

©2018

David J. Wright

ALL RIGHT RESERVED

GIANTS, TITANS, AND CIVIL STRIFE IN THE GREEK & ROMAN WORLD DOWN
THROUGH THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS

by

DAVID J. WRIGHT

A dissertation submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Classics

Written under the direction of

Leah Kronenberg

And approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

OCTOBER 2018

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Giants, Titans, and Civil Strife in the Greek & Roman World

down through the Age of Augustus

By DAVID J. WRIGHT

Dissertation Director: Leah Kronenberg

This project explores the myth of the Gigantomachy leading up to and during the age of Augustus. Scholarship often reads the myth as an allegory of order triumphing over chaos, or “civilization” over “barbarism,” and the myth is often thought to represent Greece’s conflict with foreign entities. In this study, I highlight some of the themes, both inherent in the myth and highlighted by poets and artists, that undermine this simplistic binary. In fact, I examine many examples when the myth signifies a conflict that may not be foreign at all, but rather a conflict from within. By the time the myth appears in Augustan poetry, it has strong connotations of civil war. Though the more traditional view of the myth might align with the agenda of various political propagandists in Rome’s civil wars, poets such as Vergil and Propertius draw attention to complicating elements in the myth to undermine any overly simplistic interpretations of these conflicts.

Chapter 1 explores the Gigantomachy and Titanomachy in the Archaic period in both poetry and sculpture. I address some of the “traditional” interpretations in the poetry of Hesiod and Pindar, as well as some complications to the simplistic “order vs. chaos” binary. I also treat some of the myth’s connections to civil strife in visual art and poetry.

Chapter 2 examines the myth in the 5th and 4th century Athens. While the image of the Gigantomachy on the Parthenon is often cited as being emblematic of Greece’s victory over

foreign enemies, I highlight the myth's problematic elements and its connection to civil strife in tragedy, comedy, and Plato.

Chapter 3 considers the Gigantomachy in the Hellenistic era. During this period, the myth has connotations of a victory of the “civilized” over “uncivilized” due to court poets like Callimachus, who attempt to make Macedonian kings seem more legitimate through likening their victories over foreign people to the Olympians over the Giants. At the same time, I show that the Great Altar of Pergamum, a monument which is also cited as emblematic of this traditional viewpoint, has problematic elements that complicate an “order vs. chaos” meaning. Other later Hellenistic poets also exploit ambiguous elements of the Gigantomachy to subtly criticize powerful figures such as Philip V and Rome itself.

Chapter 4 analyzes the significance of the myth in the middle and late Roman Republic. During the early Republic, the Romans occupied an uncertain space on the “civilized vs. uncivilized” spectrum. The presentation of the Gigantomachy in the poetry of Naevius reflects this uncertainty. The myth in the poetry of Ennius may suggest that fraternal strife was at the very outset of the *Annales*. During the Late Republic, civil war was painfully frequent throughout Italy, and the Gigantomachy becomes a fitting allegory for this type of conflict.

In Chapter 5, this dissertation reaches its culmination: the Gigantomachy myth in the Augustan era, a time in which the myth is especially prominent. While, on the one hand, Augustan propaganda might resonate with the more “traditional” interpretation of the myth, Augustan poets subtly draw attention to some of the more troubling aspects of Gigantomachy. Given the time period's fatigue with civil war, the Gigantomachy is an apt myth to process the chaotic violence of the civil wars of the late first century BCE.

Laurae animae dimidio meae atque memoriae matris carissimae

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I heartily thank my committee members, Tim Power, Corey Brennan, and Leah Kronenberg, for their thoughtful guidance throughout this entire project. Tim's suggestions and endless knowledge of scholarly works to consider have been incredibly fruitful for this project, and Corey's supportive enthusiasm and insights have provided a motivating force that has been immensely helpful throughout my time at Rutgers. Leah went above and beyond in her role as a supervisor. Without Leah's untiring scholarly and emotional support, this dissertation simply would not have come together. I also would like to thank the Rutgers Classics Department, their faculty, and graduates for creating the supportive environment that allowed me to pursue this project. I am particularly grateful to the Rutgers Classics Department for awarding me an affiliated fellowship at the American Academy in Rome, where a considerable portion of this project came to life. I am also thankful to the many colleagues throughout the Classics field, such as Jim O'Hara, who have greatly influenced this work and continue to influence my thinking on Greco-Roman poetry.

This dissertation is dedicated to two very important women in my life, my mother and my partner Laura. I thank Laura for believing in me and for being an excellent around-the-clock editor and an ever thoughtful listener. As always, my mother's memory also kept me going when times were especially difficult.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY SECTION

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi

INTRODUCTION..... 1

TERMINOLOGY	2
PREVIOUS STUDIES OF THE GIGANTOMACHY	5
GIGANTOMACHY AS A SYMBOLIC BATTLE BETWEEN ORDER AND CHAOS	7
CONCEPT OF CIVIL WAR.....	8
THEMES OF THE GIGANTOMACHY.....	10
CHAPTER OVERVIEWS.....	14

CHAPTER 1: ANTI-OLYMPIAN MYTHS IN THE ARCHAIC PERIOD.....17

<i>THEOGONY</i>	17
ARCHAIC SCULPTURE.....	25
XENOPHANES	30
PINDAR	31
BACCHYLIDES	35
CONCLUSION.....	44

CHAPTER 2: GIGANTOMACHY IN THE CLASSICAL ERA	45
THE PARTHENON.....	45
<i>SEVEN AGAINST THEBES</i>	47
<i>EUMENIDES</i>	49
<i>PROMETHEUS BOUND</i>	52
<i>PLOUTOI</i>	56
<i>HECUBA</i>	57
<i>HERCULES FURENS</i>	59
<i>BIRDS</i>	60
<i>ION</i>	64
PLATO.....	71
CONCLUSION.....	73
CHAPTER 3: GIGANTOMACHY IN THE HELLENISTIC ERA	75
CALLIMACHUS	76
GREAT ALTAR OF PERGAMUM.....	81
LATER HELLENISTIC POETS.....	90
CONCLUSION.....	94
CHAPTER 4: GIGANTOMACHY DURING THE MIDDLE AND LATE REPUBLIC OF ROME.....	95
NAEVIUS	96
ENNIUS	103

ACCIIUS	106
GIGANTIC ELEMENTS IN THE ROMULUS AND REMUS MYTH	108
CATULLUS.....	111
LUCRETIUS.....	112
CONCLUSION.....	121
 CHAPTER 5: THEY MIGHT BE ROMANS: THE GIGANTOMACHY AND CIVIL	
CONFLICT IN THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS.....	
GIGANTOMACHY, GEOGRAPHY, AND CIVIL WAR.....	124
GIGANTOMACHY AS FAMILIAL CONFLICT IN PROPERTIUS.....	127
THE <i>GEORGICS</i>	132
THE <i>AENEID</i>	138
CONCLUSION.....	152
CONCLUSION.....	154
BIBLIOGRAPHY	162

INTRODUCTION

The Gigantomachy was a widely popular theme in both literary and visual media throughout the Greek and Roman world. Featuring the pivotal battle in which Zeus solidifies his place as the ultimate lord of the cosmos,¹ the myth was frequently associated with the concept of order's triumph over chaos. Previous comprehensive studies of the Gigantomachy have not diverged from this interpretation.² In this dissertation, I demonstrate that such an uncompromising view is overly simplistic. The Gigantomachy was a complex myth with immense ambiguity that was often exploited by poets and artist. Throughout this project, I examine components of the myth that undermine the traditional interpretation in order to reveal how literary voices used the myth to bring meaning to the trauma, uncertainty, and manipulation of civil conflict.

Scholarship has embraced the notion that the myth was viewed as a metaphor for the Greeks' victory over foreign peoples.³ I illuminate an aspect of this myth that is not often discussed: its connection to civil strife. This association with civil strife complicates a clean "Chaos vs. Order" dichotomy. Earlier studies examined the myth exclusively in the Greek world,⁴ or solely in the Roman world. A significant portion of this study explores the Gigantomachy in Greek sources, but this project ultimately looks forward to the Augustan

¹ Though there are inklings of other potential rebellions. The *Iliad* seems to record a tradition that Hera and Zeus' children conspired to overthrow him. For threads of this story, see *Il.* 1.396-406, 1.587-94, 12.442-9, and 15.18-24. Lang (1983: 147-8) pieces together this myth.

² The main comprehensive studies are Mayer (1887), Vian (1952), Fontenrose (1959) and Hardie (1986). Chaudhuri (2014) examines the related myth, the Theomachy, or the rebellion against the gods, a category in which the Gigantomachy is included.

³ Henrington (1959: 60-62); Castriota (1992: 138-43).

⁴ Vian (1952); Vian (1952); Fontenrose (1959).

era, a period when this myth was particularly popular.⁵ I argue that this popularity is in part due to the Gigantomachy's association with civil war, which made the myth a fitting lens through which to process Rome's civil conflicts of the 1st century BCE.

Terminology

This dissertation treats three divine wars: the Titanomachy, the Typhonomachy, and the Gigantomachy.

The Titanomachy is the war between the Olympians and the Titans, usually occurring not long after Zeus overthrows his father Cronus. The first extant record of this conflict is in Hesiod (*Th.* 617-719). The conflict appears to be in northern Greece, per Hesiod's indication that the Titans fought at Mt. Othrys (638). After Zeus' eventual and inevitable victory, the immortal Titans earn imprisonment in Tartarus for all eternity.

The Titans are largely depicted in an anthropomorphic form. Surprisingly, we do not have many images of the Titans in visual art or descriptions by writers, but we know that the Hundred-Handers – close relatives of the Titans within the same generation – appear as hybrid creatures with many hands, as their name implies. We also have very few images of the Titanomachy – one such image is a bronze crater listed in the Lindian chronicle that is said to have shown a scene of the Titanomachy.⁶ Could this lack of representation of the Titanomachy be because the Titans are so closely related to the Olympians, and thus an image of family members committing violence would be too difficult to handle?⁷

⁵ The theme appears in Horace, Propertius, and Vergil. The theme is particularly important for the *Aeneid* as Hardie (1986), O'Hara (1994 and 2007), and I explore. For its prominence in the Augustan period generally, see Hardie (1986: 87).

⁶ The bronze crater is known from Xenagoras (*FGrH* 240 F 14). The two other examples are uncertain. One of them is an Attic Hydria. The other is a pediment from a temple at Corcyra. See *LIMC*, s.v. *Titanes*.

⁷ I thank Alice Sharpless for making this point in a paper in a graduate conference at UCLA (2016).

Hesiod is our also earliest extant literary account for the Typhonomachy, a cosmic battle in which Typhon, a hybrid monster and son of Gaia (of Hera in other versions), threatens to bring down the hegemony of Zeus not long after the Titanomachy (Hes. *Th.* 820-880). This battle takes Typhon from his cave dwelling in Cilicia (Pi. *P.* 1.15-17) to scenes all over the Mediterranean. The battle eventually takes the two combatants to northern Greece (just as with the Titanomachy), where Zeus cuts Typhon and blood splashes upon a Mt. Haemus, thus giving the mountain its name (Apollod. 1.63). The battle usually culminates in Sicily with Zeus placing Mt. Aetna on Typhon as a prison. In Hesiod's *Theogony*, Typhon is the last threat to Zeus' control over the universe. From the onset, Typhon is described by Hesiod in monstrous terms, with one hundred snakes emerging from his body (*Th.* 824-826). Vase paintings additionally depict him as a creature with a serpentine lower half and wings.⁸

Following Zeus' fight with the Titans, the Gigantomachy is the next major rebellion in which the Giants, also sons of Gaia, attempt to overthrow the rule of Zeus. Literary sources on the Gigantomachy are largely absent in the Archaic period. In Homer, the Aloadae present as Giant-like figures when they launch an assault on Mt. Olympus by piling Mt. Ossa upon Mt. Pelion. (*Od.* 11.313-16). In Hesiod, he mentions Giants, but does not treat their war against Zeus. Later sources will place these figures like the Aloadae in the ranks of the Giants. Some versions of the myth place this battle in Pallene in Chalcidice – another cosmic battle in northern Greece (Apollod. 1.6.1). The Gigantomachy myth is also sometimes placed in Campania in Italy (Lyc. 697). Apollodorus provides the earliest comprehensive extant treatment of this myth (1.6.1-2). In all of these battles, Zeus and the

⁸ See LIMC s.v., *Typhon*.

Olympians are victorious. The Giants are mortal (unlike their Titanic brethren), and thus die off when they lose.

Visually, the Giants undergo a transformation throughout the Greek world. In the Archaic period, they often appear as hoplites. Hesiod implies this by indicating that they were born fully armed and clad in armor (*Th.* 185-6).⁹ It is not until the time of the Persian Wars that the Giants are presented with animal skins, torches, and stones, and it is not until the late 4th or early 3rd century BCE that they are depicted in anguiped form. The first example occurs on an Apulian vase painting dating to the first quarter of the 4th century BCE.¹⁰ The most famous examples of anguiped Giants appear on the Great Altar of Pergamum. In the Roman era, the Giants frequently appear in hybrid or anguiped form.

In the Archaic period, the Titanomachy, Typhonomachy, and Gigantomachy are distinct conflicts. The majority of this dissertation does not observe a distinction between these figures and wars because, since the 5th century BCE at least, the Titans, Giants, Typhon and their respective conflicts with Zeus were conflated into one battle.¹¹ This generalization likely emerged because they are all essentially tales of “Anti-Olympians.” Indeed, the Giants, Titans, and Typhon are all closely connected, given their shared status as the Chthonic children of Gaia. The Titans are aptly referred to as “earthly” (χθονίους, *Th.* 697). Even Chthonic monsters not normally associated with the Gigantomachy are sometimes considered Giant-like participants in the battle. Creusa, for example, claims that the Gorgon fought in this battle in Euripides’ *Ion* (988-9). Sometimes, Centaurs are also part of this battle.¹² By the

⁹ For examples of the Giants wearing hoplite armor in visual art, see the frieze of the Siphnian treasury (see Chapter 1) and vase painting (See *LIMC* s.v., *Gigantes* 114-382).

¹⁰ *LIMC* s.v., *Gigantes* 389.

¹¹ E. *Hec.* 466-74, *IT* 222-4, *Ion* 989. See Vian and Moore (1998: 195-117) and Vian (2005).

¹² Naevius, fr. 4. Strzelecki, Hor. *Carm* 3.4.55.

Age of Augustus, these battles had long been conflated enough that Augustan poets would have been drawing from all of these conflicts collectively.

For this dissertation, my analysis of the Archaic period makes distinctions between these different wars, but, in later periods, I will primarily use the term “Gigantomachy” as a sweeping, inclusive term.

Previous Comprehensive Studies of the Gigantomachy

Mayer (1887) gives us the first comprehensive look at the Gigantomachy and Titanomachy. Like many 19th century dissertations, he attempts to find the “true meaning” of the Giants and Titans. He often focuses on the philological analysis of names and makes the claim that many of the Giants and Titans are just epithets of Olympian gods that eventually became different figures.¹³ He is also concerned with the meaning of the names, which lends to somewhat limiting conclusions, such as the Hundred-Handers’ many arms being symbols of the arms of the Aegean (Mayer 1887: 121).

Another seminal work is Vian’s *La Guerre des Géants: le Mythe avant l’Époque Hellénistique* (1952a). He puts a strong focus on the representations of the myth in material culture and seeks to find the myth’s origin in the Chalcidice. Vian also attempts to find an archaic Gigantomachy epic from which sculptors drew inspiration. His work was essential in establishing that there was a clear distinction between the Gigantomachy and Titanomachy in the Archaic period. Moreover, his research was crucial in establishing the Gigantomachy’s connection with the Peisistradian Panathenaea (Vian 1952a: 246-279). The scope of Vian’s project is limited to the time periods before the Hellenistic era. In this dissertation, the art and

¹³ For example, Cyclops was originally “Zeus Cyclops” (Mayer 1887: 111-114).

literature of the Hellenistic Gigantomachy period will be crucial for my study of the myth in the Roman period.

None of these works focus on the myth's connection to civil war, and neither seeks to point out any complications in the myth. Both Mayer and Vian overall suggest that myth inherently suggests a "Chaos vs. Order" theme. Fontenrose (1969) examines the myth of Apollo's acquisition of the sanctuary at Delphi by vanquishing the Python – a myth which can be seen a doublet of the Titanomachy, Typhonomachy, and Gigantomachy. Fontenrose rightly notes a pattern: sometimes the combatants in these myths share similar characteristics, a point which will be relevant to my study as a whole (1969: 470-2).¹⁴

Hardie (1986) gives a comprehensive study of the myth in the poetry of Vergil and argues that the poet uses the myth to symbolize order's triumph over chaos.¹⁵ In Hardie's view, the Olympians' victory over the Giants and Titans is a perfect symbol of "civilization's" victory over "barbarism" – an interpretation that surely would have resonated with the Trojans' victory over the Italians in the *Aeneid*. But I argue that the myth is more than a simplistic story of "civilization" triumphing over chaos. I am aided by the work of O'Hara, who argues that Vergil makes use of variations in the Gigantomachy myth to create ambiguous feelings about the war in Latium as a whole (1994).¹⁶ By looking back and examining the earlier Greek sources for the myth, I expose versions in which the myth is morally complicated and I show how Vergil and other poets made use of that complexity to allegorize uncomfortable political situations.

¹⁴ Ogden (2013: Ch. 6) furthers some of these ideas.

¹⁵ According to Hardie (1986: 154), "The Gigantomachy places [Aeneas] on the side of the gods, re-enacting the primitive victory of order over disorder."

¹⁶ O'Hara gives a revised version of this idea in his 2007 book (96-103).

Chaudhuri (2014) examines the broader category of the Theomachy, the battle against the gods that is quite similar to the Gigantomachy's story of the Giants' rebellion against the Olympians. His study, however, draws from a broader range of figures who defy gods, such as Capaneus, who is part of the myth of the "Seven Against Thebes." Chaudhuri ultimately sees this theme of Theomachy as an evolving discourse about the distinction between god and man that culminates in the age of the divine *princeps*, a time in which this distinction is blurred. He briefly treats the theme in Greek poetry, Lucretius, and Vergil, but the focus of his study is the poetry of the Imperial era. My study provides a complement to Chaudhuri's work by treating the foundational eras that lead up to his study. While Chaudhuri notes the layers of complications in this myth, he does not examine its complicated themes of chaos and order that form a central focus of my study.

Gigantomachy as a Symbolic Battle Between Order and Chaos

Many scholars associate all of these battles against the Olympians with the theme of a black-and-white "Chaos vs. Order" dichotomy. Like other scholars, Vian (1952: 10-15) proposed that the Gigantomachy myth symbolizes Zeus' victory over figures of disorder in the universe. Pollitt (1972: 12) suggests that the Giants became associated with the Persians after the Persian Wars. According to him, the Athenian Acropolis, as an analogue to Mt. Olympus, endured the assaults of the Giant-like Persians in 480 BCE.¹⁷ Vian, however, strongly denies that there is a connection between Giants and Persians following the Persian Wars of the 5th century, stating that there is no evidence for the connection between the figures, and that Pheidias was merely following the precedent of the earlier representations of

¹⁷ Castriota (1992: 138) follows this idea.

the Gigantomachy on the “Old Athena Temple” (1952: 288-89). Perhaps one of the most foundational works is Hardie’s *Virgil’s Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (1986). He argues that the myth conveys this concept of “Chaos vs. Order,” and that it is especially present in the *Aeneid* of Vergil. To argue this view, he makes ample use of the imagery of the Gigantomachy on the Great Altar of Pergamum, but Whitaker (2005) reveals that this monument’s depiction of the Gigantomachy is not so straightforward and comes with deeper hints of far greater complexity. Whitaker shows that the monument contains ambiguities that distort the distinction between Olympian and Giant and provide a sympathetic portrayal of the Giants. In my own analysis, I will further show how this frieze is not the best example of the Gigantomachy representing “Chaos vs. Order.” Through some of the themes that I survey below, I will show how often the Gigantomachy does not convey such an unequivocal dichotomy, and how often poets and artists specifically employ the myth to suggest subversive interpretations of conflict that undermine propagandistic elements of the myth.

The Concept of Civil War

Civil war forms a significant part of my study. Agamben in his book on *Stasis* observes, “there is a ‘polemology,’ a theory of war, and ‘irenology,’ a theory of peace, but there is no ‘stasiology,’ no theory of civil war” (2015: 2). Armitage, in his recent book (2017), explores the concept of civil war from antiquity to the present. He, too, laments that there is no “Civil War Theory” available; yet, he also claims that it is not his “aim to provide an overarching theory of civil war.” Though both scholars claim not to be proposing a theory for civil war, the framework that they collectively put forth is helpful in understanding why the Gigantomachy frequently became an allegory for civil war. I employ several of the

fundamental points from their studies in my own analysis of the Gigantomachy myth and civil war.

One important claim made by Agamben and Armitage is that a key component of civil war is the inherent breakdown of the distinction between friend and enemy.¹⁸ Over time, the Gigantomachy myth was used less as a tale about “Us vs. Them” and more as an introspective story of “Us vs. Us.” Furthermore, as Agamben (2015: 24) and Armitage (2017: 16, 26) discuss in their studies, all wars eventually become civil.¹⁹ This is certainly true for the Romans. As Rome extended its power over the “known world,” their foreign wars increasingly came to be seen as conflicts that were more like civil wars taking place within their very own territory.²⁰

Ultimately, I demonstrate how the Gigantomachy is an apt myth for civil war, and how the myth’s association with civil strife further complicates the traditional view of a wide gulf between those who are “civilizing” and those who are to be “civilized.” While Loraux (1997: 22) may argue that *stasis* can be seen as an essential component of civilized society, I follow Agamben (2015: 13-17) and disagree with Loraux’s suggestion. Loraux suggest that *stasis* resides at the heart of the household (1997: 44). Agamben, however, argues that *stasis* renders family members and foreign entities indistinguishable. Civil war is antithetical to “civilized” society because, during *stasis*, the very foundations of the *oikos* and *polis* break down.

¹⁸ Agamben (2015: 13-15); Armitage (2017: 12). They both follow the earlier theory of Carl Schmitt (1996).

¹⁹ Price also suggests this his study of *stasis* in the Thucydides (2001: 69ff.)

²⁰ This blurring of foreign and civil war is especially the case in Silius Italicus (though not treated in this dissertation). Though his poem is about the Punic Wars, the *Punica* is replete with the language of civil wars. See Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986: 2518); Marks (2010); Tipping (2010: 35-44); and Augoustakis (2010).

Themes of the Gigantomachy

In my study, seven themes reoccur throughout the different iterations of the Gigantomachy. With a close look, we will see poets and artists highlighting these key themes that undermine the simplistic “Chaos vs. Order” binary that is so commonly applied to the Gigantomachy myth.

Familial Strife

One of these central, alternative motifs is the presence of interrelated familial strife. The Olympians were closely related to the Titans, and they were technically related to the Giants as well. In the Greco-Roman world, the family was seen as the microcosm of the state.²¹ Rome, during the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, was particularly sensitive to these issues because of the unfortunate frequency of civil violence and civil wars. The legends of Romulus and Remus’ fratricide,²² the early Romans’ conflict with their in-laws the Sabines,²³ and the Theban cycle are emblematic of their own civil wars.

Confusion of Friend and Foe

In the Gigantomachy, it is often difficult to decipher which figures are on the side of the Giants and which are on the side of the Olympians. This confusion is sometimes the effect of the “twinning” of the Giants and Olympians. The Olympians are often represented

²¹ For the family as microcosm for the state in the Greek world, see Brock 2013: 25-42. For the Roman world, see Bannon (1997: 158-159)

²² Bannon (1997: 158-159)

²³ Brown (1995)

with Giant-like characteristics or in combat with weapons that are similar to those of the Giants. Some of these figures even switch sides immediately before or during battle. This type of confusion is a common trope in the civil war narrative, as mentioned above. This phenomenon is especially relevant during Rome's civil wars of the 1st century BCE.

Hill Assault and Siege

Typically presented as attacking Mt. Olympus, the fighting Giants have clear associations with hill assault. The Athenians perhaps drew comparisons between the Giants and the Persians, since the Persians assaulted their sacred and most important hill in 480 BCE. This analogy will also be applied to the Celts when they attack Delphi on Mt. Parnassus in 279 BCE. In the Roman world, the Capitoline and Palatine become analogues for Mt. Olympus. They had their own Gallic assault in 390, but this assault transforms into a civil one in the 1st century BCE when Remus' attack on the Palatine becomes a metaphor for civil war and Roman generals begin to lay siege to the Capitoline Hill.

Civil Conflict as Cyclical

After Zeus defeats the Titans, Typhon, and the Giants, his rule over the universe seems to be finalized. At times, however, the texts hint of a possibility that these figures might escape from their prisons and wreak havoc upon the world. This concern is a common one in civil war when fighting parties are aware that their opposition is not likely to ever truly dissolve, and that the cycle of violence will likely see no end. Indeed, Armitage remarks in his comprehensive study that civil war is often cyclical (2017: 68-69).

Violence in the Gigantomachy

Extreme violence is a key component of the Gigantomachy. The Giants are often characterized as bestial figures whose unchecked violence brings about their downfall. At the same time, Zeus uses violence to subdue the Giants. Some sources characterize this violence as “justified.”²⁴ Other traditions stress that the Olympians used *Metis* over violence.²⁵ But Zeus uses violence that is indistinguishable from the Giants. His thunderbolt is quite similar to the fire that Typhon breathes (and, in some versions, other Giants breathe). And in some versions of the myth, Zeus even brings the hybrid, brutish Hundred-Handers over to his side, despite the reputation that they hold as the embodiment of excessive violence. Interestingly, in other versions of the myth, these Hundred-Handers are on the side of the Giants/Titans (Eumelos, fr. 2 K = Schol. Apollon. 1165). These enemies of the Olympians often have animalistic traits. Typhon has many serpentine heads and the Giants are later represented with serpentine legs.²⁶ These bestial characteristics suggest animalistic violence. At the same time, poets and artists present the Olympians in these conflicts with beast-like characteristics (e.g., calling Dionysus “βρίομιος” in the *Ion*, 216) or highlight that they are helped by their animal attendants (e.g., Athena’s snake on the Great Altar of Pergamum).

Gigantomachy in Art and Rhetoric

²⁴ Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.65-66.

²⁵ A. *PV.* 205-213.

²⁶ On the Great Altar of Pergamum, some of the Giants have other bestial characteristics; one giant has the head of a lion. Another has the neck of a bull.

As stated above, the Gigantomachy was a frequent theme in visual art. Ancient poets and artists were aware that art – both poetic and visual – is inherently deceptive. This concept is especially highlighted by ecphrases, which are essentially descriptions of works of art. Often, poets create a scenario in their literature in which some of their characters who are viewing artistic representations of the Gigantomachy will misinterpret these works of art or craftily interpret them to suit their own agenda. In the poetry of Aeschylus, Euripides, Naevius, and Vergil, the Gigantomachy appears in the medium of visual art and this artistic representation is usually polysemous. In rhetoric too, the use of the Gigantomachy is not straightforward. Poets position some of their characters to speak of the Gigantomachy myth in such a way that manipulates other characters or convinces them to align with their own political needs. This use of the Gigantomachy in rhetoric fits seamlessly with the idea of civil conflict: Thucydides tells us in his treatise on *stasis* that, during these civil conflicts, the meanings of words change to reinforce individuals' agendas in the conflicts (3.82.4).

Giants as Sympathetic or Positive Figures

In early representations, it is common for the Giants to be presented as demon-like, bestial figures. There are some representations, however, that portray them in a sympathetic light, such as the image of their mother, Gaia, mourning; Gaia (and the Earth) mourning for Typhon in the *Theogony* (858); and Prometheus expressing pity for Typhon in *Prometheus Bound* following his unfortunate death at the hands of Zeus' tyranny (351-54). On the Great Altar of Pergamum, scholars have also noticed the sympathetic portrayal of Gaia as she

mourns her sons.²⁷ While the Giants are traditionally styled as categorical “antagonists” in this divine conflict, we will see them eventually becoming even positive figures.

Chapter Overviews

Chapter 1

In Chapter 1, I examine the theme of the Gigantomachy in Hesiod, other Archaic poets, and visual art. Though the Gigantomachy myth itself is absent from extant poetry, I examine the similar Titanomachy and Typhonomachy myths, and the Gigantomachy themes that are present. Though there is no overt reference to civil strife in Hesiod, we will examine the basis of anti-Olympian myth and identify noteworthy themes that make it easily identifiable with civil strife. Towards the end of the Archaic period, we will see a more direct connection to civil strife in poets like Pindar, Xenophanes, and Bacchylides. The Gigantomachy also appears in the art of the Archaic period and we will again observe its fitting connection to civil strife there.

Chapter 2

The next chapter reviews the Gigantomachy as a frequent theme of tragedy and comedy in Athens. Since Athens was a city known for its *stasis* and Greek drama was so closely connected to Athenian politics, we will see complicated Gigantomachic themes present in narratives that reflect the civil strife of the era. This is present even despite the fact that this is a time period when Athens proudly gloated about its victory over the Persians – a

²⁷ Whitaker (2005: 171) calls this the “most paradoxical image on the frieze.”

victory that one might imagine would be likened to the more traditional interpretation of the “Us vs. Them” version of the Gigantomachy.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 examines the myth in Hellenistic literature and art. At times, it signifies Greek victory over invading “barbarians” as it did during the times of the Persian Wars. This is unsurprising since there were many groups in the Hellenistic period who wished to display their “Greekness” by presenting themselves as defenders of Greece against invaders. At the same time, however, during this time period, the line between Greek and non-Greek begins to blur historically. This shift is seen in representations of the Gigantomachy as well, as Hellenized peoples begin to be cast as Giants, and as the Gigantomachy begins to serve as a lens for paradigms of familial conflicts. During this era, the attempt to claim that the Gigantomachy myth signifies “civilized vs. uncivilized” becomes much more complicated. This chapter shows how easily the charge of being “Giant-like” can be cast – in particular against the Romans, who will be of interest in later chapters.

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 treats the myth during the time of the Middle and Late Republic. When the Romans adopted the myth, it was under similar complicated circumstances. During the Middle Republic, the Romans were just beginning to establish themselves as a “civilizing” force in the Mediterranean. Their interactions involved conflicts with their Greek neighbors, the previous harbingers of “civilization.” During the Punic Wars and the wars in Greece, the Greeks were both allies and enemies of Rome. This made it quite difficult to determine who was “civilized” and who was not. In this time period, the Giants become positive figures for the first time.

Chapter 5

During the Augustan period, the traditional association of the Gigantomachy and “Chaos vs. Order” completely breaks down. This dissertation concludes at the Augustan era, the point at which the Gigantomachy is used almost exclusively as a myth about civil strife. On the surface, the Augustan poets’ use of the Gigantomachy myth does convey the original meaning of order triumphing over disorder, but this superficial presentation of the myth is reflective of the discomfort in the time when these poems were produced and the unspoken need to seemingly align with the political propaganda of those currently in power. Regimes sought to delegitimize their political opponents by styling civil wars as foreign ones. But with a closer look, we can see that the poets are subtly activating the complicating themes of the Gigantomachy that showcase it as myth of civil strife. During the 1st century BCE, the Romans were acutely aware of their problem with civil strife. Rome’s civil wars became controversial enough that any mention of them was often suppressed (see the *Res Gestae*). By using the myth of the Gigantomachy to talk about their civil wars, the Augustan poets were able to accomplish two ends: they could give the impression that the recent wars were like foreign wars in order to appease political expectations of the time, and they could simultaneously process the violence of their civil wars through the relatable medium of the Gigantomachy and its intrafamilial conflict.

CHAPTER 1

ANTI-OLYMPIAN MYTHS IN THE ARCHAIC PERIOD

Beginning in the Archaic period, the myths of the Titanomachy, Typhonomachy, and Gigantomachy provide glimpses into the view of divine war and how questions of rebellion, order, chaos, and the right to rule were treated in literature. Since each of these myths were understood to be uniquely separate myths during this time period, this chapter will keep them distinct and examine them individually. At their very core, they all represent a threat to the power of Zeus – a common thread that essentially merges them into one story in later traditions. This chapter sheds light on some of the core elements of each of these myths that will occur again in later time periods’ representations of the overarching “Anti-Olympian myth.”

Anti-Olympians in the *Theogony*

Though there are brief references to the war with the Titans and Giant-like figures in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the first full treatment of this type of divine war occurs in Hesiod’s *Theogony*.²⁸ In this poem, Zeus overthrows his father Cronus and leads a battle in which he and the gods defeat the rival Titans and claim power over the universe. While the Gigantomachy does not appear in the *Theogony* – other than in brief allusions to the birth of the Giants (*Th.* 185-7) – the poem is our earliest extant literary account of the Titanomachy and the Typhonomachy, both of which are very similar to the Gigantomachy in their conflicts

²⁸ Briareus (also called “Aegaeon”), the Giant-like Hundred-Hander appears as an ally of Zeus in *Iliad* 1.401-3. Gaia mourning the death of Typhon also appears in the *Iliad* (2.781-3). The Titans, their war, and their subsequent imprisonment are mentioned several times in the *Iliad* (8.478-81, 14.203-4, 14.274-9, 15.224-5). In the *Odyssey*, Otus and Ephialtes pile up mountains in their assault on Mt. Olympus (11.305-320). Later literary sources include them among the Giants.

and threats that they pose to Zeus' order. The *Theogony* serves as our earliest comprehensive source of such “Anti-Olympian” conflicts.

Many scholars have commented that this poem is emblematic of the “Chaos vs. Order” trope.²⁹ Indeed, Cronus eats his children and earns the reputation of an uncivilized monster (*Th.* 459). The Titans are painted as excessively hubristic:

ὕβριστήν δὲ Μενόιτιον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
εἰς ἔρεβος κατέπεμψε βαλὼν πολόεντι κεραυνῷ
εἴνεκ' ἀτασθαλίας τε καὶ ἠγορέης ὑπερόπλου.

Wide-seeing Zeus sent **violent** Menoitius down to Erebus striking him with the sooty thunderbolt because of his **reckless** and his **over-bearing prowess**. (Hes. *Th.* 514-16).³⁰

Typhon is called “lawless” and “guilty of hubris” (ὕβριστήν τ' ἄνομόν, 307) by the poet himself. Typhon's hybrid form and association with animals also suggest that he is “uncivilized” with his one hundred serpentine heads (825), his part-snake body (825), and the sounds he emits that resemble a bull (832), a lion (833), and a dog (835). Hesiod catalogues the details of these strange sounds that Typhon makes:

φωναὶ δ' ἐν πάσῃσιν ἔσαν δεινῆς κεφαλῇσι,
παντοίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον· ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ
φθέγγονθ' ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ταύρου ἐριβρύχεω μένος ἀσχέτου ὄσσαν ἀγούρου,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε λέοντος ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντος,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ σκυλάκεσσιν εἰκότα, θαύματ' ἀκοῦσαι,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ ροίζεσχ', ὑπὸ δ' ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά.

There were sounds on all the terrible heads that sent forth an ungodly voice. For sometimes they made sounds such as for the gods to understand, at other times they uttered the voice of a wild, stately bull, intractable in its rage, at other times the voice of lion who has a shameless heart, at other times like puppies, a wonder to hear, at other times they whistled, and the great mountains echoed from their base. (*Th.* 829-835)

²⁹ Solmnsen (1949: 9); Blickman (1987); Goslin (2012); Lombardi (2012).

³⁰ Translation of Latin and Greek in this dissertation are my own unless otherwise specified.

Scholars refer to his unusual sounds as an indicator of his disorderly nature.³¹ This disorderly noise is in direct contrast to the harmony created by Zeus' daughters, the Muses, who serenade the audience in the introduction to the *Theogony* (Goslin 2012: 140-141).

Commonalities Among Enemies in the Theogony

There are certain elements of the Titanomachy and Typhonomachy in the *Theogony* that make a “Chaos vs. Order” reading difficult to sustain. At times, Zeus seems a double of his Chthonic opponents. This is particularly apparent when he receives significant help from Gaia, the mother of Zeus' enemies. Gaia had nursed Zeus after his mother Rhea saved him from being devoured by his father (Hes. *Th.* 479-484). And she is the one who gives Zeus the idea to release the Hundred-Handers, who go on to become the allies that help Zeus eventually defeat the Titans (Hes. *Th.* 624-628). Ultimately, Gaia switches sides to stand as an opponent to Zeus later in the poem when she gives birth to Zeus' final rival: Typhon (821). Beyond the aid that he receives from his earthly grandmother, there is another aspect of Zeus that is Chthonic: where he was raised. Hesiod tells us that Zeus was brought up in a cave:

.... τὸν μὲν οἱ ἐδέξατο Γαῖα πελώρη
 Κρήτη ἐν εὐρείῃ τρεφόμεν ἀτιταλλέμεναί τε.
 ἔνθα μιν ἵκτο φέρουσα θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν,
 πρώτην ἐς Λύκτον· κρύψεν δέ ἐ χειρσὶ λαβοῦσα
 ἄντρῳ ἐν ἡλιβάτῳ, **ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης,**
 Αἰγαίῳ ἐν ὄρει πεπυκασμένῳ ὕληεντι.

... and **huge Earth received** him (Zeus) in broad Crete to nurse him and rear him up. There she came first to Lyctus, carrying him through the swift black night; taking him in her hands she concealed him in a deep cave, **under the hidden places of the holy earth**, in the Aegean mountain abounding with forests ... (Hes.*Th.* 479-484)

³¹ Pucci (2009), Goslin (2012), Ford (1992: 190-95).

In addition to its earthen setting, this passage contains lexical connections to two other lines in the *Theogony*. When Hesiod describes the flesh-eating monster Echidna, he uses the exact same language: “under the hidden places of the holy Earth” (ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης, 300). This formula is almost exactly repeated less than 200 lines later in the passage cited above. The formula again appears at line 334 where Hesiod describes a monstrous snake “in the hidden places of the *dark* Earth” (ἐρεμνῆς κεύθεσι γαίης). West (1966 ad loc.) notes the verbal resonances between these passages, but gives no interpretation. I argue that these verbal echoes suggest parallels between Zeus and the two other serpentine figures. Zeus needs to have Chthonic power if he is going to take on his Chthonic opponents.

Other scholars have noted some similarities between Zeus and Typhon. Fontenrose (1949: 470ff.) points out many similarities between Zeus and Typhon, particularly the resemblance in their weapons of choice: Typhon breathes fire while Zeus wields the fire-like thunderbolt. As Brockliss (2018: 135) notes, Zeus’ thunderbolt has disorderly origins. It comes from the disorderly Cyclopes (*Th.* 139-46). Ogden (2013: Ch. 6) also treats this topic and gives a comprehensive overview of this twinning of weaponry throughout Greek myth. Such Chthonic associations – through his close connection to Gaia and through these verbal echoes – further suggest a twinning of Zeus with his Chthonic opponents.

Zeus is also associated with disorder in this poem through the noises he makes via his thunderbolt. When he battles the Titans, a great amount of cacophony is created:

ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα φερέσβιος ἐσμαράγιζε
 καιομένη, λάκε δ’ ἀμφὶ πυρὶ μεγάλ’ ἄσπετος ὕλη.
 ἔξεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα
 πόντος τ’ ἀτρύγετος: τοὺς δ’ ἄμφεπε θερμὸς αὐτμὴ
 Τιτῆνας χθονίους, φλόξ δ’ αἰθέρα διὰν ἵκανε
 ἄσπετος, ὅσσε δ’ ἄμερδε καὶ ἰφθίμων περ ἐόντων
 αὐγὴ μαρμαίρουσα κεραυνοῦ τε στεροπῆς τε.
 καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν Χάος: εἴσατο δ’ ἅντα

ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν ἢ δ' οὔρασι ὄσσαν ἀκοῦσαι
 αὐτως, ὥς εἰ Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρύς ὑπερθε
 πῖλνατο: τοῖος γάρ κε μέγας ὑπὸ **δοῦπος** ὀρώρει
 τῆς μὲν ἐρειπομένης, τοῦ δ' ὑψόθεν ἐξεριπόντος:
 τόσσος **δοῦπος** ἔγεντο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων.
 σὺν δ' ἄνεμοι ἑνοσί τε κονίην τ' **ἐσφαράγιζον**
 βροντήν τε στεροπήν τε καὶ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,
 κῆλα Διὸς μέγαιον, φέρον δ' **ἰαχὴν** τ' **ἐνοπήν** τε
 ἐς μέσον ἀμφοτέρων: ὄτοβος δ' ἀπλητος ὀρώρει
 σμερδαλέης ἔριδος, κάρτος δ' ἀνεφαίνετο ἔργων.

The life-giving earth **crashed** around in burning, and the vast wood **crackled loud** with fire all about. [695] All the land seethed, and Ocean's streams and the unfruitful sea. The hot vapor lapped round the earthborn Titans: flame unspeakable rose to the bright upper air: the flashing glare of the thunderstone and lightning blinded their eyes for all that they were strong. [700] Astounding heat seized Chaos: and to see with eyes and to hear the **sound** with ears it seemed even as if Earth and wide Heaven above came together; for such a mighty **crash** would have arisen if Earth were being hurled to ruin, and Heaven from on high were hurling her down; [705] so great a crash was there while the gods were meeting together in strife. Also the winds brought rumbling earthquake and duststorm, thunder and lightning and the lurid thunderbolt, which are the shafts of great Zeus, and carried the **clangor** and the **wild cry** into the midst of the two hosts. A horrible uproar [710] of terrible strife arose (*Th.* 693-710. Trans. Evelyn-White)

Hesiod, however, does not attribute this disorderly noise to the Titans. Brockliss (2018: 136-7) remarks that the sound that the thunderbolt makes is indistinguishable from the disorderly noises that the Titans make. Zeus fosters a similar type of noisy disorder when he fights Typhon as well. As noted above, Typhon is characterized as disorderly though the type of noise that he makes. Zeus makes parallel noises through his use of the thunderbolt to defeat Typhon:

σκληρὸν δ' ἐβρόντησε καὶ ὄβριμον, ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα
σμερδαλέον κονάβησε καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρύς ὑπερθε
 πόντος τ' Ὠκεανοῦ τε ῥοαὶ καὶ Τάρταρα γαίης.
 ποσσὶ δ' ὑπ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγας πελεμίζειτ' Ὀλυμπος
 ὀρνυμένοιο ἄνακτος: ἐπεστενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.
 καῦμα δ' ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων κάτεχεν ἰοειδέα πόντον
 βροντῆς τε στεροπῆς τε, πυρός τ' ἀπὸ τοῦ πελώρου,
 πρηστήρων ἀνέμων τε κεραυνοῦ τε φλεγέθοντος.

ἔζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἡδὲ θάλασσα:
 θυῖε δ' ἄρ' ἀμφ' ἀκτὰς περὶ τ' ἀμφὶ τε κύματα μακρὰ
 ῥιπῇ ὑπ' ἀθανάτων, ἔνοσις δ' ἄσβεστος ὁρώρει:
 850 τρέε δ' Αἰδης, ἐνέροισι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσων,
 Τιτῆνες θ' ὑποταρτάριοι, Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες,
ἄσβέστου κελάδοιο καὶ αἰνῆς δηιοτήτος.

But he [Zeus] **thundered hard and mightily**: and the earth around [840] **resounded terribly** and the wide heaven above, and the sea and Ocean's streams and the nether parts of the earth. Great Olympus reeled beneath the divine feet of the king as he arose and earth groaned thereat. And through the two of them heat took hold on the dark-blue sea, [845] through the thunder and lightning, and through the fire from the monster, and the scorching winds and blazing thunderbolt. The whole earth seethed, and sky and sea: and the long waves raged along the beaches round and about at the rush of the deathless gods: and there arose an endless shaking. [850] Hades trembled where he rules over the dead below, and the Titans under Tartarus who live with Cronos, because of the **unending clamor** and the fearful strife. (*Th.* 840-852. Trans. Evelyn-White)

Goslin (2012: 363-6) sees Zeus' noise as a sort of sonic response to Typhon. According to Goslin, Zeus' response is a more orderly statement of power that contrasts with the confusion of Typhon. Brockliss (2018: 142-143), however, reminds us of the monstrous origins of Zeus' thunderbolt and points out how the lines at the end of this passage fail to distinguish who is creating the noise that causes the earthquake. Zeus essentially creates disorder through clamors that nearly destroy the universe.

At the outset of the poem, Hesiod directly contrasts the disorder of Zeus with the order that the Muses creates. In the same line, he describes Zeus as “loud thudding” (ἐριγδούποιο, 41), and the Muses as “lily voices” (ὀπὶ λειριοέσση, 41).³² The location of this juxtaposition suggests that the poet wishes to imply that this contrast will exist throughout the poem. This disorder that Zeus creates further contributes to Hesiod's presentation of him as a “twin” of his opponents.

³² As Brockliss (2018: 134) observes.

In addition to this twinning of opponents and the confusion of antagonist and protagonist in the Gigantomachy, the myth also presents itself in such a way that it is difficult to know who is on the side of the Olympians and who is on the side of the Titans. The Olympians have many figures on their side who seem like they might belong on the side of the Giants or Titans. In the *Theogony*, Zeus has a special relationship with the Titan Styx, for example. Before the war between the Olympians and Titans begins, Zeus makes offers to the Titans to fight in the coming war on the side of the Olympians (*Th.* 383-99). Styx, clearly a Titanic/Chthonic figure, joins the Olympian side. Styx is the consort of Pallas, a Titan. In the forthcoming war, she and her children will be fighting against members of their own immediate family.³³ In terms of Zeus' strategy to recruit those who might be considered his opponents, Hesiod indicates that Styx was the "first" (πρώτη, 395), implying that there were more like herself who switched to the side of Zeus, though the poet leaves the audience to wonder. Finally, it is significant that Styx brings her children with her. This, as Clay (2003: 22) argues, is how Zeus wins the war: by incorporating gods of the earlier generation into his own regime.

Styx and her children are not the only allies of Zeus who seem like they are on the wrong side. Zeus frees the Cyclopes, whose skill with the forge proves instrumental as they help craft Zeus' game-changing thunderbolt (*Th.* 501-5). Their monstrous appearance and close familial connection to Gaia might more naturally connect them to the Titans. In a

³³ Pallas shares the same name as a Giant and they may have eventually been identified with one another. In the Gigantomachy, this Pallas is usually paired against Athena and is one of the proposed origins of her epithet. In Apollod. 1.6.2, Athena defeats Pallas, flays him, and his skin becomes her Aegis. For a Roman source for Pallas as a Giant, see the fragment from Accius' *Eriphyla* (fr. 326 apud Prisc. *G.L.* 2.236.5). West (1966 ad 376) questions whether or not we can see a connection between the Giant Pallas or Attic king who was uncle Theseus and became the progenitor of the Arcadians in Italy. Considering how easily the Giants and Titans were conflated by the 5th century, I do not see how the Roman *would not* see them as connection. Furthermore, we should not that Theseus' battle with Pallantids, the sons of Pallas (and his cousins) was styled as a Gigantomachy (Soph. fr. 24.6-8). On the darker implications of this epithet of Athena, see Deacy 2016.

similar way, Zeus also frees the Hundred-Handers, whose hybrid, monstrous elements might connote the Giants and Titans rather than the Olympians (*Th.* 617-626). Their weapons of choice are large rocks (714-717), which are the typical weapon of the Giants.³⁴ The poet of the lost epic *Titanomachia* places two of these figures, Briareus (also known as Aegaeon) and Cottus, on the side of the Titans and Giants (Eumelos, fr. 2 K = Schol. Apollon. 1165c). One wonders if these figures were placed on the side of the Titans in part because it is simply confusing to have these monstrous, violent figures on the side of the Olympians. The Hundred-Handers seem like they *should* be on the side of the Titans, and this is perhaps why the poet of the *Titanomachia* puts him on that side. Prometheus is another figure who changes allegiance during this war. Hesiod curiously does not mention whose side he was on during the war with the Titans – only that he was punished for giving fire to man (*Th.* 507-584). *Prometheus Bound*, however, creates a setting in which he switches to the side of Zeus just before the war (A. *PV.* 197-241).

Hesiod also presents the death of Typhon in a sympathetic manner. With the death of Zeus' final threat to power, the audience gains an image of Earth, his mother, in mourning. Hesiod presents her as mourning twice: once before Zeus sets out to kill Typhon (ἐπεστονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα, 843), and later after Zeus deals Typhon the death blow (στονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη, 858). Here, Hesiod plays with the ambiguities of the meaning of words: “the earth groaned.” This is perhaps because the fight created significant noise, or it could be a more anthropomorphic interpretation that capitalizes the gamma in γαῖα: “mother earth lamented,” as στοναῖν and its cognates can mean “groan” or “lament” (OLD s.v. στοναχέω).

³⁴ For the frequency of large stones as weapons for the Giants in vase painting, see Hildebrandt (2014: 75)

Gigantomachy in Archaic Sculpture

While the image of the Gigantomachy in sculpture is often presented as an analogue for the Panhellenic conflict with the Persians, many sculptural projects containing the Gigantomachy predate the Persian Wars. Our first extant examples of the Gigantomachy occur in visual art of the Archaic period. In these cases, the Gigantomachy connotes *stasis*. In the 6th century, the tyrant Peisistratus took over the Athenian state by means of civil strife (Hdt.1.59-64). The Peisistratids used this imagery in their architectural program. One of the pediments on the “Old Athena Temple” presents Athena fighting Enceladus (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Athena on the "Old Athena Temple" (Image Source: By Fcgsccac - Own work, CC BY-SA 4.0, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=37814182>).

The fragments we have also suggest the use of violent force on the part of the gods against the Giants. Athena, as she faces off against one of the Giants, extends one of the snakes from her aegis towards the Giant.³⁵

³⁵ In Attic vase paintings of the early 5th century, Giants are “barbarized” by being depicted with animal-skins. See Vian 1952: 145-6.

This imagery of the Gigantomachy on the “Old Athena Temple” is often seen as a reference to the Peisistratids’ reorganization of the Greater Panathenaea. One of the *aitia* of the Panathenaea was that the festival was in honor of Athena’s victory over the Giants.³⁶ A central focus of this festival was the presentation of the ceremonial peplos that would be placed on the olive wood Athena statue. On this peplos were woven images of the Gigantomachy.³⁷ It seems that, as Boardman (1972:57-72) argues, the Peisistratids used Gigantomachic imagery in their propaganda. By suggesting a connection to Heracles, the Peisistratids justified the violence to take over Athens, just as Heracles aided the Olympians in their defeat of the Giants.³⁸ This political imagery becomes more complicated when the Tyrannicides decided to enact their assassination plot during the Panathenaic festival.³⁹

Similarly, the Alcmaeonids, the aristocratic family that was expelled from Athens as a result of Peisistratus’ *coup*, financed the temple to Apollo at Delphi, which also depicts a Gigantomachy that is famously described in the chorus of Euripides’ *Ion* (205-219). Barbanera (1995: 89-91) views this building program as a response to the Peisistratids’ own Gigantomachic project. Through the sculptural programs on these respective temples, the Peisistratids and Alcmaeonids present the conflict in Athens as a *stasis* through the imagery of the Gigantomachy.

The north frieze of the Siphnian treasury at Delphi also presents the Gigantomachy. Neer (2001) argues that this sculpture group is indicative of the class struggles on Siphnos in the latter half of the 6th century caused by the great wealth of the island’s mines. I offer two

³⁶ Some scholars think the festival was a celebration of Athena’s birthday. For a summary of the discussion, see Ridgeway 1992: 127.

³⁷ Schol. ad E. *Hec.* 446-474; Ar. *Eq.* 566; Plat. *Euthyph.* 6b; Verg. *App. Cir. Suid.* s.v. peplos.

³⁸ For the connection of the Gigantomachy and the Peisistratids, see Boardman (1975) and Ferrari (1994).

³⁹ Thuc. 6.56.2; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 18.2

new points to further support Neer's theory. On the east pediment of this treasury, we see an image of Apollo and Heracles struggling over the Delphic tripod (see Figure 2).



Figure 2: Apollo and Heracles Fighting Over Tripod, East Pediment of the Siphnian Treasury (Image Source: David J. Wright).

Scholars have interpreted this image in various ways. Parke and Boardman (1957) have read it as a reference to the First Sacred War. Heracles, since he tries to steal Apollo's oracular seat, is an allegory for Crisa. Apollo represents the Amphictyony and the tripod is Delphi itself. Boardman (1978: 231) later changes his mind and suggests, in line with Peisistratus' Heracleian propaganda in Athens, that Heracles represents Peisistratus on this pediment.⁴⁰ I suggest another interpretation: in agreement with Neer's theory that the images on this treasury reflect civil unrest on Siphnos, I posit that the conflict between Apollo and Heracles can be read as fraternal. Indeed, Apollo and Heracles are half-brothers. The fraternal nature of this struggle is highlighted by the fact that their father, Zeus, stands between them to stop

⁴⁰ Watrous (1982: 167-8) sees this scene as Delphic propaganda. Heracles represents Peisistratus (and Athens). Apollo stands for Delphi. The tripod equals whatever they happen to be fighting over. Neer (2001: 293) rightfully dismisses this and Boardman's views as Athenocentrism.

their fight. I also add that the gods, as in the case of Athena on the “Old Athena Temple,” use extreme violent force when fighting the Giants (see Figure 3).



Figure 3: Lion Bites Giant on North Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury (Image Source: David J. Wright).

In this image, a lion from Themis' chariot brutally bites one of the Giants. Beast-like violence is often characteristic of the Giants themselves, so it seems odd here that the artist has the gods enacting this type of violence. This bestial violence is contrasted by the “civilized” image of the Giants in hoplite armor.⁴¹ I suggest that this imagery of fraternal conflict and animalistic violence heavily connotes civil strife.

This association of the Gigantomachy and civil strife also appears on the temple of Artemis at Corcyra. This pediment contains perhaps one of the few visual depictions of a

⁴¹ For the hoplite and “civilization,” see Carpenter (2003: 23-4). Watrous (1982) views the Gigantomachy's hoplite armor as anti-Athenian propaganda. It also seems significant that this frieze is the *only* of a phalanx in Archaic sculpture (Stewart 1997: 89).

Titanomachy. On the right side of the pediment is an image of a beardless Zeus assailing another figure with a thunderbolt (see Figure 4).



Figure 4: Zeus about attack a Titan (or a Giant?) on the West Pediment of the Temple to Artemis at Corcyra (Image Source: By Dr.K. - Own work, CC BY-SA 3.0, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=16642167>).

Some scholars have suggested that the attacked figure is a Titan. If this is the case, we would have the image of Zeus assaulting one of his close relatives. Other scholars have posited that the figure is perhaps a Giant.⁴² In either scenario, it is a violent image. Even before the famous bouts of *stasis* catalogued by Thucydides (3.81-3), Corcyra was a city famous for its internal conflict. The myth-history of the city-state confirms this. Corcyra was a colony of Corinth, and it is clear from its myth-history that Corcyra did not exist in harmony with its mother city. According to Herodotus, Periander, tyrant of Corinth, exiles his son Lycophron

⁴² For the various identifications of these figures, see Rodenwaldt (1939: 79ff).

to rule Corcyra after Periander kills his wife, Lycophron's mother, Melissa (3.50-53). Shortly after his unwelcome arrival, the Corcyrans murder their new ruler Lycophron. In retaliation, Periander sends all of the sons of the Corcyrean nobles to Sardis to become eunuchs (3.48). In a later time period in the 6th century, Corcyra defeats its mother city in a prolonged naval battle. Given the strained relationship and this ongoing existence of tension, it is unsurprising to see an image of familial strife on the pediments of one of Corcyra's more impressive temples.⁴³

Gigantomachy in Xenophanes

The association of these divine wars with civil conflict is more directly implied in other cases. Looking back to the 6th century BCE, we can observe this connotation of the myth in a fragment of Xenophanes. In this fragment, which may be almost an entire poem, the speaker shares the rules of the symposium. Towards the end of the fragment, he lists the poetic topics that will be appropriate for this gathering:

χρὴ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν θεὸν ὑμνεῖν εὖφρονας ἄνδρας
 εὐφήμοις μύθοις καὶ καθαροῖσι λόγοις,
 σπείσαντάς τε καὶ εὐξαμένους τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι
 πρήσσειν· ταῦτα γὰρ ὧν ἐστὶ προχειρότερον,
 οὐχ ὕβρεις· πίνειν δ' ὅποσον κεν ἔχων ἀφίκοιο
 οἴκαδ' ἄνευ προπόλου μὴ πάνυ γηραλέος·
 ἀνδρῶν δ' αἰνεῖν τοῦτον ὃς ἐσθλὰ πιὼν ἀναφαίνει,
 ὥς ἤι μνημοσύνη καὶ τόνοσ' ἀμφ' ἀρετῆς,
 οὗ τι μάχας διέπειν **Τιτῆνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων**
 οὐδὲ <τι> Κενταύρων, πλάσμα<τα> τῶν προτέρων,
 ἢ **στάσιας σφεδανάς**· τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστιν·

It is necessary first for men of good disposition to compose a hymn to a god with reverent stories and clean accounts, making libations and praying to be capable of enacting justice. In fact, these things, not acts of violence, are more pressing: to drink as much as one can and make it home without an attendant unless he is elderly. And

⁴³ For the sculptural program possible connection to Corcyra's turbulent relationship with Corinth, see Macroni (2004: 215).

(it is necessary) to praise this man who, drinking, offers up what is good so that there might be a recollection of and striving for *arête*, **not to be engaged in the battles of the Titans and Giants**, not at all of the Centaurs, the fictions of those before us, or **violent stasis**. For there is nothing useful in this. (fr. 1.13-23)

The connection between Gigantomachy and civil strife is made explicit by listing *stasis* (line 23) in the same categories as these types of divine conflicts. Xenophanes does not want these types of stories for his *symposia* since he is seeking to foster a necessary component of a good symposium: *εὐνομία*. Ford (2002: 56-57) suggests there is an association in this poem between these types of battles and civil strife. He sees this poem in conjunction with other sympotic poetry that warns against topics of civil strife, particularly that of Alcaeus, whose poetry is rife with language of *stasis*.⁴⁴ He argues that the struggles in heaven provide a “mythic paradigm for aristocratic infighting.”

Gigantomachy in Pindar

In Pindar, the association of the Gigantomachy with themes of “Chaos vs. Order” is a strong one. In *Pythian* 1, the poet extols the athletic achievements of Hieron of Aetna. At the beginning of the poem, the speaker praises the power of his lyre which can calm the violence of Zeus and Ares. He then reviews the Muses’ song, which can frighten even the opponents of Zeus, including Typhon:

ὅς τ’ ἐν αἰνᾷ Ταρτάρῳ κεῖται, θεῶν πολέμιος,
 Τυφῶς ἑκατοντακάρανος: τόν ποτε
 Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολώνυμον ἄντρον: νῦν γε μὰν
 ταί θ’ ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιερκέες ὄχθαι
 Σικελία τ’ αὐτοῦ πιέζει στέρνα λαχνάεντα: κίων δ’ οὐρανία συνέχει,
 νιφόεσσ’ Αἴτνα, πάνετες χιόνος ὀξείας τιθήνα:
 τᾶς ἐρεύγονται μὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἀγνόταται

⁴⁴ For a list of passages from sympotic poetry treating *stasis*, see (Ford 2002: 65n50). Ford follows Bowra (1938: 362) and Herter (1956: 45-47) with the interpretation here that the Gigantomachy and Titanomachy connote *stasis* in this Xenophanes fragment. He argues against Gentili and Prato (1979: ad loc.) who see it as reflecting poetic genre.

ἐκ μυχῶν παγαί: ποταμοὶ δ' ἀμέραισιν μὲν προχέοντι ῥόον καπνοῦ
 αἰθῶν': ἀλλ' ἐν ὄρφναισιν πέτρας
 φοίνισσα κυλινδομένα φλόξ ἔς βαθεῖαν φέρει πόντου πλάκα σὺν πατάγῳ.
 κεῖνο δ' Ἀφάιστοιο κρουνοὺς ἔρπετὸν
 δεινοτάτους ἀναπέμπει: τέρας μὲν θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων
 ἀκοῦσαι,
 οἷον Αἴτνας ἐν μελαμύλλοις δέδεταί κορυφαῖς
 καὶ πέδῳ, στρωμνὰ δὲ χαράσσοισ' ἅπαν νῶτον ποτικεκλιμένον κεντεῖ.

Who lies in dreadful Tartarus, the enemy of the gods, Typhon with the hundred heads. At one point a Cilician cave with many names reared him. Now the sea-girt banks beyond Cumae and Sicily weigh down upon his shaggy breast. A celestial pillar holds him down: snowy Aetna, a year-round nurse of swift snow. Most sacred streams of terrible fire are belched forth from its caverns. During the day, the rivers bring forth a shimmering flow of smoke. But in the darkness a red flame hurling rocks into the deep plain of the sea brings with a clash. That beast sends up most wondrous streams of Hephaestus. The marvel is wondrous to behold. And it is also a wonder for those present to hear it. Such a thing is bound in the dark-leaved peaks and plain of Aetna. His bed scratches and goads his entire stretched-out back. (Pind. *Pi.* 1.15-28)

This image of the disorderly monster kept in check by the Muses' song and, more practically, by the masses of Cumae and Sicily is contrasted with the image of order created by Pindar's lyre at the beginning of the ode (lines 1-14). The poem praises the athletic achievement of Hieron I, tyrant of Syracuse. In addition to his success in chariot racing, it also celebrates the Syracusan victory over the Carthaginians and Etruscans in 474. This can be seen as a way for the Syracusans – who were Western Greeks who therefore held a marginalized status in the Greek world – to prove their “Greekness.” Protecting Greece from invading “barbarians” was seen as a way of expressing Hellenic identity. The speaker makes an explicit reference to war with a foreign enemy later in the ode:

λίσσομαι νεῦσον, Κρονίων, ἄμερον
 ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοίνιξ ὁ Τυρσανῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸς ἔχη, ναυσίστονον ὕβριν ἰδὼν τὰν
 πρὸ **Κύμας**:
 οἷα Συρακοσίων ἀρχῶν δαμασθέντες πάθον,
 ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὃ σφιν ἐν πόντῳ βάλεθ' ἀλικίαν,
 Ἑλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας. ἀρέομαι
 πὰρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος, Ἀθηναίων χάριν,

μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δ' ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸ Κιθαιρῶνος μαχῶν,
 ταῖσι Μήδειοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι,
 παρὰ δὲ τὴν εὐύδρον ἄκτὰν Ἰμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεως τελέσαις,
 τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἄρετῃ, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμώντων.

I entreat you, son of Cronus, grant that the Phoenician and Etruscan battle-cry stay tame at home, seeing the ship-lamenting **hubris** at **Cumae** such as they suffered when they were conquered by the ruler of the Syracusans, that which flung their youth from the swift ships onto the sea, and they saved Greece from grievous slavery. From Salamis I will win my pay, the gratitude of the Athenians, in Sparta from the battles in front of Cithaeron, in which the curved-bowed Medes were struggling, but beside the well-watered bank of the Himera I gain my pay by completing a song for the children of the Deinomenes which they received through their excellence when their enemy was suffering. (Pind. *Pi.* 1.71-80)

In this passage, Zeus' victory over Typhon is equated with Hieron's victory of the Carthaginians and Etruscans. In the passage above, the speaker places the body of Typhon in Sicily and Cumae (16-17), the same locations of the battles fought by the Syracusans (71-72). Typhon and the enemies of Hieron are also connected through their hubris. As we saw above in the *Theogony*, Hesiod applies the charge of hubris to Typhon as well. Hieron's victory over the "barbarians" is parallel with Zeus' victory of the hubristic Typhon.⁴⁵

In *Pythian* 8, we see yet another connotation of *stasis* in a treatment of the Gigantomachy when Pindar praises Aristomenes of Aegina for his victory in a wrestling match in 446 BCE. The opening lines begin with an ode to *Ἥσυχία*, or "Peace":

Φιλόφρον Ἥσυχία, Δίκας
 ὃ μεγιστόπολι θύγατερ,
 βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολέμων
 ἔχουσα κλαῖδας ὑπερτάτας
 Πυθιονικὸν τιμὰν Ἀριστομένει δέκευ.
 τὸ γὰρ τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξαι τε καὶ παθεῖν ὁμῶς
 ἐπίστασαι καιρῷ σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ·
 τὸ δ' ὁπότεν τις ἀμείλιχον
 καρδίᾳ κότον ἐνελάσῃ,
 τραχεῖα δυσμενέων
 ὑπαντιάξαισα κράτει τιθεῖς
 ὕβριν ἐν **ἄντλῳ**, τὰν οὐδὲ Πορφυρίων μάθεν

⁴⁵ See Hall (2002: 122-3), Hall (2004: 48-9), Mitchell 2007: 11, and Kowalzig 2007:141-2.

παρ' αἴσαν ἐξερεθίζων. κέρδος δὲ φίλτατον,
 ἐκόντος εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων φέροι.
 βία δὲ καὶ μέγαλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῳ.
 Τυφῶς Κίλιξ ἐκατόγκρανος οὐ νιν ἄλυξεν,
 οὐδὲ μὰν βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων· δμᾶθεν δὲ κεραυνῷ
 τόξοισι τ' Ἀπόλλωνος ...

Hesychia of a well-disposed mind, O daughter of *dike* who makes cities the greatest, having the highest keys of counsels and war, welcome the honor of a Pythian victory for Aristomenes. For you know to how to act gently and, at the same time, receive gentleness at the exact proper time. You, whenever someone drives in an implacable grudge in his heart, you, meeting the harshness of your enemies with strength, place the *hubris* in **the flood**. Porphyryon did not understand it, chafing you beyond measure. Glory is **most dear** if someone takes it **from the home** of a willing person. Boastful violence trips up with time. Hundred-header Cilician Typhon did not escape him nor did the king of the Giants. They were overcome by the thunderbolt and by the arrows of the Apollo ... (Pi. *Pyth.* 8.1-18)

I argue here that Porphyryon is a symbol of internal strife. I follow Edmunds (1987: 23-23), who argues that the language φίλτατον (13) and ἐκ δόμων (14) suggest a civil, not foreign, threat for Aegina.⁴⁶ *Hesychia* itself often signifies a lack of internal conflict within a city.⁴⁷ I offer two pieces of evidence to further support his suggestion. First, the Xenophanes fragment that I treated briefly above provides evidence that this type of association existed before Pindar. Furthermore, I suggest there is more imagery of civil strife in this passage. In line 12, Pindar indicates that *Hesychia* places *hubris* in the “flood.” Ἄντλος in this passage is often translated as “flood,” but it conveys a variety of meanings in contemporary and earlier poetry. In Homer, ἄντλος indicates the hold of a ship (*Od.* 12.411, 15.479). A fragment of Alcaeus contains the word stasis:

ἄσυννέτημι τῶν ἀνέμων **στάσιν**,
 τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κῦμα κυλίνδεται,
 τὸ δ' ἔνθεν, ἄμμες δ' ὄν τὸ μέσσον
 νᾶϊ φορήμεθα σὺν μελαίναι

⁴⁶ Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1922: 443) and Wade-Gery (1932: 214-15) see it as referring to an external enemy.

⁴⁷ Wade-Gery (1932: 224), Mullen (1973-74: 479), Carne-Ross (1985: 170).

χείμωνι μόχθεντες μεγάλοι μάλα·
πὲρ μὲν γὰρ ἄντλος ἰστοπέδαν ἔχει ...

I do not understand the *stasis* of the winds. One wave rolls this way, another rolls that way. We are carried in our ship towards the middle suffering along with the great storm. The **bilge-water** overwhelms the masthold. (Alc. fr. 305.1-6)

This passage is quoted by Heraclitus as an example of allegory (*All.* 5). The poem is actually about a conspiracy of the tyrant Myrsilus against the Mytilenians. *Stasis* here in the first line most certainly indicates “civil unrest” in addition to its primary meaning as “direction.” In Aeschylus’ *Seven Against Thebes*, staged roughly 20 years before this poem, ἄντλος also means “bilge-water,” and has clear political implications (796). Given the prevalence of the “Ship of State” metaphor in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry, it is not difficult to see a similar significance in these lines of Pindar.⁴⁸

Gigantomachy in Bacchylides

A dithyramb of Bacchylides (*Dith.* 1 = *Odes* 15) provides a very complex presentation of the Gigantomachy myth. The poet recreates a scene from the beginning of the Trojan War. In this episode, an embassy of Greeks, led by Menelaus and Odysseus, attempt to broker peace with the Trojans by demanding Helen back. This embassy is arranged by the Trojan Antenor and his family:

A' Ἀντή]γορος ἀντιθέου (1)
.....]ρακοῖτις Ἀθάνας πρόσπολος
≈~—] Παλλάδος ὀρσιμάχου
—~— χ]ρυσέας
—~—~]ν Ἀργείων Ὀδυσσεῖ (5)
Λαρτιάδαι Μενελ]άωι τ' Ἀτρεΐδαι βασιλεῖ
—~— βαθύ]ζωνος Θεανώ

⁴⁸ See Brock (2013: 53-67), Edmunds (1987: 9-16). For primary sources, see Arch. fr. 13, fr. 105, fr. 106, Alc. fr. 326L-P (here, he uses the word *stasis*), Sol. fr. 12 W.

- ~—~—~]ον
 —~—~—~]ν προσήνεπεν·
 —~—~—~ ἐ]υκτιμέναν (10)
 —~—~—~]
 —~—~—~]δων τυχόντες
 —~—~—~—~]ς σὺν θεοῖς†
 —~—~—~—~]δους
 (deest epod. α') (15)
- B' —~—~—~] (22)
 —~—~— μεσονύ]κτιος κέαρ
 (desunt vv. XII)
 —~—~—~—~] (36)
 ἄγον, πατήρ δ' εὖβουλος ἥρως
 πάντα σάμεινεν Πριάμωι βασιλεῖ
παῖδεςσὶ τε μῦθον Ἀχαιῶν.
 ἔνθα κάρυκες δι' εὐ- (40)
 ρεῖαν πόλιν ὀρνύμενοι
 — Τρώων ἀόλλιζον φάλαγγας
- Γ' δεξίστρατον εἰς ἀγοράν.
 πάντῃ δὲ διέδ' ραμεν αὐδάεις λόγος·
 θεοῖς<ιν> δ' ἀνίσχοντες χέρας ἀθανάτοις (45)
 εὖχοντο παύσασθαι δυᾶν.
 Μοῦσα, τίς πρῶτος λόγων ἄρχεν **δικαίων**;
 Πλεισθενίδας Μενέλαος γάρυϊ θελξιεπεῖ
 φθέγξατ', εὐπέπ' λοισι κοινώσας Χάρισσιν·
 “ὦ Τρῶες **ἀρηϊφίλοι**, (50)
 Ζεὺς ὑψιμέδων ὅς ᾗ ἅπαντα δέρκεται
 οὐκ αἴτιος θνατοῖς μεγάλων ἀχέων,
 ἀλλ' ἐν ἰμέσῳ κεῖται κιχεῖν
 πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις **Δίκαν** ἰθεῖαν, ἀγ' νᾶς
Εὐνομίας ἀκόλουθον καὶ πινυτᾶς Θέμιτος· (55)
 — ὀλβίων **παιδῶν** νιν αἶρεῦνται σύνοικον.
- ἀ δ' αἰόλοις κέρδεσσι καὶ ἀφροσύναις
 ἐξαισίσις θάλλουσ' ἀθαμβῆς
 “**Υβρις**, ἃ πλοῦτ[ο]ν δύναμιν τε θοῶς
 ἀλλότ' ριον ὥπασεν, αὖτις (60)
 δ' ἐς βαθὺν πέμπει φθόρον,
 κε]ῖνα καὶ **ὑπερφιάλους**
Γᾶς] παιδας ὥλεσεν **Γίγαντας**.”

Godly Antenor's loyal wife, priestess of Athena, opened up the holy temple of battle-rousing Pallas with its golden doors to the twin messengers of the

Argives, Odysseus, Laertes' son, and king Menelaos son of Atreus. So deep-girdled Theano once met them ...

... she spoke to [them: 'Guests, why have you come to] well-built [Troy?] ... and you have met (my fifty) sons, ... with the gods' help

... since there is nothing deceitful in the spoken word brought to mortals by wisdom ...

[The sons of Antenor] brought them, while their father **the wise hero** declared the whole message to king Priam and his **sons**: the word of the Akhaians. Then heralds, speeding through the broad city, gathered the ranks of Trojans into the agora where the people muster. And their loud word ran about in all directions. Raising their hands to the deathless gods, they prayed for an end to anguish. Muse, who was the first to begin the **words of righteousness**? Pleisthenid Menelaos spoke with spell-binding words; the fair-robed Graces informed his words:

'Trojans, **dear to Ares**, Zeus on high who sees all things is not accountable to mortals for their great woes. It lies open for all men to attain upright **Justice**, companion to pure **Order** and provident Law. Blessed are they whose **sons** choose her to share their homes.

But, luxuriating in shifty cunning and outright folly, brazen Hubris, who swiftly hands a man another's wealth and power, only to send him into deep ruin: she it was who destroyed those **arrogant sons of Earth, the Giants**.' (*Dith.* 1 = *Odes* 15. Trans. Fearn with slight modifications)

This scene is recalled by Antenor himself in the *Iliad* (3.205-224).⁴⁹ The end of Bacchylides' poem features the Gigantomachy, when Menelaus warns Trojans that their own *hubris* will bring them down just as the *hubris* of the Giants brought about their own destruction. This passage may seem like another example of the Gigantomachy being used as a metaphor for the "Greek vs. Barbarian" trope. Indeed, the Trojans are analogous to the Giants through their hubristic behavior, just as the Titans and Typhon could be associated with hubris in Hesiod and Pindar. Paris' abduction of Helen certainly contributed to the *hubris* that the Greeks saw in the Trojans.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ The *Cypria* may have also been a model (*Epit.* 3.28).

⁵⁰ See Castriota (1992: 86-89) and Maehler (2004: ad 15.57-59).

But the presentation of the difference between Greeks and Trojans (and consequently, Giants and Olympians) is not so absolute and clear-cut in this Bacchylides ode. Notably, the reference to the Giants in this passage appears in embedded narrative. It is not Bacchylides himself who likens the Trojans to Giants, but Menelaus, a figure within the poem. Since Homer, poets have played with the veracity of embedded speech. As Aristotle observes (fr. 163 R = ΣT Hom. *Il.* 19.108), Homer avoids the fantastical in the narrator's voice, but instead often places fantastical elements in the mouths of characters in the poem.⁵¹ In the preamble to Menelaus' implied comparison of the Trojans and the Giants, he recalls Solon. Menelaus' claim that humankind's troubles do not come from Zeus (51-2) echoes a similar statement at the beginning of a fragment of Solon (fr. 4.1-2 W).⁵² The echoes continue as Menelaus speaks of "Good Order" (Εὐνομία, 55), which recalls the focus of Solon's elegies: good order (Εὐνομία, 4.32), justice (Δίκαν, 54; Δίκης, Sol. fr. 4.14) and *hubris* (Υβρις, 59; Sol. fr. 4.8, 4.34). Solon has the potential to be used and abused by Aristocrats. Solon 4 W comes to us through Demosthenes (19.225). The Attic orator uses Solon to make the case that the gods protect the city. He cites Solon and indicates his opponent Aeschines incorrectly uses the same passage of Solon (D. 19.226).⁵³ Similarly, the infamous member of the Thirty Tyrants Critias stresses his own connection to Solon through his great-grandfather Dropides in Plato's *Timaeus* (20e). According to Plato's *Charmides* (157e), the aristocratic virtue of Critias' family came from Solon. Aristotle tells us, however, that the poetry of Solon was used against Critias by the Athenian demagogue Cleophon (Arist. *Rhet.* 1375b32). Clearly, rhetoricians and politicians use Solon for their own needs. Bacchylides' audience surely was

⁵¹ E.g., *Od.* 9-12. See also Griffin 1977:40 with n13

⁵² These elegies of Solon in turn echo the opening of the *Odyssey* (1.32-4)

⁵³ For the use and abuse of Solon in rhetoric and politics, see Fearn (2007: 259-162).

accustomed to hearing different figures of power use the poetry of Solon to make whatever point they wanted, and we can see that Bacchylides presents Menelaus as positioning himself to do that here. If this is the case, how does that reflect on Menelaus' use of the Gigantomachy *exemplum* at the end of his speech?

Menelaus' use of Solon is not the only employed rhetorical tactic. He calls the Trojans "dear to Ares" (ἀρηϊφίλοι, 50). The use of the adjective is striking because, normally, the adjective is applied to Menelaus himself. This adjective, "dear to Ares," is applied to Menelaus in 19 of its 25 appearances throughout the *Iliad*.⁵⁴ In its one occurrence in the *Odyssey*, it describes Menelaus (15.169). Menelaus' use of the word is not without significance here since this word is applied to Menelaus at the onset of the *Iliad* passage that this Bacchylides poem recalls (*Il.* 3.206). Throughout the *Iliad*, the Trojans never receive this epithet. This characterization of the Trojans as warlike does occur in the *Iliad*, but only in the mouth of Menelaus:

“λείπετέ θην οὕτω γε νέας Δαναῶν ταχυπώλων,
 Τρῶες **ὑπερφίαλοι**, δεινῆς ἀκόρητοι αὐτῆς,
 ἄλλης μὲν λώβης τε καὶ αἵσχεος οὐκ ἐπιδευεῖς,
 ἦν ἐμὲ λωβήσασθε, κακαὶ κύνες, οὐδέ τι θυμῷ
 Ζηνὸς ἐριβρεμέτεω χαλεπὴν ἐδείσατε μῆνιν
 ξεινίου, ὅς τέ ποτ' ὕμμι διαφθέρσει πόλιν αἰπὴν· (625)
 οἳ μιν κουριδίην ἄλοχον καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ
 μὰν οἴχεσθ' ἀνάγοντες, ἐπεὶ φιλέεσθε παρ' αὐτῇ·
 νῦν αὖτ' ἐν νηυσὶν μενεαίνετε ποντοπόροισι
 πῦρ ὅλοδ' ὀλοὸν βαλέειν, κτεῖναι δ' ἥρωας Ἀχαιοῦς.
 ἀλλὰ ποθὶ σγήσεσθε καὶ ἐσσύμενοί περ Ἄρηος. (630)
 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἣ τέ σέ φασι περὶ φρένας ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,
 ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ θεῶν· σέο δ' ἐκ τάδε πάντα πέλονται·
 οἷον δὴ ἀνδρεσσι χαρίζεται **ὑβριστῆσι**,
 Τρωσὶν, τῶν μένος αἰὲν ἀτάσθαλον, οὐδὲ δύνανται
 φυλόπιδος κορέσασθαι ὁμοίου πτολέμοιο. (635)
 πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστί, καὶ ὕπνου καὶ φιλότητος

⁵⁴ Menelaus as ἀρηϊφίλος in the *Iliad*: 3.21, 3.52, 3.69, 3.90, 3.136, 3.206, 3.232, 3.253, 3.307, 3.430, 3.432, 3.452, 3.457, 4.13, 4.150, 5.561, 17.1, 17.11, 17.138. Interestingly, the epithet is applied to the Achaeans four times: 6.73, 16.303, 17.319, 17.336.

μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο,
 τῶν πέρ τις καὶ μᾶλλον ἐέλδεται ἐξ ἔρον εἶναι
 ἢ πολέμου· Τρῶες δὲ μάχης ἀκόρητοι ἔασιν.”

“This indeed is the way you will leave the ships of the Danaans, drivers of swift horses, you **rash** Trojans, insatiate of the dread din of battle. And other outrage and shame you do not lack, with which you have done outrage to me, you treacherous cowards, and had no fear in your heart of the harsh wrath of loud-thundering Zeus, the god of hospitality, who will one day destroy your high city. For you carried away willfully over the sea my wedded wife and with her much treasure, when it was with her that you had found hospitality; and now again you are eager to fling consuming fire on the seafaring ships and to slay the Achaean warriors. But you will yet be stayed from your fighting, no matter how eager you are! Father Zeus, men say that in wisdom you are above all others, both men and gods, yet it is from you that all these things come; in such a way now you favor men **of violence**, the Trojans, whose might is always ungoverned, nor can they ever have their fill of the din of evil war. Of all things is there satiety, of sleep, and love, and sweet song, and the incomparable dance; of these things surely a man hopes to have his fill rather than of war; but the Trojans are insatiate of battle.” (*Il.* 13.620-39, trans. Murray)

In this speech, in which he gloats over the slain body of the Trojan Peisander, Menelaus paints an ugly picture of the Trojans. He calls them “reckless” (ὕπερφίαλοι, 621) and “insatiable for the terrible war-shout” (δεινῆς ἀκόρητοι αὐτῆς, 621). Later in the speech, he accuses them of *hubris* (ὕβριστῆσι, 633) and then, on two more occasions, makes the claim that they are ravenous when it comes to war (οὐδὲ δύνανται /φυλόπιδος κορέσασθαι ὁμοῖου πτολέμοιο, 634-5; Τρῶες δὲ μάχης ἀκόρητοι ἔασιν, 639). Willcock (1984: ad loc.) remarks that these lines are full of “bitterness and hatred” and “weak resentment.” Leaf has also found Menelaus’ claim of *hubris* to be unfounded. Fenik (1986: 42) calls this speech “sanctimonious moralizing.” Buchan (2012: 68) claims that Menelaus is “hardly in control of his own rhetoric.”⁵⁵ It is safe to say that Menelaus’ claims are not quite accurate.

Bacchylides clearly alludes to this speech when he has his Menelaus describe the Giants as ὑπερφιάλους (61) and through his reference to *hubris* (59). Nowhere in the *Iliad* are

⁵⁵ For an opposing perspective on this speech, see Janko (1992: ad loc.).

the Trojans described by the narrator as they are described by Menelaus in that speech. At the beginning of the poem, Achilles even claims that they are not to blame for the war (1.153-7). Menelaus' speech in the *Iliad* comes off as empty rhetoric. Menelaus projects his own faults onto the Trojans. He and the Achaeans are the ones who are "beloved by Ares" (see n5). Bacchylides here clearly calls to mind a speech from the *Iliad* that contains Menelaus' overblown rhetoric that inaccurately portrays the Trojans as warmongers. At the same time, the Menelaus from this speech in the *Iliad* says Zeus is cause of the all things (σέο δ' ἐκ τάδε πάντα πέλονται, 13.632), but the Menelaus in Bacchylides says quite the contrary: that Zeus is not the cause of human suffering (Ζεὺς ... οὐκ αἴτιος θνατοῖς μεγάλων ἀχέων, 51-2). Adkins (1972: 84-5) sees Menelaus' claim of *hubris* as suspicious, since accusations of *hubris* often come from those in power (i.e., elites). If Menelaus' empty rhetoric shines through in both the *Iliad* and Bacchylides, what does that say about his implication that the Trojans are analogous to the Giants? Or perhaps what does this say about likening any opposing party to a Giant?

Another of my identified themes of Gigantomachy myth, the confusion of friend and foe, is present in this Bacchylides poem. As Fearn points out (2007: 275-6), the Trojans in this dithyramb share many of the characteristics of the Greeks. Antenor serves a similar function to that of the Greeks in this passage: he acts as communicator of the words of the Achaeans (σάμαινεν ... μῦθον Ἀχαιῶν, 38-39). Furthermore, Antenor is depicted very positively. He is described as "of good counsel" (εὖβουλος, 37) and a "hero" (ἥρωες, 37 – a term not used of him in the *Iliad*). His analogue within this poem is Menelaus, who speaks "just words" (λόγων ... δικάϊων, 47). Fearn remarks that these factors "seem to destabilize any polarity between the Greeks and unified Trojans." I further add to Fearn's point that

since this passage recalls the scene from the *Iliad* in which Antenor hosted Menelaus and Odysseus (3.205-224), the idea of *xenia* is also evoked. Antenor has a closer connection to these Greeks, and it is perhaps this special relationship that allowed for an alternate tradition regarding Antenor's allegiance. In some versions of the myth, he betrays Troy to have his family spared.⁵⁶ The audience's knowledge of this myth would make him very similar to figures of the Gigantomachy and Titanomachy who switch sides in the war for their own benefit.

This poem is political and the complexity of its use of the Gigantomachy myth increases as we consider the political context that Fearn proposes. According to Fearn (2007: 234-337), this dithyramb was performed at Athens during the Panathenaea at some point during the early 5th century by a chorus of 50 boys. According to legend, Antenor had 50 sons, and Fearn suggests an implied comparison between Antenor's sons in the poem and the chorus performing it (2007: 302-304). By having a character in the poem give a speech to an implied audience, Bacchylides creates a doubling of audiences that might imply that the message of the embedded speaker could also be received by the external audience, the Athenians, who, as we have seen and will continue to see, can easily be associated with the Trojans (Fearn 2007: 277-8). Furthermore, the language of the dithyramb itself implies connection between the singers and figures in the poem: the sons of Antenor are referred to as "children" (παῖδεςσι, 39), as well as the Giants themselves (παῖδας, 63).

⁵⁶ According to Pausanias (10.27.3-4), the Lesche of the Cnicians at Delphi (dating to ca. 475 BCE) contained a representation of the Greeks sparing the house of Antenor because of a leopard's skin that was placed over the house's mantel. Sophocles wrote a play called the *Antenoridae* which involved Antenor's betrayal and sparing by the Greeks. We have several fragments (see *TrGF* IV). According to Strabo, the play mentions the leopard skin placed over the door of Antenor's home as a sign to the Greeks to spare his home. (Strab. 13.1.5; see also *TrGF* IV 160-1). The earliest substantial evidence for the betrayal aspect of this myth is Lyc. *Alex.* 340-3.

If we believe Fearn that the original audience was Athenian, the poem even has more potential significance. The Athenians thought of themselves as “earthborn” (γηγενής).⁵⁷ Autochthony was central to Athenian identity and it was how they made claim to their superiority over the rest of the Greeks (Mitchell 2007: 86-87). The Giants, however, are also “earthborn” as indicated in this dithyramb (Γᾱς] ... παῖδας, 63).⁵⁸ This further complicates the reading because usually, the Athenians saw themselves as the opponents of the Giant-like figures. The images of the Gigantomachy on the Parthenon have been read as symbolic of the Athenian triumph over the Persians at the beginning of the 5th century (see below). Here, the Athenians are implicitly associated with their traditional enemies, the Giants.

Furthermore, Fearn (2007: 234-337) posits a potential context for the poem: the Panathenaea, a festival which has many connections to the Gigantomachy. During this procession, a presentation of Athena’s ceremonial *peplos* featured an embroidered image of the Gigantomachy.⁵⁹ A fragment of Aristotle suggests that the entire festival is a celebration of Athena’s victory over the Giants.⁶⁰ It was during the Panathenaic procession that the Tyrannicides decided to take action against the Peisistratids.⁶¹ The Peisistratids, as I have shown, have their own connection to the Gigantomachy through their own propaganda in their architectural program on the Acropolis. The Athenians themselves seemed to use the Gigantomachy to celebrate their victory over the Persians, but at the same time, because of their earthborn nature, the Athenians have an implied connection to the Giants. Bacchylides

⁵⁷ Consider that their early kings, Cecrops, Erechtheus, and Erichthonius are all often rendered with snaky tails (as the Giants are in 4th century visual depictions). The myth of Erichthonius in particular demonstrates this idea. He quite literally was “born from the earth”: Hephaestus’ semen, cast off Athena and onto the ground, impregnated Gaia (Apollod. 3.14.6).

⁵⁸ Giants are referred to as “earthborn” elsewhere in Greek literature: E. *Cyc.* 5; E. *Ion* 987, 1529; S. *Trach.* 1058; Ar. *Av.* 824.

⁵⁹ Schol. ad E. *Hec.* 446-474; Ar. *Eq.* 566; Plat. *Euthyph.* 6b; Verg. *App. Cir. Suid.* s.v. peplos.

⁶⁰ Arist. fr. 637 Rose. See Vian 1952: 246-64

⁶¹ Thuc. 1.20, 6.56.2; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 18.2.

subtly calls this out and connects it to their own internal political violence with his implied reference to the Tyrannicides. Shear (2012: 111-15) shows that the images of Harmodius and Aristogeiton in Attic pottery and sculpture are closely connected to images of Apollo slaying the Giants in vase paintings. It appears that the Gigantomachy is connected to civil strife through its association with the Tyrannicides. And as Fearn suggests (2007: 318-20), this connection to that violent episode of civil strife is not as laudatory as it normally is when the Tyrannicides are evoked in an Athenian context; Bacchylides subtly hints at the problematic aspects of civic violence.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen many of the complicating themes of the Gigantomachy myth, all of which offer evidence that the unequivocal “Chaos vs. Order” narrative is incomplete. Hesiod lays the groundwork for us to both observe that traditional interpretation of the myth that goes on to become a prevailing narrative and to more closely note the subtle, but powerful themes that contradict that interpretation.

It is important to note that there are many representations of the Gigantomachy that predate the Persian Wars and they often seem to connote civil conflict. Though the Greeks did use the myth to suggest an uncompromising idea of “Greek vs. Other,” there are still examples of the myth, such as that of Pindar and Bacchylides, that were used after the Persian wars that do not suggest a simple “Us vs. Them” binary.

CHAPTER 2

GIGANTOMACHY IN THE CLASSICAL ERA

As we move into the 5th century, the Gigantomachy becomes more paradoxical. This is the century in which the Greek city-states have their decades long conflict with the Persians. The Greeks, and the Athenians in particular, begin to define themselves in opposition to the “barbarian.” Some argue that it is during this time that the Persians become assimilated with the Giants as I will discuss further below. The Gigantomachy also begins to feature prominently in Greek tragedy, a genre inextricably tied to Athenian politics and *stasis*. It is during this period that the Gigantomachy becomes conflated with the Titanomachy and, perhaps for this reason, the myth becomes more ethically complicated. Ultimately, the presentation of the Gigantomachy in tragedy will undermine the geo-political significance of the Gigantomachy as a categorical symbol of “Civilized vs. Uncivilized.”

Gigantomachy on the Parthenon Frieze

One of the most famous examples of the Gigantomachy is on the metopes on the east frieze of the Parthenon. The statesmen Pericles commissioned this sculptural program after the Persians set fire to the Acropolis in 480. This frieze is part of a sculptural plan that dates to the 450s and 460s. In addition to the Gigantomachy, this frieze also contains an Amazonomachy, Centauromachy, and the sack of Troy. Many scholars have connected these metopes with the Greeks’ eventual victory over the Persians. The metopes are thought to represent a “civilized” Hellenic victory over barbarous Persians.⁶² The Acropolis is a natural

⁶² Henrington (1955: 60-62)

analogue to Mt. Olympus and the Persians are Giant-like in their assault of it.⁶³ Other themes on the metopes were thought to represent this same theme as well, such as the sack of Troy on the north frieze. Scholars have traditionally seen the Greeks in these metopes as a representation of the Athenians and the Trojans as a representation of the barbarous Persians, in which case the Greeks' victory over the Trojans symbolizes the Athenian victory over their Eastern opponents in the Greco-Persian Wars.⁶⁴ Ferrari (2000) argues that this interpretation is misguided.⁶⁵ She provides another interpretation in which the Achaeans represent the Persians on the metopes because they sack the holy city of Troy. In doing so, they commit many acts of sacrilege. As we know from the *Nostoi*, most of the Greeks suffer many punishments on their way back home. If this is the case for the Ilioupersis, what does that say about the images of the Gigantomachy?⁶⁶ Tarbell (1920:226-227) has questioned the civilized and uncivilized connotation of the metopes containing the Centauromachy and Amazonmachy as well.⁶⁷ We can similarly deconstruct the other alleged images of "Greek vs. Barbarian" on the other metopes. Is it presumptuous to think that they too must indicate the triumph of order over chaos, or Greek over "barbarian"?

⁶³ See Castriota (1992: 138-43).

⁶⁴ For an overview, see Ferrari (2000: 120-121).

⁶⁵ She argues against the traditional view, a summary of which can be found in Berger (1986: 14-15)

⁶⁶ It is interesting that Metope III of this frieze contains an image of Dionysus fighting with a snake. As I noted earlier, the image of the Olympians using bestial force against the Giants puts them on a level moral plain.

⁶⁷ Tarbell (1920: 228-229) questions the validity of the "Civilized vs. Uncivilized" connotation of the Amazonomachy and Centauromachy generally. He points out that no ancient commentary ever makes this connection. He notes that one of the few ancient comments on one of these types visual depiction is from Pausanias (5.6.8) who, when observing the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia which contains a Centauromachy merely remarks that the artist chose this theme because Peirithous is the son of Zeus (to whom the temple is dedicated) and Theseus is the great-grandson of Pelops (who appears on the east pediment). Tarbell also argues that these myths are frequently employed in art well before the Persian Wars.

In the following sections, I will examine the imagery of the Gigantomachy in Greek tragedy and comedy. In these sections, we will see some of the more complicating themes of the Gigantomachy employed by Greek poets.

Gigantomachy in *Seven Against Thebes*

In Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*, the Typhonomachy plays a significant role. In one scene, the messenger tells Eteocles of two combatants who reenact the Typhonomachy:

Ἄγγελος

τέταρτος ἄλλος, γείτονας πύλας ἔχων
 Ὅγκας Ἀθάνας, ξὺν βοῇ παρίσταται,
 Ἴπομέδοντος σχῆμα καὶ μέγας τύπος:
 ἄλω δὲ πολλήν, ἀσπίδος κύκλον λέγω,
 ἔφριξα δινήσαντος: οὐκ ἄλλως ἐρῶ.
 ὁ σηματουργὸς δ' οὐ τις εὐτελὴς ἄρ' ἦν
 ὅστις τόδ' ἔργον ὥπασεν πρὸς ἀσπίδι,
 Τυφῶν' ἰέντα πύρπνοον διὰ στόμα
 λιγνὸν μέλαιναν, αἰόλην πυρὸς κάσιν:
 ὄφεων δὲ πλεκτάναισι περίδρομον κύτος
 προσηδάφισται κοιλογάστορος κύκλου.
 αὐτὸς δ' ἐπηλάλαξεν, ἔνθεος δ' Ἄρει
 βακχᾷ πρὸς ἀλκὴν Θυιάς ὥς φόβον βλέπων.
 τοιοῦδε φωτὸς πεῖραν εὖ φυλακτέον:
 Φόβος γὰρ ἤδη πρὸς πύλαις κομπάζεται.

Ἐτεοκλής

πρῶτον μὲν Ὅγκα Παλλάς, ἥτ' ἀγχιπτολὶς,
 πύλαισι γείτων, ἀνδρὸς ἐχθαίρουσ' ὕβριν,
εἴρξει νεοσσῶν ὥς δράκοντα δύσχιμον:
 Ὑπέρβιος δέ, κεδνὸς Οἶνοπος τόκος,
 ἀνὴρ κατ' ἀνδρα τοῦτον ἠρέθη, θέλων
 ἐξιτορηῆσαι μοῖραν ἐν χρεῖα τύχης,
 οὔτ' εἶδος οὔτε θυμὸν οὐδ' ὅπλων σχέσιν
 μωμητός, Ἑρμῆς δ' εὐλόγως ξυνήγαγεν.
 ἐχθρὸς γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀνδρὶ τῷ ξυστήσεται,
 ξυνοίσετον δὲ πολεμίους ἐπ' ἀσπίδων
 θεούς: ὁ μὲν γὰρ πύρπνοον Τυφῶν' ἔχει,
 Ὑπερβίῳ δὲ Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος

σταδαῖος ἦσται, διὰ χερὸς βέλος φλέγων·
 κοῦπω τις εἶδε Ζῆνά που νικώμενον.
 τοιάδε μέντοι προσφίλεια δαιμόνων·
 πρὸς τῶν κρατούντων δ' ἐσμέν, οἱ δ' ἥσσωμένων,
 εἰ Ζεὺς γε Τυφῶ καρτερώτερος μάχη·
 εἰκὸς δὲ πράξειν ἄνδρας ᾧδ' ἀντιστάτας,
 Ὑπερβίῳ τε πρὸς λόγον τοῦ σήματος
 σωτήρ γένοιτ' ἂν Ζεὺς ἐπ' ἀσπίδος τυχών.

Scout

Another, the fourth, has the gate near Onca Athena and takes his stand with a shout, Hippomedon, tremendous in form and figure. I shuddered in fear as he spun a huge disk—the circle of his shield, I mean— [490] I cannot deny it. The symbol-maker who put the design on his shield was no lowly craftsman: the symbol is Typhon, spitting out of his fire-breathing mouth a dark, thick smoke, the darting sister of fire. [495] And the rim of the hollow-bellied shield is fastened all around with snaky braids. The warrior himself has raised the war-cry and, inspired by Ares he raves for battle like a maenad, with a look to inspire fear. We must put up a good defense against the assault of such a man, [500] for already Rout is boasting of victory at the gate.

Eteocles

First Onca Pallas, who dwells near the city, close by the gate, and who loathes **outrageousness** in a man, will fend him off **like a dangerous snake away from nestlings**. Moreover, Hyperbius, Oenops' trusty son, [505] is chosen to match him, man to man, as he is eager to search out his fate in the crisis that chance has wrought—neither in form, nor spirit nor in the wielding of his arms does he bear reproach. Hermes has appropriately pitted them against each other. For the man is hostile to the man he faces in battle, [510] and the gods on their shields also meet as enemies. The one has fire-breathing Typhon, while father Zeus stands upright on Hyperbius' shield, his lightning bolt aflame in his hand. And no one yet has seen Zeus conquered. [515] Such then is the favor of the divine powers: we are with the victors, they with the vanquished, if Zeus in fact proves stronger in battle than Typhon. And it is likely that the mortal adversaries will fare as do their gods; and so, in accordance with the symbol, [520] Zeus will be a savior for Hyperbius since he resides on his shield (*A. Sept.* 496-520. Trans. Smyth)

Hippomedon attacks the gate of Athena Onca. He has an image of Typhon on his shield. His opponent, Hyperbius, has Zeus on his shield. Eteocles comments that Hyperbius is sure to win because he has Zeus on his shield and, consequently, Eteocles and the Thebans have Zeus on their side. It is implied that Hippomedon is hubristic (a frequent charge against the Giants) when Eteocles says that Athena will fend him off and that she hates hubris. Cameron

(1970: 103-4) views this dichotomy of Zeus and Typhon on the shields to be one of “good vs. evil,” and symbolic of the battle at Thebes on the whole. Eteocles and the defenders are righteous because they are defending their city against Polyneices, who has broken the agreement.

At the same time, while it is implied that Hippomedon is Chthonic through the image of Typhon on his shield, Athena is meant to keep him away, but she herself is compared to a snake. It is also important to consider that Hyperbius, Hippomedon’s opponent, is presumably Theban. Thebans are known to be earth-born because of the myth of Cadmus and the sowing of the dragon’s teeth. Furthermore, Hyperbius’ unusual name – that appears nowhere else in Greek literature⁶⁸ – suggests that he is a Giant-like figure. His name combines ὑπέρ and βία (“of exceeding force”).⁶⁹ *Seven Against Thebes* as a whole is a fraternal conflict. It is in essence a battle of brother against brother as Polyneices leads an army against his brother Eteocles.

Gigantomachy and the *Eumenides*

Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* provides subtle examples of this familial connection between the Olympians and their Chthonic opponents. At the opening of the play, the oracle at Delphi shares the origins of her sanctuary:

Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχῇ τῇδε πρεσβεύω θεῶν
τὴν πρωτόμαντιν Γαῖαν· ἐκ δὲ τῆς Θέμιν,
ἣ δὴ τὸ μητρὸς δευτέρα τόδ’ ἔζετο
μαντεῖον, ὡς λόγος τις· ἐν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ
λάχει, θελούσης, οὐδὲ πρὸς βίαν τινός,
Τιτανὶς ἄλλη παῖς Χθονὸς κατέζετο,

⁶⁸ As Hutchinson (1985: ad loc) notes, we know nothing of Hyperbius outside of the *Seven*. Presumably he was a Theban since he was a defender.

⁶⁹ Consider the names assigned by inscription to some of the Giants on the Siphnian Treasury. One has an inscription “ΥΠΕΡΤΑΣ,” the other “ΒΙΑΤΑΣ.” See Watrous (1982: 162).

Φοίβη· δίδωσι δ' ἡ γενέθλιον δόσιν
 Φοίβω· τὸ Φοίβης δ' ὄνομ' ἔχει παρώνυμον.

First in this prayer I give precedence to Gaia, the first prophet of the gods. After her, (I give precedence to) Themis who sat second to her mother as oracle according to a certain legend. In the third place, by her consent – **not at all by force against anyone** – the Titan Phoebe, daughter of Earth, took the seat. She gave it to Phoebus as a birthday gift. He has this name from Phoebe. (A. *Eum.* 1-8)

The speaker here takes great pains to suppress a certain version of the myth. But, at the same time, the suppressed version shines through glaringly in spite of this. The speaker presents the transition from Chthonic Phoebe to Olympian Apollo as a peaceful one. This version of the myth differs starkly from the more traditional version of Apollo's acquisition of Delphi. According to the more prominent version, Apollo takes the sanctuary by force through combat with the Python, child of Gaia and protector of her sanctuary (*h. Ap.* 300-74). Other versions feature an acquisition of Delphi that Apollo is able to achieve only by waging violence against either Gaia herself or Themis (Pi. fr. 55, E. *IT* 1234-83). The suppression of this version is undercut and, therefore, underscored by the Pythia expressly stating that it was *not* taken by violence (οὐδὲ πρὸς βίαν τινός, 5). Furthermore, a signpost indicates that there may be other versions of the myth with the phrase, “according to a certain legend” (ὥς λόγος τις, 4). Lloyd-Jones (1979: 10) remarks that Aeschylus emphasizes the peaceful transfer of power here because Apollo would otherwise be taking the sanctuary from a *relative*. The Olympian/Titan dynamic is even more discretely stressed here as the audience gains a reminder that the Phoebe referred to here is the *Titan* Phoebe (Τῖτανις, 5).

The fact that the Olympians, Titans, and Giants share the close relationship of kinship complicates the Olympian/Chthonic dichotomy and problematizes their conflict. Accordingly, the Gigantomachy can be characterized not as a *polemos*, but as an instance of

stasis. In the ancient Greek world, the family was seen as a microcosm for the state.⁷⁰ One can imagine how reasonable it could have been to connect the Gigantomachy with *stasis*. In his legendary treatise on *stasis* (3.81-4), Thucydides opts not to distinguish between “good” and “bad” warring factions – a trope that has been so often assigned to the Gigantomachy. In his eyes, both sides are culpable and equally violent. A leading characteristic of *stasis* is the breakdown of bonds between family members and intrafamilial violence. We see the conflict between the Olympians and Titans depicted unfavorably, even with an Olympian victory.⁷¹

As we will see, the stressing of this familial connection suggests that this myth can connote *stasis*. The language and imagery of *stasis* are featured prominently throughout the whole of the *Eumenides*. The year in which the play was produced, 458 BCE, may be of significance. Sommerstein remarks, “Never between 508/507 and 411 was Athens in more danger of plunging into bloody civil conflict” (1989: 29). According to Thucydides (1.107.4-7), the Athenian oligarchs were encouraging the Spartans to invade Attica and overthrow the democracy.

In the play itself, there are several references to civil conflict: Athena (858-66) and the Furies (976-67) inveigh directly against *stasis*. They separately each warn about both extremes it can present: anarchy and despotism (526-8, 696-7). Aeschylus here hints that *stasis* will be a major theme of this play by subtly referring to it in the opening lines of the play.

⁷⁰ On the connection between state and family in the Greek world, see Brock 2013: 25-42.

⁷¹ Though the conflict between Apollo and Gaia/Python is not part of the Gigantomachy or Titanomachy proper, I maintain it is part of the greater “Olympian vs. Chthonic” mythic paradigm.

Gigantomachy in *Prometheus Bound*

The familial relationship between Olympian and Titan is especially highlighted in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*. In the war between the Titans and Olympians, Prometheus goes to war against his next of kin. Now that he is on the wrong side of Zeus' anger, he continues to come into conflict with his own family members. The play stresses their familial connection. In the opening of the tragedy, Hephaestus, Kratos, and Bia chain Prometheus to his fated rock. Hephaestus and Kratos engage in a dialogue about the ethics of their actions. Kratos states that Prometheus has committed a crime against Zeus, their *tyrannos*, and that he deserves the punishment he is about to receive. Hephaestus replies:

Κράτος Βία τε, σφῶν μὲν ἐντολὴ Διὸς
ἔχει τέλος δὴ κοῦδὲν ἐμποδὼν ἔτι·
ἐγὼ δ' ἄτολμός εἰμι **συγγενῇ** θεὸν
δῆσαι βία φάραγγι πρὸς δυσχειμέρῳ.

So far as you two are concerned, Power and Violence, the orders of Zeus have been completely fulfilled, and there is no task still lying before you. But for my part, I can hardly bring myself to take a **kindred** god and forcibly bind him at this stormy ravine. (A. *PV*. 12-15)

Hephaestus is made uncomfortable with this task of chaining Prometheus precisely because he is Prometheus' relative.⁷² Hephaestus is related to Prometheus through Gaia, who is the Titan's mother. According to the version that Aeschylus follows here, Prometheus' mother is Themis, who is identified with Gaia (209-10). The Earth-goddess is Hephaestus' great-grandmother on both sides. This same word, **ξυγγενής**, appears again later when Hephaestus summarizes his explanation as to why his duty of chaining a relative makes him

⁷² Griffith, on the use of *συγγενής*, also suggests Prometheus have a connection to fire and the fact that they both shared an altar at the academy (1983: ad loc.). The scholia on this line and on 39 also suggest that this may be a meaning of *συγγενής*. I follow Groenenboom (1928: ad loc.), however, and believe this is overly-inventive. For the altar to these two deities at the academy, see Paus. 1.30.2. For *συγγενής* to mean "kin," see Hdt. 1.109; E. *Heracl.* 229; Ar. *Pax* 618, *Av.* 368.

uncomfortable: “Kinship is terribly powerful, you know, and so is companionship” (τὸ **συγγενές** τοι δεινὸν ἢ θ' ὁμιλία, 40). This imagery of feuding family members is often associated with *stasis*.⁷³ Thucydides, in his treatise on *stasis* in Book 3 of his *Histories*, describes the internal conflict at Corcyra:

πᾶσά τε ἰδέα κατέστη θανάτου, καὶ οἷον φιλεῖ ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ γίγνεσθαι, οὐδὲν ὅτι οὐ ξυνέβη καὶ ἐτι περαιτέρω. **καὶ γὰρ πατήρ παῖδα ἀπέκτεινε ...**

Every form of death was present, as is accustomed to happen in such a situation. Nothing happened that was not too extreme. **For even father was killing son ...** (Thuc. 3.81)

He expands his discussion to musings on *stasis* in general and makes the case that one of the causes of *stasis* is the dissolution of familial bonds:

καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ **ξυγγενές** τοῦ ἐταιρικοῦ ἀλλοτριώτερον ἐγένετο διὰ τὸ ἐτοιμότερον εἶναι ἀπροφασίστως τολμᾶν.

Indeed even **family bonds** became more unnatural than that of party because there was more readiness to be daring without any hesitation (Thuc. 3.82.6).

Thucydides uses the exact same term as Aeschylus: **ξυγγενής**.⁷⁴ This word reemerges later in *Prometheus Bound*. In this passage, Ocean appears to console Prometheus and offers him help:

τὸ τε γάρ με, δοκῶ, **συγγενές** οὕτως ἐσαναγκάζει.

I think that our familial relationship compels me thus. (A. *PV*. 289-90)

Ocean offers to aid Prometheus in spite of the potential displeasure he may incur at the hands of Zeus (33-334). Once again, it is the familial status of their relations which spurs Ocean to

⁷³ On the connection between state and family, see Brock 2013: 25-42.

⁷⁴ On *stasis* in Thucydides, see Price (2001) who argues that Thucydides presents the entire Peloponnesian War as one *stasis* between the Greeks.

consider engaging in *stasis*. From these examples in *Prometheus Bound*, we can see a clear presentation of the Titanomachy as a familial conflict.

In the first chapter, I discussed how there were elements in the depiction of Typhon that could be seen as sympathetic for the monster. In *Prometheus Bound*, Aeschylus heightens the pathos for Typhon as well as Atlas, another Titan that suffered at the hands of Zeus. Prometheus, speaking to Oceanus about those who have suffered at the hands of Zeus, talks about two figures in particular who are worthy of pity:

οὐ δῆτ' ἐπεὶ με καὶ κασιγνήτου τύχαι
 τεύρουσ' Ἀτλαντος, ὃς πρὸς ἐσπέρους τόπους
 ἔστηκε κίον' οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθονὸς
 ὤμοις ἐρείδων, ἄχθος οὐκ εὐάγκαλον.
 τὸν γηγενῇ τε Κιλικίων οἰκήτορα
 ἄντρων ἰδὼν ᾧκτιρα, δάιον τέρας
 ἑκατογκάρανον πρὸς βίαν χειρούμενον
 Τυφῶνα θοῦρον· πᾶσιν ὃς ἀντέστη θεοῖς,
 σμερδναῖσι γαμφηλαῖσι συρίζων φόβον·
 ἐξ ὀμμάτων δ' ἤστραπτε γοργωπὸν σέλας,
 ὥς τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδ' ἐκέρσων βία·
 ἀλλ' ἦλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἄγρυπνον βέλος,
 καταιβάτης κεραυνὸς ἐκπνέων φλόγα,
 ὃς αὐτὸν ἐξέπληξε τῶν ὑψηγόρων
 κομπασμάτων. φρένας γὰρ εἰς αὐτὰς τυπεῖς
 ἐφεισάλωθη κάξεβροντήθη σθένος.
 καὶ νῦν ἀχρεῖον καὶ παράορον δέμας
 κεῖται στενωποῦ πλησίον θαλασσίῳ
 ἱπόμενος ρίζαισιν Αἰτναίαις ὕπο·
 κορυφαῖς δ' ἐν ἄκραις ἤμενος μυδροκτυπεῖ
 Ἥφαιστος· ἔνθεν ἐκραγήσονται ποτε
 ποταμοὶ πυρὸς δάπτοντες ἀγρίαις γνάθοις
 τῆς καλλικάρπου Σικελίας λευροῦς γύας·
 τοιόνδε Τυφῶς ἐξαναζέσει χόλον
 θερμοῖς ἀπλάτου βέλεσι πυρπνόου ζάλης,
 καίπερ κεραυνῷ Ζηνὸς ἠνθρακωμένος.

Since, besides, I am distressed by the fate [350] of my brother Atlas, who, towards the west, stands bearing on his shoulders the pillar of heaven and earth, a burden not easy for his arms to grasp. Pity moved me, too, at the sight of the earth-born dweller of the Cilician caves curbed by violence, that destructive monster [355] of a hundred heads, impetuous Typhon. He

withstood all the gods, hissing out terror with horrid jaws, while from his eyes lightened a hideous glare, as though he would storm by force the sovereignty of Zeus. [360] But the unsleeping bolt of Zeus came upon him, the swooping lightning brand with breath of flame, which struck him, frightened, from his loud-mouthed boasts; then, stricken to the very heart, he was burnt to ashes and his strength blasted from him by the lightning bolt. [365] And now, a helpless and a sprawling bulk, he lies hard by the narrows of the sea, pressed down beneath the roots of Aetna; while on the topmost summit Hephaestus sits and hammers the molten ore. There, one day, shall burst forth [370] rivers of fire, with savage jaws devouring the level fields of Sicily, land of fair fruit—such boiling rage shall Typho, although charred by the blazing lightning of Zeus, send spouting forth with hot jets of appalling, fire-breathing surge. (A. *PV* 349-375. Trans. Smyth)

Aeschylus highlights the pain that Prometheus feels for his lost brethren. The death of his brother Atlas brings him distress (με καὶ κασιγνήτου τύχαι / **τείρουσ'** Ἄτλαντος, 349-50). Prometheus highlights their familial connection (κασιγνήτου, 349).

Prometheus also expresses pity for the monster Typhon (ᾠκτιρα, 354). He highlights this pity by engaging in wordplay; Prometheus calls him the “inhabitant of the Cilician caves” (Κιλικίων **οἰκήτορα** / ἄντρον, 353-4) and plays with the similarity between οἰκήτωρ and οἰκτίρειν. Prometheus also highlights that Typhon was checked by violence (πρὸς βίαν, 355). Finally, this passage is important for my argument because it draws attention to the notion that Typhon is restrained, but not completely. There is a chance he could return. Prometheus even envisages a specific time this will happen (referring to the eruption of Aetna).⁷⁵

Above, we observed an underscoring of the bonds of kinship between Titan and Olympian in *Prometheus Bound*, but there is in fact a more direct reference to *stasis* in this play. When the chorus of Ocean-nymphs asks Prometheus why he suffers such a punishment, his response includes a recapitulation of the war in heaven:

ἐπεὶ τάχιστ' ἥρξαντο δαίμονες χόλου

⁷⁵ Prometheus “predicts” the eruption of Aetna, which happened in 479.

στάσις τ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ὠροθύνετο,
οἱ μὲν θέλοντες ἐκβαλεῖν ἔδρας Κρόνον,
ὥς Ζεὺς ἀνάσσοι δῆθεν, οἱ δὲ τοῦμπαλιν
σπεύδοντες, ὥς Ζεὺς μήποτ' ἄρξειεν θεῶν,
ἐνταῦθ' ἐγὼ τὰ λῶιστα βουλευὼν πιθεῖν
Τιτᾶνας, Οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ Χθονὸς τέκνα,
οὐκ ἠδυνήθην· αἰμύλας δὲ μηχανὰς
ἀτιμάσαντες καρτεροῖς φρονήμασιν
ῥῶιοντ' ἀμοχθὶ πρὸς βίαν τε δεσπόσειν.

As soon as the gods initiated their anger, *stasis* arose amongst one another: some wishing to remove Cronus from his seat so that Zeus would rule, I suppose, others striving for the opposite: that Zeus would never rule the gods. At this point I, though having the best plan, was not able to persuade the Titans, the children of Earth and Uranus. Disdaining wily tricks they thought in their stubborn minds that they without toil could attain dominion by force (A. *PV*. 199-208).

Here, the conflict between the gods is called a *stasis*, as opposed to *polemos*, which is typically used of conflict of an external force here.⁷⁶ Aeschylus draws from the language from Athenian politics to show that the battle in heaven was not like their own conflict with the Persians, but more like one between citizens of the same group. On this, Long likens Zeus to a tyrant who rose to power through political strife (1958 ad loc.), and Griffith remarks that the Titanomachy in this play is more “political” than personal, as it is in Hesiod (1983 ad loc.). Overall, this play paints the war between the Olympians and Titans as a civil conflict.

Gigantomachy in the *Ploutoi*

Fragments of Cratinus offer further associations of Athenian *stasis*. A fragment from the *Ploutoi* deems Pericles the son of *Stasis* and Cronus:

Στάσις δὲ καὶ πρεσβυγενὴς Κρόνος ἀλλήλοισι μιγέντε

⁷⁶ In Homer's rendition of Otus and Ephialtes's assault on heaven (often grouped with the Gigantomachy), the struggle is referred to as a φύλοπις πολέμοιο (*Od.* 11.314). In Hesiod, the war between the gods is referred to as a πόλεμος (*Th.* 638, 665, 714).

μέγιστον τίκτετον τύραννον,
ὄν δὴ κεφαληγερέταν θεοὶ καλέουσιν.

Stasis and first-born Cronus copulating with one another gave birth to the greatest tyrant whom the gods call the head-collector. (fr. 258 K)

Κεφαληγερέτης was a derogatory epithet for Pericles. Cratinus derisively calls Pericles a tyrant and conflates him with Zeus. Here, we see a tyrannical presentation of Zeus that seems to be similar to the way he is represented in *Prometheus Bound*. Once again, there is a connection between *stasis* and the struggle between the gods, particularly with a negative portrayal of Zeus. From the other fragments of this play, we can surmise that the play depicted Pericles as a tyrannical Zeus who had ousted Cimon (here, a Cronus figure) from his seat of political power. Cimon was ostracized in 463. It seems that Cratinus rendered his political tenure as a sort of “Golden Age,” that is, the age of Cronus (Bakola 2010: 213-19). Like in Aristophanes’ *Birds*, the Chthonic figures here get a more positive portrayal. The placement of the Titanomachy in the context of Athenian drama surely increased the myth’s political significance. It is fitting that this play would contain so much of the Titanomachic imagery that is associated with civil strife. As Bakola (2010:122) demonstrates, this play seems to have closely engaged with Aeschylus’ *Prometheus* trilogy.

Gigantomachy in the *Hecuba*

Euripides’ *Hecuba* has a brief reference to the Gigantomachy, but in this case the intrafamilial aspects of the conflict are evoked. In the play, the chorus of recently enslaved Trojan women imagines a life of slavery. They make a reference that would be quite familiar to the Athenian audience:

ἢ Παλλάδος ἐν πόλει
τὰς καλλιδίφρους Ἀθα-

ναίας ἐν κροκέῳ πέπλῳ
 ζεύξομαι ἄρα πώ-
 λους ἐν δαιδαλέαισι ποι- (470)
 κίλλουσ' ἀνθοκρόκοισι πή-
 ναις ἢ **Τιτάνων γενεάν**,
 τὰν Ζεὺς ἀμφιπύρῳ **κοιμί-**
ζει φλογμῷ **Κρονίδας**;

Or in the city of Pallas will I yoke the Athenian foals with a beautiful chariot on the saffron peplos, embroidering them with a well-wrought web of flower dye or (shall I embroider) the race of the Titans whom the son of Cronus “put to sleep” with the double-end flame? (E. *Hec.* 466-74)

The chorus refers to the weaving of the ceremonial robe that a group of girls, the *arrephoroi*, would weave.⁷⁷ This passage presents a troubling image of the Gigantomachy. Traditionally, it is the Gigantomachy and not the Titanomachy that is depicted on this *peplos*. On the one hand this could be a simple conflation of the two conflicts, as some commentators often state.⁷⁸ I suggest that, while Euripides may be taking advantage of the fact that these battles were often conflated, he does reference the Titans with purpose in these lines. The opponents in this conflict are referred to as the “race of the Titans” (Τιτάνων γενεάν, 472), a group more closely related to the Titans. Euripides highlights this by calling Zeus the “son of Cronus” two lines below (Κρονίδας, 474). Zeus, who overthrew his father, is given the epithet that evokes his father’s memory. Although this is a common epithet of Zeus, this cannot be a coincidence, given that it is used within a reference to a Titanomachy. Euripides has the chorus use a euphemism for the word “kill.” Instead of a more graphic word, they use the word “put to sleep” (κοιμίζει, 471-472). Similar to the discomfort with intrafamilial violence in the *Eumenides* discussed above, the chorus suppresses the more violent imagery between kin. Stamatopoulou (2012) also thinks the reference to the Titans and not the Giants here is

⁷⁷ Ironically, the Trojan women could not participate in the weaving of this peplos because it was considered the privilege of high-born Athenian girls (see Harpokration, s.v. ἀρρηφορεῖν).

⁷⁸ See Gregory (1999: ad loc.) and Collard (1991: ad loc.). They follow the scholiast on these lines (ad 472).

intentional. She thinks that the Trojan chorus, since they are non-Athenians, make a mistake. She maintains that this particular section of the ode has greater implications for the tragedy. Zeus' destruction of the Titans with fire (ἀμφιπύρῳ ... φλογμῷ, 473-4) mirrors the destruction of Troy (also with fire) (Stamatopoulou 2012: 77). I would take Stamatopoulou's observations a bit further. In the tragedy, Hecuba eventually enacts vengeance upon Polymestor for the murder of her son. Polymestor, who was married to Priam's daughter, essentially committed parricide by murdering Polydorus. Hecuba continues the cycle of familial violence by the blinding of Polymestor and the murder of his sons.

Gigantomachy in *Hercules Furens*

In Euripides' *Hercules Furens*, Athena engages in her battle against the Giant Enceladus and actually takes on a Giant-like appearance, herself. As Heracles chases down his children to murder them, the chorus remarks that a great storm is assailing the house of Heracles. Amphitryon blames Athena as the culprit:

Χορός

ἰδοὺ ἰδοὺ,
θύελλα σείει δῶμα, συμπίπτει στέγη.

Ἀμφιτρύων⁷⁹

ἦ ἦ: τί δρᾷς, ὦ Διὸς παῖ, μελάθρῳ;
τάραγμα ταρτάρειον, ὥς ἐπ' Ἐγκελάδῳ ποτέ, Παλλάς,
ἐς δόμους πέμπεις.

Chor.

Look! Look! A hurricane shakes the house. It shakes apart the roof.

Amph.

Hey! What are you doing, **oh child of Zeus**, to my house? A Tartarean uproar, just as once against Enceladus, you send to my house, Pallas. (E. *HF* 904-908)

⁷⁹ Some attribute these lines the Chorus. Here, I follow Bond (1981: ad loc.) and Deacy 2005.

Amphitryon believes that Athena is the source of the great storm. Giants and Titans are frequently allegorized as cosmic storms.⁸⁰ The words “oh child of Zeus” (ὦ Διὸς παῖ) are deliberately ambiguous as Deacy points out (Deacy 2005: 46). The phrase could refer to Heracles or his patron goddess. Deacy remarks that Athena, in part, reflects the more violent aspects of her protégé and he notes the goddess’ “destructive” role here. Athena is also referred to by her epithet Pallas, which has a strong connection to the Titans and Giants and their violent tendencies (see below). Later, through a messenger speech (1002-1006), the audience learns that Athena appeared and threw a boulder (the typical action of a Giant) to prevent Heracles from killing his father. At first it seems that Athena is the one lashing out with Giant-like behavior in Amphitryon’s accusation. Though, with time, the audience learns that Hercules is the analogue to the Giant, since he is an analogue to Enceladus.

Amphitryon’s confusion here is significant as well. It seems that he believes that Athena, through her Giant-like attack, is attempting to bring down his house. In reality, she seeks to save it through her acts of violence. The Gigantomachy can be viewed in a similar manner. When this theme is applied in political propaganda, it can be difficult to discern who is the Giant and who is the Olympian.

Gigantomachy in *The Birds*

The Gigantomachy is a central motif of Aristophanes’ *Birds*, and the myth plays with the audience’s expectations about the divine battle. The plot of the play begins with the protagonist Peisetaerus, who is fed up with Athenian politics. He convinces the birds to form a new quasi-utopian city in the sky. Peisetaerus hatches an ingenious plan: to take advantage

⁸⁰ See Hardie (1986: 90-97)

of their location between earth and the abode of the Olympians and blockade the gods so that they cannot receive their sacrifices. When Peisetaerus first proposes the wall that will create a blockade between earth and sky, the chorus responds with a Gigantomachic reference: “O Cebriones and Porphyryon, what a fear-inducing city!” (ὦ Κεβριόνη καὶ Πορφυρίων, ὥς σμερδαλέον τὸ πολίσιμα, 533). Porphyryon, according to Pindar, was the “King of the Giants” (βασιλεὺς γιγάντων, *Pyth.* 8.17). Conveniently for the play, Πορφυρίων was also a type of bird.⁸¹ Cebriones is a bit more mysterious. According to the scholia on these lines, it is the name of both a Giant and a bird. Either way, Porphyryon clearly suggests a Gigantomachy, and this is in line with play’s theme of “war against the gods.” We will see that Porphyryon in particular comes up again later in the play (1249-52).

The next overt reference to the Gigantomachy occurs later in the play when the Peisetaerus and the birds are trying to figure out what to name their city. They eventually settle on what is often translated as “Cloudcuckooland.” Peisetaerus gives it another name that is quite programmatic:

καὶ λῶον μὲν οὖν
τὸ **Φλέγρας πεδίων**, ἵν’ οἱ θεοὶ τοὺς γηγενεῖς
ἀλαζονευόμενοι καθυπερηκόντισαν.

Even better: the **Phlegraeon fields** where the gods overshot completely the Giants in bragging. (823-825)

The Phlegraeon fields are the legendary location where the Olympians fought the Giants. Herodotus says that this same place in his own time was called Pallene (7.123.1). Ancients debated its location and eventually it was placed in the region of Campania in Italy.⁸² By proposing a name for their new utopia that is the same as the region where the Giants and

⁸¹ See Dunbar (1998: ad loc.)

⁸² *Lyc. Alex.* 688-93; *Diod.* 4.21.5-7, 5.71.4; *Strab.* 5.4.4-6, 6.4.53.

Olympians fought, they suggest a connection between themselves and the Giants. But as we shall see, the outcome of the birds' revolution is quite the opposite of the Giants, who were notoriously defeated during this battle. Once the birds' blockade of Olympus has officially begun, the gods send down Iris as a messenger to demand sacrifices from the mortals below. Peisetaerus stops her and informs her she cannot pass through Cloudcuckooland. She promptly accuses Peisetaerus of *hubris* for thinking he can take on the gods. Peisetaerus responds by threatening Iris (and Zeus) with physical violence. He plans to do more violence than the Giant's assault on heaven:

ἄρ' οἴσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς εἴ με λυπήσει πέρα,
μέλαθρα μὲν αὐτοῦ καὶ δόμους Ἀμφίονος
καταιθαλώσω πυρφόροισιν αἰετοῖς,
πέμψω δὲ πορφυρίωνας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
ὄρνις ἐπ' αὐτόν, παρδαλᾶς ἐνημμένους
πλεῖν ἑξακοσίους τὸν ἀριθμόν; καὶ δὴ ποτε
εἷς Πορφυρίων αὐτῷ παρέσχε πράγματα.

Don't you know that if Zeus grieves me further, I will burn down his house and the house of Amphion with fire-bearing eagles? I will send Porphyryion birds clad in leopard skins into the sky against him – more than sixty in number! Even one Porphyryion in the past caused trouble for him! (1246-1252)

Once again Aristophanes exploits the double-meaning of “Porphyryion” to mean both Giant and bird. The Gigantomachic significance is clear through the context of Peisetaerus' image of assaulting heaven, which calls to mind the image of the two Giants Ephialtes and Otus who attempt to scale Mt. Olympus by piling Mt. Pelion upon Mt. Ossa first recounted in Homer (*Od.* 11.313-16). Furthermore, the “Porphyryions” are dressed in leopard skins, and Giants often are depicted wearing animal skins.⁸³

Later in the play, Prometheus enters the scene at line 1494. He is carrying a parasol so as to hide himself from Zeus' gaze. He comes to Cloudcuckooland because he too wishes to

⁸³ See Dunbar (1997: ad loc).

become part of Peisetaerus and the birds' new enterprise. According to the tradition of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, he was a Titan on the side of the *Olympians* during the battle between Zeus and the Titans. Here, Aristophanes inverts the usual set-up of the Titanomachy myth and has Prometheus fighting *against* Zeus. It seems that Prometheus knows how to pick the winning side since at the end of the *Birds* he suggests that Peisetaerus is indeed victorious over the Olympians. Prometheus provides the crucial information that can help Peisetaerus in his war against Zeus: if Peisetaerus marries Basilea, the daughter of Zeus and "royal power" personified, he can unseat Zeus from his place of power (1531-1535). In the end Peisetaerus' blockade of Olympus is successful. The gods send an embassy eventually to express the Olympians wish to yield to his demands. This play culminates with the wedding of Peisetaerus and Basilea, which solidifies the comic hero's status as the new lord of the universe.

What is significant about this play is the fact that Peisetaerus and the birds, though Gigantomachic figures, *win* the war against Olympians and take their place. The Giants and Titans were traditionally history's losers. Peisetaerus is seemingly the hero and sympathetic figure of the play. As scholars have noted, the Athenian audience, at least initially, would have identified with him since he wants to leave Athens for many of the same reasons they might have wanted to: fatigue from the courts, war, and *stasis*. Henderson (1997) has read this representation of Peisetaerus' utopia as wholly successful and without a latent critique. Other scholars have noted some of the more troubling aspects of Peisetaerus' society.⁸⁴ Peisetaerus essentially uses his sophistry to convince the birds to make a man, normally the

⁸⁴ For an overview of political interpretations, see Ambler (2012) who ultimately views Peisetaerus as an exploitative politician, but at the same time, the citizens of Cloudcuckooland deserve to be duped because of their own naiveté.

natural enemy of birds, a *tyrannos* of their new society. Furthermore, once Peisetaerus does establish this city in the clouds, it has some aspects that are remarkably similar to Athens. Perhaps most concerning is when the audience learns of the execution and consumption of the city's allegedly treasonous citizens: Peisetaerus essentially becomes a Cronus-figure (1584-85). It becomes difficult to tell whether Peisetaerus is a savior or an oppressor. In the end, this play presents a complex presentation of the Gigantomachy. The Giant-like figures win this war and are to some degree admirable. The birds create an orderly Utopia with this Gigantic strategy.

Gigantomachy in the *Ion*

The Gigantomachy is a key theme in Euripides' *Ion*. Mastronarde (1975) has argued that one of the themes of this play is "Chaos vs. Order." The Gigantomachy in particular, he argues, is marker of this theme (1975: 166). In this play, Creusa and Ion essentially represent the forces of disorder which in turn are put in order by the Olympian Apollo and Athena. I, however, will point out a strain which will show that this is not the case.

The fact that the Gigantomachy is featured in an ecphrasis at the beginning of the play emphasizes its status as an important motif.⁸⁵ Lee (1997: 178) remarks that the Gigantomachy that the chorus describes will be reenacted in the attempts to kill Ion (And perhaps Ion's attempt to kill Creusa?). The second strophe of the *parodos*, the Chorus famously describes the sculptures on the temple at Delphi:

πάνται τοι βλέφαρον διώ-
κω. σκέψαι κλόνον ἐν τείχεσ-
σι λαῖνοισι Γιγάντων.
†ὧδε δερκόμεσθ', ὦ φίλαι.†

⁸⁵ Mastronarde (1975) and Rosivatch (1977) both argue that this ecphrasis early in the play is a signpost of the themes of the entire play.

λεύσσεις οὖν ἐπ' Ἐγκελάδῳι
 γοργῶπὸν πάλλουσιν ἵτιν ...;
 λεύσσω **Παλλάδ'**, ἐμὴν θεόν.
 τί γάρ; κεραυνὸν ἀμφίπυρον
 ὄβριμον ἐν Διὸς
 ἐκηβόλοισι χερσίν;
 ὀρῶ· τὸν δάτιον
 Μίμαντα πυρὶ καταθαλοῖ.
 καὶ **Βρόμιος** ἄλλον ἀπολέμοι-
 σι κισσίνοισι βάκτροις
 ἐναίρει Γᾶς τέκνων ὁ Βακχεύς.

I am glancing around everywhere. See the battle of the giants, on the stone walls.
 I am looking at it, my friends.
 Do you see the one brandishing her **Gorgon** shield against Enceladus?
 I see **Pallas**, my own goddess.
 Now what? the mighty thunderbolt, blazing at both ends, in the far-shooting hands of Zeus?
 I see it; he is burning the furious Mimas to ashes in the fire.
 And Bacchus, the **roarer**, is killing another of the sons of Earth with his ivy staff, unfit for war. (E. *Io* 205-219)

In this passage, as in Hesiod, there is a doubling of opponents. First, let us consider the use of Athena's epithet Pallas in this passage (line 212). Recently, Deacy (2016) has made a convincing argument for the significance of the name Pallas. She argues that the name Pallas connotes the more violent aspects of the goddess (through connection to *πάλλειν*). Socrates in Plato's *Cratylus* (406d-407a) gives *πάλλειν* as the origin of her other name because of her "shaking" of weapons and armor. Apollodorus mentions that Pallas was one of her opponents in the Gigantomachy. The mythographer tells us that Athena kills and flays the Giant Pallas and from this skin makes her aegis (1.6.2). There was another tradition that Pallas was the father of Athena whom she killed when he tried to rape her (Schol. ad *Lyc.* 355; Cic. *DND* 3.59-60). The name Pallas (besides as Athena's epithet) first appears in Hesiod's *Theogony* (376, 383) where Pallas is a Titan who is the consort of Styx. During the war between the

Olympians and Titans, Styx switches to the side of Zeus (383-403). A fragment of Epicharmus (active in the 480s and 470s) suggests that Athena faces off against this Titan:

... ἐκ τᾶς τῷ Διὶ
φαντι κεφαλᾷς ἀπολέσαι πρᾶτιστα πάντων ἐμ μάχαι
τᾷ γενομέναι κατὰ Κρόνον Πάλλαντα, τὸ δὲ τούτῳ δέρος
πὸτ τὸ φοβερὰν εὐθὺς εἶμεν περιβαλεῖν αὐτᾶς κύκλωι·
διόπερ αὐτὰν Παλλάδ' ὀνομασθῆμεν ὑπὸ πάντων τόκα.

The very first thing that happened in the battle that took place against Cronus, they say, was that Pallas perished (at the hands of the goddess born) from the head of Zeus. And in order to be frightening, she immediately threw his skin around herself; which is why everyone referred to her as 'Pallas.' (fr. 135; trans. Olson)

Since the Gigantomachy and Titanomachy were often conflated by the 5th century,⁸⁶ it seems very likely that these Pallas figures were conflated as well. A later fragment of Accius represents a Pallas with Gigantic features:

Pallas **bicorpor anguium** spiras trahit.

Double-bodied Pallas drags the coils of snakes. (fr. 307 = Prisc. *Gl.* 2.236K)

Here, Pallas clearly has Gigantic characteristics. He is described as “double-bodied” (*bicorpor*) and has a snaky bottom (*anguium spiras*). The Giants began to be depicted with serpentine legs by the beginning of the 4th century.⁸⁷ When this conflation of the Titan Pallas and Giant Pallas happened, it is difficult to say. The fragment of Epicharmus cited above seems to suggest that the conflation had happened in his time.⁸⁸ Athena faces off against Pallas, who is one of her typical opponents in the Gigantomachy. Yet the fact that this battle is against Cronus (κατὰ Κρόνον) suggests the Titanomachy. Based on this, we can conclude that the two Pallases were seen as the same figure by at least the early 5th century. What does

⁸⁶ See Introduction.

⁸⁷ First known image is a lekythos dating 400-375 (see LIMC, *Gigantes* 389).

⁸⁸ Olson (2007: 54) suspects that Epicharmus is conflating the Titanomachy and Gigantomachy here.

this mean for the passage from the *Ion*? We have seen that the name “Pallas” evokes the more violent connotations of the goddess. On the one hand it, it can be connected to violent shaking with its association with *πάλλειν*. The name also can connote the gruesome of skinning of one of Athena’s kindred deities. Athena, clad her in aegis, essentially becomes a doublet of a Titan/Giant. To return to the *Ion*, it is fitting that has this epithet when she faces off against one. This doubling of opponents continues when we consider her shield. It has a Chthonic gorgon on it (γοργωπὸν, 210). In turn, we see Athena taking on more of the characteristics of her opponents. Furthermore, as Deacy (2016: 16) notes, Athena has the epithet Pallas in the *Iliad* when Homer speaks of her attempt to overthrow her father (*Il.* 1.400).⁸⁹ So this epithet of Pallas perhaps suggests familial strife as well.

This entire play forces the Athenian audience to reckon with their autochthonous identity. This identity is complicated, however, when the negative implications of autochthony are brought to light.⁹⁰ The Athenians thought they were “born from the earth” and this was used as claim to their ethnic superiority. Several of their mythical founders such as Erechtheus, Erichthonius, and Cecrops are shown with snakey legs which indicate their close connection to the earth (Hdt. 8.55). Creusa, mother of Ion, is the daughter of Erechtheus who is described as “earthborn” in this play (γηγενοῦς / Ἐρεχθονίου, 20-21). At the same time, the Giants are “born from the Earth.” (γηγενής; A. *Pr.* 353, E. *Ba.* 996, S. *Tr.* 1058). Later, Ion describes her in serpentine terms:

ὃ ταυρόμορφον ὄμμα Κηφισοῦ πατρός,
οἶαν ἔχιδναν ἔφυσας ἢ πυρὸς
δράκοντ’ ἀναβλέποντα φοινίαν φλόγα

⁸⁹ It is also of not that that an alternate tradition is that Athena acquires the name Pallas after accidentally killing a childhood friend and pseudo-sister of the same name (Apollod. 3.144).

⁹⁰ Mitchell 2007: 86-87.

O bull-shaped face of Kephisos, her ancestor, what a viper you begat in this woman or is she rather a snake with a fiery look which brings death? (*E. Ion* 1261-4. Trans. Lee)

This play, like the Bacchylides fragment that I discussed in Chapter 1, brings up the problematic nature of being autochthonous and thus potential complications to Athenian identity. As mentioned earlier, Mastronarde (1975) suggests that both Creusa and Ion are Chthonic figures. But, at the same time, Ion has a significant Olympian pedigree as the son of Apollo.⁹¹ He lives in the “house” of his father (54-56) and even adopts some of his characteristics such as his laurel leaves (103-104) and bow (108). This play perhaps leaves the audience wondering, are we Olympian or Giant?

The ecphrasis is also of note because of the violence it inspires. Athanassaki (2010: 226-7) notes that the Chorus exhibits a penchant for violence after seeing the artwork on the temple. They look to the violence of the Gigantomachy as opposed to the image on the pediment of the temple: Apollo’s peaceful arrival at the sanctuary. The Giants are often cast as harbingers of violence.⁹² Athanassaki (2010) ultimately argues that Euripides uses this play to comment on Athenians’ propensity for violence. They wish death upon Ion (705, 719-20), they encourage Creusa to try to kill Ion (857-8), and they use violent imagery in an ode that hopes for his death (1048-1073).

It is important to point out that it is the *Olympians* who are performing acts of violence on this frieze, not the Giants. In fact, the text itself highlights the violent acts of the Olympians and not the Giants. The Chorus, in turn, are inspired to violent acts by the supposed bringers of justice, the Olympians. The fact that this is an ecphrasis is also significant because, as a

⁹¹ As Rosivach (1977: 293-4) notes.

⁹² See Introduction.

work of art, it has the potential to deceive and openness to interpretation.⁹³ The ancients were aware of visual art's potential to deceive.⁹⁴ The chorus *could* have seen and been influenced by the peaceful images on the temple, but they instead chose to see what they wanted to see: the violent images. Now this claim could easily be made for any ecphrasis. But the Gigantomachy seems marked here since it was so commonly used in both monumental art and politically charged art.⁹⁵

The Gigantomachy comes up later in the play as well. In this passage, Creusa creates a plan with her tutor to murder Ion. Before she reveals the core of her plan, to use the poisoned blood of the Gorgon, she gives a little background information:

{Κρ.} ἄκουε τοίνυν· οἶσθα γηγενῇ μάχην; (987)
 {Πρ.} οἶδ', ἦν Φλέγραι Γίγαντες ἔστησαν θεοῖς.
 {Κρ.} ἐνταῦθα Γοργόν' ἔτεκε Γῆ, δεινὸν τέρας.
 {Πρ.} ἦ παισὶν αὐτῆς σύμμαχον, θεῶν πόνον; (990)
 {Κρ.} ναί· καὶ νιν ἔκτειν' ἡ Διὸς Παλλὰς θεά. (991)
 {Πρ.} ἄρ' οὐτός ἐσθ' ὁ μῦθος ὃν κλύω πάλαι; (994)
 {Κρ.} ταύτης Ἀθάναν δέρος ἐπὶ στέρνοις ἔχειν.
 {Πρ.} ἦν αἰγίδ' ὀνομάζουσι, Παλλάδος στολήν;
 {Κρ.} τόδ' ἔσχεν ὄνομα θεῶν ὅτ' ἦξεν ἐς δόρυ. (992)
 {Πρ.} ποῖόν τι μορφῆς σχῆμ' ἔχουσαν ἀγρίας;
 {Κρ.} θώρακ' ἐχίδνης περιβόλοις ὠπλισμένον⁹⁶

Creusa

Listen then. Do you recall the battle fought by Earth's progeny?

Tutor

I do, when the Giants did battle with the gods at Phlegra.

Creusa

At the time Earth gave birth to the Gorgon, a terrible monster.

Tutor

To fight alongside her children, a trial to the gods?

Creusa

Yes. Pallas, the goddess, daughter of Zeus, killed her.

Tutor

⁹³ On ecphrasis and deception, see Russell (1981: 25); Bann (1989: 32); Whitmarsh (2002).

⁹⁴ It is for this very reason that Socrates wishes to ban art from his *Kallipolis* in Book 10 of Plato's *Republic*. See Rouveret (1989: 50-59).

⁹⁵ In the following chapters, we will see ecphrases of Gigantomachy used in similar manner.

⁹⁶ The text is Lee (1997).

Is this the story I heard long ago?

Creusa

Yes that Athena wears on her breast the hide of this creature.

Tutor

Which people call the “aegis”, the armour of Pallas?

Creusa

It acquired that name when she rushed into the ranks of the gods.

Tutor

Roughly what sort of fierce shape does the object have?

Creusa

A breastplate, fitted with snaky coils. (*Ion* 987-994. Trans. Lee)

Creusa includes the Gorgon in the Gigantomachy. This is the first attestation of the Gorgon in this battle, though later accounts do include her in it.⁹⁷ Traditionally, Perseus defeats the Gorgon.⁹⁸ The question of whether Euripides made up this version or is following a pre-existing tradition has been much debated.⁹⁹ Earlier in this play, Athena is depicted as facing off against Enceladus, not the Gorgon. In addition, this also contradicts the earlier narrative, because in the Gigantomachy in the earlier ecphrasis, the Gorgon is already on the shield of Athena (210).¹⁰⁰ This is highlighted by the fact that the tutor does not seem to remember this story: “Is this really the story that I heard long ago?” (ἄρ’ οὐτός ἐσθ’ ὁ μῦθος ὃν κλύω πάλαι; 994). Creusa manipulates the myth for her own purposes. Through this manipulation, we see how the myth can be twisted to suit the means of the speaker.¹⁰¹

What is also significant here is that Creusa plans to use the blood of the Gorgon to kill, unbeknownst to her, her own son. She uses Chthonic weaponry inherited from Chthonic family against her one of her own family members. Like the battle depicted on the temple at the beginning of the play between Giant-like Pallas and the Giant Enceledus, Creusa and Ion,

⁹⁷ Diod. 3.70.

⁹⁸ E. *Andromeda* fr. 123, *El.* 459ff. See also Schuaenburg (1960: 19ff.)

⁹⁹ See Mastronard (1975n33) for an overview of the debate.

¹⁰⁰ Martin (2018: ad loc.) calls this an “ironic inconsistency.”

¹⁰¹ Or the observer, as we saw with the ecphrasis above.

but when it is reenacted through Creusa and Ion, the familial nature of the conflict is highlighted. Ion is partially Olympian through father Apollo, but he is also partially Chthonic through his mother Creusa. He is just like the Chthonic-Olympian Pallas who attacks her Chthonic opponent.

Scholars have suggested that the *Ion* is a response to Aristophanes' *Birds*. Birds play a prominent role in the *Ion*. The titular hero tries to shoo birds away from his temple at the beginning of the tragedy on two occasions (106-8, 158-176). It is a bird who reveals the plot against Ion by drinking the poisoned cup (1196-1208). Dimantakou-Agathou (2012), through examining the prevalent bird imagery, and the verbal, thematic, and structural parallels between the two plays, argues that the *Ion* is a direct response to the *Birds*.¹⁰² I would like to supplement her argument with another parallel: the prominence of the Gigantomachy theme in both plays. As I pointed out above, the Gigantomachy plays a very ambiguous role in the *Birds*. It would seem that Euripides also noticed the myth's potential for ambiguity and similarly made use of this in his own play.

Though its exterior seemingly suggests that the Gigantomachy is about Chaos vs. Order, the *Ion* draws attention to the many complications the play can have.

Gigantomachy in Plato

Plato offers many critiques of myths like the Gigantomachy. One particular passage further draws out the connection between familial strife, the Gigantomachy, and civic strife. The Socrates of his *Republic* says he will ban the traditional mythology from his ideal city,

¹⁰² Diamantakou-Agathou uses her argument to date the *Ion* after 414.

precisely because they set a poor example. Cronus and Uranus offer a poor paradigm for father and sons. Socrates says:

μὰ τὸν Δία, ἧ δ' ὅς, οὐδὲ αὐτῷ μοι δοκεῖ ἐπιτήδεια εἶναι λέγειν.
οὐδέ γε, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, τὸ παράπαν ὡς **θεοὶ θεοῖς** πολεμοῦσιν
τε καὶ **ἐπιβουλεύουσι** καὶ μάχονται .

“By Zeus,” I said, “I do not think it is advantageous to say that gods go to war with gods, and plot against one another and engage in battle ...” (Plat. *Rep.* 2.378b-c)

While the mention of gods battling gods (**θεοὶ θεοῖς πολεμοῦσιν**) conjures the famous scene from the *Iliad* in which the Olympian gods, in an almost silly fashion, engage in battle with one another (20.1-74), here, Socrates undoubtedly also intends to reference the Titanomachy as he was speaking of the immoral actions of Uranus and Cronus in the previous section (Plat. *Rep.* 2.377e).¹⁰³ Interestingly, he does not separate the Titans into a distinct category, but simply calls them *theoi*. The polyptoton of these two nouns (**θεοὶ θεοῖς**) in this passage is significant. Plato here may hope to show the similarity between the two combatants. The verb “to plot” (**ἐπιβουλεύουσι**) also must have resonated with Athenians of the early 4th century who endured several plots of such as the Coup of 411, the Thirty Tyrants, and the subsequent coup to restore the democracy.¹⁰⁴ Socrates continues:

εἴ γε δεῖ ἡμῖν τοὺς μέλλοντας τὴν πόλιν φυλάξειν αἰσχιστον νομίζειν τὸ ῥαδίως ἀλλήλοις ἀπεχθάνεσθαι—πολλοῦ δεῖ **γίγαντομαχίας** τε μυθολογητέον αὐτοῖς καὶ ποικιλτέον, καὶ ἄλλας ἔχθρας πολλὰς καὶ παντοδαπὰς θεῶν τε καὶ ἡρώων πρὸς **συγγενεῖς** τε καὶ οἰκείους αὐτῶν—ἀλλ' εἴ πως μέλλομεν πείσειν ὡς οὐδεὶς πώποτε **πολίτης** ἕτερος ἑτέρῳ ἀπήχθετο οὐδ' ἔστιν τοῦτο ὅσιον, τοιαῦτα λεκτέα μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ παιδιά εὐθὺς καὶ γέρουσι καὶ γραυσί, καὶ πρεσβυτέροις γιγνομένοις καὶ τοὺς ποιητὰς ἐγγὺς τούτων ἀναγκαστέον λογοποιεῖν.

If it is necessary that the guardians of our city to think it most shameful that they easily become hateful to one another – it is far from necessary that the myth of the **Gigantomachy** should be told and embroidered, and all the other

¹⁰³ Cf. Plat. *Euth.* 6a in which Plato briefly discusses the paradoxical paradigm for a father that Zeus sets with his maltreatment of his father.

¹⁰⁴ It appears twice in the famous *stasis* treatise of Thucydides (3.82.4, 3.82.5).

types of enmities of the gods and heroes against their **kin** and members of their household. – but if somehow we intend to persuade that no **citizen** ever fought with one another and it is unholy: these sorts of things must be said to the children by old men and women, and when they are older they must compel the poets to tell stories similar to these. (Plat. *Rep.* 2.387c-d)

Socrates specifically mentions the Gigantomachy as one of the myths that he wishes to be banned from his city. Socrates elaborates that this myth is one of the many types of myths in which the gods *fight their own family members* (πρὸς **συγγενεῖς** τε καὶ οἰκεῖους αὐτῶν), particularly with the word συγγενής which we have seen in *Prometheus Bound* used by Olympians to refer to their Chthonic brethren and in Thucydides in reference to the breaking of familial bonds caused by *stasis*. Socrates even makes the direct connection to the state himself: he intends to ban the Gigantomachy and other myths in which the gods fight their kin specifically because they cause dissent among the citizenry (**πολίτης** ἕτερος ἑτέρῳ ἀπήχθετο).

Conclusion

Though this period is often thought of as one that celebrates Greek victories over foreign “barbarians” through art that incorporates the Gigantomachy, I have demonstrated that this myth can be used for very different ends. As we have seen, scholars often cite the Parthenon as an example of “Chaos vs. Order,” but there are a great many other representations of the Gigantomachy in which the establishment of order is not so clear. Tragic poets and comic poets exploit the ambiguities of the Gigantomachy myth to reflect the ambiguous realities of the polis and its propensity for internal conflict. We have observed that the Gigantomachy essentially became associated with *stasis*. In the next chapter, we will

see a shifting uncertainty as to who is a “barbarian,” which will further allow for the Gigantomachy to be used to convey complex conflicts.

CHAPTER 3

GIGANTOMACHY IN THE HELLENISTIC ERA

The Hellenistic Era was a time when the Greek world was expanding. Definitions of what was considered “Greek” were changing. The division between “Greek” and “barbarian” was becoming blurred. The Gigantomachy, as we will see, was still a popular theme. Rulers and regimes still tried to project their “Greekness” by defining themselves in opposition to “barbarians.” Some poets and visual artists presented images of the Gigantomachy that supported these groups in fostering a “Greek vs. Non-Greek” association. At the same time, however, some poetry and artwork suggest real complications in the myth as well. I suggest that the shifting cultural demographics of the time period made the Gigantomachy an even more complex myth.

In the early 5th century, Greek city-states attempted to prove their “Greekness” by styling themselves as defenders of Greece against “barbarian” invaders. As discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, the Athenians in particular used their role in the Persian Wars for Panhellenic political purposes.¹⁰⁵ There was a similar phenomenon among Western Greeks, as we saw with Pindar’s use of the Typhonomachy in *Pythian I*. Western Greeks, because of their marginalized identity, sought to assert their Greek identity.¹⁰⁶ This same concept will apply to the Hellenistic World. Macedonians too were historically excluded from the Greek world.¹⁰⁷ They in turn tried to establish their “Greekness” by competing in Panhellenic games and styling themselves as defenders of Greece from foreign invaders.

¹⁰⁵ As we saw with significance of the metopes of Parthenon. See Mitchell (2007: passim).

¹⁰⁶ See Hall (1989); Hall (2001)

¹⁰⁷ The Macedonians were excluded from the Olympics until Alexander I famously proved his “Greekness” by Argive descent (Hdt. 5.22).

Gigantomachy in Callimachus

Callimachus in particular suggests the “Greek vs. Barbarian” agenda for the Ptolemaic dynasty. In his *Hymn to Delos*, Apollo, from his mother’s womb, predicts the Celtic invasion of the Balkan peninsula. He calls invading Celts are called “late-born Titans”:

καί νύ ποτε ξυνός τις ἐλεύσεται ἄμμιν ἄεθλος
 ὕστερον, ὅπποταν οἱ μὲν ἐφ' Ἑλλήγεσσι μάχαιραν
 βαρβαρικήν καὶ Κελτὸν ἀναστήσαντες Ἄρηα
ὀψίγονοι Τιτῆνες ἀφ' ἐσπέρου ἐσχατόωντος
 ῥώσωνται νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότες ἢ ἰσάριθμοι
 τείρεσιν, ἥνικα πλεῖστα κατ' ἡέρα βουκολέονται,
 παιδ[] . . . σα[].[] (177a)
 Δωρ. ι. [.]. [] . . . οσα[]ς (177b)
 καὶ πεδιά Κρισσαῖα καὶ Ἡφαί[στο]ιο φάρ[αγγ]ες
 ἀμφιπεριστείνωνται, ἴδωσι δὲ πῖονα καπνὸν
 γείτονος αἰθομένοιο, καὶ οὐκέτι μοῦνον ἀκουῇ,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη παρὰ νηὸν παυγάζοιντο φάλαγγας
 δυσμενέων, ἤδη δὲ παρὰ τριπόδεσσιν ἐμεῖο
 φάσγανα καὶ ζωστῆρας ναιδέας ἐχθομένας τε
 ἀσπίδας, αἱ Γαλάτησι κακὴν ὁδὸν ἄφρονι φύλῳ
 στήσονται· τέων αἱ μὲν ἐμοὶ γέρας, αἱ δ' ἐπὶ Νείλῳ
 ἐν πυρὶ τοὺς φορέοντας ἀποπνεύσαντας ἰδοῦσαι
 κείσονται βασιλῆος ἀέθλια πολλὰ καμόντος.

And now at some later time a common struggle will come to us, when against the Hellenes **later born Titans** raising up a barbarian dagger and Celtic war, from the farthest west (175) will rush, like snowflakes or equal in number to the stars, when they graze most closely together upon the aether . . . and the plain of Crisa and the glens of Hephaestus are hard pressed on all sides, and they shall see the rich smoke (180) of the burning neighbor, and no longer only by hearsay, but already beside the temple they would perceive phalanxes of the enemy, already alongside my tripods the swords and the shameless belts and the hated shields that will line the evil path of the Galatians, a crazed tribe. (185) Some of these shields will be my reward, others will be set by the Nile, having seen the bearers breathe their last in the fire, the prizes of a much laboring king. (Call. *Del.* 171-187. Trans. Stephens)

The Celts are explicitly compared to the Titans. This is passage that is often cited when scholars make the claim that the Gigantomachy signifies “Chaos vs. Order,” “Civilized vs.

Uncivilized,” or “Greek vs. Barbarian.”¹⁰⁸ One can read this passage as Callimachus presenting Ptolemy II as one who legitimizes his rule through the expulsion of foreign invaders.¹⁰⁹

One must remember, however, the political context of this poem. The Celts invaded the Balkan Peninsula in the 3rd century BC.¹¹⁰ The lines above refer to the Celtic assault on Delphi in 280/279. The Aetolian League, with, according to Pausanias, the help of Apollo, repelled the Celts from the sanctuary.¹¹¹ At lines 185-7, Callimachus transitions to Ptolemy’s suppression of the Celts in Egypt and by implication equates it with the Aetolian defense of Delphi (Stephens 2003: 114-115). But Ptolemy’s suppression of the Gauls was not so simple as the Aetolian League’s. Firstly, it should be noted that Ptolemy’s half-brother Ptolemy Ceraunus (the one he expelled) was killed in 279 in a battle against the Celts in Macedonia (Paus. 1.7). Most importantly, it should be noted that Ptolemy hired these Celts to wage war on his half-brother, Magas of Cyrene (Paus. 1.7).¹¹² Essentially, Ptolemy hires these “Late-born Titans” to wage war against a member of his own family. This taints any sort of “Order vs. Chaos” narrative that the reference might hope to convey.

There is another association that may indicate a complicated conflict. The references to the Titans may recall their Egyptian equivalents. This poem may have been a kind of *genethliakon* (“birthday poem”) for Ptolemy. In the poem, Apollo prophesies Ptolemy’s birth on the island of Cos which closely corresponds to his own on Delos (162-70). This hymn can be read as an attempt to put Ptolemy on par with the Delphian god.¹¹³ By the 6th century

¹⁰⁸ Hardie (1986: 123-4), Mineur (1984: ad loc.), Nisbet and Rudd (2004 ad *Carm.* 3.4).

¹⁰⁹ Mitchell (2003: 284-5) treats the image of expelling Celtic invaders as means to legitimize Macedonian rule.

¹¹⁰ For a detailed account of the beginning of the invasion, see Paus. 10.22. For the Celtic invasion of the 3rd century BCE generally, see Mitchell (2003).

¹¹¹ See Paus. 10.23.19.4-23.8. See also Nachtergaele (1977: 146, 177ff) and Mitchell (2003).

¹¹² On the Celtic mercenaries, see Hölbl (2001: 39 and n18).

¹¹³ For an overview of this theory, see Mineur (1984: 10-16).

BCE, the Egyptian god Seth was conflated with Typhon.¹¹⁴ According to Egyptian myth, Typhon kills his brother Osiris (who was conflated with Dionysus). Horus, the Egyptian analogue to Apollo and son of Osiris, in turn murders his uncle Seth.¹¹⁵ Koenen (1959) argues that this poem was in honor of Ptolemy's coronation, and that Egyptian enthronizations in general commemorated the victory over mythical enemies. Mineur (1984: 13) suggests that reference to the Titans and Celtic Mercenaries in the passage above allude to this Egyptian parallel. In this case, the reference to the "Late-born Titans" activates the the conflict that that Ptolemy II had with his half-brothers.

But even before this passage, Callimachus sets the reader up for a reference to the Titanomachy. Earlier in this hymn, Ares, who has been tasked by Hera to prevent Leto from giving birth, almost throws a large portion of a mountain at the river god Peneius:

... ἀλλά οἱ Ἄρης
 Παγγαίου προθέλυμνα καρήατα μέλλεν ἀείρας
 ἐμβαλέειν δίνησιν, ἀποκρύψαι δὲ ῥέεθρα·
 ὑψόθε δ' ἐσμαράγησε καὶ ἀσπίδα τύψεν ἀκωκῇ
 δούρατος· ἡ δ' ἐλέλιξεν ἐνόπλιον· ἔτρεμε δ' **Ὀσσης**
 οὔρεα καὶ πεδῖον Κραννώνιον αἷ τε δυσαιεῖς
 ἐσχατιαὶ Πίνδοιο, φόβῳ δ' ὠρχήσατο πᾶσα
 Θεσσαλίη· τοῖος γὰρ ἀπ' ἀσπίδος ἔβραμεν ἦχος.
 ὥς δ', ὅπότε Αἰτναίου ὄρεος πυρὶ **τυφομένοιο**
 σείονται μυχὰ πάντα, κατουδαίοιο **γίγαντος**
 εἰς ἐτέρην **Βριαρῆος** ἐπωμίδα κινυμένοιο,
 θερμάστραι τε βρέμουσιν ὑφ' Ἡφαίστοιο πυράγρης
 ἔργα θ' ὁμοῦ, δεινὸν δὲ πυρίκμητοί τε λέβητες
 καὶ τρίποδες πίπτοντες ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι ἰαχεῦσιν,

But Ares, having lifted the peaks of Pangaeum from their base, was going (135) to hurl them into his eddies and cover up his streams. On high he crashed and struck his shield with the point of his spear, and made it quiver with a warlike beat. The mountains of **Ossa** trembled and the plain of Crannon and the windswept heights of the **Pindus**, and all of Thessaly danced in fear. (140)

¹¹⁴ Pherecydes of Syros and Aeschylus (*Supp.* 560) conflate these figures. For the conflation of these two figures, see (Kranz 1934: 114). See also Griffiths (1960: passim).

¹¹⁵ Hdt. 2.144; Diod. 1.21-22.

Such a noise rang from his shield. Just as, when the whole interior of **Mt. Etna**, **smoldering** with fire, is shaken because the Giant **Briareos** under the earth moves onto his other shoulder, the furnaces roar under Hephaestus' tongs (145) and likewise his implements; the fire-wrought basins and tripods ring out as they fall upon each other. (Call. *Del.* 133-146. Trans. Stephens)

The throwing of a mountaintop is inherently a Gigantomachic act.¹¹⁶ In this case, however, Ares acts against the will of Zeus and is thus more aligned with the Giants. The din of his shield makes the other mountains rumble, one of which is Mt. Ossa (137), a mountain famously used when the Giants attempt to scale Mt. Olympus.¹¹⁷ According to Seneca, Mt. Pindus is also displaced in the Gigantomachy (*HF* 980). Furthermore, Callimachus mentions Mt. Aetna, a volcano closely associated with both the Gigantomachy and the Typhonomachy. In Aeschylus (*PV* 351ff and 365), Pindar (*O.* 4.6, *P.* 1.17ff., fr. 92), this is the location of Typhon's prison. Callimachus alludes to this tradition with the word τυφομένοιο ("smoldering," 141) which is clearly linguistically related to the name "Typhon." Callimachus, however, surprises the audience and follows a tradition that places Briareus under Aetna.¹¹⁸ Briareus is quite the shadowy figure in both the Titanomachy and Gigantomachy. In Hesiod, he is a Titan on the side of Zeus, and he joins Zeus' side through bribery (see Chapter 1). According to the lost *Titanomachia*, he fights on the side of Titans (Eumelos, fr. 2 K = Schol. Apollon. 1.1165c). Since he is called a Giant here (γίγαντος, 140), and since the Titans and Giants were conflated, it seems likely that Callimachus follows this version of the myth. Though it does seem of note that Callimachus chooses such a complex figure as the resident under Aetna. It would have been much simpler to have a more clear-cut

¹¹⁶ Giusepetti (2013: 154-58) argues that this imagery activates the Gigantomachy myth and prefigures the Gigantomachic imagery later in the poem.

¹¹⁷ *Od.* 11.313-316; Verg. *G.* 278-282; Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.52; Prop. 2.1.19-20.

¹¹⁸ In other traditions, some of which Callimachus follows (*Aet.* fr. 1.36), Enceladus is buried beneath Aetna (Verg. *A.* 3.578).

Giant or Titan such as Enceladus or Typhon. By casting Ares as a Gigantic figure, Callimachus creates a new Gigantomachy that is within the Olympian family.

In Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, a subtle reference to the Titanomachy carries a connotation of a familial conflict. In this poem, the speaker gives an overview of all of Zeus' accomplishments. In the following passage, Callimachus speaks of Zeus' early years:

ἀλλ' ἔτι παιδὸν ἐὼν ἐφράσσαο πάντα τέλεια·
τῷ τοι καὶ γνωτοὶ **προτερηγενέες** περ ἐόντες
οὐρανὸν οὐκ ἐμέγηραν ἔχειν ἐπιδαΐσιον οἶκον.

But, still being a child, you thought up all adult things. Therefore, though being your earlier born, your relatives did not begrudge you to have your allotted home in the sky. (Call. *Iov.* 57-59)

Callimachus applies the term προτερηγενέες (“early born”) to Zeus' siblings, Hades and Poseidon, since according to some traditions, Zeus was born before them (*Th.* 478).¹¹⁹ This is a rare word and its use here is not without significance as I will argue; there is only other earlier extant occurrence of this adjective. It first appears in a fragment of the 5th century poet and grammarian Antimachus where it refers to the Titans (fr. 41a7).¹²⁰ Given its sole earlier use as an epithet for the Titans, the adjective must retain the association with Titans in this passage.

This poem is clearly of political significance. Ptolemy II Philadelphus is likely the addressee and stand-in for Zeus for hymn.¹²¹ The passage above most likely refers to the fact that he stole the throne from his half-brother, Ptolemy Ceraunus. As Clauss (1986 :160) states in his analysis of this hymn: the transition of power was “not as smooth as that of Zeus

¹¹⁹ According to Homer, Zeus is the oldest (*Il.* 13.335, 15.166).

¹²⁰ The only extant occurrence in Greek literature is Apollonius' *Argonautica* to describe ancient Egyptians who lived before Deucalion (4.268).

¹²¹ See Clauss (1986) who convincingly dates the hymn to 285/4 or 284/3 and argues for Ptolemy II Philadelphus as the addressee. For an overview of the literature on the proposed addressee, see n2-3 of this article.

over his brothers.” After Ptolemy is ousted as heir apparent, he flees to Seleucus’ court in Macedonia where he plots to restore himself to the throne from roughly 287-280 (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F 12.2). I suggest that Callimachus subtly alludes to this by using the adjective’s only earlier extant usage was to describe Titans, relatives of Zeus whose transition from power was not at all smooth either. Clauss also addresses the opening lines of this hymn, and he believes that they have political significance. Zeus is called the “driver of the Pelagonians.” (Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, 3). The “Pelagonians” can refer to the Giants through their connection from being born from the “clay” (πηλός) as the scholiast (ad loc.) notes. The “Pelagonians” can be a name for the Titans (Strab. 7. fr. 4331). Clauss (1986: 162) sees this reference to Zeus as a “driver” as a fusion of the figures of Zeus, Hermes¹²² (he was a driver of cattle), and Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The placement of this at the beginning of the hymn and its association with Ptolemy II Philadelphus connects Zeus’ involvement in the Gigantomachy with the driving away of family members. I suggest that this further highlights the idea the Gigantomachy and Titanomachy were associated with familial strife.

Chaos vs. *Chaos* on the Great Altar of Pergamum

The Great Altar of Pergamum is often cited when scholars address the Gigantomachy and mention its significance of “Order vs. Chaos” or “Civilized vs. Uncivilized.”¹²³ On the base of this altar is a large frieze that is one of our more comprehensive representations of the Gigantomachy. The Altar, which is usually dated to the decade after 188 BCE,¹²⁴ has been

¹²² Clauss (1986) examines the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* as a primary literary model for Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*.

¹²³ See Hardie (1986:136-50) and Pollit (1986:181-2,105).

¹²⁴ On the date of the altar, see Kähler (1948: 142).

connected to Pergamene victory over the Gauls.¹²⁵ There are many reasons for this. The Olympians tend to occupy the top half of the frieze while the Giants tend to be found in the lower portion of the frieze. The Olympians are mainly all anthropomorphic and they all appear to be winning their conflicts. The Giants, by contrast, all appear to be losing their battles. Many of the Giants have snake-like legs or other beast-like features.¹²⁶

The Giants were not always represented this way. In archaic poetry and art, they are represented as human-like warriors, often in hoplite armor.¹²⁷ In the 5th century, they are frequently depicted with animal skins, which identify them with the Persian “other.”¹²⁸ It is in the late 4th, early 3rd century that they begin to be represented with serpentine features, starting in South Italian pottery.¹²⁹ This frieze is the first extensive use of Giants as anguipeds. On the one hand, this feature speaks to their association with their mother, Gaia, as Chthonic figures are often represented with serpentine tails. On the other hand, this also stems from a desire to distinguish them from the Olympians. On the altar, the serpentine limbs and other bestial features serve to highlight the stark difference between Olympian and Giant.

One scholar, however, has sought to point out that the Olympian/Giant dichotomy is not so simple. Whitaker (2005) shows that often it can be a little difficult to tell the difference between Olympian and Giant because of the animals used by the Olympians to enact violence or bestial characteristics of the Olympian’s allies themselves.¹³⁰ I will give a few

¹²⁵ For the connection of the frieze and the historical event, see Moreno (1194, 416-430-2). For the historical event, see Hansen (1971: 88-92, 101-27); Allen (1983:79-81).

¹²⁶ One Giant has a lion’s head and another has a bull’s neck.

¹²⁷ For a comprehensive overview of the iconography of the Giants, see Vian (1952).

¹²⁸ Vian (1952: 145-6).

¹²⁹ Vian (1952: 147).

¹³⁰ Stewart (1993: 163) makes this observation in passing.

examples. One is the section on the east frieze, where Athena faces off against Alcyoneus (see Figure 5).



Figure 5: Athena, Alcyoneus, Nike, and Gaia on the East Frieze of the Great Altar of Pergamum (Photo Credit: Claus Ableiter, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=1810893>).

Athena occupies the center of this panel. Nike crowns the goddess on the top right. In the bottom right corner, Gaia is in a position of mourning for her defeated children. In the lefthand corner features Athena's opponent, Alcyoneus, as Athena grips him by his hair. As I stated above, the gods tend to occupy the upper portion of the frieze, which heralds their victory. In the lower section, there are two Chthonic figures. Their position on the lower portion of the panel suggests their imminent defeat.

There is a snake in the vicinity of Alcyoneus, and we might assume, since he is a Giant, that the snake is part of one of his legs. Alcyoneus, however, is an anthropomorphic Giant and the snake is actually Athena's. This is not the only instance of the Olympians using Chthonic weaponry against the Giants. In a section of the north frieze, Nyx, who is on the side of the Olympians, holds a serpentine projectile (see Figure 6).



Figure 6: Nyx Wields a Snake Orb on the North Frieze of the Great Altar of Pergamum (Photo Credit: Miguel Hermoso Cuesta, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Gigantomachy_frieze_of_the_Pergamon_Altar__Moirae_contra_Gigantes#/media/File:Altar_P%C3%A9rgamo_Moiras_01.JPG).

It appears that the goddess wields an orb that is covered by a snake. Nyx uses Chthonic weaponry against a Giant that looks like it could be an Olympian.¹³¹ Scholars have posited that this scene may reflect a historical event involving snake projectiles. In the early 2nd century BCE, Hannibal, who was in league with the Bithynians in a campaign against the Pergamenes, staged a naval attack that involved the throwing of earthenware full of venomous snakes.¹³² This frieze, however, displays a surprising reversal of this event. This is an allusion to successful attack *against* the Pergamenes on a Pergamene monument. The one using the serpentine weapon is not a Giant, but a goddess on the side of the Olympians with

¹³¹ The Giant also sports a Macedonian helmet, a detail which will be important for my discussion below.

¹³² Nep. *Han.* 10-11; Justin 32.4.2-8. For the connection of Nyx's serpentine globe with this historical event, see Hansen (1971n90) and Kunze (1990: 137).

whom, we would imagine, the view should identify. This is indeed a complex presentation for the Pergamene viewer.

The Giants are normally known for their bicorporal nature, some of those on the side of the Olympians have similar non-normative bodies. Hecate on the east frieze is presented with two heads and two sets of arms (see Figure 7).



Figure 7: Hecate on the East Frieze of the Great Altar of Pergamum (Photo Credit: CC BY-SA 3.0, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=3511291>).

At first glance, one might assume she is on the side of the Giants. She also uses a torch as weapon. Torches were often associated with the weapons of the Giants.¹³³ A similar visual confusion happens on the northern avant-corps on the west side (see Figure 8).

¹³³ Vian 1952: 146-7.



Figure 8: Triton Faces off Against an Anthropomorphic on the Northern Avian-Corps of the Great Altar of Pergamum (Photo Credit: Claus Ableiter, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=1810770>).

In this vignette, there is a very bestial-looking Triton. He has horses' legs, a sea serpent's tail, and wings. He faces off against an anthropomorphic Giant. As with the case of Hecate, at first glance, it may difficult to distinguish between Giant and Olympian.

Many of the figures have weapons that were reflective of the styles of the 2nd century BCE. But the attempt to pin the Olympians as the Pergamenes and the Giants as the Celts becomes difficult upon close inspection. Several of the Giants have *Macedonian*-style helmets. Otus (the central figure to Hecate's back) wears such a helmet (see Figure 9).



Figure 9: Otus on the East Frieze of the Great Altar of Pergamum (Photo Credit: Claus Ableiter, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=1774988>)

A closer examination of the inside of his shield reveals Zeus' thunderbolt and a Gorgon (see Figure 10). Both bear Olympian associations. Zeus's thunderbolt is the means by which he vanquishes the Titans and Giants. The Gorgon, though a Chthonic figure, is what the Olympian Athena normally displays on her shield.



Figure 10: Detail of Otus' Shield-Strap on the East Frieze of the Great Altar of Pergamum (Photo Credit: Claus Ableite, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=1774988>)

Also on the east frieze, another Giant (identified as Ephialtes, the brother of Otus¹³⁴) dons a Macedonian helmet (see Figure 11), while yet another Giant bears a Macedonian helmet and a Macedonian starburst shield (see Figure 12).¹³⁵

¹³⁴ It is also perhaps of note that these two brothers appear on the frieze in Macedonian armor. These two Giants are the sons of Poseidon who appears on the east frieze (*Od.* 13.305-320). Their inclusion makes this more of a familial conflict and it is perhaps with good reason that the father and sons do not appear on the same frieze. This also perhaps why they both have Macedonian armor and are very anthropomorphic.

¹³⁵ On the Giants wearing Macedonian-style armor, see Stewart 1993:162-3, Stewart 2001: 40.



Figure 11: Ephialtes on the East Frieze of the Great Altar of Pergamum (Photo Credit: Miguel Hermoso Cuenta,

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Gigantomachy_frieze_of_the_Pergamon_Altar_Apollo_contra_Gigantes#/media/File:Altar_de_P%C3%A9rgamo_Apolo_03.JPG).



Figure 12: Detail of Macedonian Starburst Shield (Photo Credit: Wolfgang Sauber,

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Gigantomachy_frieze_of_the_Pergamon_Altar_-_Hera_contra_Gigantes#/media/File:Pergamon-Altar_-_Pferde_3.jpg).

The Pergamenes did frequently come into conflict with the Macedonians, so it is not too surprising to see Giants with Macedonian armor. At the same, fighting against a “barbaric” Celt and fellow Greek-speaking Macedonian was not the same thing, in the Greek mind, at least. The Pergamenes fought alongside the Romans against the Macedonians in the First (214-205), Second (200-197), and Third (172-168) Macedonian Wars. In a sense, the Pergamenes teamed up with the “Barbarian” Romans against their fellow Macedonian-descended kingdoms. At the same time, there were rumors that in 169 Eumenes was plotting to switch to the side of the Macedonians.¹³⁶ Furthermore, as Whitaker (2005: 165) notes, the Pergamenes at times allied themselves with the Celts.

The other frieze on this altar, the Telephus panel, can also help us interpret the Gigantomachy. Telephus was included in this sculptural program because the Attalids, the ruling dynasty of Pergamon, claimed him as their founder. Telephus was also one of the alleged founders of Pergamon.¹³⁷ Telephus, however, like the Gigantomachy, is a confusing figure in Greek myth. On the one hand, he the son of one of the most prominent Greek heroes, Heracles, and, in some versions of the myth, he is born in Arcadia. On the other hand, he is an easterner as he was eventually adopted by Teuthras, king of Mysia in Asia Minor.¹³⁸ He is part of the early Trojan cycle, yet he fights *against* the Achaeans.¹³⁹ Some versions of the myth place this battle at Caicus river.¹⁴⁰ The Telephus panel contains scenes from this battle conspicuously places it at the Caicus River. Attalus I famously defeated the *Gauls* at this same river in 237 BCE. These two battles are equated on the Great Altar, as it shows

¹³⁶ Polyb. 29.5.1-29.9.13. See Hansen 1971: 116-117, Green 1990: 429.

¹³⁷ Paus. 1.4.6.

¹³⁸ Apollod. 2.7.4.

¹³⁹ Apollod. 3.17.

¹⁴⁰ *P. Oxy.* 4780. See Obbink 2005.

Telephus' battle against the Achaeans at the Caicus river. In essence, this equates the Achaeans with the "barbaric" Celts. If the Greeks are equated with the "uncivilized" Celts, how does that affect the viewer's interpretation of the "uncivilized" Giants?

It should also be noted that the Pergames were the frequent ally of the Romans, who were often considered *barbaroi* to Greek-speaking peoples.¹⁴¹ Is this monument meant to be a symbol of the Pergamenes' defense of Greek civilization if they fought other Greek-speaking people, allied themselves with the Galatians and Romans? This serves to present a very nebulous portrayal of the Gigantomachy. Who is on whose side? And who is the viewer supposed to identify with? The Pergamenes seemed to occupy a very liminal space in terms of their "Greekness." Therefore, this Gigantomachy frieze, in all of its confusion, is a fitting allegory for this uncertainty.

Gigantomachy in Later Hellenistic Poets

This theme also carried ambivalent political significance among poets of the later Hellenistic period. It is also relevant that most of these poems have to deal with Rome. In the 2nd century and 1st centuries BCE, the various Greek states all had different experiences with Rome. Some were Rome's ally. Many others found themselves on the wrong side of Roman aggression.¹⁴² Many Greek poems come down to us presenting Rome in different ways. Sometimes they praise Rome as a savior. Other times they present the city as a conquering "barbarian." Some are rather ambivalent.

Melinno has a poem in Sapphic Stanzas that seemingly praises Rome. This poem is commonly called the "Ode to Rome." She is said to be from Lesbos, but many scholars

¹⁴¹ For Romans as *barbaroi* from the Greek perspective, see Champion (2000).

¹⁴² See Champion (2000).

disagree. She is usually dated to around the 2nd century BCE.¹⁴³ This poem is also significant in the history of Greco-Roman literature because it is seen as revival of the Sapphic stanza, which had fallen into disuse. This poem in particular may have influenced later Roman poets who decided to take up the Sapphic stanza.¹⁴⁴ Her poem seemingly praises Rome:

χαῖρέ μοι, Ῥώμα, **θυγάτηρ Ἄρηος**, (1)
χρυσεομίτρα δαΐφρων ἄνασσα,
 σεμνὸν ἅ ναίεις ἐπὶ γᾶς Ὀλυμπον
 αἰὲν ἄθραυστον.
 σοὶ μόνῃ, πρέσβιστα, δέδωκε Μοῖρα (5)
 κῦδος ἀρρήκτω βασιλῆον ἀρχᾶς,
 ὄφρα κοιρανῆον ἔχοισα κάρτος
 ἄγεμονεύης.
 σᾶ δ' ὑπὰ σδεύγλα κρατερῶν λεπάδων
 στέρνα γαίας καὶ πολιᾶς θαλάσσας (10)
 σφίγγεται· σὺ δ' ἀσφαλῶς κυβερνᾷς
 ἄστεα λαῶν.
 πάντα δὲ σφάλλων ὁ μέγιστος αἰὼν
 καὶ μεταπλάσσω βίον ἄλλοτ' ἄλλως
 σοὶ μόνῃ πλησίστιον οὖρον ἀρχᾶς (15)
 οὐ μεταβάλλει.
ἧ γὰρ ἐκ πάντων σὺ μόνῃ κρατίστους
ἄνδρας αἰχματὰς μεγάλους λοχεύεις
εὖστοχον Δάματρος ὅπως ἀνείσα
καρπὸν †ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν.

Hail Rome, **daughter of Ares**, warlike queen with your **golden belt**, you who dwell in holy Olympus, unshakably always set on earth. To you alone, elder daughter, Fate gave the glory and unbreakable rule, in order to be the leader, having royal power. Under the straps of your yoke the breasts of the earth and grey sea are bound tightly; you govern the cities of people securely. Greatest Time, who causes all things to falter and alters the life sometimes this way, sometimes another, for you alone does not change the favorable wind of your rule. **For you indeed alone from all the cities give birth to the strongest, spear-bearing, great men, as if from men [?] you brought forth the rich crop of Demeter's fruit.** (fr. 541 = Stobaeus 3.7.12. Trans. Lind)

¹⁴³ Bowra (1957: 28) makes an convincing argument for this date. He also gives a summary of other theories for dating the poem.

¹⁴⁴ Notably Horace and Catullus.

It seems like a typical panegyric. Rome is presented as an Olympian, even dwelling in the god's home itself (ἄ ναιεῖς ἐπὶ γᾶς Ὀλυμπον, 3). Rome is also presented as a figure that establishes order (σὺ δ' ἀσφαλέως κυβερνᾷς / ἄστεα λαῶν, 11-12). In the last stanza of the poem, however, it becomes more ambiguous. She praises Rome for the men it produces. She gives the impression that the men are "earth-born" like the Giants. She compares Rome to Demeter, a figure often conflated with Gaia, mother of the Giants.¹⁴⁵ Rome gives birth to large, fully-armed soldiers just as Gaia does in Hesiod (*Th.* 185-86).¹⁴⁶ Also, after reading the last stanza, when we look back at the first stanza, perhaps we can see it a new light. Rome is called the "daughter of Ares" (θυγάτηρ Ἄρης, 1) and is described as wearing a golden girdle" (χρυσεομίτρα, 2). This is not necessary wholly praiseworthy title since it implies an association with the Amazons; Ares was the father of Amazons and the Amazons were known to wear such golden girdles.¹⁴⁷ The Amazons themselves are often grouped in with figures of disorder like the Centaurs and Giants.¹⁴⁸

Alcaeus of Messene makes a rather explicit reference to the Gigantomachy in a very political context. Five elegies attributed to Alcaeus that survive treat Philip V. Four of them are unequivocally hostile to the Macedonian king.¹⁴⁹ The one I am about to address has, in earlier scholarship, been seen as poem of praise that recants Alcaeus' earlier stance on Philip:

Μακύνου τείχη, Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε· πάντα Φιλίππῳ
ἀμβατά· χαλκείας κλεῖε πύλας μακάρων.
 χθῶν μὲν δὴ καὶ πόντος ὑπὸ σκῆπτροισι Φιλίππου
 δέδμηται, λοιπὰ δ' ἅ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ὁδός.

¹⁴⁵ For the conflation of Gaia and Demeter, see Leniëks (1996: 229-231).

¹⁴⁶ Bowra (1957: 27) see an allusion to the *spartoi*, an allusion which he views a positive. We should note however, that the *spartoi* share many qualities with the Giants as Ogden (2013: 117).

¹⁴⁷ For Ares and the Amazons, and this possible of significance of "daughter of Ares," see Bowra (1957: 23).

¹⁴⁸ See Munson (2001: 124-25, especially n239).

¹⁴⁹ *AP* 7.247, 9.519, 10.12, 16.5.

Heighten your walls, Zeus. All things are **scalable** for Philip. Shut the bronze gates of the blessed ones. The land and sea have been bound under the scepter of Philip, and the only road remaining is the one to Olympus. (*AP* 9.518)

Earlier scholarship viewed this elegy as unadulterated praise of Philip. In their view, Alcaeus essentially deifies Philip with this poem.¹⁵⁰ One needs to take into account, however, that Philip is also like a Giant in this poem.¹⁵¹ This poem is full of language of siege. Olympus is surround by walls (τείχη, 1). Philip nevertheless can scale anything. As Edmond (1958: 118) points out, Philip here is like Aloadae, the two Giant-like brothers (who were eventually conflated with the Giants). The word ἀμβατός (line 2) is rare in Greek Poetry. It only occurs twice in Homer. One of the times it appears is during the *Odyssey* passage (11.316) that treats the Aloadae.¹⁵² This poem shows the interchangeability of Giant and Olympian and how loosely the myth can be used in a political setting.

Another Hellenistic poet, Alpheus of Mytilene, offers a similar encomium of Rome that borrows from Alcaeus:

Κλειε, θεός, μέγαλοιο πύλας ἀκμῆτας Ὀλύμπου· (1)
 φρούρει, Ζεῦ, ζαθέαν αἰθέρος ἀκρόπολιν.
 ἦδη γὰρ καὶ πόντος ὑπέζευκται δορὶ Ῥώμης
 καὶ χθών· οὐρανὴ δ' οἶμος ἔτ' ἔστ' ἄβατος.

Close, god, the untiring gates of great Olympus. Keep watch, Zeus, upon your holy citadel. Already the land and sea are yoked under the spear of Rome. The path to the sky is still **unscalable**. (*AP* 9.526)

Alpheus clearly alludes to Alcaeus by using the word ἄβατος, an adjective linguistically and phonetically similar to his ἀμβατός. Some scholars have interpreted this poem in a positive manner.¹⁵³ It is seen as a positive portrayal of Rome's rise. But, at the same time, this

¹⁵⁰ Momigliano (1942); Walbank (1942); Walbank (1943).

¹⁵¹ Edson (1948) makes this observation.

¹⁵² It also occurs at *Il.* 4.433-4 where Andromache advises Hector to station men where the walls are more "scalable."

¹⁵³ Edson (1948: 116-117).

portrayal can be troubling. As Weimer (2015) argues, Alpheus appears to be aware of the ironical tone of his predecessor Alcaeus. Zeus is essentially preparing for war. He is bunkering down on Mt. Olympus to prepare for an assault. One cannot help but equate Rome with the Giants given the imagery of a siege. They wish to arrogantly scale Olympus' walls just as the Giants did. The language, however, is purposefully ambiguous. One could easily read this poem as a panegyric of Rome. This poem serves as an apt example of how the Gigantomachy could be used for ambivalent means.

Conclusion

At times, the Gigantomachy still retains its traditional meaning since Hellenistic dynasts often sought to prove their "Greekness" by fending off "barbarians." But during this time period, societal shifts created a changing perspective on Greek identity. It became more difficult to distinguish between "Greek" and "non-Greek," "civilized" and "uncivilized." Conflict within and among the Hellenistic dynasties proved to be complex as well. Naturally, the Gigantomachy served as an apt myth during a time of so much confusion about identity. As Romans entered the Greek world in this time, they held a precarious status that placed them between "civilized" and "barbarian" – a reality that was especially suitable for drawing parallels to the Gigantomachic confusion over who does and does not bear the right to bring order.

CHAPTER 4

GIGANTOMACHY IN THE MIDDLE AND LATE REPUBLIC

In this chapter, I shift focus to the Gigantomachy in the Roman world, where we continue to see some similar themes to that of the myth in the Greek world. Six clear themes are present here: 1) confusion of friend and foe, 2) hill assault, 3) the inherent deceptive nature of art, 4) family strife, 5) the cyclical nature of the myth; 6) sympathy for or a positive portrayal of the Giants. All of these themes draw a common thread that helps us further understand how the myth is indicative of complicated conflict between related parties – not just a story of good versus bad. On other occasions in the examples within this chapter, the evocation of the Gigantomachy will seem to be a straightforward, even explicit, reference to civil strife.

As we proceed closer to the time of the Late Republic, a time when Rome was actively grappling with civil strife, we begin to see evidence that the myth was perceived as one about civil strife and that it was utilized as a lens to interpret civil strife. Surprisingly, however, we may also see a connection that the myth has to civil strife even before the dreaded “Crisis of the Late Republic” and perhaps we can discern images of quasi-civil strife in poetry treating the Punic Wars – though certainly not as prominently as in the high-conflict times of the Late Republic. When the Gigantomachy is transferred to the Roman world, the “Chaos vs. Order” theme continues to be called into question and it becomes more clear that the myth is one of civil strife.

This chapter will treat images of the Gigantomachy that could lend itself to civil strife, as well as more direct connections between Gigantomachy and civil strife. I will explore the imagery in the poetry of Naevius, Ennius, and Lucretius, all of whom had a

significant influence on the poetry of Vergil (whose work forms a significant portion of my final chapter). Furthermore, I will also examine mythic and historical figures who may have developed connotations of the Gigantomachy in this period. These myths and stories have close connections to civil strife themselves. The poetry of the Augustan era naturally might have picked up on these connotations and this may have further reinforced the association of the Gigantomachy.

Gigantomachy in Naevius

The first extant allusion to the Gigantomachy in Latin literature appears in a fragment of Naevius. At some point in the first book of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, the Gigantomachy appears in an ecphrasis:

Inerant signa expressa, quomodo Titani,
bicipites Gigantes magnique **Atlantes**
Runcus ac Purpureus, filii Terras ...

On it images figures were portrayed: how the Titans and double-bodied Giants and the great **Atlases** and Runcus and Purpureus, sons of Earth ... (*Bellum Punicum*, fr. 4 Strzelecki)

Like many poets since the 5th century, Naevius groups the Titans and Giants together. What is surprising is the other figure not normally in this group: Runcus the centaur.¹⁵⁴ The exact context of this ecphrasis is unclear. Some scholars, however, have posited that it describes the temple of Olympian Zeus at Agrigentum.¹⁵⁵ Diodorus tells us that the temple depicted the Gigantomachy on its east pediment and the Trojan War on its west pediment (Diod.13.82.4). There are also remains of several large Atlas figures who seemed to function as engaged

¹⁵⁴ Horace adds centaurs and even the hero Pirithous into the mix of his Gigantomachy (3.4.42-80).

¹⁵⁵ Hermann Fränkel (1935: 59-61) first puts forth this idea and Strzelecki (1964) follows. Eduard Fraenkel (1954) argues against this. Flores (2014) his commentary on the *Bellum Punicum* (= fr. 7) accepts this interpretation.

support structures between the columns. The strange plural “Atlases” could allude to these architectural figures.¹⁵⁶ To a Greek viewer, this Gigantomachic imagery could symbolize the triumph of Hellenism over “barbarism”;¹⁵⁷ the temple was likely built in 480 after Syracuse and Agrigentum’s victory over the Carthaginians in the battle of Himera.¹⁵⁸

We also know that the first book of the *Bellum Punicum* dealt with Valerius Messalla’s campaign in Sicily (fr. 3 Strezelecki) and likely treated the siege of Agrigentum.¹⁵⁹ This ecphrasis could very well be a rendition of Valerius Messalla observing the temple.¹⁶⁰ We know that this temple also depicted scenes from the Trojan War.¹⁶¹ A good portion of the *Bellum Punicum* treats the wanderings of Aeneas,¹⁶² and an ecphrasis of the Trojan War would be an ideal jumping off point for the section on Rome’s ancestor. If a Roman is the view of this ecphrasis, this would present a complicated image of the Gigantomachy. On the one hand, the Roman viewer might naturally identify with the Olympians in this scenario since the Romans began to see themselves as the ones who brought “civilization.” They easily could see themselves as a civilizing force in the First Punic War. At the same time, the view might become confused when they see the image of the Trojan War. They might want to identify with the “civilizing” Greeks in this scene. But the Trojans are their ancestors, and for much of the 4th century, the Greeks living in Italy were “barbarians” to them. Furthermore, as Feeney puts it, Hellenism in Sicily was no “monolithic entity,” although the Romans came to the aid of some Greek state in Sicily,

¹⁵⁶ These are called *telamones* in Latin (Vitr. 6.76.).

¹⁵⁷ Duffallo (2013: 18)

¹⁵⁸ Diod. 11.26.2. On Western’s Greek view of Carthaginians as “barbarians” see Prag 2010.

¹⁵⁹ See Goldberg (1995: 51-2) with bibliography.

¹⁶⁰ As Duffallo (2013) notes, Valerius was said to have had a painting of his own victories put up in the senate; thus, he may have been a natural viewer of art in Naevius’ poem (Plin. *NH* 35.222)

¹⁶¹ Diod. 13.82.4.

¹⁶² Strezelecki (1964) provides ancient testimonia for this.

many Greeks still fought on the side of the Carthaginians (2008: 125). The theme of “confusion of friend and foe” must also be present in Naevius’ rendition of the Gigantomachy. This provides a rather nebulous presentation of the Gigantomachy indeed.¹⁶³

Some scholars still dispute the claim that this refers to the temple of Olympian Zeus at Agrigentum.¹⁶⁴ Even if this fragment *does not* depict sculptures from the temple at Agrigentum, it clearly presents a complicated picture of the Gigantomachy to a Roman reader. For most of the 4th century, many of Greeks living in South Italy had been the enemy. Their subjugation by Rome had been seen as “civilization” overcoming disorder (from a Roman perspective at least). Now the Romans were coming to their aid in southern Italy, so the connotation of “chaos vs. order” might not been so easy to discern on this ecphrasis. In this conflict in particular, there were Greeks on both the Roman and Carthaginian sides.

A Vergilian ecphrasis may shed even more light on this in Naevius. Book 1 of the *Aeneid* contains a similar work of artifice that is difficult to interpret.¹⁶⁵ When Aeneas first arrives in Carthage, he approaches a temple dedicated to Juno. On the temple are representations of the Trojan War. These images naturally have great meaning for Aeneas since he had recently just fought in the war. He responds with a tearful speech:

'Quis iam locus' inquit 'Achate,
quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?
En Priamus! Sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi;
sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.
Solve metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem.'
Sic ait, atque animum pictura pascit **inani**,

“What place,” he said, “Achates, what region in the world is now not full of our toil? Behold Priam! These here are the rewards for praiseworthy action. There

¹⁶³ See Dufallo (2013: 16-19) and Feeney (2016: 124-5). Roussel (1970) argues that there were more pro-Carthaginian Greeks than pro-Roman Greeks during the First Punic War.

¹⁶⁴ See Goldberg (1995: 52n47).

¹⁶⁵ Goldberg (1995: 52) briefly notes the similarities: Aeneas’ viewing of the images of the Trojan war prefigures his future recounting of the fall of Troy to Dido in Book 2.

are tears for things and the mortal woes touch the mind. Release your fear. This reputation will bring some salvation for you.” Thus he spoke, and he feeds his spirit on the idle image. (Verg. *A*.1.459-64)

Aeneas takes solace in the fact that the struggles of his people are represented on this work of art. He views this artistic representation as a sympathetic portrayal of his people’s plight and he thinks that this is a good sign that they might receive some compassion from the locals.

This representation, however, is far from sympathetic. It is important to realize that this frieze is on a temple to *Juno*. These panels are most naturally interpreted as a celebration of her victory over the hated Trojans through her support of the Greeks (Johnson 1976: 104-5). Johnson, in his analysis of these lines, notes how the work of art described in the poem and the poem itself are inherently deceptive, a point brought out by the polyphony of the word *inani* (464): either “lifeless” (OLD s.v. 7) or “deceptive” (OLD s.v. 11).

Moreover, there is a particular image on the temple that may have further resonance with the ecphrasis in Naevius. At one point, Aeneas recognizes himself among the combatants:

Se quoque principibus permixtum adgnovit Achivis.

He even recognizes himself mixed among the princes of the Argives. (*A*.1.488)

There are two ways for us (and Aeneas) to interpret this passage, and our interpretation depends on our reading of *permixtum* “mixed.” On the one hand, in the reading that is more flattering to Aeneas (and to Augustus), the root of this verb, *miscere*, can have the sense of “to engage in battle with” (see OLD s.v. 4b). This reading would mean that Aeneas is fighting against the Greeks. This particular compound, *permiscere*, can also mean “collaborate with” (see OLD s.v. 2). In this case, the text (and the temple) may be alluding to the tradition that Aeneas betrays the Trojans in order to gain safety and escape the

destruction of his city.¹⁶⁶ In one version dating to the 4th century BCE, he even “becomes one of the Achaeans” (εἰς Ἀχαιῶν ἐγγόνει).¹⁶⁷ Servius on these lines even notes that Vergil is subtly alluding to this to this nefarious tradition (Serv. ad loc).¹⁶⁸ Turnus also implies this at the end of the poem when he calls Aeneas the “deserter of Asia” (*desertorem Asiae*, 12.15). Other scholars have seen allusions to this tradition. Ahl (1989: 28-29) argues that Aeneas’ rendition of the episode in which he and some other Trojans put on the armor of the Greeks as a way of “explaining” this unflattering tradition to Dido. Casali (1999) posits that the “impious deeds” (*impia facta*, 4.596) that Dido mentions before her suicide are not, as some scholars have argued, a reference to her betrayal of Sychaeus, but are in fact a reference to Aeneas’ treachery.¹⁶⁹ Naevius likely knew of this tradition as two other fragments suggest. One depicts two Trojan women, possible the wives of the two Trojan traitors, Aeneas and Antenor:

... amborum uxores
noctu Troiade exhibant, capitibus opertis,
flentes ambae, abeuntes lacrimis cum multis

... The wives of both of them were going out from Troy at night with covered heads, both crying and going away with many tears ... (fr. 5 Strzelecki = Serv. ad *A.* 3.10)

Another fragment seems to more directly hint at their treachery:

eorum sectam sequuntur multi mortales,
multi alii e Troia strenui viri,
ubi foras cum auro ill<n>c exhibant

Many mortals are following their path; many others, strong men from Troy,
when they were departing with gold ... (fr. 6 Strzelecki = Serv. ad *A.* 2.979)

¹⁶⁶ Lutatius Catulus, fr. 2; Sen. *Ben.* 6.36; Tert. *Ad nat.* 2.9; Pomp. Porph. ad Hor. *Carm. saec.* 41.

¹⁶⁷ D.H. 1.48.3 = *FGrHist* 769 F 3 (Menecrates of Xanthus). Scafoglio (2013) argues that the tradition goes back earlier and that Homer subtly alludes to it.

¹⁶⁸ He also notes this tradition at *A.* 1.242.

¹⁶⁹ For more on Aenean treachery, see Bettini (2013: 190-217)

These lines seem to indicate that some of the Trojans were looting as they were escaping Troy. These lines could very well be a description of the images from the Trojan on temple of the Agrigentum and these fragments likely could be describing Aeneas' betrayal.¹⁷⁰

While Goldberg (1995: 52) has noted some of the similarities between these two ecphrases, I am going to put forth the suggestion that Vergil here is consciously recalling the Naevius ecphrasis. Naevius had a profound influence on Vergil's *Aeneid*.¹⁷¹ The *Aeneid* and the *Bellum Punicum* share many similarities, particularly in terms of structure. Vergil appears to follow Naevius in Book 1 of the *Aeneid* in particular. First, in the poems of both authors, Jupiter and Venus exchange speeches followed by Jupiter's prophecy (Serv. ad *A.* 1.198; Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.31). The storm in the *Aeneid* also was an adaptation of a storm in Book 1 of the *Bellum Punicum* (Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.31). What is more, if we are to imagine Valerius Messalla recognizing Aeneas on the side of the temple in Naevius poem, it would be fitting for Vergil to have a parallel in which Aeneas recognizes himself on the temple. As I mentioned above, Naevius seems to be aware of Aeneas' betrayal of the Trojans, so if Vergil is following Naevius' lead here, an allusion to the betrayal would be very fitting.

Vergil's allusion to Naevius' Gigantomachy is not a mere literary nod; he evokes the ambiguity of the ecphrasis in Sicily with his own work of art that is difficult to interpret. An allusion to Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* also makes sense because it looks forward to Aeneas' future account with Carthaginians (Dido in particular) and the subsequent conflict between the Romans and Carthaginians that this encounter will bring about. Goldberg (1995: 52)

¹⁷⁰ In the next chapter, I will treat that the Gigantic imagery surrounding Aeneas. It makes sense that Aeneas would be compared to a Giant, since, as I have shown, they have been known to switch sides in the war. It is especially that apt that Aeneas will be compared to Briareus, a Giant who is known to be on both sides of the war, depending on the tradition.

¹⁷¹ Luck (1983); Flores (2014: passim).

remarks that the images of the Trojan War on the temple prefigure Aeneas' narrative of that same war in Book 2. Scholars have noted that the Trojan War can be read as allegories for the civil wars of Vergil's own time.¹⁷² I would like to add that perhaps this ecphrasis, through its allusion to the earlier Naevius passage, looks forward to the complex conflict that were the Punic wars.

The Punic Wars eventually became viewed as quasi-civil. Ovid implies the conflict will be familial by implying that Dido may be pregnant with Aeneas's child (*Her.* 7.133-8). Secondly, Naevius lived through and probably wrote the *Bellum Punicum* during the Second Punic War. During this conflict, many of Rome's allies rebelled and joined Carthage's side once Hannibal had some success in Italy.¹⁷³ Other scholars have remarked that Hannibal's war in Italy could be viewed a quasi-civil war.¹⁷⁴ Naevius himself may have been from Capua,¹⁷⁵ an ally which rebelled against Rome. Naevius was involved in civil strife himself. He was said to be thrown in prison for insulting the Metelli¹⁷⁶ and was eventually exiled to North Africa.¹⁷⁷

Perhaps most importantly, this passage of Naevius can show how the Gigantomachy can be used as a means of empty rhetoric: any group can accuse the other of being "barbarous Giants." We saw this being the case with the fragment of Bacchylides (fr. 15). As often is the case with reported speech or works of art, the creator can use them to deceive or the audience can misinterpret. As we stated above, one way to read the ecphrasis in *Aeneid* 1

¹⁷² See Giusti (2018:205-6) with n22.

¹⁷³ Polyb. 15.7; Liv. 28.44, 29.3.

¹⁷⁴ Goldschmidt (2013: 139) argues that Ennius presents the Punic wars as civil.

¹⁷⁵ Gel. 1.24.1.1.

¹⁷⁶ Plautus probably refers to his imprisonment at *Mil.* 211-213 (See Marmorale 1950: 112ff. and Jocelyn 1969: 34-7; Gel. pr. 3.3.3., 3.3.15.1; "Asconius" ad Cic. *Verr.* 1.10.29 with Marmorale 1950: 66, 254 and Jocelyn 1969: 42).

¹⁷⁷ Jer. *Chron. ad a.* 1816; Jocelyn 1969:41; Marmorale 1950: 132

is that Aeneas is deceived by the images on the temple.¹⁷⁸ If we believe that the ecphrasis in *Aeneid* 1 is using Naevius' as model, perhaps we can see that Naevius uses the Gigantomachy in a work of art to show how easily the myth can be manipulated. The viewer of the Gigantomachy is not quite sure who are supposed to be the Giants: the Carthaginians? The Greeks (if so, which Greeks?)? The Romans?

Titanomachy in Ennius

From the fragments that remain of Ennius, it seems that the Titanomachy was part of his *Annales*. The reference to the Titanomachy may have Gigantomachic resonances (which is unsurprising given that they were conflated). A fragment of Book 1 mentions a "Titan":

cum † suo **obsidio** magnus Titanus premebat ...

When great Titan was pressing with his (?) siege ... (1.21 = Non. 216.31-34)

The language of siege is of note. The text indicates that Titan was pressing someone or something "with a siege" (*obsidio*). As stated in the Introduction, the Giants in particular are associated with siege warfare. We know that Ennius translated *The Sacred History* of Euhemerus, a Hellenistic writer who rationalized Greek myth in a fictional travelogue by making the gods of Hesiod's *Theogony* mortals who eventually became worshiped for their famous deeds. In this fragment, I maintain that Ennius is following in the tradition of Euhemerus. Another fragment of Ennius, which many scholars place right before this fragment, seems to give a genealogy: *Saturno / quem Caelus genuit* ("To Saturn, whom Sky begot," 1.20 = Non. 197.2). In the translation of Euhemerus, the story of the gods' succession goes as follows: there are two brothers, Titan and Saturn. Titan is the older brother and,

¹⁷⁸ As Johnson (1976: 104-5) does.

technically, the rightful heir to the throne. Titan, however, is the “inferior in appearance” (*facie deterior*) to his brother, and the women in this family want Saturn to rule. Titan agrees to let Saturn have the throne on the condition that Saturn not raise any of his own male children. Titan did this with the hope that the kingdom would pass to his own sons. Saturn’s wife, Ops, secretly does have sons and hides them away, Jupiter included. When Titan learns of this secret progeny, he gathers his children, called “Titans,” to use as his own personal army and locks Saturn and Ops away.¹⁷⁹

With this backstory in mind, there may have been fraternal conflict at the outset of Ennius’ epic. Perhaps this familial struggle looks forward to the fraternal conflict between Romulus and Remus which would come later in Book 1.¹⁸⁰ What is important for my argument is the fact that Ennius here alludes to the Titanomachy styled as a fraternal conflict. Even after Titan is defeated, the familial conflict continues. According to Ennius’ translation of Euhemerus, Jupiter, who has been hid away, defeats his uncle and frees his parents from bondage. Saturn is restored to his rightful seat of power. This harmony does not last long. He learns of a prophecy that his son will overthrow him and plots to ambush him. Jupiter, however, learns of this plot and expels him. Saturn eventually settles in Italy.¹⁸¹ Varro tells us that Ennius calls Italy the “land of Saturn” (*Saturnia Terra*, 1.18 = Var. *LL* 5.42), and that, in particular, Saturn dwelled on the Capitoline Hill (see also Fest. 430 and Verg. *A.* 8.58). We do know, however, that with time this hill will be overtaken by Jupiter, as this is the location

¹⁷⁹ For the entire account, see *Euh.* 83-6 = Lactant. 1.14. A similar tradition is followed by the third Sibylline oracle (3.127ff). Diodorus, in his euhemerizing account mentions that Saturn had a brother Titan, but omits the fraternal strife (6.1.9).

¹⁸⁰ See below for the parallels between the conflict between Titan and Saturn and Amulius and Numitor.

¹⁸¹ *Euh.* 83-86 = Lactant. 1.14.

of the temples to Jupiter Optimus Maximus and Jupiter Stator. Horace later will stress the fact that Jupiter eventually overtakes Saturn's home (*contremuit domus Saturni veteris*, 2.12.8-9).

This familial strife can also look forward to civil strife later in the poem. Some scholars posit that Virgil's proto-civil war in Italy has a precedent in Ennius.¹⁸² After all, when Rome's allies defect during Hannibal's invasion, Rome goes to war against her former comrades-in-arms. *Discordia* seems to hold an integral position in Book 7 of the *Annals* as this fragment implies:

...Postquam Discordia taetra
Belli ferratos postes portasque refregit

After disgusting Discord broke the iron posts and gates of war (7.225-6)

Skutsch (1985 ad loc.) believes these lines refer to the beginning of the first Punic War. One of the Vergilian adaptations for this is of course the image of *Furor impius* in the *Aeneid* (1.294-33). The demon that essentially causes civil war is pictured as being locked away in in the Temple of War (*Belli Portae*, 1.294). *Impius Furor* is represented as a prisoner hoping to escape, much like the Titans and Giants who were locked away in Tartarus or under mountains or islands. Another instance of the Vergilian reception of these lines has Juno breaking down the gates:

Belli ferratos rumpit **Saturnia** postis.

Saturnia breaks down the iron gates of war. (Verg. *A.* 7.622)

Servius (ad loc.) notes the Ennian provenance of these lines. Johnson (1976: 40) suggests that Juno is essentially *becoming* Discordia. Juno's Titanic epithet, *Saturnia*, seems fitting since she is stirring up a proto-civil war amongst the Trojans and Italians. Vergil possibly read the

¹⁸² Goldschmidt (2013: 139); Haüßler (1976: ch. 4)

Titanomachic resonances in the Ennian and proceeded to flesh them out in his rendition of the Titanomachy in the *Aeneid*.

Giants in Accius

A tragedy of Accius also featured a Gigantic figure:

Pallas **bicorpor anguim** spiras trahit.

Double-bodied Pallas drags the coils of snakes. (fr. 307 = Prisc. *Gl.* 2.236K)

As I discuss in Chapter 2, this is probably a conflation of the Titan Pallas and the Giant Pallas. Pallas is a Titan mentioned in Hesiod as the wife of Styx (376, 383). A fragment of Epicharmus (fr. 135) makes Pallas the opponent of Athena whose skin Athena wears after his defeat.¹⁸³ The fact that he has serpentine characteristics here implies that he is a Giant.

Priscian tells us that this comes from the *Eriphyla* of Accius. The figure of Eriphyla is directly connected to the Theban cycle. She is the sister of Adrastus, king of Argos, and the wife of Amphiaraus. She becomes arbiter for disagreements between both. At one point, Amphiaraus disagrees with Adrastus that Argos should aid Polyneices in his campaign against his brother. In order to bribe Eriphyla to advocate for Argos' help, Polyneices gives Eriphyle a necklace. Won over, Eriphyla persuades Amphiaraus to fight at Thebes where he eventually perishes.¹⁸⁴ Eriphyla is later slain by her son who had been charged by Amphiaraus to avenge his death. The necklace, originally the property of Harmonia, wife of Cadmus, was cursed and had serpentine imagery on it (Nonn. *Dion.* 5.135ff.).

Scholars have posited that this Accius fragment may be an ecphrasis that describes the necklace.¹⁸⁵ From this, we can observe that the image has connections to civil and

¹⁸³ See discussion in Chapter 2.

¹⁸⁴ For the Eriphyle myth, see Apollod. 3.6.2.

¹⁸⁵ La Penna (2002).

familial strife. It is what Polyneices uses to gain allies for civil war against his brother, and Eriphyla's acceptance of this gift brings about the death of her husband and her own death at the hands of her son. As I have explored elsewhere, another "Pallas" was Athena's father who was killed by the goddess when he tried to rape her (Schol. ad *Lyc.* 355; Cic. *DND* 3.59-60).

Furthermore, the reception of these lines in Vergil can illuminate the connotations of civil and familial strife that this necklace, and perhaps the Gigantomachy, can have. This reception, to my knowledge, has gone unnoticed. The imagery and literary function of the description of this necklace draws a striking resemblance to a piece of jewelry in Vergil. In Book 7, the fury Allecto approaches Amata, the mother of Aeneas' bride-to-be:

huic dea caeruleis unum de crinibus anguem
conicit, inque sinum praecordia ad intima subdit,
quo furibunda domum monstro permisceat omnem.
ille inter vestis et levia pectora lapsus
volvitur attactu nullo, fallitque furem
vipeream inspirans animam; **fit tortile collo**
aurum ingens coluber, fit longae taenia vittae
innectitque comas et membris lubricus errat.

Upon her (Amata) the goddess throws a snake from her dark-blue hair, and it enters into her bosom and her innermost chest. With this monster she, in fury, rattles her entire house. The (snake), gliding, rolls through her clothes and delicate breast with no contact, and it deceives her in her madness as it breathes into her its viper's breath. It becomes a necklace on her neck, a mighty golden snake. It becomes a band of a long fillet and intertwines her hair and, gliding, wanders in her limbs. (Ver. *A.* 7.346-53)

This necklace serves a function similar to that of Eriphyla. The necklace of Amata drives her to foment strife between her family and eventually a pseudo-civil war between the Trojans and Italians. She opposes the alliance proposed by her husband Latinus and the marriage of her daughter to Aeneas. These lines also appear in a very tragic context, which may lend credence to a tragic model like Accius' *Eriphyla*. In the coming lines, Amata and a group of

Latin women that she incites are likened to maenads and thus activate the tragic register of the *Bacchae*.¹⁸⁶ Finally, the fact that Amata's necklace is serpentine further suggests a relationship with the serpentine Pallas in Accius' play. If Vergil reads the Giant Pallas as an instrument of familial and civil unrest, then perhaps we can see further connections between the Gigantomachy and civil conflict.

Gigantic Elements in the Myth of Romulus and Remus

During the Late Republic, I argue the Romulus and Remus myth developed Gigantomachic associations, and these associations further added to the Gigantomachy's connection to civil strife. The Romulus and Remus myth began to develop associations with civil strife in the 3rd century BCE.¹⁸⁷ In the next chapter, we will see Remus' assault on the Palatine hill right next to the Giants' assault on Olympus in the elegies of Propertius (3.9.50-3). The association between these two myths may have developed earlier. The reason for this association may have developed from one tradition in which Remus is said to have mocked the battlements that Romulus was building the Palatine hill.¹⁸⁸ As we observed with the Capitoline and the Aventine, a hill like the Palatine can easily be seen as a Roman Olympus.¹⁸⁹

Romulus also has many associations with one key figure in the Gigantomachy: Jupiter. In the same year, the Roman people dedicated sculpture groups of Romulus and Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill in 296 BCE (Livy 10.23.11-12). The statue of Jupiter was a

¹⁸⁶ For the use of tragedy in Vergil, see Panoussi (2009). She treats the lines discussed above and shows their connection to the *Bacchae* (124-133). There is no mention, however, of an intertextual relationship with Accius.

¹⁸⁷ See Wiseman (1995: 143) and Bannon (1997: 158-159).

¹⁸⁸ This tradition is preserved in Diodorus (8.6), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.87.4), and Livy (1.7.)

¹⁸⁹ Ovid explicitly makes this comparison in the *Metamorphoses* (1.176).

rendition of the deity in a four-horsed chariot. These statues were put up by the curule aediles who were probably doing this in response to the threat of an alliance between the Etruscans, Samnites, and Gauls (Wiseman 1995: 73). There was a concern that the Gauls might once again threaten the Capitol as they did in 390. The image of Zeus/Jupiter in *quadriga* is a common one for his post-battle victory over the Giants.¹⁹⁰ The placement of this statue on the Capitoline hill might have Gigantomachic resonances since the assault on the Capitol in 390 BCE can be seen as a second iteration of the Gigantomachy.¹⁹¹

Romulus' special relationship with Jupiter also bolsters this association. According to Livy, he built Rome's first temple to Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitoline Hill (Liv.1.10). He also later vows a temple to Jupiter Stator "the Stayer" because he believed the Olympian protected the citadel (1.20). In this episode of Livy, there is a moment in which Romulus and Jupiter almost become indistinguishable. In a conflict with the Sabines who, at the time, are occupying the citadel, Romulus addresses the Romans:

"Romani, Iuppiter optimus maximus resistere atque iterare pugnam iubet."
Restitere Romani tamquam caelesti voce iussi.

"Romans, Jupiter Optimus Maximus bids you to hold your ground and renew the battle." The Romans held their ground as though ordered by a voice from heaven (1.12).

The voices of Romulus and Jupiter are merged. Romulus becomes a living manifestation of Jupiter's will. Romulus is also closely connected to Jupiter through his deified name, Quirinus. The "Old Capitoline Triad" was composed of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus.¹⁹² Livy records another tradition that, Romulus, when he is trying to build his new city's population mocks other peoples who claim there are "born from the earth" (*multitudinem natam e terra*

¹⁹⁰ For the connection of the image of Zeus in the four-horsed chariot in the Gigantomachy, see Moore (1995).

¹⁹¹ For the Gigantomachic associations of this statue, see Feeney (2008: 54).

¹⁹² See Ryberg (1931) and Dumézil (1996: 141-147).

sibi prolem, 1.8). Romulus appears Jovian in this context since Jupiter's enemies the Giants and Titans are thought of as "earthborn."

Rhea Silvia, the mother of Romulus and Remus, also may add to this connotation of the Romulus and Remus myth. Many sources call the mother of Romulus "Ilia," a name that stresses the Trojan ancestry of the Roman race.¹⁹³ Later sources begin to call her "Rhea Silvia"¹⁹⁴ or just "Rhea"¹⁹⁵ – a name that naturally might lead to a conflation with the Titan Rhea.¹⁹⁶ Wiseman and Graillot have also proposed that Rhea Silvia/Ilia was conflated with the Magna Mater as way to incorporate the eastern goddess into their founding myths.¹⁹⁷ The Romans conflated the Magna Mater with the Greek Rhea as well.¹⁹⁸ Smith (2007: 291-2) argues that the twins have characteristics of "earthborn heroes." Romulus and Remus were found on the ground and were raised by a wild animal.

Moreover, perhaps Euhemerus' version of the Saturn succession myth (discussed above) can also shed some light on the origins Romulus and Remus myth.¹⁹⁹ The relationship of Amulius and Numitor bears striking resemblance to that of Saturn and Titan. Numitor and Amulius are brothers. Numitor holds the throne in Alba Longa. His brother Amulius, however, plots to take it from him. After killing Numitor's sons and expelling him from his kingdom, Amulius seeks to ensure that this rival brother will have no heirs by making Numitor's only daughter a Vestal Virgin. Besides the parallel that Titan makes Saturn swear an oath to raise no male children, Saturn's accession to the throne is aided by female figures,

¹⁹³ In Naevius (fr. 19-20) and Ennius (1.32-48), she is just "Ilia."

¹⁹⁴ Liv. 1.3; DH 1.76.3.

¹⁹⁵ Castor of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 250 F5); Var. *LL* 5.144.

¹⁹⁶ Smith (2007: 291) makes this suggestion in passing.

¹⁹⁷ For the conflation of Rhea and the Magna Mater, see Lucr. 633-38 and Ov. *Fast.* 4.195-210.

¹⁹⁸ See Roller (1999: 279), Wiseman (1985: 201), and Graillot (1912: 37). Cruttwell (1946: 27-8) draws a parallel with the *silva* on Mt. Ida (see *A.* 2.696).

¹⁹⁹ For Ennius' translation of Euhemerus' account, see *Euh.* 83-86 = Lactant. 1.14.

Vesta in particular. Rhea the Vestal Virgin indirectly supports Numitor's accession to the throne by giving birth to two male children who will aid Numitor in winning back his kingdom. Just as Jupiter restores his father Saturn to the throne, so too Romulus and Remus help Numitor regain his kingdom.²⁰⁰ Though the familial conflict does not end here for both stories. After Saturn is made king again, he plots to assassinate his son. In the story of Romulus and Remus, Romulus kills Remus not too long after they restore Numitor to the throne. Given the parallels between these two origins myths, I suggest that the legend of Amulius and Numitor is a doublet of the Saturn-Titan conflict. Like the myth of divine succession in which each generation of gods vie for supremacy, the next generation after Numitor and Amulius too will engage in familial conflict.

Gigantomachy in Catullus

The Gigantomachy does not come up overtly in the poems of Catullus. I will argue that it does come up subtly in poem 64 and it has a direct connection to civil strife. In poem 64, Catullus famously jumps in and out of various myths, but the entire poem, at least ostensibly, is anchored in the myth of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. Toward the end of this poem, the speaker meditates on the ills of his age:

sed postquam **Tellus** scelere est imbuta nefando
iustitiamque omnes cupida de mente fugarunt,
perfudere manus fraterno sanguine fratres ...

But after Earth is stained with the unspeakable crime and everyone has dispelled justice from their greedy mind, and brothers stain their hands with fraternal blood ... (Cat. 64.397-9)

²⁰⁰ For the succession myth involving Amulius, Numitor, Rhea Silvia, and the twins, see Liv. 1.3-6 and DH 1.76-85.

Here Catullus speaks of the civil strife of his own time. The image of brother fighting brother was particularly a popular metaphor for civil war during this time. The image of the earth being stained with blood is also common in representations of civil war. Later Vergil will use this image for the fields of Pharsalus and Philippi (*G.* 1.489-497). I will argue that, here, Catullus subtly alludes to the birth of the Giants.²⁰¹ In Hesiod, the Giants are created through the drops of blood from Uranus' castration landing on Gaia (*Th.* 185). The familial strife between Cronus and Uranus will lead to more strife: Zeus will rise up against Cronus and eventually the Giants will rise up against Zeus. According some traditions, the blood of the Giants leads to the birth of humankind,²⁰² a race that will continually engage in quasi-civil wars through their eternal conflicts. Through this allusion to the birth of the Giants, Catullus suggests that the violence among Romans is cyclical, just as the conflict between the gods and their family was.

Gigantomachy in Lucretius

In Catullus' contemporary Lucretius, the Gigantomachy is more prominent and, in his rendition of the myth, the Giants take on a more positive role. In Hesiod, the Giants and Titans represented agents of disorder, to be superseded by Zeus' rule of cosmic harmony.²⁰³ In Classical and Hellenistic art and poetry, the defeat of the Giants was at times symbolic of Greek victories over the chaotic "barbarians" such as the Persians, Carthaginians, and Gauls. The Gigantomachy was used for philosophical allegories as well. In Plato (*Sophist* 246a-b), the Giants, in their assault on heaven and their love of grasping material objects, are likened

²⁰¹ I argue in the next chapter that the image of blood in the fields of Pharsalus and Philippi alludes to the Gigantomachy.

²⁰² Schol. ad Apoll. 4.992; Ov. *Met.* 1.157-162.

²⁰³ Not without complication as I show in Chapter 1.

to the materialist philosophers who impiously do not believe in the Olympian gods. The Giants are portrayed derisively in this dialogue, as would make sense in a dialogue written by an idealist philosopher (philosophers who were in direct opposition to the materialists).²⁰⁴

Lucretius takes up this analogy of Giants as materialist, but puts a positive spin on it. He does this at the outset of the poem by likening Epicurus, the founder of his philosophical school, to the Giants:

quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec minitanti
murmure compressit caelum, sed eo magis acrem
inritat animi virtutem, effringere ut arta
naturae primus portarum claustra cupiret.
ergo vivida vis animi pervicit et extra
processit longe flammantia moenia mundi ...

A Greek man first dared to raise his mortal eyes in opposition and first to stand in defiance. Neither the rumor of the gods nor the thunder-bolts with their threatening rumbling in the sky hold him back, but rather they incited the fierce *virtus* of his soul so that he first might break through the tight-fitting barriers of the gates of nature. Therefor the lively power of his soul overcame and proceeded beyond that flaming barriers of the world ... (Lucr. 1.68-73)

Epicurus, like the Giants, must endure the bolts of Jupiter. But unlike the Giants, Epicurus emerges victorious. The Giants themselves, through their attempt on heaven, try to burst though the barrier between earth and sky. Epicurus, through his philosophy, accomplishes and even surpasses this by breaking through the very barriers of nature (*naturae ... portarum claustra*) and the limits of the universe (*moenia mundi*). Through this image, Lucretius reworks the Gigantomachy myth.²⁰⁵ The Giants were not symbols of disorder, but courageous beings who dared to stand up to the Olympians. This represents a significant break from the tradition. This characterization is in line with the “confusion of sides” trope that we have seen elsewhere in the Gigantomachy myth.

²⁰⁴ Both Gale (1994: 44) and Clay (1997: 191) connect this passage to Lucretius.

²⁰⁵ See Gale (2000: 121).

Later in the *De Rerum Natura*, we see a similar sympathetic portrayal of the Giants. At this point in the poem, Lucretius is attempting to convince Memmius that the Giants do not belong in Tartarus since their anti-Olympian tendencies should not be considered impious:

religione refrenatus ne forte rearis
 terras et solem et caelum, mare sidera lunam,
 corpore divino debere aeterna manere,
 propterea que putes ritu par esse Gigantum
 pendere eos poenas inmani pro scelere omnis,
 qui ratione sua disturbent **moenia mundi** ...

May you, bound back by *religio*, not think by chance that the lands and the sun, the sun, stars, and moon ought to remain eternally with a divine body and therefore think that in the manner of the Giants it is right for those who disturb the **walls of the world** with their reasoning, pay all the punishments for their great crime ... (Lucr. 5.114-119)

Through the Gigantomachic imagery and verbal echoes with “walls of the world” (*moenia mundi*), Lucretius recalls his description of Epicurus in Book 1. Once again there is an analogy between the Giants and materialist philosophers (and thus Lucretius and his fellow Epicureans). The Giants should not be punished, because in their assault of Mt. Olympus, they were not actually attacking something divine. Gale (1994: 43-4) sees this passage as an inversion of the traditional view of the Giants.²⁰⁶ Once again, we see a sympathetic, perhaps even laudatory portrayal of the Giants.

This positive portrayal of the Giants is complicated by another passage in the poem. This example of a Gigantomachy has not yet fully been treated by modern scholarship.²⁰⁷ After speaking of primitive man, Lucretius goes on to speak of the rise of “civilization” and the delusions of wealth:

²⁰⁶ Hardie (1986: 209-13) expresses a similar view.

²⁰⁷ Gale (1994: 188-9) briefly acknowledges that there may be a possible allusion to the Gigantomachy here. Penwill (2009) sees not an allusion to myth, but to Caesar’s campaigns.

at claros homines voluerunt se atque potentes,
 ut fundamento stabili fortuna maneret
 et placidam possent opulenti degere vitam,
 nequiquam, quoniam ad **summum** succedere **honorem**
 certantes iter infestum fecere viai,
 et tamen e **summo**, quasi **fulmen**, deicit ictos
invidia interdum contemptim in **Tartara taetra**;
invidia quoniam ceu **fulmine** summa vaporant
 plerumque et quae sunt aliis magis edita cumque;

But men wished themselves to be famous and powerful so that their fortune could remain with stable foundation and they, wealthy, be able to live the calm life. In vain! Since they, striving to reach the highest honor, have made a hostile journey of the road. And nevertheless, from the height, jealousy meanwhile strikes them down with disgust, as if by a thunderbolt, into loathsome Tartarus. Since the heights and whatever is more elevated than the rest for the most part burn up because of envy as if by the thunderbolt. (Lucr. 5.1120-1128)

It is man's desire for wealth that brought about conflict. The description of these greedy men clearly recalls the Gigantomachy. These men wish to reach a high place (*summum ... honorem*) like the Giants attempting to reach Mt. Olympus.²⁰⁸ The fact that these individuals are struck by lightning (*fulmen ... fulmine*, 25, 27) is significant, since it is Jupiter's weapon of choice against the Giants and Titans. Furthermore, their banishment to Tartarus evokes the punishment of the Titans.²⁰⁹ Schrijvers (1996: 226) sees in *Tartara taetra* (1126) an allusion to a passage in the *Iliad* in which Zeus threatens to hurl to Hades any god who participates in the conflict between the Trojans and Achaeans:

ἢ μιν ἐλὼν ῥίψω ἐς **Τάρταρον** ἡερόεντα
 τῆλε μάλ', ἧχι βάθιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον,
 ἔνθα **σιδήρειαί τε πύλαι** καὶ **χάλκεος οὐδός**,
 τόσσον ἔνερθ' Αἴδεω ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης.

Or I will grab them and cast them down into into murky Tartarus far off, where there is a very deep underground pit. In that place there are iron gates and a

²⁰⁸ See Hom. *Od.* 11.313-316.

²⁰⁹ For the Titans in the Underworld, see Hom. *Il.* 8.478-81, 14.274; For their bondage in bronze, see Hes. *Theog.* 732-.

bronze entrance. It is as far beneath Hades as the Earth is from the sky. (*Il.* 8.13-16)

This passage itself has Titanomachic resonances. Zeus threatens to do to his fellow Olympians what he did to the Titans: lock them away in the Underworld in a prison of iron and bronze.²¹⁰ Hesiod uses similar formulaic language when describing the Titans' banishment and imprisonment in the world:

... καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
πέμψαν καὶ δεσμοῖσιν ἐν ἀργαλείοισιν ἔδησαν,
νικήσαντες χερσὶν ὑπερθύμους περ ἐόντας,
τόσσον ἔνερθ' ὑπὸ γῆς ὅσον οὐρανὸς ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης·
τόσσον γάρ τ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς **Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα.**

He sent them (the Titans) under the earth of broad ways and bound them in grievous bondage, conquering them with his hands in spite of their daring. As far beneath the earth they were as the sky is from the earth. For this is the distance between the earth and Tartarus. (Hes. *Th.* 718-721)

The parallels between this passage and the Homeric passage are clear through such phraseology as τόσσον ἔνερθ and οὐρανὸς ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης (both in Hes. *Th.* 720 and Hom. *Il.* 8.15). Also, the Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα (Hom. *Il.* 8.13, Hes. *Th.* 721) which appears verbatim in the Homeric passage is alluded to in the Lucretian passage with *Tartara taetra* (5.1126). Perhaps Richard Thomas' term "window reference," an allusion through an intermediary to more distant source for this reference, is apropos here.²¹¹ I suggest that Lucretius in the passage above (5.1120-28) alludes to Homer through Hesiod and this double-allusion strengthens the Gigantomachic/Titanic resonances of this passage.

²¹⁰ Later in this book (478-81), Zeus brings up the Titans and their imprisonment in Tartarus in an implied threat to Hera.

²¹¹ See Thomas (1986).

Though Lucretius is talking about a hypothetical, reconstructed past, one cannot help but notice the resonances this passage would have with the politics of his own times.²¹² We can also read into Lucretius' use of *summum ... honorem*, "highest honor." *Honor* was very often used to describe Roman political office (*OLD* s.v. 5). The *summus honor* could be seen as the rank of consulship.²¹³ Two figures from Lucretius' lifetime, both Sulla and Catiline, incited a civil war because an office was denied (or they believed it was denied) to them.²¹⁴

Invidia is significant here as well. This word, often translated as "jealousy" or "envy," was seen as a cause of civil strife in the Roman world. A fragment of Democritus suggests that it has a connection to *stasis* (φθόνος γὰρ στάσιος ἀρχὴν ἀπεργάζεται, Fr. 245). A passage from Plautus shows the word's connection to civil strife. In the *Aulularia*, Megadorus proposes a new system for suitor and would-be brides for his world:

nam meo quidem animo si idem faciant ceteri
 opulentiores, pauperiorum filias
 ut indotatas ducant uxores domum,
 et multo fiat **civitas concordior**,
 et **invidia** nos minore utamur quam utimur,
 et illae malam rem metuant quam metuont magis,
 et nos minore sumptu simus quam sumus.

Now in my opinion, if the rest of the rich men do the same thing: they take home daughters of a poor man without dowries, then the state would become much more harmonious, and we would experience envy less than we do (now) and those women would fear trouble more than they do now and we would incur less expense than we do now. (Pl. *Au.* 479-483)

In Megadorus' musings, he makes it clear that these types of unions would make it better for the state (*civitas concordior*, 481), specifically that the state would be more harmonious. In

²¹² Fowler (1989: 143) remarks that this passage is "full of the language of contemporary politics." Gale (2000:190) mentions that these lines refer to civil wars, but without further analysis.

²¹³ For *summus honor* used to indicate consul, see Juv. 1.117. See also Hellegouarc'h (1972).

²¹⁴ For Sulla, see Plut. *Sull.* 9; App. *BC* 1.56-57;

this harmonious state, there would be less *invidia*. From this we can gather there was a connection perceived between civil unrest and *invidia* in Plautus' time. Given that he was composing his plays in the wake of the Punic Wars, a time in which vast amounts of wealth were flowing into Rome, it is not hard to imagine a passage like this reflects the anxieties of his own time.²¹⁵ Lucretius himself uses the word when talking of the greed of the civil wars that had plagued Rome in his lifetime:

denique **avarities** et honorum caeca **cupido**,
 quae miseros homines cogunt transcendere fines
 iuris et interdum socios scelerum atque ministros
 noctes atque dies niti praestante labore
 ad summas emergere opes, haec vulnera vitae
 non minimam partem mortis formidine aluntur.
 turpis enim ferme contemptus et acris egestas
 semota ab dulci vita stabilique videtur
 et quasi iam leti portas cunctarier ante;
 unde homines dum se falso terrore coacti
 effugisse volunt longe longeque remosse,
sanguine civili rem conflant divitiasque
 conduplicant **avidi**, caedem caede accumulantes,
 crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris
 et consanguineum mensas odere timentque.
 consimili ratione ab eodem saepe timore
 macerat **invidia** ante oculos illum esse potentem,
 illum aspectari, claro qui incedit honore,
 ipsi se in tenebris volvi caenoque queruntur.

And finally, greed and a blind desire for honors which compels sad men to transgress the boundaries of law and occasionally to be partners in and promoters of crime struggling to rise up to the heights of wealth: these wounds of life are fed in no small measure by fear of death. For loathsome contempt and harsh destitution seem utterly separate from the sweet and stable life, as if now waiting before the gates of death. Hence, while men, compelled by this false terror wish to escape themselves and be far removed, they greedily procure and double their fortune at the cost of the blood of their citizenry as they heap up slaughter upon slaughter. They cruelly rejoice at the sad death of a brother and they hate and fear the tables of their kin. Often, by similar reasoning from this same fear jealousy that another man before their eyes has power or is in the spotlight who struts with distinguished honor weakens them.

²¹⁵ On the role of *concordia* in this play and its relations to politics in Plautus' time, see Christenson (2014).

They themselves complain that they are being tossed about in the darkness and mud. (3.59-77)

In this passage Lucretius stresses the greed (*avarities, cupido*, 59; *avidi*, 71) which caused the civil wars (*sanguine civili*, 70) of his own time. Fowler (1989: 138) commenting on the significance that this language would have for the Roman “who might think especially of the Sullan proscriptions,” compares it to a passage of Sallust in which he describes Catiline’s retinue (*Cat.* 14.1). Lucretius stresses that it is jealousy (*invidia*) which compels men to engage in such destructive behavior.²¹⁶ In light of Lucretius’ use of *invidia* here, I suggest that the passage discussed above (5.1120-1128) reflects Lucretius’ own times, but civil war in general. Since I have demonstrated a connection between civil conflict and the Gigantomachy earlier in Greek literature, I argue that Lucretius’ juxtaposition of political language, particularly the language of civil strife, and Gigantomachic language is not coincidental. This type of association existed in his Greek predecessors and Lucretius is picking up on this.

There is one more passage of Lucretius that is of importance for my study. This passage contains a a subtler reference to the Gigantomachy. In Book 6, Lucretius sets out to explain scientifically Mt. Aetna’s volcanic eruptions:

Nunc ratio quae sit, per **fauces** montis ut Aetnae
 expirent ignes interdum turbine tanto,
 expediam; neque enim mediocri clade coorta
flammae tempestas Siculum **dominata** per agros
 finitimis ad se convertit gentibus ora,
 fumida cum caeli scintillare omnia templa
 cernentes pavida complebant pectora cura,
 quid **moliretur rerum** natura **novarum**.

Now I will explain in which fires sometimes breathe out in such a whirlwind through the jaws of Mt. Aetna. For, with immense destruction rising up, a

²¹⁶ Epstein (1987) argues that it was personal feuds, and not partisan ideology, that ultimately led to the civil wars and the dissolution of the Republic. He addresses *invidia*’s pivotal role in this (48-63).

storm of flames lording it over the fields of the Sicilians turns the faces of neighboring nations towards itself, when they, seeing all the temples of the sky spark with smoke, fill their hearts with fearful concern as to what type of revolution nature might be devising. (6.639-46)

This passage, I suggest, contains a subtle reference to the Gigantomachy through its invocation of Aetna. This volcano is the blocking force that imprisons two Gigantic figures, depending on which tradition the author follows. According to some version of the myth, it holds Typhon who, though not traditionally part of the Gigantomachy, is often conflated with the Giants.²¹⁷ According to others, it is the Giant Enceladus who is part of the traditional Gigantomachy.²¹⁸ Though Lucretius (perhaps purposefully) does not hint at which version of the myth he follows, he does suggest a Giant through the anthropomorphic (or perhaps intentionally zoomorphic) imagery. The mountain is said to have jaws (*fauces*), which could refer to any sort of opening to an inanimate object (*OLD* s.v. 3,4), or the orifice of any animal or human (*OLD* s.v. 1,2). The volcano is further anthropomorphized by “dominating” (*dominata*, 642) the fields.

One cannot help but notice the political implications of this passage as well. The volcano puts forth a “storm of flame” (*flammae tempestas*, 643). The idea of civil unrest as a storm goes back to archaic Greek literature.²¹⁹ Moreover, I argue that the word *dominata* here is significant. Many of Rome’s civil wars were allegedly caused by individuals aspiring for autocracy. Cicero himself calls Sulla’s time in power the *Sullae dominatio* (*Agr.* 1.21, 2.81.13). He also uses the word of people like Catiline who try to take over the state during times of political turmoil (*Cat.* 2.19).²²⁰ Finally one cannot help but acknowledge the

²¹⁷ Pi. *Ol.* 4.6-7, *Pyth.* 1.15-28; A. *PV.* 365.

²¹⁸ Schol. ad Pi. *Ol.* 4.11.

²¹⁹ See Chapter 1

²²⁰ Sallust says that it was the *dominatio Sullae* that inspired Catiline (*Cat.* 5.6)

political implications of the last line of the passage above. *Moliri* can have implications of sinister political machinations.²²¹ *Res novae*, the Roman term for “revolution,” stands out most prominently. Between the implied reference to the Gigantomachy and this language clearly evoking civil strife, we can see a further association between Gigantomachy and civil war.²²²

Conclusion

While the previous chapter reviewed collective confusion over a Hellenic identity as kingdoms and city-states grappled with diminishing power, this chapter has conversely looked at the rise of Rome and Romans’ corresponding confusion as they sought to understand their own burgeoning role as a Mediterranean hegemon. It was during the 3rd century BCE that Rome became the *caput mundi*. Though considered “barbaroi” by Greeks, the Romans quickly took up the role of “civilizers.” The wars with Carthage could easily be presented as “civilized vs. uncivilized,” but, at the same time, these conflicts were certainly complicated, with Greeks fighting on both sides and many of Rome’s own allies rebelling. The poetry during and after the Punic Wars reflects this complication and draws upon the Gigantomachy to process the disorder of these conflicts.

During the 2nd and 1st century BCE, Rome became embroiled in civil strife. The myth that was previously used for complex foreign conflicts became a fitting analog for complex, internal conflicts. Ennius, for example, may have placed a fraternally-charged

²²¹ For a near contemporary example see Cic. *Har.* 40.0: “Who therefore contrives discord among the Optimates? (*Quis igitur optimatum discordiam molitur?*).”

²²² Aetna comes up on two other occasions in the *De Rerum Natura*, at 1.772ff. and 2.593. At 1.772ff., the volcano is anthropomorphized (*minantur ... se colligere iras ... faucibus*) and scholars have noted this anthropomorphization (Gale 2000: 121; Hardie 1986: 211) but they have not discussed the anthropomorphization in the passage I treated above, nor have they noted the implications of civil strife.

Gigantomachy at the very beginning of his epic, and Lucretius becomes the first Roman poet to style the Giant as a heroic figure.²²³

In the following and final chapter, we will see the Gigantomachy's association with civil war reach its culmination. While powerful figures in Rome will seek to advance a clichéd point of view about their supposed destiny to bring order, poets clearly and almost universally will begin to employ subtle ways of using the myth to subvert such propaganda.

²²³ Lucretius may be the first poet even depending on how we view Aristophanes' bird-like Giants.

CHAPTER 5

THEY MIGHT BE ROMANS: THE GIGANTOMACHY AND CIVIL CONFLICT IN THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS

In previous chapters, I have explored the myth of the Gigantomachy in the Greek world and have shown that it is not as simple as a battle of “Chaos vs. Order,” or “Civilized vs. Uncivilized.” I have also demonstrated that the myth can be used an allegory not only for a conflict with a foreign enemy, but also for a civil war. In this chapter, I illustrate that the problematic elements of the Gigantomachy in Greek literature still exist in the poetry of the age of Augustus. In fact, many of these elements will seem even more prominent, given that Rome had experienced several decades of civil conflict before Augustus put an end to the civil wars. In the wars between Octavian and Sextus Pompey, and in the wars between Octavian and Mark Antony, the losers are presented as “barbaric others.” Sextus Pompey chose the figure of the sea monster Scylla to be an avatar for his cause.²²⁴ Unfortunately for Pompey, Augustan propaganda turned the image around on him and used it to cast him as an uncivilized, brutish beast. He was also linked to another monster in Sicily: the Cyclops.²²⁵ Similarly, Mark Antony boasted of his familial descent from Hercules. This too was turned against him as the Augustan propaganda highlighted the more uncivilized aspects of Hercules.

Hardie, in his seminal work, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, argues that Vergil uses the Gigantomachy myth to convey a “Chaos vs. Order” theme and that this connotation carries over to the political strife of the 40s and 30s BCE as a means for

²²⁴ It is of note that Sextus Pompey put the images of Scylla on his own coinage. For an overview of Sextus Pompey's coinage, see Evans (1987.)

²²⁵ See Powell (2008.)

Augustus to justify violence against fellow Romans. O'Hara, however, deconstructs this idea in his chapter that convincingly argues that Vergil takes advantage of the many different mythological traditions of the Gigantomachy to show that the "Chaos vs. Order" binary is overly simplistic.²²⁶ My study further demonstrates just how complicated the Gigantomachy myth is in Augustan poetry and underscores its troubling connection with civil war.

Gigantomachy, Geography, and Roman Civil War

In 48 BCE, Caesar and Pompey meet in the fields of Pharsalus in a battle that would go on to be seen as the decisive moment of victory between the armies of these two political factions. This is essentially the exact same plain where the Titans meet in Hesiod's version of the Titanomachy. Pharsalus is situated at the foot of Mt. Othrys, which, according to Hesiod, is where the Titans resided (*Theog.* 632).²²⁷ Furthermore, Otus and Ephialtes, the two Giant-like sons of Iphimedia, launched their assault on Zeus by piling the Mountains Ossa and Pelion upon Mt. Olympus.²²⁸ Based on the location of these mountains, we can assume this attack was in the same region as Pharsalus and the Titanomachy.²²⁹

In the Typhonomachy, often conflated with the Gigantomachy and the Titanomachy, the battle between Zeus and Typhon rages all over the Mediterranean. Typhon receives a particularly serious wound in northern Greece and bleeds onto Mt. Haemus, which received its name from this event (αἷμα = blood, Apollod.1.63). Mt. Haemus overshadowed another

²²⁶ See O'Hara (2007: 96-103). See also O'Hara (1994) for an earlier version of this.

²²⁷ See West (1966: ad loc.).

²²⁸ For earliest version, see Hom. *Od.* 11. 302-320. The order of the mountains varies based on the poet. Vergil (*G.* 1.278-82) had them place Ossa on Pelion and Olympus on Ossa. These two figures are later included among the Giants (Apollod. 1.7.4).

²²⁹ One coin (RRC 474/4), dated to 45 BCE, alludes to the Gigantomachy. This coin, minted by Lucius Valerius Acisculus, shows the image of an anguiped figure struck by the thunderbolt. Grueber (1910: 535) and Sear (1998: 56) sees this as a reference to Caesar's victory over the Pompeians.

critical battle of the civil wars of the second half of the 1st century: Philippi. Philippi was paired with the battle of Pharsalus. Vergil does this at the end of Book 1 of the *Georgics* in a portion of the poem that is especially rife with the language of civil strife. The speaker lists all of the portents surrounding the assassination of Julius Caesar. One of them in particular is of note:

... quotiens Cyclopum effervere in agros
vidimus undantem ruptis fornacibus **Aetnam**,
flammarumque globos liquefactaque **volvere saxa!**

How often we saw surging Aetna glowing with its ruptured furnaces in the fields of the Cyclopes and hurling the balls of fire and melted rocks! (*G.* 1.471-3)

Gale (2000: 120-22) has discussed the parallels between this passage and Lucretius' description of Aetna's eruptions (1.772-5, 6.680-93). She argues that this Vergil passage alludes through the Lucretius passage back to a passage from *Prometheus Bound* (367-71), in which Prometheus predicts the escape of Typhon from his mountainous prison. I have already demonstrated the imagery of civil strife presented through this play, particularly through the association of familial strife among members of the divine family. This "window reference" increases the connotations of civil strife in this passage and the Titanomachy's association with it.

As shown in Chapter 4, Aetna itself has a strong connection to civil war, especially in the discussed Lucretius passage (6.639-46).²³⁰ Even without the allusion to *Prometheus Bound*, the resonance is still there. This association was undoubtedly intensified when Aetna erupted shortly before the assassination of Caesar in 44. The image of the Gigantomachy is

²³⁰ Gale (2000:120-22) does not look at these lines in relation to Vergil's evocation of Aetna. I think Lucretius' use of the language of civil strife intensifies Vergil's allusion to Aetna and the imagery of civil strife associated with it.

also recalled because Aetna is a prison that holds either Enceladus, Typhon, or Briareus (which the allusion to *Prometheus Bound* obviously shows as well).²³¹ The image of hurling rocks (*volvere saxa*) into the air further recalls the Giants as this is their weapon of choice.²³²

All of this imagery looks forward to the civil war:

ergo inter sese paribus concurrere telis
 Romanas acies **iterum** videre Philippi; 490
 nec fuit indignum superis **bis sanguine** nostro
Emathiam et latos **Haemi** pinguescere campos.
 scilicet et tempus veniet, cum finibus illis
 agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro
 exesa inveniet scabra robigine pila, 495
 aut gravibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanis
grandiaque effossis mirabitur **ossa** sepulcris.

Therefore Philippi again saw Roman battle lines dashed together with equal arms among themselves. Nor was it unworthy for the gods that Emathia and the wide fields of Haemus become rich with our blood. And of course a time will come when in these lands the farmer working earth with his curved plow will discover javelins corroded away by rough rust, or he will kick up empty helmets with this heavy hoes and he will marvel at the huge bones from the dug up tombs. (*G*.1.489-97)

The sites of these battles were nearly 350 kilometers apart, yet the text implies that both battles happened near Philippi. As Thomas notes, the geography is “inexact” (1986 ad loc.).

A possible explanation for this geographic inexactitude is poetic license. A common Gigantomachic theme might have made this poetic liberty easier. Philippi had a natural connection to the Typhonomachy. Vergil presents the battle as happening at the foot of Mt. Haemus, the location where Zeus wounds Typhon and the monster’s blood spills out on to its mountain. Vergil subtly alludes to this tradition through his language: *sanguine ... Haemi* (491-2). The Gigantomachy is further alluded to with the “giant bones” (*grandia ... ossa*,

²³¹ For Aetna as prison for Typhon see Pi. *Ol.* 4.6-7, *Pyth.* 1.15-28; A. *PV.* 365. For Enceladus, see Schol. ad Pi. *Ol.* 4.11; Call. *Aet.* 1.35f.; Verg. *A.* 3.578ff.

²³² Hes. 675, 715; Apollod.1.63

496-7). On the one hand, these “giant bones” could be a reference to the bones of heroes; the purported discovery of the bones of heroic figures was a common trope in the ancient world.²³³ But there are also similar accounts of discovering the bones of the Giants, as Lowe (2015: 196) notes.²³⁴ The province of Macedonia’s connection to the Gigantomachy makes it easier for the poet to draw all of these locations together.²³⁵ It seems that in the 1st century, northern Greece, the Gigantomachy/Titanomachy, and civil war all became connected in a shared narrative.²³⁶

There is an earlier historical parallel for this association between the location of the Gigantomachy and civil strife. The tyrant Peisistratus and his army met in battle with the Athenians at the deme of Pallene in Attica, an act of civil strife itself (Hdt. 1.62-3). Boardman (1972:66) suggests that Peisistratus may have used the location of this battle to suggest an association with Gigantomachy, which, according to legend, happened at Pallene in Chalcidice (Diod. 4.15).

Gigantomachy as Familial Conflict in Propertius

As examined in Greek literature in earlier chapters, the Gigantomachy carried a connotation of familial strife. The Romans themselves saw their own civil wars through the lens of familial strife. In all of these civil conflicts of the 1st century BCE, it was very common for family members to be on opposing sides. In a civil war battle between Pompeius Strabo and Cinna in 87 BCE, two brothers on opposing sides accidentally commit

²³³ Hdt. 1.68; Plut. *Thes.* 36.

²³⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 72; Paus. 1.35.7, 8.29.1

²³⁵ Ovid will later similarly conflate Pharsalus: “Emathia and Philippi will become wet again with slaughter.” (*Emathique iterum madefient caede Philippi*, *Ov. Met.* 15.824).

²³⁶ Lucan continues the geographic association in the *Pharsalia*. See Masters (1992: 154-155).

fratricide.²³⁷ Caesar's war with Pompey was often represented as a war "between father-in-law and son-in-law."²³⁸ The mythical founder Romulus' sin of fratricide was seen as an *aition* for their own civil war at the end of the 1st century.²³⁹ Other Roman legends of familial strife became popular in the 1st century. Rome's war with the Sabines and the interventions of the Sabine women were presented as a familial conflict (Liv.1.13). Ovid is quick to call out the familial relationship between both sides of the conflict in his representation of the myth in the *Metamorphoses* (14.800-2).²⁴⁰

Syncretism of the Greco-Roman gods with the Egyptian gods also contributes to this theme of familial discontent among the gods. Dating back to the 6th century, the Greeks began to find parallels for their gods in the pantheon of the Egyptians. In the Egyptian divine family, the gods and Gigantomachic figures are even more closely related. Seth was syncretized with Typhon, who is the child of Hera and Zeus.²⁴¹ In the Hellenized Egyptian version, Seth kills his brother Osiris, who is identified with Dionysus.²⁴² In the Diodorus' version, the familial strife is also political, as Osiris is the king of Egypt, and it appears that Typhon is working with a band of conspirators. Typhon divides up the body of his brother and distributes the severed remains among his fellow conspirators. Perhaps this would further suggest civil conflict as an example of the "Body Politic" theme. Furthermore, Diodorus tells us that Isis, sister-wife of Osiris, along with the help of her son Horus, defeats Typhon on the very same spot that Hercules defeated the Giant Antaeus. This geographic reference furthers the Gigantomachic resonances of the Isis, Typhon, and Horus conflict. Between Julius'

²³⁷ Cornelius Sisenna in his *Histories* record the event (fr. 129 = Tac. *Hist.* 3.51, cf. Liv. *Per.* 79).

²³⁸ Prop. 3.11.38 (see discussion below); Cic. *Tusc.* 186, *Off.* 3.82; Verg. *A.* 6.831-2.

²³⁹ See Wiseman (1995: 143) and Bannon (1997: 158-159).

²⁴⁰ See also Ov. *Fast.* 3.202.

²⁴¹ In some purely Greek versions, Hera is the mother of Typhon: *H. Hymn Apoll.* 306-348; Steis. fr. 239 Campbell.

²⁴² Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 fr. 300; Pi. fr. 91 SM; Hdt. 2.144; Strab. 17.23; Plut. *Isis and Osiris*; Diod. 1.21.

Caesar's own affair with Cleopatra, and Octavian's later "war against Egypt," one can imagine the topicality of Egyptian culture in Rome in the late 1st century.²⁴³ Because of the Romans' sensitivity to the themes of familial strife, one can imagine the resonance this syncretism must have had, especially since Mark Antony enjoyed an association with Dionysus. Given the eventual breakdown of the triumvirate, would that make Octavian a Typhon-figure?

In a similar vein, Euhemerism may have been a contributing factor to the association of the Titanomachy and civil strife. Euhemerus was a court philosopher from the 4th century whose theory that all gods were simply humans who received divine honors for their benefits to man was especially favorable during a time when Macedonians monarchs were conceiving aspirations for divinity. Ennius produced a prose translation of Euhemerus preserved for us in fragments in Lactantius' *Institutiones Divinae*. Ennius' translation records a version that differs slightly from the traditional Saturn and Jupiter in myth. In this account mentioned earlier in Chapter 4, Saturn has a brother named "Titan" who does not want to share the power of the realm. Titan realizes that he is inferior to Saturn, but makes him agree that he will not bring up any male children. Saturn has a male child, Jupiter, who is immediately concealed and raised in secret. Eventually, Neptune and Pluto are born and hidden away as well. With time, Titan learns of Saturn's secret sons and binds Saturn and his sister-wife Ops. Jupiter grows up and amasses an army of Cretans. He succeeds through combat in freeing his father and mother from his wicked uncle. Jupiter restores his father to the throne and retires to Crete. This familial harmony is short-lived. Saturn learns from an oracle about a potential threat from his son and hatches a plot to kill him. Upon learning of this plot, Jupiter

²⁴³ See Peterson (2016)

overthrows and banishes his father. Jupiter eventually sends a band of men to assassinate Saturn in his hideout in Italy (apud Lact. 1.14). Johnston (1977) has convincingly argued that this account directly influenced Vergil's representation of Saturn in the second half of the *Aeneid*. I suggest that it has grander implications for the poetry of the Augustan era. Changing from a simple "son vs. father" paradigm in the more "authorized" Hesiodic account, Euhemerus illustrates a more complicated familial conflict for the Titanomachy.

Propertius further emphasizes this idea of Roman civil war as familial strife. In his poem 3.11, a celebration of Augustus' victory over Antony, the speaker defends his subjection to a woman as part of the elegiac lifestyle and gives mythical examples of other heroes under the control of women. He moves on to a historical example, namely that of Cleopatra, and wishes that Pompey had died before his flight to Alexandria, so that he would never have brought Caesar to Cleopatra:

issent **Phlegraeo** melius tibi funera campo,
vel tua si **socero** colla daturus eras.

Your death would have been better for you in the Phlegraeian field, even if you were going to give your neck to your father-in-law. (3.11.37-8)

Richardson (1977: ad loc) believes that the "Phlegraeian fields" here refer to Campania and this potential "death" of Pompey refers to a near-fatal bout of sickness that he experienced in Naples.²⁴⁴ The Phlegraeian fields were considered to be one of the traditional sites for the Gigantomachy.²⁴⁵ Just exactly where they were was a matter of debate. Earlier sources place it on the westernmost peninsula of Chalcidice, which eventually became known as Pallene (Hdt. 7.123). Later traditions, however, place the Phlegraeian fields in the Campania

²⁴⁴ Richardson cites Plut. Pomp. 57.1 and Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 186.

²⁴⁵ See Introduction.

region.²⁴⁶ Heyworth (2008: 338) suggests that the “Phlegraeian fields” in this Propertius passage refer to Pharsalus, and argues that “Phlegraeian fields” are used here because the civil wars are rendered Gigantic. I assert that my reading above of the connection between the civil wars and the region of Macedonia bolsters Heyworth’s suggestion and that my dissertation as whole will support his passing claim that the civil wars were regarded as Gigantomachic. The poet here stresses a familial connection as Pompey had been married to Caesar’s daughter and thus renders the war between them a familial conflict.

Another passage from Propertius may further suggest an association between the Gigantomachy and familial strife. In this poem (3.9), the poet presents a scenario in which Maecenas asks him to write an epic poem. The speaker initially declines and engages in the typical *recusatio*. He does not want to write epic, but to continue engaging in writing the love poetry he is accustomed to. The poet goes over a wide variety of topics that he will not sing of, but towards the end of the poem, he suddenly changes his tune:

te duce vel Iovis arma canam caeloque minantem
 Coeum et Phlegraeis Eurymedonta iugis;
 eductosque pares silvestri ex ubere reges,
 ordiar et caeso moenia firma Remo ...

With your guidance I will sing of the arms of Jupiter and Coeus and Eurymedon threatening the sky in the Phlegraeian ridges. I will begin with the equal kings raised from the rustic teat and the walls made strong with the slaughter of Remus. (3.9.50-53)²⁴⁷

The juxtaposition of these two passages implies a relation. On the one hand, these two potential poetic themes are similar because they both have to do with transgressive figures

²⁴⁶ Diod. 1.71.4, 4.21.5; Plin. *NH.* 3.61, 18.111; Sil. 8.538.

²⁴⁷ Wiseman (1995:125) uses these lines (particularly *caeso moenia firma Remo*) to suggest that Remus was seen as a foundational sacrifice for the city. According to his theory, the myth was created in the early 3rd century BCE when Rome allegedly resorted to human sacrifice because of a foreign threat. Neel (2014:154) disagrees.

who attack or lay siege to certain sacred hills. There was a precedent for this in the Greek world. The Athenian Acropolis was assimilated to Mt. Olympus and the Persians' assault on it could be likened to the Giants' attack on the seat of the gods. Moreover, in Lucretius, we have seen the Giant-like Epicurus and the Giants themselves represented as the assailants of walls (1.73, 5.119). More importantly, as Neel (2014) briefly remarks, these lines refer to civil war, given the Olympians' and Giants' distant relation. Neel also mentions that the Greek examples are more typically used to refer to foreign wars. But it is here we meet the crux of my argument: It is during this period that the meaning of the Gigantomachy begins to shift to exclusively indicate an internal war.

Gigantomachy in the *Georgics*

Though I briefly examined Vergil's use of the Gigantomachy in terms of the geography of the civil war battles, I now explore more fully how Vergil engages with the myth. A passage in Book 1 of the *Georgics* suggests an association of the Gigantomachy and civil strife. Following the tradition of Hesiod, Vergil provides a discussion of the days of the week for a farmer. He offers a warning about the fifth day:

... quintam fuge: pallidus Orcus
Eumenidesque satae; tum partu Terra nefando
Coeumque Iapetumque creat saeuumque Typhoea
et **coniuratos** caelum rescindere **fratres**.
ter sunt conati imponere Pelio Ossam
scilicet atque Ossae frondosum inuoluere Olympum;
ter pater **exstructos disiecit** fulmine montis.

Avoid the fifth day: gloomy Orcus and the Eumenides were born (on this day). Then Earth in an unspeakable birth gave birth to Coeus and Iapetus and savage Typhoeus and the conspiring brothers. They thrice tried to tear open heaven place Ossa on Pelion and naturally to roll leafy Olympus on Ossa. Thrice the father scattered the built up mountains with his thunderbolt. (*G*.1.277-82)

As stated above, the geography of the mountains places these Gigantic figures in the region where Pompey and Caesar fought, and, through a bit of creative license, where Octavian and Antony fought the conspirators. In this passage, we see the grouping of the Giants with the Titanic figure Iapetus and other Gigantic Typhon and Otus and Ephialtes. One cannot help but imagine the resonance that the phrase “conspiring brothers” (*coniuratos ... fratres*) must have had on the audience of the late 1st century BCE who had experienced the conspiracies of Catiline and those of Brutus and Cassius. Even the mention of “brothers” might evoke the concept of civil strife (even though these two brothers are on the same side). It is also perhaps of note that Jupiter is portrayed in a destructive capacity here (*disiecit*, 282), whereas the Giants are *constructive* in their piling up of the mountains (*exstructos*, 282). The two words are even juxtaposed. This seems to strongly contrast the traditional portrayal of the Olympians as the harbingers of order and the Giants as agents of destruction.

Confusion of sides is another common trope in civil war. The political theorist Carl Schmitt argued that the sovereign state is derived from a distinction between friend and enemy (1932). As discussed in the Introduction, Agamben and Armitage have explored this as a key to understanding the traumatizing effect of civil war. Naturally, this distinction breaks down in a civil war. This too is be a reason why the Gigantomachy fits so well with Roman civil wars. Bartsch (1997: 54) speaks of the doubling that happens in Lucan’s *Pharsalia*. Enemy and friend become indistinguishable. She gives the example of the battle at Massilia in Book 3. The line between Roman and Massilian becomes blurred.²⁴⁸ An example that predates the Augustan era can be found as well. Melchior (2010: 406-10) convincingly argues that in the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust, through “deviant focalization” (to

²⁴⁸ Hunink (1992) in his commentary on Book 3 of the *Pharsalia* notes the confusion of opponents, especially at 3.670 and 3.728. See also Rowland (1969).

borrow Fowler's (1990) term), suggests that the audience can identify with both sides of the combatants – conspirators and the “official” Roman soldiers – in his description of the battle of Faesulae (Sall. *Cat.* 60). Both sides believe that they are following the *pristina virtus* of the Republic. Both sides are guilty of transgressions.

The figure of Mark Antony is also important for this concept. Though he never formally defected like these other figures, his role in the civil wars that led to the establishment of the Principate must have been confusing to the average Roman. First, he was Caesar's righthand man and potential successor after the dictator's assassination. Then he was the rival of Caesar's heir Octavian, and the enmity between them led to Antony being declared a public enemy and eventually their conflict at Mutina in 43. Soon afterwards, Octavian and Antony established an alliance to avenge Caesar's murder. Cicero aptly sums up the issue with some fine wordplay:

Si consul Antonius (A), Brutus (B) hostis (C); si conservator rei publicae
Brutus (B), hostis (C) Antonius (A).

If Antony is consul, Brutus is an enemy; if Brutus is the savior of the republic,
Antony is the enemy. (Cic. *Phil.* 4.3.8)

Quintilian lists this as an example of an antimetabole (*Inst. Or.* 9.3.86). As Quint (2011: 275) remarks, this literary device sums up the paradoxical nature of this period. Not long after Philippi, one could say that Antony became a public enemy again through his association with siege of Perusia through the familial connection of his brother Lucius and then wife Fulvia (from the perspective of Octavian's side of the Caesarian party). The struggle between the two nearly comes to a head again at Brundisium, but the centurions of both of their respective armies refuse to fight. When Fulvia dies, the two renew their triumvirate and solidify it with Antony's marriage to Octavia. In the late 30s, this treaty breaks down and

Antony once again becomes an outlaw for the final time. Quint (2011) calls this Octavian's "double-cross" of the senatorial elite. Quint argues that the *Aeneid* was Vergil's experience in the civil wars of the 1st century. The twinning and interchangeability of Aeneas and Turnus in Book 12 are a result of Antony's constantly changing place in the civil wars of the 40s and 30s. I would like to supplement Quint's point, noting that there are many other accounts of Romans and allies switching sides during the civil wars of the 1st century that further contribute to this confusion of friend and foe. Famously, Caesar's lieutenant Titus Labienus switches to the Pompeian cause at the outbreak of the civil war in 49, and brings some of the German and Gallic cohorts with him ([Caes.] *Afr.* 19).²⁴⁹ Two brothers in Caesar's cavalry of Allobroges, a Gallic tribe, defect from Caesar to Pompey's side during the battle of Dyrrachium (Caes. *BC.* 3.59-61).²⁵⁰ Other famous defectors include Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus²⁵¹ and Sextus Pompey's admiral Menodorus.²⁵²

As we have seen in the figures of the Hundred-Handers, the Cyclopes, and Styx, it is not always easy to determine the sides of the combatants in the Gigantomachy. Later traditions feature a side-switching Prometheus.²⁵³ Another combatant from a later tradition of the Gigantomachy is relevant here as Diodorus provides us with a noteworthy example of defection in the myth. In his euhemerizing account, the Giant Musaeus switches to Zeus' side:

... φανῆναι τὰ περὶ τούτων ἐπικριθέντα ἐπισημαίνεται κράτος καὶ ἀπόστασις
ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων πρὸς αὐτοῦς. ἀκόλουθον δὲ τούτοις γενέσθαι τοῦ πολέμου
τὸ τέλος· αὐτομολῆσαι μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων Μουσαῖον, καὶ τυχεῖν
ὠρισμένων τιμῶν ...

²⁴⁹ Cic. *Att.* 7.13.1, DC 41.4.

²⁵⁰ Examples of defection of unnamed individuals in civil war: [Caes.] *Hisp.* 7.4.4, 11.2.3, 11.3.2, 12.2.2, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.

²⁵¹ Vell. Pat. 2.84, Suet. *Ner.* 3.

²⁵² App. *BC* 5.78-80, 96, 102, DC 48.45.7, Hor. *Carm.* 3.16.23-4 with Nisbet and Rudd (2004: ad loc.). Cicero was also called a *Levissimus transfuga* in the *In Ciceronem* (4).

²⁵³ See Chapter 2.

... there was revealed to him (that is, Zeus) what was the will of the gods in the affair, the omens indicating the victory of the gods and a defection to them of the enemy. And the outcome of the war accorded with the omens; for Musaeus deserted to him from the enemy, for which he was accorded **peculiar honours** ... (Diod. 5.71.3, trans. Oldfather)

The means by which Zeus coaxes Musaeus to join him are of note: Musaeus changes sides because of Zeus' bribe of *τιμή*. This myth appears to be a doublet of the Styx episode in the *Theogony* since Zeus offers *τιμή* to her and her children in order to get them on his side in the coming Titanomachy (389-397). This similarity perhaps suggests a pattern within this Gigantomachy myth: there were often figures who changed sides. Given that this was such a common trope in the Gigantomachy myth and it was such a prominent phenomenon in Ancient Rome, it is not difficult to see how poets would make use of this myth's potential to allegorize their civil wars.

An important section of the *Georgics* activates this theme of confusion between friend and enemy. In the poem's *sphragis*, the speaker mentions his most notorious patron, Augustus:

Haec super arborum cultu pecorumque canebam
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentes
per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.

I was singing of these things: about the cultivation of the fields and flocks and about trees while great Caesar thunders at the great Euphrates in war and, as victor, grants laws to the willing peoples and makes his way to Olympus.
(Verg. *G.* 4.561-3)

Thomas (1986: ad loc.) notes the language of Jupiter that is ascribed to Augustus: "he thunders" (*fulminat*). Furthermore, Augustus "grants law" (*dat iura*) and thus has a connotation of "bringing order." Gale (2003: 327), however, sees Gigantomachic

implications in the image of “striving for Olympus” (*viam adfectat Olympo*, 4.563).²⁵⁴ In the same breath, Augustus is styled as both Jupiter and Giant. I suggest a literary model for this passage that has not been explored by other scholars. In Chapter 3, I examined how certain Greek elegiac poets used the Gigantomachy to portray powerful figures ambiguously; it is often difficult to tell whether they are praising or criticizing these figures. As I stated, Melinno (fr. 451) seems to be praising Rome, but her representation of the Romans as earthborn might have an association of the Giants. Alcaeus of Messene’s elegies are especially relevant here:

Μακύνου τείχη, Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε· πάντα Φιλίπῳ
 ἀμβατά· χαλκείας κλεῖε πύλας μακάρων.
 χθὼν μὲν δὴ καὶ πόντος ὑπὸ σκῆπτροισι Φιλίππου
 δέδμηται, λοιπὰ δ’ ἅ πρὸς Ὀλύμπον ὁδός.

Heighten your walls, Zeus. All things are scalable for Philip. Shut the bronze gates of the blessed ones. The land and sea have been bound under the scepter of Philip, and the only **road** remaining is **the one to Olympus**. (*AP* 9.518)

Vergil here seems to be directly alluding to Alcaeus’ elegy here.²⁵⁵ The phrase “road to Olympus” (ἅ πρὸς Ὀλύμπον ὁδός) appears nowhere else in Greek literature (besides the Alpheius fragment below), and appears to be a direct analog to Vergil’s (*viam... Olympo*, 4.563). As I stated in Chapter 3, it does not seem likely that Alcaeus’ poem is genuine praise of Philip, given that his other poems attack Philip. We see hints that Philip is like the Aloadae with the implication of scaling Olympus. Alpheus’ “encomium” of Rome has similar phraseology:

Κλεῖε, θεός, μεγάλοιο πύλας ἀκμῆτας Ὀλύμπου·
 φρούρει, Ζεῦ, ζαθέαν αἰθέρος ἀκρόπολιν.

²⁵⁴ The same verb *adfectare* is used of the Giant’s assault on Olympus in Ovid: *adfectasse ferunt regnum caeleste gigantas* (*Met.* 1.152)

²⁵⁵ Through his clear references to Philip V, we can securely date this poem to the late 3rd, early 2nd century BCE (see Edson 1948).

ἤδη γὰρ καὶ πόντος ὑπέζευκται δορὶ Ῥώμης
καὶ χθών· οὐρανὴ δ' οἶμος ἔτ' ἔστ' ἄβατος.

Close, god, the untiring gates of great Olympus. Keep watch, Zeus, upon your holy citadel. Already the land and sea are yoked under the spear of Rome. The **path to the sky** is still unscalable. (*AP* 9.526)

The date of this poem is uncertain, but Alpheus can be dated to the Augustan age at the earliest.²⁵⁶ While it is difficult to determine the tone of this poem for certain, I follow Weimer (2015) and maintain that Alpheus recognizes and activates the ironical tone of the Alcaeus elegy. Vergil, then, who was likely aware of these two elegies, uses them as a model for his ambiguous portrayal of Augustus.

A reference to the Gigantomachy at the end of Book 4 is fitting, since, as I have discussed above, Vergil caps Book 1 of the *Georgics* with a reference to the Gigantomachy. This reference to Augustus “striving for Olympus” recalls the earlier Gigantomachic civil conflicts treated in Book 1, and in particular earlier Greek poet’s deployment of similar language, and casts a dark shadow on his rise to power.

Gigantomachy in the *Aeneid*

O’Hara (2007) examines how Latin poets dealt with this phenomenon of conflicting myths and incorporated them into their poetry. He discusses the contradictory elements of the myth of the Gigantomachy in the *Aeneid* in particular (2007: 96-103).²⁵⁷ I will show how these allusions to contradictory versions of the myth aptly suit the myth’s association with civil war. My reading sharply contrasts with that of Hardie (1985), who argues that the Gigantomachic imagery in the *Aeneid* is meant to signify the Trojans (and thus, the Romans’

²⁵⁶ For date, see Bowra (1957: 28-9).

²⁵⁷ See also his 1994 article that examines the Gigantomachy in a slightly more in-depth manner.

and Augustus') ultimate victory over the forces of chaos embodied in the Turnus and the Italians. Following O'Hara, I will show that Gigantomachic themes in the *Aeneid* are inherently contradictory. I believe that Vergil picks up on the inherently contradictory nature of this myth and employs it to fit a poem that clearly engages with allegories of the recent civil wars in Rome.

Hardie himself has difficulty explaining his theory that Aeneas and the Trojans are associated with the order-inducing Olympians and that Turnus and the Italians are associated with the chaos-spreading Giants, in the case of Vergil's simile comparing Aeneas to Aegaeon the Hundred-Hander (1986: 154-6). In the following passage, Aeneas is compared to the Titan after killing a slew of Italians in a rampage after the death of Pallas:

Aegaeon qualis, centum cui bracchia dicunt
centenasque manus, quinquaginta oribus ignem
pectoribusque arsisse, **Iouis cum fulmina contra**
tot paribus streperet clipeis, tot stringeret ensis:
sic toto Aeneas desaeuit in aequore uictor
ut semel intepuit mucro.

Such as Aegaeon, whom they say had a hundred arms and hands, and that fire blazed from his fifty mouths and chests when he was rumbling **against the lightning of Jupiter** with so many equal shields. Thus Aeneas as victor raged throughout the entire plane as soon as his sword became wet. (Verg. *A.* 10.565-70)

This passage does not fit Hardie's schema since here we have Aeneas compared to a Giant-like Titan. It is especially confusing since, in the Hesiodic version of the Titanomachy, the Hundred-Handers are on the side of the Olympians. But it is not until half way through the simile that the audience realizes that Vergil is following the version of the lost epic, the *Titanomachia*, in which the Hundred-Handers fought on the side of the Titans (Eumelos, fr. 2 K = Schol. Apollon. 1165c). Aegaeon was another name for Briareus. This monstrous figure was the Hundred-Hander, in Hesiod, who was joined to the Olympians through a political

alliance confirmed by marriage (Hes. *Th.* 817). The comparison of Aeneas to Briareus in particular of all the Gigantic figures perhaps merits notice. Augustus himself was tied to a former and future enemy Mark Antony through a political marriage.

Hardie, understandably, has to begin to shift his wording to explain Aeneas' association with a Giant-like figure; he attributes it to the "complexities of civil war" and that "both sides are culpable" (1986: 154-6) I think Hardie is exactly right, but this idea could apply to all examples of the Gigantomachy in the *Aeneid*. O'Hara (1994) offers the convincing suggestion that Vergil is weaving together contradictory traditions of the myth. The reader may expect the Hesiodic version of the myth when they see Aeneas compared to Aegaeon, and they would expect the Olympian association with it. Vergil, however, shocks the reader three lines into the simile by changing the version to that of the *Titanomachia*. The delay of the preposition *contra* (657) further adds to the surprise that Vergil is not following the Hesiodic tradition and that Aegaeon is *against* Jupiter. Thus, Vergil can incorporate two contradictory versions of the myth in one simile. This use of contradiction is used fittingly for a poem that is clearly about civil war.²⁵⁸ The different versions of the myth make it difficult to tell whose side Aegaeon is on. Even in Hesiod's *Theogony*, Aegaeon, because of his monstrous appearance, seems like he *should* be with the Titans, and this is perhaps why the poet of the *Titanomachia* puts him on that side (Eumelos, fr. 2 K = Schol. Apollon. 1165c).²⁵⁹ As I have shown with the examples of Mark Antony, Titus Labienus, and Menodorus, civil war in Rome has that same problem. This is not the only instance in which the Gigantomachy myth contributes to the theme of confusion between friend and enemy in

²⁵⁸ Several scholars have looked at the *Aeneid*'s war in Italy as an allegory for Rome's civil wars of the 1st century BCE. See Camps (1969: 96-7), Tarrant (2012: 6-8), and Reed (2007: 5-6, 58-60).

²⁵⁹ In the *Iliad*, Thetis references a time when Zeus uses Aegaeon/Briareus against his own family members when they rise up in rebellion (1.395-406)

the *Aeneid*. Throughout the epic, the imagery of Giants is applied to Italians and Trojans alike.

Sometimes, Turnus and the Rutulians are Giant-like. But in other moments, that identity seems to be reserved for the Trojans. In Book 9, the Trojan youths are described in Giant-like terms: “youths, the equals of mountains and ancestral pines” (*abietibus iuvenes patriis et montibus aequos*, 9.673). Later in this same book, Turnus slays Bitias. Turnus is painted with Olympian language. When he hurls his spear, it is compared to a thunderbolt: “sent forth in the manner of the thunderbolt” (*fulminis acta modo*, 9.705). Later he “sends thunderbolts on his shield” (*clipeoque micantia fulmina mittit*, 9.733). The thunderbolt is the weapon that Jupiter traditionally uses to defeat the Giants, Titans, and Typhon.²⁶⁰ The death of Bitias is described in Giant-like terms:

dat **tellus** gemitum et clipeum super intonat ingens.
 talis in Euboico Baiarum litore quondam
saxea pila cadit, magnis quam **molibus** ante
 constructam ponto iaciunt, sic illa ruinam
 prona trahit penitusque vadis inlisa recumbit;
 miscent se maria et nigrae attolluntur harenae,
 tum sonitu Prochyta alta tremit durumque cubile
 Inarime Iovis imperiis imposta **Typhoeo**.

The earth (or, Mother Earth) lets out a groan and his mighty shield thunders above. Such a stone pillar sometimes fall on the Euboean shore of Baia which, previously constructed with massive heaps, they toss out onto the sea. Thus it headlong brings destruction and dashed deeply into the shallows, it sinks. The seas mix themselves. And the dark sands are raised up. Then Prochyta rumbles deep with a sound and Inarime, the harsh resting place placed upon Typhoeus by the power of Jupiter. (9.709-716)

²⁶⁰ Zeus overcomes Titans with the thunderbolt: Hes. *Th.* 72, 515, 707; Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.44. Zeus overcomes Typhon with the thunderbolt: Hes. *Th.* 845, 854, Pi. *P.* 1. Apollod. 1.6.3. Zeus overcomes the Giants with the thunderbolt: Od. 11.302-320; Pi. *P.* 8.17; E. *Bacch.* 215; Apollod. 1.62.

Vergil plays with the polyvalence here of *tellus* in line 709. On the surface, it simply means “earth,” since Bitias is striking the ground in his fall. But, since the Romans had no notion of upper-case or lower-case letters, the audience would not be able to tell if this indicated simply “earth” or “Mother Earth,” the goddess. The ensuing simile is full of Gigantomachic language. The image of the pillar itself being tossed into the sea is inherently Gigantomachic: the use of large rocks as weapons is a common component of this myth.²⁶¹ Furthermore, the location is significant. Some accounts place the location of the Gigantomachy in southern Italy in the Bay of Naples region, so a reference to Baia would naturally evoke this association. Finally, the simile ends with a reference to the monster Typhon, who is frequently identified with the Giants.²⁶² This presentation of the Gigantomachy is in stark contrast to Hardie’s vision of how the theme works in the *Aeneid*. Here, Turnus is the Olympian and the Trojans are the Giants. Hardie (1986: 143-6, 287-9) discusses these lines and notes Gigantomachic allusions, but explains away the contradiction of the Olympian traits of Turnus by saying it is “complicated by our recollection of the non-Olympian and Chthonic nature of the decoration of Turnus’ helmet (7.785ff). O’Hara (1994: 220) addresses the problems of Hardie’s interpretation. I add that a “confusion of friend and foe” theme, inherent in both civil war and the Gigantomachy, is a tool to further shed light on these contradictions.

Several of the complicating themes of the Gigantomachy are present in the Hercules and Cacus episode, reflecting a conflict that does not suggest a clean image of civilization overcoming disorder. In Book 8, the Greek king of the Arcadians and new ally to the immigrant Trojans, relates this story in an inset narrative (8.193-267). Hercules, traveling

²⁶¹ Hildebrant (2014: 75); Apollod. 1.6.1.

²⁶² Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.53.

through Italy on a journey back from Spain where he had stolen the cattle of Geryon, engages in a fight of cosmic proportions and eventually defeats the monster in a violent struggle.

Scholars have long noted the Gigantomachic elements in this vignette.²⁶³ Some scholars view Hercules here as a civilizing Olympian figure here and Cacus as a barbaric, Giant-like monster.²⁶⁴ Hercules is seen as a parallel to Aeneas and therefore a precursor to Augustus.

Morgan (1998) addresses the polyphony of this episode. He attributes the conflicting viewpoints to the backdrop of civil war in this poem. One of the ways he does this is through the association of this conflict with that of Romulus and Remus. He notes that Vergil places the conflict of this battle on the Aventine hill (*Aventini montem*, 8.231). This was the known haunt of Remus.²⁶⁵ Morgan (1998:183-4) discusses how the Romans viewed civil war as a familial conflict, and he connects the Hercules-Cacus episode with fratricide by its connection to Romulus. While I agree that this is valid, I suggest a stronger case for an underlying theme of familial strife. Vergil is perhaps the first to make Cacus the son of Vulcan. While this could imply a sinister connection between Cacus and Aeneas' shield since they are both products of Vulcan, it could also make Hercules and Cacus more closely related since we have the sons of two Olympians facing off: the son of Jupiter and the son of Vulcan. Furthermore, there is a hypotext to this epyllion that furthers the association with familial strife, in particular, *fraternal* strife. Several scholars have posited that the model for this episode is the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*.²⁶⁶ One of the key components to Hermes' theft is that he attempts to use a trick to deceive Apollo. He leads the cattle to his cave backwards so

²⁶³ Hardie (1986: 111-118), Galinsky (1966).

²⁶⁴ Schnepf (1966), Buchheit (1963: 116-33), Galinsky (1966), Hardie (1986:111-118), and Gransden (1976)

²⁶⁵ Prop. 4.1a.50, Liv. 1.6.

²⁶⁶ Williams (1972: ad loc.), Sutton (1977). See Clauss 2016 who gives extensive treatment of the Homeric Hymn's influence, mediated through Hellenistic literature, on the Hercules-Cacus episode in Augustan literature.

that the direction of the footprints (at least, in theory) might deceive the viewer (*h. Herm.* 68-88). Cacus employs this same scheme (*A.* 8.209-212). With this trick, Vergil activates the *Homeric Hymn* to Hermes. The audience naturally views Apollo as an analogue to Hercules and Cacus as an analogue to Hermes. One of the themes of the hymn is the conflict between half-brothers. Naturally, Vergil's audience would project this image of a brotherly quarrel onto Hercules and Cacus, especially since a twinning effect occurs. The audience, however, will be quick to notice the difference in outcomes of the fraternal conflict in these two episodes. Unlike in the *Homeric Hymn*, where Hermes' transgression against Apollo is forgiven and brushed off (*h. Herm.* 389-580), the Hercules-Cacus episode ends in a fraternally-charged murder (*A.* 8.259-65). In this episode, we observe the Gigantomachy, familial strife, and civil war intertwined in one narrative.

In addition to its connotations of fraternal strife, the Hercules and Cacus story contains this theme of the confusion of friend and enemy. Lyne (1987) views Hercules and Cacus as indistinguishable from one another. He reads the excessive violence of the episode as morally compromising for Hercules. He points out an interesting intertext. On two occasions, Cacus is described as spewing flames:

huic monstro Volcanus erat pater: illius atros
ore **vomens ignis** magna se mole ferebat

Vulcan was the father of this monster. It was his dark flames that he belched forth as he was bearing himself with his great mass. (*A.* 8.198-9)

Vulcan is the father of this monster, just as he is the creator of Aeneas' shield which appears later in this book.²⁶⁷ On this shield, Augustus also "vomits" flames: *geminas cui tempora flammis / laeta vomunt* ("His happy temples were spewing twin flames," 8.681-2).²⁶⁸ This is

²⁶⁷ Later in the poem, language describing Cacus is used of the shield: *uastos umbo uomit aureus ignis* (10.271)

²⁶⁸ Lyne 1987:31-32.

not the only lexical connection between the two. The outside of Cacus' cave is described in gruesome terms: *foribusque adfixa superbis /ora uirum tristi pendebant pallida tabo* "The faces of men, white with grim pollution, hang fixed on haughty doors," 8.196-7). There is a striking verbal parallel once again in this same book and on the shield of Aeneas. The poet describes Augustus:

ipse sedens niueo candentis limine Phoebi
dona recognoscit populorum aptatque **superbis**
postibus ...

He (Augustus) sitting at the gates of the threshold of shining Phoebus
recognizes the gifts of the people fitted to the haughty doors (8.720-2).

The placement of *superbis* at the end of the line, in the exact same location as the earlier passage dealing with Cacus, suggests an even stronger connection.²⁶⁹ These intertextual echoes, as Lyne notes, connect Augustus, the supposedly civilizing hero, to the very uncivilized Cacus. This complicates our picture of Augustus and Cacus. This should be unsurprising to us though, as we have seen the Gigantomachy theme frequently play with the notion of who is on the civilizing side. It also seems that these verbal echoes are present in this passage on the shield of Aeneas in Book 8 since it too contains themes of the Gigantomachy.

In general, the shield of Aeneas is full of the language of the Gigantomachy (8.626-728). The images on the shield culminate with the battle of Actium at the center (8.675-713). Hardie (1986: 97-104) reads this section as a representation of Augustan, or Olympian, order triumphing over the barbaric, Giant-like East. On Augustus' side, there are the Olympian gods: Neptune, Venus, Minerva (8.699), and Apollo (8.704). Antony and Cleopatra's gods are more animalistic and Giant-like: "Monsters of gods of every type and Anubis the barker

²⁶⁹ For the ambivalent use of *superbus* in the *Aeneid*, see Christenson (2002).

(*omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis*, 8.687-8).²⁷⁰ It seems that that this Gigantomachic imagery is used to portray Augustus' civil war against Antony as a foreign war. The very notion that this is a foreign war is undercut by the fact that Discordia, the goddess associated with civil war, is placed in middle of this image (8.702). What is more, as I noted above, a curious image is applied to Augustus: *geminas cui tempora flammis / laeta vomunt* ("happily his temples belched twin flames" 8.680-1). Furthermore, the fact that the flames are "twin" (*geminas*) give Augustus the images of being bipartite, which strengthens his associations with hybrid monsters like Typhon and the Hundred-Handers. Obviously, on the surface this imagery refers to the flames on Augustus' helmet. But, at the same time, it cannot help but recall the Giant-like monster Cacus earlier in this book through its lexical similarities (*vomens ignis*, 8.198). It also recalls other Giant-like figures who breathe fire, such as Typhon and Chimaera.²⁷¹ The depiction of Augustus as a fire-breathing monster makes it difficult for the audience to decide with whom they should identify. Furthermore, it is striking that Vergil mentions Antony by name in this passage: "On this side, Antony with barbaric riches and all types of weapons" (*hinc ope barbarica variisque Antonius armis*, 685). In the *Res Gestae*, Augustus simply refers to him as "that one" (*is*, 24). The specific use of his name dispels any illusion of a foreign war. Antony also cultivated a close association with Hercules.²⁷² This association might be increased by the fact that Antony is labeled *victor* in the next line (686). Earlier in this book, Hercules is called *victor* on two occasions (8.203, 362). Hercules played a pivotal role for the Olympians' victory in certain versions of the

²⁷⁰ Many of the Giant-like figures in Greek mythology (starting with Typhon) have animalistic components. By the 4th century, Giants tended to be depicted with serpentine feet. See elsewhere in dissertation.

²⁷¹ Typhon as a fire-breather: Hes. *Th.* 827-8; Chimaera as a fire-breather: Hes. *Th.* 319, 324.

²⁷² Plut. *Ant.* 4; App. *BC* 3.16; The association is suggested by his coinage as well: RRC 494/2. See Zanker (1988: 44-5) and Gurval 1995 :92-3.

Gigantomachy.²⁷³ In addition, perhaps Antony can have a Bacchic association here. Besides Hercules, Antony claimed Bacchus/Dionysus as a patron (a claim that Augustus will later use against him).²⁷⁴ Let us return to the image of Antony with spoils of the east:

hinc **ope barbarica** variisque Antonius armis,
victor ab Aurorae populis et litore rubro ... (8.685-6)

This image of Antony with his riches could easily describe Bacchus/Dionysus, who is often styled as “conqueror of the East.” Similar language is used of Bacchus earlier in the *Aeneid*. Perhaps not without coincidence, after comparing Augustus to Hercules (6.801-03), Anchises explains to Aeneas by negative comparison that his future descendant Augustus will be greater than Bacchus:

nec qui pampineis **victor** iuga flectit habenis
Liber, agens celso Nysae de vertice tigris.

Nor did Liber (cover so much territory) who, driving tigers from the top of Nysa as victor, guides the chariot with reins of ivy. (*A.* 6.804-5)

Dionysus/Bacchus also plays a key role in the Olympian’s victory in the Gigantomachy and Antony’s association with him here complicates Vergil’s presentation of Gigantomachic imagery in this passage.

It is important to note the extent to which the Gigantomachic imagery pervades the shield. As I have discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, the Gigantomachy was a popular theme in ecphrases. I have shown ecphrases, as illusive figures themselves, can be difficult to interpret or can be distorted for political means. If we accept the shield as representing the Augustan

²⁷³ S. *Trach.* 1059; Apollod. 1.6.1-2.

²⁷⁴ In 41, Antony enters Ephesos dressed as Dionysus (Plut. *Ant.* 4.4). He also received cult honors as a “New Dionysus” at Athens (Socrates of Rhodes, *FGrH* 192 F 2; Sen. *Suas.* 1.6.7. After his victory in Armenia in 34, he returns along with a triumphal procession in Dionysiac regalia (Vell. Pat. 2.82). See also Zanker (1988:46-47) and Gurval (1995:93).

agenda,²⁷⁵ then we can see how the Gigantomachy can represent themes of Augustan art.

Vergil, however, makes it clear that Vulcan's shield is not easy to interpret; it is "not explainable" (*non enarrabile*, 8.625). He constantly reminds the audience that this is a work of art. In his description of the shield, a verb indicating the maker's action intrudes into narration.²⁷⁶ He even highlights the fictive nature of Vulcan's creation:

illum indignanti **similem similemque** minanti
aspiceres

You would see that man (Horatius Cocles) **similar** to one who is angry and **similar** to one who is threatening. (8.649-650)

He frequently comments on the materials that the different sections are made of.²⁷⁷ He also underscores that this is an object *to be viewed* (*aspiceres*). The stressing that this is an artistic creation that is only "like" the truth further draws into question the reliability of this shield as an endorsement of Augustan propaganda. Vergil even further suggests this idea when Aeneas looks at the shield, but is "ignorant" (*ignarus* 8.730): he has no idea what it means.²⁷⁸

The figure of Mezentius has Gigantomachic resonances as Kronenberg (2005) has discussed. She notes the Epicurean tendencies in the figure of Mezentius, which are drawn from Lucretius' inversion of the Gigantomachy into a positive theme (see Chapter 4) and this accounts for the Etruscan king's transformation of character in Book 10. Mezentius is a Giant in many ways. He is a *contemptor divum* ("scorner of the gods," 7.648, 8.7). This title can be seen as Gigantic in that the Giants famously make an assault on Olympus. At one point in

²⁷⁵ As Hardie (1986: 336-76) and Binder (1971: 150-282).

²⁷⁶ *Fecerat*, 628, 630, 637; *addiderat*, 637; *finxerat*, 726.

²⁷⁷ *argenteus*, 655; *aurea*, 659, *auro*, 661; *aerates*, 675; *auro*, 675; *ferro*, 701.

²⁷⁸ For the meta-propandistic elements of this shield, see Casali (2006).

Book 9, Mezentius holds an entire flaming tree (51-52).²⁷⁹ In Book 10, he is compared to the Giant-like Orion:

At uero ingentem quatiens Mezentius hastam
turbidus ingreditur campo. quam magnus Orion,
cum pedes incedit medii per maxima Nerei
stagna uiam scindens, umero supereminet undas,
aut summis referens annosam montibus ornum
ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit ...

But Mezentius aggressively enters the field shaking his mighty spear such as when great Orion struts on foot through the deepest parts of the middle of the Ocean, cutting his way. He looms over the waves with his shoulder, or bringing back an aged ash tree from the top of the mountains he walks on the ground and hides his head in the clouds ... (10.762-77)

In addition to Kronenberg's observation that Vergil activates Lucretius' positive characterization of the Giants to make Mezentius a sympathetic character, he also adds to the confusion of sides that occurs in the Gigantomachy. Mezentius is an Etruscan, but yet, the rest of the Etruscans fight on the side of the Trojans.

This theme of the Gigantomachy plays an important role at the culmination of the epic in Book 12. The confusion as to who is an Olympian and who is a Giant continues. As both O'Hara and Hardie have noted, the Rutulian hero Saces describes Aeneas in Olympian terms:

fulminat Aeneas armis summasque minatur
deiecturum arces Italum excidioque daturum,
iamque **faces** ad tecta volant ...

Aeneas **thunders** in his arms and threatens **to cast down the tops** of Italian citadels and bring them destruction. Now **torches fly** towards their roofs. (12.654-6)

Hardie (1986:148) reads this "thundering" language as connecting Aeneas to Jupiter and foreshadowing his future Olympian victory. This image, however, is immediately undercut, I

²⁷⁹ The hurling of trees is a common image in the Gigantomachy: Apollod.16.1. For the imagery in attic pottery, see Hildebrant (2014).

argue, with the siege imagery that follows. As I have shown elsewhere, the Giants were connected with siege-style warfare through their assault on Mt. Olympus.²⁸⁰ In particular, they were associated with throwing burning projectiles.²⁸¹

Later in the Book, the Gigantomachic language surrounding Aeneas recurs:

At pater Aeneas audito nomine Turni
deserit et muros et summas deserit arces
praecipitatque moras omnis, opera omnia rumpit
laetitia exsultans horrendumque **intonat** armis:
quantus Athos aut quantus Eryx aut ipse coruscis
cum **fremet** ilicibus quantus gaudetque nivali
vertice se attollens pater Appenninus ad auras.

But Father Aeneas, after hearing the name of Turnus, deserts the walls and the heights of the citadel and casts aside all delays he breaks off all the siege-works. Leaping with joy he thunders terribly in his arms as much as when Athos or Eryx roars with its shimmering oaks and Father Appennine rejoices in his snowy top, raising himself to the sky. (12.697-703)

Once again Aeneas is equated with Jupiter with the language of “thundering” (*intonat*) as Hardie (1986: 148) notes. O’Hara (2007:100) notes “the conflicting signals” that the subsequent lines convey with the characterizing of Aeneas with mountainous, and therefore Gigantic imagery.

Later in Book 12, Jupiter has sent a bird of ill-omen which makes it clear to Juturna, Turnus’ sister and helper, that there is no hope for the Rutulian. In the following lines, Aeneas is described in Gigantic terms:

Aeneas instat contra telumque coruscat
ingens arboreum ...

Aeneas presses on in opposition and brandishes his mighty tree-like spear.
(12.888-889)

²⁸⁰ Castriota 1992: 193. The Giant-like birds conducting a siege on Mt. Olympus is a pervading theme of Aristophanes’ *Birds* (See Chapter 2). See also Lucr. 1.73, 5.119.

²⁸¹ Apollod. 1.6.1.

Aeneas appears Giant-like in the wielding of his spear since, as I noted elsewhere, Giants frequently use trees as weapons. The roles quickly switch when Turnus utters the famous line: “It’s the gods that frighten me, and Jupiter as an enemy,” (*Di me terrent et Iupiter hostis*, 12.895). Turnus is immediately placed on the side against Jupiter, mainly that of the Giants. Turnus begins to act Giant-like immediately by spying a large rock (*saxum ingens* 12.896). Turnus throws the rock, but his throw misses the mark. Aeneas hurls his spear, and he is colored with both Gigantic and Olympian images:

... et corpore toto
eminus intorquet. **murali** concita numquam
tormento sic **saxa** fremunt nec **fulmine** tanti
dissultant crepitus.

He hurled (the spear) head on with his entire body. Not thus do stones hurled from a siege machine roar, nor does such great the rum burst forth from a thunderbolt (12.920-23)

By a negative comparison, Aeneas is likened to a Giant. The noise that comes from the cast of his spear sounds like stones hurled from a siege machine. The hurling of rocks was a *modus operandi* of the Giants.²⁸² The mention of a siege machine (*murali ... tormento*) strengthens this association as well, since the Giants were besiegers.²⁸³ This image of Aeneas as Giant is immediately inverted in the second half of the simile, however, when his spear throw is compared to thunder, the weapon that Jupiter uses to defeat the Giants. Hardie (1986:147-8) is quick to point out the Olympian connotation of these lines, but ignores the Gigantomachic elements in the first part. Aeneas’ spear strikes Turnus and the Rutulian hero is incapacitated.

... incidit ictus
ingens ad **terram** duplicato poplite Turnus.
consurgunt gemitu Rutuli totusque remugit

²⁸² The rocks “roar” (*fremunt*) – the same verb used of the Giant-like winds of Book 1 (*fremunt* 1.56).

²⁸³ See note 36 above.

mons circum et vocem late nemora alta remittunt.

Gigantic Turnus struck falls to the ground on bended knee. The Rutulians rise up with a groan and the whole mountain all around moans and the deep groves send back their voice. (12.925-929)

In his final moments, Turnus is described as *ingens*, the same adjective used of Giant-like Pandarus in Book 9 (735). The countryside mourns Turnus. There is no explicit mention of the earth mourning Turnus as in the description of Bitias' death at 9.709 discussed above.²⁸⁴ Perhaps there is a subtle reference to Mother Earth with mention of *terra* in line 926. On the one hand, we observe the confusion of who is Gigantic and who is Olympian. Furthermore, in this Book (and throughout the later half of the *Aeneid*), scholars have observed a "twinning" of Aeneas and Turnus.²⁸⁵ This "twinning" also happens in the Gigantomachy and one could easily imagine that "twinning" would be fitting for a civil war allegory.

Conclusion

I hope to have shown the reasons for the Gigantomachy's association with civil war in 1st century Rome, and how Roman poets made use of this association. In earlier Greek sources, the myth can convey a battle between "civilizers" and disorderly beings, but as I have argued in my earlier chapters, there was also a precedent for the myth to connote *stasis*. Augustan propaganda may have hoped to present the civil wars as a conflict against foreign enemies, but poets took advantage of many elements inherent in the myth in order to undermine the "civilizing" narrative. Far from being a simple "chaos vs. order" theme, the Gigantomachy is immensely ambiguous in Augustan poetry. Its inherent connection to civil strife made it a loaded topic for Romans of the 1st century BCE. The location of the civil

²⁸⁴ *dat tellus gemitum et clipeum super intonat ingens.*

²⁸⁵ See Quint 2011 (discussed above).

wars themselves, the Gigantomachy's connection to familial conflict, and the theme of confusion of friend and foe, and protagonist and antagonist, all made this myth morally complicated. The very mention of Gigantomachy in the Augustan era would connote civil war. This topos becomes a controversial reference in a time when Titus Labienus, one of the famous *transfugae* of the 1st century BCE said: "The best defense in the case of civil war is forgetting," (*optima civilis belli defensio oblivio est*, Sen. *Con.*10.35).

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, I have shed light on several of the more complicating themes of the Gigantomachy myth, and how often poets and artists employ the myth to draw attention to complex conflicts or even to subversively undermine propagandistic uses of the myth.

While, in its earlier Greek iterations, the myth had connotations of order triumphing over chaos, there are components of the myth that undermined this idea. Though the myth is often presented as an allegory of Greek victory over “barbarians,” we have many examples in which the myth clearly reflects an internal, civil conflict.

Many of these complicating elements contribute to the myth’s suitability as an analog for civil war. The Gigantomachy myth resonated especially with 1st century BC Romans – given their experience with many civil wars. Throughout these civil wars, opposing parties sought to “other” their opponents by associating them with monstrous creatures. On the surface, the appearance of the Gigantomachy would serve this purpose. Poets like Vergil and Propertius, however, subtly highlight ways that the more ethically troubling aspects of the myth reflect the traumatic aspects of civil strife that Rome experiences. Indeed, it is during the Augustan period that the Gigantomachy becomes nearly synonymous with civil war.

A brief look into the future can show that the Gigantomachy retained this strong association with civil strife and many of its troubling elements. There are numerous opportunities for further research to consider how the framework I have put forth could be applied to poetry in the Imperial era and beyond. The following such topics are examples of questions ripe for further research.

The poetry of Ovid straddles the period between the Augustan and Imperial eras. In his verses, the Gigantomachy is politically fraught. The *Amores*, a poem published not too

long after Augustus' civil wars,²⁸⁶ contains a *recusatio*. At the beginning of his second book, Ovid announces that he plans to write about love, but before he does this, he alludes to an earlier attempt at epic:

Ausus eram, memini, caelestia dicere bella
centimanumque Gyen—et satis oris erat—
 cum male se Tellus ulta est, ingestaque Olympo
 ardua devexum Pelion Ossa tulit.
 in manibus nimbos et cum Iove fulmen habebam,
 quod bene pro caelo mitteret ille suo—
 Clausit amica fores! ego cum Iove fulmen omisi;
 excidit ingenio Iuppiter ipse meo.
 Iuppiter, ignoscas! nil me tua tela iuvabant;
 clausa tuo maius ianua fulmen habet.

I had dared, I remember, to sing of the celestial wars and the **hundred-handed Gyen**—and there was enough voice—when Earth poorly avenged herself, and steep Ossa with Olympus thrown on top bore sloping Pelion. In my hands I was holding the clouds and the thunderbolt with Jupiter, which he hurled well on behalf of his own sky—but my girlfriend closed the doors! I lost my thunderbolt along with Jupiter. Jupiter himself fell from my talents. Jupiter, forgive me! Your weapons do not help me at all. The closed door has a greater thunderbolt than yours. (Ov. *Am.* 2.11-20).

On the surface this passage has a metapoetic aspect to it; the Gigantomachy was often associated with lofty epic.²⁸⁷ Therefore, Ovid indicates that he does not want to engage with a clichéd poetic theme. At the same time, it is not difficult to imagine that Ovid here also references the civil wars of Augustus, and through this *recusatio* he essentially refuses to treat the topic of these traumatic civil wars. Interestingly, one of the figures that Ovid mentions is Gyges, of the Hundred-Handers who changes sides during the Titanomachy. The mention of this figure also complements my overall thesis. As McKeown (1998: ad loc.) notes, “Ovid’s phrasing here is too imprecise to permit us to know on which side Gyges is

²⁸⁶ For the dating of the *Amores*, see McKeown (1987: 74-89).

²⁸⁷ See Innes (1979:166). The Hellenistic poets saw this theme as emblematic of the poetry to which they were opposed. On the Callimachean opposition to the Gigantomachy, see McKeown (1998: ad loc.).

fighting.” I suggest that Ovid’s “imprecision” here is purposeful. Ovid presents the conflict like that of the recent civil wars: it can be difficult to tell who is on your side.

Another politically-charged passage occurs in Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*. Here, the poet ends his survey of the metallic ages with the Gigantomachy:

Neve foret terris securior arduus aether,
adfectasse ferunt **regnum** caeleste gigantas
 altaque congestos struxisse ad sidera montis.
 tum pater omnipotens misso perfregit Olympum
 fulmine et excussit subiectae Pelion Ossae.
 obruta mole sua cum corpora dira iacerent,
 perfusam multo natorum sanguine Terram
 immaduisse ferunt calidumque animasse cruorem
 et, ne nulla suae stirpis monumenta manerent,
 in faciem vertisse hominum; sed et illa propago
 contemptrix superum saevaeque avidissima caedis
 et violenta fuit: scires e sanguine natos.

And lest the lofty air be more secure than the lands, they say that the Giants strove to attain the kingdom in the sky and to have heaped up and piled the mountains to the high stars. Then the all-power father broke Olympus by sending his thunderbolt and he shook Pelion from Ossa which was placed on top of it. When their frightful bodies, weighed down by their own mass, were lying about, they say that Earth became soaked with a great deal of her children’s blood and breathed life into the warm gore, and so there would be a reminder of her own progeny, she turned them into the likeness of humans; but that scion was that race was hateful of the gods above, most desirous of cruel slaughter, and was violent: you would know they were born from blood. (Ov. *Met.* 1.151-62)

It is difficult not to see the connotations of civil strife in this passage. The Giants “strove” (*adfectasse*) for the kingdom in Olympus. As I have discussed elsewhere in this dissertation, the phrase *adfectare regnum* often evokes figures like Julius Caesar who engage in civil war with aspirations of royal power (in the eyes of some).²⁸⁸ The conflict, like Rome’s civil wars, is presented as cyclical as the last lines imply that the generation after the Giants, humankind, will continue to bring on civil war because it is inherently violent (159-162). At the

²⁸⁸ Anderson (1997: ad loc.) notes a possible connection with Julius Caesar.

beginning of the passage that follows this conflict, Jupiter, not without significance, is called “*Saturnius*,” an epithet which may evoke the familial strife associated with Saturn. Ovid then turns to a council of the gods who appear to be analogues of Roman aristocrats. These gods live on Olympus, but Ovid makes a not so subtle comparison to the Palatine hill (1.175-176). In the following lines (177), Jupiter becomes an Augustus figure as he plans to destroy the human race with a flood. He is explicitly compared to Augustus shortly thereafter (200-205). In this example, Ovid, naturally, takes a politically subversive approach in his use of the Gigantomachy.

We can also apply this framework of the Gigantomachy to the poetry of Lucan. Given that Lucan’s poem is about civil war, it should be unsurprising that the Gigantomachy myth is a popular theme within it. At the beginning of the epic, the poet performs an encomium of Nero:

quod si non aliam uenturo fata Neroni
 inuenere uiam magnoque aeterna parantur
 regna deis caelumque suo seruire Tonanti
 non nisi saeuorum potuit post bella gigantum,
 iam nihil, o superi, querimur; scelera ipsa nefasque
 hac mercede placent.

But if the fates could find no other way for Nero’s arrival and the eternal kingdoms were bought by the gods at a hefty price and heaven was prepared to serve its own Tonans not unless after the battles of the savage Giants, we do not complain at all; the crimes and the sacrilege are pleasing at this price. (Luc. 1.32-38)

He directly compares the civil wars to the Gigantomachy. By analogy, the Gigantomachy is “crimes” and “sacrilege” (1.32-38). The sincerity of these lines has been debated by scholars.²⁸⁹ I follow Roche (2009: 7-10 and ad loc.) and find them ironical: the problematic presentation of Nero’s ancestor Caesar throughout the poem makes it very difficult to take

²⁸⁹ For a survey, see Roche (2009: ad 33-66)

this panegyric seriously. How could civil wars ever be seen as a good thing? Roche (2009: ad loc.) also remarks that there were two foreign wars taking place at the time, both of which Lucan could have mentioned, but chose not to. Later in this invocation, Nero appears almost Gigantic. Lucan presents Nero as “seeking the stars” (*astra petes*, 1.46). Note that the verb *petere* can mean “attack” (*OLD* s.v. 2). The Giants were thought to have “sought the stars” in their assault on the heavens: in the Ovid passage cited above, the Giants pile up the mountains “to the stars.” In the passage discussed below, there will be similar imagery and vocabulary when Caesar is compared to Jupiter in the Gigantomachy. Caesar is among the Massilians who wish to avoid participation in his civil war with Pompey:

si caelicolis furor arma dedisset
aut si terrigenae **temptarent astra** gigantes,
non tamen auderet pietas humana uel armis
uel uotis prodesse Ioui, sortisque deorum
ignarum mortale genus per fulmina tantum
sciret adhuc caelo solum regnare **Tonantem**.

If madness granted arms to the sky-dwellers, or if the earthborn Giants were **making an attempt on the stars**, nevertheless human *pietas* would not dare to betray the arms of Jupiter, and the mortal race, ignorant of the lot of the gods, would only know that **Tonans** alone was still reigning in the sky. (Luc. 3.315-320)

The Massilians imply a connection between Caesar and Jupiter. Not just any Jupiter, but Jupiter *Tonans* (*Tonantem*, 320), to whom Nero was compared in the passage cited above. At the same, there is also a description of the Giants attacking the stars (*temptarent astra*, 316). This seems to recall Nero “seeking the stars” in the invocation (*astra petes*, 1.46). In the passage that follows, war does break out, and the “confusion of friend and foe” trope is

prominent throughout the rest of the book. The line between Roman and Massilian is blurred.²⁹⁰

The Gigantomachic language continues throughout the *Pharsalia*, where both Caesar and Pompey each occasionally take on the role of Giant and Olympian interchangeably. At the beginning of the poem, Caesar takes the form of a Jovian thunderbolt that strikes Pompey (1.151-56). In the next book, Caesar hurls rocks into the sea in a Giant-like fashion (2.658-79). Later in the poem, Pompey's men are compared to the Olympians before they battle the Giants (7.144-150). In that same book, Caesar threatens to cast Emathia into the sky (7.797-9). The lack of distinction between Olympian and Giant is prominent throughout Lucan and contributes to the mayhem and confusion that is so common in civil war.

Similarly, Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus all contain Gigantomachic themes that exhibit comparable complexities. One could, however, jump forward in time to examine this interpretation of the Gigantomachy in another area of work: Claudian. Composing during the 5th century CE, this poet was a member of the court of Honorius. One of his poems, the *Rape of Proserpina*, has an opening replete with the language of the Gigantomachy. The epic opens with a speech by Pluto, in which he expresses his anger over not having a wife and makes a threat against Jupiter:

ne pete firmatas pacis dissolvere leges,
 quas dedimus nevitque colus, neu **foedera fratrum**
civili converte tuba. cur **impia** tollis
 signa? quid **incestis aperis Titanibus auras?**
 posce Iovem; dabitur coniunx.

Do not try to break apart ratified laws of peace which we have given and the distaff has spun. Do not overturn **the alliance of brothers** with the **civil** trumpet. Why do you now raise **impious** standards? Why **do you open the sky to the incestuous Titans?** Ask Jove. A wife will be granted. (Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 1.63-7)

²⁹⁰ For the breakdown of the distinction between friend and enemy in this passage, see Hunink (1992: adloc). See also Bartsch (1997: 54) and Rowland (1969).

Pluto threatens Jupiter with war – specifically, a Titanomachic war. The language surrounding this Titanomachy is teeming with language of civil war. Pluto threatens a war that is fraternal (*foedera fratrum*, 64). The trumpet with which Jupiter would summon this war is “civil” (*civili*, 1.65). The standards that Jupiter would raise would be “impious” (*impia*, 65). *Impius* gained a connotation of civil strife in the 1st century BCE.²⁹¹ In the Augustan era, the Gigantomachy had become synonymous with civil war. Since the time of Augustus, civil wars within the Roman empire have occurred frequently for centuries and through Claudian’s own time. It is also possible to view this poem in light of his contemporary political situation. Honorius was the Roman emperor in the West, while his brother Arcadius was emperor in the East. As Gruzelier (1993: ad loc.) notes, these lines may reflect the tension between the two brothers. The Titanomachy is now both civil and global as Claudian expresses anxiety over whether both halves of his world will engage in civil war.

I believe that this framework of the Gigantomachy in my study has the potential to expand beyond the scope of antiquity. Chaudhuri, in the epilogue of his book, ponders the implication that his study of the *Theomachy* might have for Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, a poem that centers on Lucifer’s rebellion against God (2014: 324). In addition to the *Theomachy*, *Paradise Lost* contains significant Gigantomachic imagery.²⁹² My study reveals that poets began to present the Giants in a more sympathetic light as time moved forward. Similarly, Milton creates pathos for Satan in *Paradise Lost*. In this case, it would certainly be worth exploring the political context of the English Civil War that took place during the lifetime of the author.

²⁹¹ Vergil in particular uses *Impius* to denote a civil conflict (Fantham 2011: 563-4).

²⁹² Butler (1998).

These themes can have resonance with recent uses of the myth across art forms, including modern film. In the 2000 sports drama *Remember the Titans*, a football team fights racial inequality in the segregated South of the 1960s. The titular team name is not without significance. At a key moment in the film, the coach delivers an impassioned speech in the locker room before the team faces a team that is thought to be better matched. In an effort to inspire the players, the coach explains the meaning of the team's name:

“In Greek mythology, the Titans were greater even than the gods. They ruled their universe with absolute power. Well, that football field out there, that's our universe. Let's rule it like Titans.”

Though often in mythology the Titans are cast as the villains, the Titans here take on positive associations. The “losers” of mythology eventually become the winners.

As both Agamben (2015: 24) and Armitage (2017: 16, 26) note in their studies on civil war: all wars become civil. Indeed, we are reminded that the Giants have a close connection to humankind. Hesiod heavily implies this idea in the *Theogony* by placing the birth of Giants next to the birth of humans in the same line and giving them a common γένος (50). The two are strikingly similar to Hesiod's “Race of Bronze” in the *Works and Days* (145).²⁹³ The Orphic mysteries find humankind's origins in the soot of the scorched Titans and Dionysus.²⁹⁴ Other traditions indicate that humans are sprung from the blood of the Giants.²⁹⁵ I do not find it surprising that the myth eventually takes on the connotations of the “primal myth” of sibling fighting sibling, much like that of Romulus and Remus or Cain and Abel.

²⁹³ As Clay (2003: 97) observes.

²⁹⁴ Olympiodorus *In Plat. Phaed.* 1.3-6.

²⁹⁵ Schol. ad Apoll. 4.992; Ov. *Met.* 1.157-162. I have suggested that there are other passages that may allude to this myth elsewhere (Chapters 4 and 5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkins, A.W.H. 1972. *Moral Values and Political Behavior in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the End of the Fifth Century*. London.
- Agamben, G. 2015. *Stasis: Civil War as a Political Paradigm*. Stanford.
- Ambler, W. 2012. "Tyranny in Aristophanes's *Birds*," *The Review of Politics* 74.2:195-206.
- Anderson, W.S. 1997. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 1-5*. Norman, OK.
- Ahl, F. 1989. "Homer, Vergil, and Complex Narrative Structures in Latin Epic: An Essay," *Illinois Classical Studies* 14: 1-35.
- Ahl, F.M., M.A. Davis, and A. Pomeroy. 1986. "Silius Italicus," *Aufstieg und der Niedergang der römischen Welt* 1.32.5: 2803-2912.
- Allen, R.E. 1983. *The Attalid Kingdom: A Constitutional History*. Oxford.
- Armitage, D. 2017. *Civil Wars: A History in Ideas*. New York.
- Athanassaki, L. 2010. "Performing Myth through Word, Deed and Image: The Gigantomachy in Euripides' *Ion*," in A.M. González de Tobia, ed., *Mito y Performance: Grecia e la Modernidad* (La Plata), pp. 199-142.
- Augoustakis, A. 2010. *Motherhood and the Other: Fashioning Female Power in Flavian Epic*. Oxford.
- Bakola, E. 2010. *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*. Oxford.
- Bann, S. 1989. *The True Vine: On Visual Representation and the Western Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Bannon, C.J. 1998. *The Brothers of Romulus: Fraternal Pietas in Roman Law, Literature, and Society*. Princeton.
- Bartsch, S. 1997. *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge.
- Berger, E. 1986. *Der Parthenon in Basel: Dokumentation zu den Metopen*. Basel.
- Bettini, M. and M. Lentano. 2013. *Il Mito di Enea: Immagini e Racconti dalla Grecia a oggi*. Turin.
- Blickman, D.R. 1987. "Styx and the Justice of Zeus in Hesiod's *Theogony*," *Phoenix* 41.4: 341-355.

- Boardman, J. 1972. "Herakles, Peisistratos, and his Sons," *Revue Archéologique* 65: 57-72.
- Boardman, J. 1975. "Herakles, Peisistratos, and Eleusis," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 95:1-12.
- Boardman, J. 1978. "Herakles, Delphi, and Kleisthenes of Sikyon," *Revue Archéologique*, 227-334.
- Brock, R. 2013. *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*. London.
- Brockliss, W. 2018. "Olympian Sound in the Catalogue of Women," *The Classical Journal* 113.2.
- Bowra, C.M. 1938. "Xenophanes, Fragment 1," *Classical Philology*. 33:4.
- Bowra, C.M. 1957. "Melinno's Hymn to Rome," *Journal of Roman Studies* 47.1/2: 21-28.
- Buccheit, V. 1963. *Vergil über die Sendung Roms: Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum un Zur Aeneis*. Heidelberg.
- Brown, R. 1995. "Livy's Sabine Women and the Ideal of Concordia," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 125: 291-319.
- Butler, G.F. 1998. "Giants and Fallen Angels in Dante and Milton: the *Commedia* and the Gigantomachy in *Paradise Lost*," *Modern Philology* 95.3: 352-363.
- Binder, G. 1971. *Aeneas und Augustus. Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aenis*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Camps, W.A. 1969. *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Cameron, H.D. 1970. "The Power of Words in the *Seven Against Thebes*," *Transactions of the American Philological Society* 101: 95-118.
- Casali, S. 2013. "Facta Impia (Vergil, Aeneid 4.596-9)" *The Classical Quarterly* 49.1: 203-211.
- Carne-Ross, D.S. 1985. *Pindar*. New Haven.
- Carpenter, T. H. 2003. *Dionysian Imagery in Fifth-century Athens*. Oxford.
- Casali, S. 2006. "The Making of the Shield: Inspiration and Repression in the *Aeneid*," *Greece & Rome* 53.2: 185-204.
- Castriota, D. 1992. *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in 5th Century Athens*. Madison.

- Champion, C. 2000. "Romans as BAPBAPOI: Three Polybian Speeches and the Politics of Cultural Indeterminacy," *Classical Philology* 95.4: 425-444.
- Chaudhuri, P. 2014. *The War with God: Theomachy in Roman Imperial Poetry*. Oxford.
- Christenson, D. 2014. "Superbia in Vergil's *Aeneid*: Who's Haughty, Who's not?" *Scholia* 11: 44-54.
- Christenson, D. 2014. "A Roman *Thesaurus*: Religion, Marriage, Metatheater, and Concord in *Aulularia*," in I.N. Perysinakis and E. Karakasis, eds., *Plautine Trends: Studies in Plautine Comedy and its Reception* (Berlin).
- Clauss, J. J. 1986, "Lies and Allusions: The Addressee and Date of Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus." *Classical Antiquity* 5.2: 155-170.
- Clauss, J.J. 2016. "The Hercules and Cacus Episode in Augustan Literature: Engaging the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* in Light of Callimachus' and Apollonius' Reception," in A. Faulkner, A. Vergados, and A. Schwab, eds., *Reception of the Homeric Hymns*, (Oxford), pp. 55-79.
- Clay, D. 1991. "Lucretius' Gigantomachy," in K.A. Agra, M.H. Koenen, and P.H. Schrijvers, eds., *Lucretius and his Intellectual Background*, (Amsterdam), pp. 187-192.
- Clay, J.S. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.
- Collard, C. 1991. *Euripides: Hecuba*. Warminster.
- Cruttwell, R.W. *Vergil's Mind at Work: An Analysis of the Symbolism of the Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Deacy, S. 2005. "Herakles and his 'Girl': Athena, Heroism and Beyond," in L. Rawlings and H. Bowden, eds., *Herakles and Hercules: Exploring a Greco-Roman Divinity* (Swansea), pp. 37-50.
- Deacy, S. 2016. "'We Call her Pallas, You Know': Naming, Taming, and the Construction of Athena in Greek Culture and Thought," *Revue D'Études Antiques* 100: 59-72.
- Dufallo, B. 2013. *Captor's Image: Greek Culture in Roman Ecphrasis*. Oxford.
- Dumézil, G. 1996. *La religion romaine archaïque*. Paris.
- Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford.
- Edson, C. 1948. "Philip V and Alcaeus of Messene," *Classical Philology* 43.2: 116-121.
- Epstein, D. 1987. *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics*. New York.

- Evans, J.D. 1987. "The Sicilian Coinage of Sextus Pompeius (Crawford 511)." *The American Numismatics Society Museum Notes* 32: 97-157.
- Fantham, E. 2011. *Roman Readings: Roman Response to Greek Literature from Plautus to Statius to Quintilian*. Berlin.
- Fearn, D. 2007. *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*. Oxford.
- Flores, E. 2014. *Commentario a Gn. Naevi Bellum Poenicum*. Naples.
- Folwer, D. 1989. "Lucretius and Politics," in M. Griffin and J. Barnes, eds., *Philosophia Togata* (Oxford), pp.120-50.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca, NY.
- Ford, A. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.
- Fraenkel, E. 1954. "The Giants in the Poem of Naevius," *Journal of Roman Studies* 44:14-17.
- Fränkel, H. 1935. "Griechische Bildung in altrömische Epen II," *Hermes* 70: 59-72.
- Feeney, D. 2008. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge,
- Feeney, D. 2016. *Beyond Greek: The Beginnings of Latin Literature*. Cambridge, MA.
- Fenik, B. 1986. *Homer and the Nibelungenlied*. Cambridge, Ma.
- Ferrari, G. 1994. "Heracles, Peisistratus, and the Panathenaea," *Mètis* 9-10: 219-226.
- Ferrari, G. 2000. "The Ilioupersis in Athens," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100: 119-150.
- Fuchs, G. 1969. *Architekturdarstellungen auf römischen Münzen*. Berlin.
- Fontenrose, J. 1959. *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins*. Berkeley.
- Gale, M. 1994. *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge.
- Gale, M. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Gale, M. 2003. "Poetry and Backward Glance in Vergil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*."

- Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133: 323-352.
- Gregory, J. 1999. *Euripides: Hecuba. Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Graillot, H. 1912. *Le culte de Cybele mere des dieux, à Rome et dans l'empire romain*. Paris.
- Green, P. 1990. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*. Berkeley.
- Gentili, and C. Prato, eds. 1979. *Poetae Elegiaci. Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Giusepetti, M. 2013. *L'Isola esile: Studi sull' Inno a Delo di Callimaco*. Rome.
- Giusti, E. 2018. *Carthage in Virgil's Aeneid: Staging the Enemy under Augustus*. Cambridge.
- Goldberg, S. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Goldschmidt, N. 2013. *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Goslin, O. 2010. "Hesiod's Typhonomachy and the Ordering of Sound," *TAPA* 140: 351-373.
- Griffith, M. 1983. *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1960. *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*. Liverpool.
- Groeneboom, P. 1928. *Aischylos: Prometheus*. Gronigen.
- Grueber, H.A. 1910. *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*. London.
- Gruzelier, C. 1993. *Claudian: De Raptu Proserpinae*. Oxford.
- Gurval, R.A. 1995. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor.
- Gransden, K.W. 1976. *Virgil: Aeneid Book VIII*. Cambridge.
- Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Hall, J. 2001. "Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Identity," I. Malkin, ed., *Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, (Cambridge, MA), pp. 159-186.
- Hall, J. 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago.
- Hall, J. 2004. "How 'Greek' were the Western Greeks," in K. Lomas, *Greek Identity in the*

- Western Mediterranean*, (Leiden), pp. 55-81.
- Hansen, E.V. 1971. *The Attalids of Pergamum*. 2nd ed. Ithaca and London.
- Haüßler, R. 1976. *Das Historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil*. Heidelberg.
- Hardie, P.R. 1986. *Vergil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- Henrington, C.J. 1955. *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias: A study in the Religion of Periclean Athens*. Manchester.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. 1972. *Le Vocabulaire latin des relations des partis politiques sous la République*. Paris.
- Henderson, J. 1997. "Mass versus Elite and the Comic Heroism of Peisetairos," in G. Dobrov, ed., *Aristophanes and Athens* (Chapel Hill), pp. 135-148.
- Herter, H. 1956. "Das Symposion des Xenophanes," *Weiner Studien* 69: 33-48.
- Heyworth, S.J. 2008. *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford.
- Hildebrandt, F. 2014. "The Gigantomachy in Attic and Apulian Vase-Painting. A New Look at Similarities, Differences, and Origins" in J. Oakley, ed., *Athenian Potters and Painters III* (Barnsley), pp. 73-80.
- Hölbl, G.A. 2001. *History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. London.
- Hunink, V. 1992. *Lucan: Bellum Civile Book III, a Commentary*. Gieben.
- Hutchinson, G.O. 1985. *The Seven Against Thebes*. Oxford.
- Innes, D.C. 1979. "The Gigantomachy and Natural Philosophy," *Classical Quarterly* 29: 165-71
- Jocelyn, H.D. 1969. "The Poet Gn. Naevius, P. Cornelius Scipio, and Q. Caecilius Metellus," *Antichthon* 3: 32-47.
- Johnson, W.R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Chicago.
- Johnston, P.A. 1977. "Vergil's Conception of Saturnus," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 10: 57-70.
- Kähler, H. 1948. *Der Große Fries von Pergamon*. Berlin.
- Koenen, L. 1959. "ΘΕΟΙΣΙΝ ΕΧΘΡΟΣ: Ein eiheimischer Gegenkönig in Ägypten," *Chronique D'Egypte* 34: 108-24.

- Kowalzig, B. 2008. "Nothing to Do with Demeter? Something to Do with Sicily! Theatre and Society in the Early Fifth-Century West," in M. Revermann and P. Wilson, eds., *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honor of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford), pp. 128-157.
- Kranz, W. 1934. "Vorsokratisches I," *Hermes* 69: 114-19.
- Kronenberg, L. 2005. "Mezentius the Epicurean," *Transactions of the American Philological Society* 135.2: 403-431.
- Kunze, M. 1990. "Neue Beobachtungen zum Pergamonaltar," in B. Andreae, ed., *Phrymarchos-Probleme. Mit einem Anhang zur Datierung des grossen Altares von Pergamo* (Mainz), pp.123-39.
- La Penna, A. 2002. "La collana di Armonia e il bálteo di Pallante: una nota su Vergilio e Accio," *Maia* 54: 259-262.
- Lang, M. 1983. "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*," in C. Rubino and C. Shelmerdine, eds., *Approaches to Homer* (Austin), pp. 140-164.
- Lee, 1997. K.H. *Euripides: Ion*. Oxford.
- Lenieks, V. 1996. *City of Dionysus: A Study of Euripides' Bakchai*. Stuttgart.
- Linderski, J. 2002. "The Pontiff and the Tribune: The Death of Tiberius Gracchus," *Athenaeum* 90: 339-66.
- Lombardi, M. 2012. "Chaos e Ade in Hes. *Th.* 720-819," *Hermes* 140.1: 1-24.
- Long, H. 1958. "Notes on Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 102.3: 229-280.
- Loraux, N. 1997. *La Cité Divisée: l'oubli dans la mémoire de l'Athènes*. Paris.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1979. *Aeschylus: Oresteia*. London.
- Luck, G. 1983. "Naevius and Vergil," *Illinois Classical Studies* 8.2: 67-273.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Macroni, C. 2004. "Kosmos: The Imagery of the Archaic Greek Temple," *Anthropology and Aesthetics* 45: 211-224.
- Maehler, H. 2004. *Bacchylides: A Selection*. Cambridge.
- Massa-Pairault, F. 2007. *La gigantomachie de Pergame ou l'image du monde*. Athens.

- Marmorale, E.V. 1950. *Naevius Poeta: Introduzione, Bibliographia, testo dei frammenti e commento*. 2nd ed. Florence.
- Martin, G. 2018. *Eurpides, "Ion": Edition and Commentary*. Berlin.
- Marks, R.D. 2010. "Silius and Lucan," in A. Augostakis, ed., *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus* (Leiden), pp. 127-53.
- Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*. Cambridge.
- Mastronarde, D.J. 1975. "Iconography and Imagery in Eurpides' *Ion*," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8: 163-76.
- Mayer, M. 1887. *Die Giganten und die Titanen in der Antiken Sagen und Kunst*. Berlin.
- McKeown, J.C. 1987. *Ovid: Amores. Volume I. Text and Prolegomena*. Liverpool.
- McKeown, J.C. 1998. *Ovid: Amores. Volume III. A Commentary on Book II*. Liverpool.
- Melchior, A. 2010. "The Enemy in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*," in R. Rosen and I. Sluiter, eds., *Valuing Others in Antiquity* (Leiden), pp. 391-417.
- Mineur, W.H. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos*. Leiden.
- Mitchell, L. 2007. *Panhellenism and the Barbarian*. Swansea.
- Mitchell, S. 2003. "The Galatians: Representations and Reality," in A. Erskine, ed., *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Oxford), pp. 280-93.
- Momigliano, A. 1942. "Terra Marique," *Journal of Roman Studies* 32: 1 & 2: 53-64.
- Moore, M. 1995. "The Central Group in the Gigantomachy of the Old Athena Temple on the Acropolis," *American Journal of Archaeology* 99.4: 633-9.
- Moreno, P. 1994. *Scultura ellenistica*. 2 vols. Rome.
- Morgan, L. 1998. "Assimilation and Civil War: Hercules and Cacus: *Aeneid* 8," in H.-P. Stahl, ed., *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan and Political Context* (London), pp. 175-197.
- Mullen, W. 1973-74. "Pindar and Athens: A Reading in the Aeginetan Odes," *Arion* 1.3: 446-95.
- Munson, R. 2001. *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus*. Ann Arbor.

- Nachtergaele, G. 1977. *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes: recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques*. Brussels.
- Neel, J. 2015. *Legendary Rivals: Collegiality and Ambition in the Tales of Early Rome*. Leiden.
- Nisbet, R.G.M and M. Hubbard. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. and N. Rudd. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*. Oxford.
- Obbink, D. 2005. "4708. Archilochus, elegies (more of VI 854 and XXX 2507)", *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* Vol. LXIX: 1942.
- Ogden, D. 2013. *Drakōn: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman World*. Oxford.
- O'Hara, J. 1994. "They Might be Giants: Inconsistency and Indeterminacy in Vergil's War in Italy," *Colby Quarterly* 30.3: 206-226.
- O'Hara, J. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Cambridge.
- Olson, S.D. 2007. *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy*. Oxford.
- Panoussi, V. 2009. *Greek Tragedy in Vergil's "Aeneid": Ritual, Empire, and Intertext*. Cambridge.
- Park and Boardman, H.W. and J. Boardman. 1957. "The Struggle for the Tripod and the First Sacred War," *Journal for Hellenic Studies* 77: 276-82.
- Peterson, L. 2016. "The Place of Roman Isis: Between Egyptomania, Politics, and Religion," *Oxford Handbooks Online*.
- Pollit, J.J. 1972. *Art and Experience in Classical Greece*. Cambridge.
- Pollitt, J.J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Era*. Cambridge.
- Powell, A. 2008. *Virgil the Partisan*. Swansea.
- Prag, J.R.W 2010. "Tyrannizing Sicily: The Despots Who Cried 'Carthage!'" in A. Turner, K.O. Chong-Gossard, and F. Vervaeke, *Private and Public Lies: The Discourse of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World* (Leiden), pp. 52-71.
- Price, J. 2001. *Thucydides and Internal War*. Cambridge.
- Pucci, P. 2009. "Poetry of the *Theogony*," in F. Montanari, Chr. Tsangalis, and A. Rengakos,

- Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden), pp. 37-70.
- Quint, D. 2001. "Virgil's Double Cross: Chiasmus in the *Aeneid*," *American Journal of Philology* 132.2: 273-300.
- Reed, J.D. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton.
- Richardson, L. 1977. *Propertius: Elegies I-IV*. Norman, OK.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1992. "Images of Athena on the Acropolis," in J. Neils, ed., *Goddess in the Polis: Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Princeton), pp. 119-142.
- Rodenwalt, G. 1939. *Die Bildwerke des Artemistempels von Kokyra*. Berlin.
- Roller, L.E. 1999. *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of the Anatolian Cybele*. Berkeley.
- Rosivatch, V.J. 1977. "Earthborns and Olympians: the Parados of the Ion," *The Classical Quarterly* 27.2: 284-294.
- Roussel, D. 1970. *Les Siciliens entre les Romains et les Carthaginois à l'époque de la première guerre punique*. Paris.
- Rouveret, 1989. *Histoire et imaginaire de la peinture ancienne*. Rome.
- Russel, D.A. 1981. *Criticism in Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Rowland, R.J. 1969. "The Significance of Massilia in Lucan," *Hermes* 97: 204-8.
- Ryberg, I.S. 1931, "Was the Capitoline Triad Etruscan or Italic?" *The American Journal of Philology* 52.2: 145-156.
- Scafoglio, G. 2013. "The Betrayal," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53: 1-14.
- Schauenburg, K. 1960. *Perseus in der Kunst des Altertums*. Bonn.
- Schmitt, C. 1996. *The Concept of the Political*. Trans. G. Schwab. Chicago.
- Schnepf, H. 1959. "Das Herculesabanteuer in Virgils Aeneis (VIII 184ff.)," *Gymnasium* 66: 250-68.
- Sear, D.R. 1998. *The History of the Coinage of the Roman Imperators 49-27 BC*. London.
- Sharpless, A. 2016. "Animals and Animalism in the Gigantomachy," (paper read at the "Into the Wild: Flora and Fauna in the Classical World" graduate conference at UCLA, October 22)

- Shear, J.L. 2012. "The Tyrannicides, their Cult and the Panathenaia," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 132: 107-119.
- Skutsch, O. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.
- Smith, S. 2007. "Brutus as an Earthborn Founder of Rome (Livy 1.56)," *Mnemosyne* 60.2: 285-293.
- Solmsen, F. *Hesiod and Aeschylus*. New York.
- Sommerstein, A. 1989. *Aeschylus: Eumenides*. Cambridge.
- Stamatopoulou, Z. 2012. "Weaving Titans for Athena: Euripides and the Panathenaic *Peplos* (*Hec.* 466-74 and *IT* 218-24)" *Classical Quarterly* 62.1: 72-80.
- Sutton, D. 1977. "The Greek Origins of the Cacus Myth," *The Classics Quarterly* 27.2: 391-3.
- Stewart, A. 1993. "Narration and Allusion in the Hellenistic Baroque," in P.J. Holliday, ed., *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art* (Cambridge), pp. 130-174.
- Stewart, A. 1997. *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Stewart, A. 2001. "Pergamo Ara Marmorea Magna: On the Date, Reconstruction, and Function of the the Great Altar of Pergamon," in N.T. de Grummond, ed., *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: Sculpture in Context* (Berkeley), pp. 32-57.
- Stephens, S.A. 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley.
- Stephens, S.A. 2015. *Callimachus: The Hymns*. Oxford.
- Strzelecki, W. 1964. *Belli Punici carmina quae supersunt*. Leipzig.
- Tarbell, F.B. 1920. "Centauromachy and Amazonomachy in Greek Art: The Reason for the Popularity," *American Journal of Archaeology* 24: 226-31.
- Tarrant, R. 2012. *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII*. Cambridge.
- Thomas. R.F. 1980. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90: 171-198.
- Thomas. R. F. 1988. *Virgil: Georgics*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Tipping, A. 2010. *Exemplary Epic: Silius Italicus' Punica*. Oxford.

- Vian F. 1952a. *La Guerre des Géants: le Mythe Avant l'Époque Hellénistique*. Paris.
- Vian, F. 1952b. "La Guerre des Géants devant les penseurs de l'antiquité," *Revue des Études Grecques* 65: 1-39.
- Vian, F. and M.B. Moore. 1988. "Gigantes" *LIMC* vol. 4.1: 191-270.
- Vian, F. 2005. "Le syncrétisme et l'évolution de la Gigantomachie," in D. Accorinti, ed., *L'épopée posthomerique: Recueil d'études* (Alessandria), pp. 197-207.
- Wade-Gery, H.T. 1932. "Thucydides the Son Melesias." *Journal for Hellenic Studies* 52: 205-227.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1985. "Propaganda and Dissent? Augustan Moral Legislation and the Love Poets," *Klio* 67.1: 180-4.
- Walbank, F.W. 1942. "Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome, Part I," *Classical Quarterly* 36: 134-145.
- Walbank, F.W. 1943. "Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome, Part II," *Classical Quarterly* 37: 1-13.
- Watrous, L. 1982. "The Sculptural Program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi," *American Journal of Archaeology* 86: 159-72.
- Weimer, C. 2015. "Alpheius of Mytilene and Some Responses to Rome," (paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Boulder, CO).
- West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2002. "Written on the Body: Ekphrasis, Perception, and Deception in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*," *Ramus* 31.1-2: 111-125.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.
- Willcock, M.M. 1984. *The Iliad of Homer: Books XIII – XXIV*. London.
- Williams, R.D. 1972. *Virgil: Aeneid I-VI*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1955. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1985. *Catullus and his World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor.