Pindaro: Le Olimpiche*. Milano, 99-102.
- Mader, B. (1987). s.v. "Ἡφαίστος". *LfgRE*, xii, 949-51.
- Malkin, I. (1998). *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. California.
- Malten, L. (1912). s.v. "Hephaistos". *RE*, xv, 311-66.
- Marg, W. (1970). *Hesiod: Sämtliche Gedichte*. Stuttgart.
- Mazon, P. (1947). *Hésiode: Théogonie, les Travaux et les Jours, le Bouclier*. Paris.
- McNutt, S.R.; Williams, E. (2010). "Volcanic Lightning: Global Observations and Constraints on Source Mechanisms". *Bulletin of Volcanology*, 72, 1153-67.
- McNutt, S.R.; Thomas, R.J. (2015). "Volcanic Lightning". Sigurdsson, H.; Houghton, B.; McNutt, S.; Rymer, H.; Stix, J. (eds), *The Encyclopedia of Volcanoes*. 2nd ed. London, 1059-67.
- Mess, A. von (1901). "Der Typhonmythus bei Pindar und Aeschylus". *RhM*, 56, 167-74.
- Morgan, C. (1990). *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC*. Cambridge.
- Morgan, K.A. (2015). *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century BC*. New York; Oxford.
- Morrison, A.D. (2007). *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*. London.
- Morrison, A.D. (2010). "Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality". Fearn, D. (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*. Oxford, 227-53.
- Most, G.W. (2006). *Hesiod: "Theogony", "Works and Days", Testimonia*. Cambridge (MA).
- Most, G.W. (2018). *Hesiod: "Theogony", "Works and Days", Testimonia*. Cambridge (MA). Revised ed. of Most 2006.
- Nicholson, N. (2011). "Pindar's Olympian 4: Psaumis and Camarina after the Deinenomenids". *CPh*, 106, 93-114.
- Nieto Hernández, P. (2011). s.v. "Nereids". *HE*, ii, 570.
- Nordheider, H.W. (2010). s.v. "χόανος". *LfgRE*, xxv, 1226.
- Paley, F.A. (1883). *The Epics of Hesiod. With an English Commentary*. London.
- Pfeijffer, I.L. (1999). "Bacchylides' Homer, his Tragedy, and his Pindar". Pfeijffer, I.L.; Slings, S.R. (eds), *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides*. Amsterdam, 43-60.
- Philipp, R. (1955). s.v. "ἄϊδνός". *LfgRE*, ii, 267.
- Phillips, E.D. (1953). "Odysseus in Italy". *JHS*, 73, 53-67.
- Pocchetti, P. (2012). "Language Relations in Sicily: Evidence for the Speech of the Σικανοί, the Σικελοί and Others". *Tribulato* 2012, 49-94.
- Ready, J. (2012). "Zeus, Ancient Near Eastern Notions of Divine Incomparability, and Similes in the Homeric Epics". *CA*, 31, 56-91.
- Ricciardelli, G. (a cura di) (2018). *Esiodo: "Teogonia"*. Milano.
- Rizzo, M.A.; Martelli, M. (1993). "Un incunabolo del mito greco in Etruria". *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene*, 66-7(1988-89), 7-56.
- Rohde, E. (1925). *Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, 9th-10th editions. Tübingen.
- Robbins, E. (1997). "Public Poetry". Gerber, D.E. (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden; New York; Köln, 221-87.
- Rood, N. (2007). "Hesiod's Metallurgy Simile (*Th.* 861-7)". *CCJ*, 53, 112-23.
- Rutherford, R.B. (2012). *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation*. Cambridge.
- Rutherford, R.B. (2019). *Homer: "Iliad" Book XVIII*. Cambridge.

- Rutherford, I.C. (2015). "Pindar's Cycle". Fantuzzi, M.; Tsagalis, C. (eds), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*. Cambridge, 450-60.
- Rzach, A. (1902). *Hesiodi carmina*. Leipzig.
- Rzach, A. (1912). s.v. "Hesiodos". *RE*, viii.1, 1167-240.
- Saïd, S. (2011). *Homer and the Odyssey*. Oxford. Transl. by R. Webb. Transl. of: *Homère et l'Odyssee*. Paris, 1998.
- Scarth, A. (1989). "Volcanic Origins of the Polyphemus Story in the *Odyssey*". *CW*, 83, 89-96.
- Schein, S.L. (ed.) (2013). *Sophocles: "Philoctetes"*. Cambridge.
- Schmidt, M. (1992). s.v. "Medeia". *LIMC* vi.1, 386-98.
- Schroeder, O. (1922). *Pindars Pythien*. Leipzig; Berlin.
- Schwabl, H. (1966). *Hesiods Theogonie: eine unitarische Analyse*. Wien.
- Severyns, A. (1928). *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Liège.
- Sfyroeras, P. (2018). "Pindar at Colonus: A Sophoclean Response to Olympians 2 and 3". Andújar, R.; Coward, T.R.P.; Hadjimichael, T.A. (eds), *Paths of Song: The Lyric Dimension of Greek Tragedy*. Berlin; Boston, 65-86. *Trends in Classics*. Supplementary volumes 58. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110575910-005>.
- Sider, D. (1984). "Empedocles B96 (462 Bollack) and the Poetry of Adhesion". *Mnemosyne*, 37, 14-24.
- Siebert, L.; Simkin, T.; Kimberly, P. (2010). *Volcanoes of the World*. 3rd ed. Berkeley.
- Sigurdsson, H. (1999). *Melting the Earth: The History of Ideas on Volcanic Eruptions*. New York; Oxford.
- Simkin, O. (2012). "Coins and Language in Ancient Sicily". *Tribulato* 2012, 162-87.
- Smith, C.J. (1999). "Medea in Italy: Barter and Exchange in the Archaic Mediterranean". Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.), *Ancient Greeks West and East*. Leiden, 179-206.
- Solmsen, F. (1982). "The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text". *HSCPh*, 86, 1-31.
- Sotiriou, M. (1998). *Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*. Göttingen.
- Spoerri, W. (1955). s.v. "Αἴτνη". *Lfgre* iii, 390.
- Stamatopoulou, Z. (2017). *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry: Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge.
- Ströhle, A. (1921). *Die den Alten bekannten vulkanischen Gebiete*. Tübingen.
- Swift, L.A. (2010). *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford.
- Tribulato, O. (ed.) (2012). *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily*. Cambridge.
- Tsagalis, C. (2013). "Typhon and Eumelus' Titanomachy". *Trends in Classics*, 5, 19-48.
- Tsagalis, C. (2017). *Early Greek Epic Fragments*. Vol. 1, *Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic*. Berlin.
- Vasta, E. (2004). "Teogonia"; "Note". Cingano, E.; Vasta, E. (2004). *Esiodo Teogonia*. Milano, 2-118.
- Watkins, C. (1995). *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford.
- Wernicke, K. (1894). s.v. "Adranos". *RE* i, 405.
- West, D. (1969). *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*. Edinburgh.
- West, M.L. (ed.) (1966). *Hesiod: "Theogony"*. Oxford.
- West, M.L. (ed.) (1988). *Hesiod: "Theogony" and "Works and Days"*. Transl. with an introduction and notes. Oxford.

- West, M.L. (1990). *Studies in Aeschylus*. Stuttgart.
- West, M.L. (2014). *The Making of the Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Westlake, H.D. (1977). “Λέγεται in Thucydides”. *Mnemosyne*, 30, 345-62.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1921). *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1922). *Pindaros*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1955). *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. 2 Bde. 2. Aufl. Basle; Stuttgart.
- Willcock, M.M. (1978). *The “Iliad” of Homer*, vol. 1. London.
- Williams, G.D. (2017). *Pietro Bembo on Etna: The Ascent of a Venetian Humanist*. Oxford.

