



**Grau de Filologia Clàssica**

**Treball de Fi de Grau**

**Curs 2022-2023**

**Happiness in the Archaic Period:  
A comprehensive analysis of the evolution of happiness-related  
keywords during the Archaic Period**

**NOM DE L'ESTUDIANT: Isaac Allen Rutter**

**NOM DEL TUTOR: Sergi Grau Guijarro**





## Declaració d'autoria

Amb aquest escrit declaro que soc l'autor/autora original d'aquest treball i que no he emprat per a la seva elaboració cap altra font, incloses fonts d'Internet i altres mitjans electrònics, a part de les indicades. En el treball he assenyalat com a tals totes les citacions, literals o de contingut, que procedeixen d'altres obres. Tinc coneixement que d'altra manera, i segons el que s'indica a l'article 18 del capítol 5 de les Normes reguladores de l'avaluació i de la qualificació dels aprenentatges de la UB, l'avaluació comporta la qualificació de "Suspens".

Barcelona, a 19 de juny de 2023

Signatura:

## **Happiness in the Archaic Period:**

A comprehensive analysis of the evolution of happiness-related keywords during the Archaic Period

Isaac Allen Rutter  
Universitat de Barcelona

**Resum:** Aristòtil considera εὐδαιμονία com el bé superior de la vida humana i com un benestar que prové de l'assoliment del potencial d'un mateix. La definició d'Aristòtil d'εὐδαιμονία a l'*Ètica a Nicòmac* va aportar una comprensió concreta d'un concepte que, abans, no tenia una definició uniforme. Per compensar aquesta absència, aquest treball pretén descobrir el significat de la felicitat en l'època arcaica. La recerca consisteix en una anàlisi profunda dels principals adjectius relacionats amb la felicitat utilitzats en l'època arcaica com ara εὐδαίμων, μάκαρ, ὄλβιος i εὐτυχής. L'anàlisi engloba diferents autors i gèneres, tractant la felicitat segons Homer, Hesíode, Soló, Safo, Píndar, Heròdot i Demòcrit. Aquest treball ofereix un estudi de l'ús de cada autor de les paraules relacionades amb la felicitat, així com una anàlisi de l'evolució dels termes per aportar una comprensió més ampla del seu significat en aquesta època.

**Paraules clau:** felicitat, època arcaica, εὐδαιμονία, μάκαρ, ὄλβιος, εὐτυχής.

**Abstract:** According to Aristotle, εὐδαιμονία is the highest good of human life. It comes from a life-long exercise to fulfill one's potential. Aristotle's definition of εὐδαιμονία in the *Nicomachean Ethics* provided a concrete understanding of a concept that, previously, lacked a concrete definition. To make up for this absence, this work sets out to find answers to what happiness first meant in the Archaic Period. The research consists of an analysis of the main words relating to happiness which were used in the Archaic Period such as εὐδαίμων, μάκαρ, ὄλβιος and εὐτυχής. The analysis touches on different authors and genres by examining happiness according to Homer, Hesiod, Solon, Sappho, Pindar, Herodotus and Democritus. This work provides an examination of each author's usage of happiness-related keywords, as well as an analysis of their evolution to provide an understanding of what meanings these words had during this period.

**Key words:** happiness, Archaic Period, εὐδαιμονία, μάκαρ, ὄλβιος, εὐτυχής.

# INDEX

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. HAPPINESS IN THE EPIC GENRE.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1. <i>Happiness in Homer</i> .....	2
2.2. <i>Happiness in Hesiod</i> .....	10
<b>3. HAPPINESS IN THE LYRIC GENRE.....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1. <i>Happiness in Solon</i> .....	15
3.2. <i>Happiness in Sappho</i> .....	18
3.3. <i>Happiness in Pindar</i> .....	20
<b>4. HAPPINESS IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY GENRE.....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1. <i>Happiness in Herodotus</i> .....	27
<b>5. HAPPINESS IN PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY.....</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1. <i>Happiness in Democritus</i> .....	34
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>36</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout human history, few ideas have captured people's minds as much as the pursuit of happiness. The quest for happiness has been a topic of study for many philosophers and intellectuals throughout different cultures and ages. However, the first person to embrace the study of happiness with remarkable depth was the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle. From the 4th century BC, Aristotle tried to map out a concrete definition of what happiness consisted of in order to try and comprehend its role in human daily lives.

Firstly, εὐδαιμονία is formed by εὖ and δαίμων. Autenrieth defines δαίμων as: “divinity, divine power; sometimes equivalent to θεός, but esp. of the gods in their dealings with men.”<sup>1</sup> Bailly defines it as, “celui qui distribue à chacun son lot, son sort.”<sup>2</sup> In this way, etymologically its meaning would be something like ‘being good with god’, as in having a good relationship with a divinity who determines their fortune.

According to Aristotle, εὐδαιμονία is the highest good in life and represents the ultimate goal of a human being. It is not a momentary satisfaction as some understand happiness nowadays. It is a life-long pursuit and is achieved by mastering certain virtuous habits or qualities that fulfil one's potential. Aristotle considered generosity, a sense of justice and wisdom to be virtuous qualities that a happy man should acquire. Even though it is generally translated as ‘happiness’, a more adequate translation could be ‘fulfilment’. Aristotle says that young boys cannot call themselves εὐδαίμονες, because they are too young to have a fulfilled life<sup>3</sup>. In addition because Aristotle thinks that εὐδαιμονία lies in the actions of a person and not just in their way of thinking, a certain degree of good fortune, εὐτυχία, is a necessary component to εὐδαιμονία. Without certain resources, it is hard to carry out good deeds and without these a person cannot experience true εὐδαιμονία. However, even if someone is very wealthy this will not make them εὐδαίμων. Even the greatest wealth cannot make a miserable person happy because true happiness can only be attained through constant exercise of one's best qualities to construct a character that is virtuous. Effectively, Aristotle states that happiness demands both total virtue and a whole lifespan to achieve: δεῖ γάρ, ὥσπερ εἶπομεν, καὶ ἀρετῆς τελείας καὶ βίου τελείου (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1100a).

---

<sup>1</sup> Autenrieth, Georg. (1891). δαίμων. In *A Homeric Dictionary for Schools and Colleges*. Harper and Brothers.

<sup>2</sup> Bailly, Anatole. (2000). δαίμων. In *Dictionnaire Grec-Français*. Hachette.

<sup>3</sup> Here is the original text from *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1100a.1-1100a.5: that explains this: διὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν οὐδὲ πᾶς εὐδαίμων ἐστίν οὐπω γὰρ πρακτικὸς τῶν τοιούτων διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν οἱ δὲ λεγόμενοι διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα μακαρίζονται. δεῖ γάρ, ὥσπερ εἶπομεν, καὶ ἀρετῆς τελείας καὶ βίου τελείου.

Aristotle, with his studies on εὐδαιμονία, managed to achieve a specific definition of what seemed such a multifaceted concept. However, prior to Aristotle, in the Archaic Period, there is a lack of a systematic definition of happiness. The absence of a precise definition makes the study of previous Greek interpretations all the more relevant. This investigation traces the intellectual lineage that led to Aristotle constructing his own definition of εὐδαιμονία.

Firstly, the main objective of this work is to examine the concepts relating to happiness that were used in this period to see what meaning they have and how these words evolve over time. This examination will lead to an understanding of each author's individual idea of happiness and also, a broader picture of what was considered to be happiness in the Archaic Period.

To accomplish this objective, the research will be focused on the most important words relating to the idea of happiness such as εὐδαίμων, μάκαρ, ὄλβιος and εὐτυχής. The scope of the investigation will include a careful selection of the most significant authors of this period and the most important genres of different ages to provide a deeper understanding.

With regards to the structure of this work, there are six main sections. Following this section, there is the analysis of happiness in the epic genre by delving into Homer's and Hesiod's works. Subsequent sections explore the idea of happiness in the lyric genre by examining Solon's, Sappho's and Pindar's works. After these sections, there is the analysis of happiness in Historiography which focuses on Herodotus. The penultimate section will examine the idea of happiness in presocratic philosophy with an analysis of Democritus' philosophical reflections. Finally, the sixth and final section includes the conclusions based on the research conducted throughout the work with the aim to determine what understanding of happiness existed in the Archaic Period.

## **2. HAPPINESS IN THE EPIC GENRE**

### *2.1. Happiness in Homer*

The writing of the two epic poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are attributed to Homer, although there is mystery surrounding Homer's identity and the exact origins of his works<sup>4</sup>.

Turning firstly to the *Iliad*, it describes the ten-year Trojan War between the city of Troy and a confederation of Greek states. Achilles, a warrior whose rage (μῆνις) significantly

---

<sup>4</sup> For more about the Homeric Question, see Nagy, Gregory. (2004).

influences the course of the war, serves as the poem's main theme. The *Iliad* starts with the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon, the commander of the Greek army, over the captured lady, Briseis. Due to Achilles' decision to stop fighting, the Greek army suffers great losses. The Trojans, guided by Hector, start to triumph, but the situation changes when Achilles re-enters the war and assassinates Hector. Hector's funeral and Achilles' reconciliation with the Greek army mark the poem's conclusion.

The *Odyssey* tells the tale of Odysseus, a Greek hero who, after being absent for ten years after the Trojan War, is trying to find his way back home. During his return home to Ithaca (νόστος), Odysseus is faced with a number of difficulties, including conflicts with mythical creatures, temptation by seductive women that lead him astray from his objective and the fury of the sea god, Poseidon. Back in Ithaca, Odysseus' wife, Penelope, and son, Telemachus, are fending off suitors who are fighting for Penelope's hand in marriage and attempting to take Odysseus' place. Odysseus eventually returns to Ithaca, assassinates the suitors and reunites with his family with the help and guidance of the goddess Athena.

In these epic poems, the characters are heroes, therefore, in the first place, it is important to try to pinpoint exactly what a hero is. To begin with, heroes are demi-gods who are physically superior to humans and are capable of amazing acts which appear unachievable. However, it is important to highlight that these heroes are mortal.<sup>5</sup> A hero strives for glory (κλέος), recognition and respect and they would sooner die in the pursuit of this goal than lose their honour and not be remembered. "This word (κλέος) was used in ancient Greek poetry or song to refer to the poetry or the song that glorifies the heroes of the distant heroic past."<sup>6</sup>

The striving for κλέος is part of the heroic mentality. All heroes have this heroic mindset. There is no doubt that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* portray different prototypes of hero due to the different contexts. On the one hand, Odysseus, in the *Odyssey*, is venturing into unknown territory and battling monsters or otherworldly creatures. On the other hand, Achilles, in the *Iliad*, is fighting in a great war with fellow warriors. As Finkelberg states: "To sum up, either Homeric poem offers its own version of heroism. In the *Iliad* being a hero amounts to readiness to meet death on the battlefield. [...] According to the *Odyssey* a hero is one who is prepared to go through life enduring toil and suffering."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 11.

<sup>6</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 26.

<sup>7</sup> Finkelberg, Margalit. (1995), p. 12.

In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the protagonists have to deal with extreme situations. In the Homeric world, human affairs result from chance and are unstable. It is up to the gods to dispense good fortune or bad. Achilles, in verses 529-533 of Book XXIV of the *Iliad*, talks about the inexorable fate and the suffering of mortals. Achilles conveys the idea of luck and fortune by using the image of Zeus holding two urns, one for good happenings and the other for bad ones (δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει δῶρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων). Zeus generally dispenses a mix of the good and the bad to humans (ὧ μὲν κ' ἀμμίξας δῶη Ζεὺς τερπικέραυτος, ἄλλοτε μὲν τε κακῶ ὅ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῶ), even though he can give more bad happenings than good to some. Andersen puts forward the verses 210-12<sup>8</sup> of Book XXIII of the *Odyssey*, where Penelope exclaims that the gods have given her and Odysseus sorrow out of jealousy because they did not want them to be together and enjoy their youth (θεοὶ δ' ὄπαζον οἰζύν, οἱ νῶϊν ἀγάσαντο παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντε ἥβης ταρπῆναι καὶ γήραος οὐδὸν ἰκέσθαι). Here the topic of gods being jealous of mortals and rerouting their destiny for their own consolation can be appreciated.

Having clarified the concepts of hero, it is now necessary to examine the notion of happiness in Homer. As De Heer says: “the object of the heroic way of life was at the same time the object of their pursuit of happiness.”<sup>9</sup> To begin with, in Homer, there is no trace of the noun εὐδαιμονία or of the adjective εὐδαίμων. The two principal words that are widely translated as ‘happy’ are the adjectives, μάκαρ and ὄλβιος.

The adjective, μάκαρ, appears mostly accompanying the noun θεός, as exemplified by the following passages of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In the *Iliad*, verses 338-339 of Book I, there is a passage where Achilles is talking to the heralds sent by Agamemnon: τῶ δ' αὐτὸ μάρτυροι ἔστων πρὸς τε θεῶν μακάρων πρὸς τε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων. There is a clear contrast between the adjective μάκαρ for gods and the adjective θνητός for humans. In the *Odyssey*, verse 7 of Book V, Athena implores Zeus and the rest of the gods using the adjective μάκαρ: Ζεῦ πάτερ ἢ δ' ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες. Here, it is interesting to point out the adverb, αἰὲν. The gods, in contrast to humans, enjoy a perpetual state of comfort and stability. They are not worried about toil or loss as humans are and do not suffer the direct despair and grief that comes with war or with being far-away from home and family. De Heer puts forward verses 42-46 of Book VI of the *Odyssey* where it is explained how Athena goes back to the

---

<sup>8</sup> Andersen, Øivind (2011), p. 6.

<sup>9</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 1.



Olympus, an abode that is always safe (ἀσφαλές)<sup>10</sup>. Wind, rain or snow never have an impact (οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρω δεύεται οὔτε χιῶν ἐπιίλνεται) and the sky is always clear (μάλ' αἴθρη πέπταται ἀνέφελος). The gods enjoy their lives there and are always μάκαρ (τῷ ἔνι τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ἥματα πάντα). Compared to Odysseus' journey which is full of violent winds and obstacles, the lives of the gods are stable and storm-free. The accusative ἥματα πάντα represents this stability in the same way the adverb αἰὲν did before. It can be gathered that the adjective μάκαρ represents a type of happiness related to stability from adversity, intrinsically related to the security that the divine enjoy.

However, even though it is not as common, Homer does use the adjective μάκαρ for humans in some instances such as the following two examples. In verses 67-69 of Book XI of the *Iliad*, the fight of the Trojans and the Greeks is compared to the image of reapers working on each side of a μάκαρ man's field of wheat or barley (οἱ δ', ὥς τ' ἀμητῆρες ἐναντίοι ἀλλήλοισιν ὄγμον ἐλαύνωσιν ἀνδρὸς μάκαρος κατ' ἄρουραν πυρῶν ἢ κριθῶν). They cut through the crops as they work, dropping tons of grains as they go. This use of μάκαρ stands out from the others. It can be inferred that this use of μάκαρ for a human is because he is living a life that is similar to the divine. His work is being done for him and he does not need to worry about working for food, a similar situation to the gods. This farmer simply has to watch how his crops are reaped, similar to how gods watch humans work. De Heer puts down the use of this adjective to the fact that this human is self-sustainable. He is μάκαρ because “his property gives him security and a, humanly speaking, easy life, two circumstances which [...] put him in a class of mortals which has some resemblance to the gods.”<sup>11</sup> Murray (Murray, 1924), in this instance, translates μάκαρ as ‘rich’, so it could be gathered that this use for humans is related to living a comfortable life due to the means that come with being rich or possessing a property.

The other use in the *Iliad* is in Book III, verses 181-183, when Priam identifies Agamemnon on the battlefield during the rampage thanks to the help of Helen. Priam starts praising him ὦ μάκαρ Ἀτρεΐδη μοιρηγενὲς ὀλβιόδαιμον. These adjectives are used in a context of praise and of admiration towards Agamemnon. The adjective μοιρηγενὲς is formed by Μοῖρα and γενεῆς. LSJ (Liddell et al., 1940) provides the definition of “favoured by Μοῖρα at one's birth, child of Destiny”. The term “Moirai” is used to refer to the combined power of the three Moirai,

---

<sup>10</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 10.

<sup>11</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), pp. 6-7.

who decide the destiny of both gods and mortals. The Μοῖρα weave the threads of life and even the gods are subject to their authority. Here it can be understood that Priam sees Agamemnon as someone who has a favourable destiny because he is helped out by the Μοῖρα. Ὀλβιόδαιμον is formed by the adjective ὄλβιος and the noun δαίμων which refers to a divinity. Autenrieth (Autenrieth et al., 1891) provides this definition: “ὄλβιο-δαίμων : blessed by the deity, Il. 3.182.” It can be seen that Agamemnon is μάκαρ due to the fact that he is μοιρηγενές and ὄλβιόδαιμον which give him an easier life. Μάκαρ is always used in the sense of admiration that normally comes from an understanding that the person who is μάκαρ is superior. Priam praises Agamemnon in this way because he feels admiration and also, he does not consider himself to have been blessed by the Μοῖρα in destiny or by a deity in happiness.<sup>12</sup> This passage perfectly exemplifies how μάκαρ is always related to a happiness that is necessarily granted by the gods.

The sense of admiration directly linked to μάκαρ is made even clearer in verses 482-486 of Book XI of the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus journeys to the underworld where he meets the spirit of the dead hero, Achilles. Odysseus tells him, Achilles, that he was the most μάκαρ (σεῖο δ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ, οὗ τις ἀνὴρ προπάρριθε μακάρτατος οὔτ’ ἄρ’ ὀπίσσω) because when he was alive he was worshipped like a god by the people of Argos (πρὶν μὲν γὰρ σε ζῶν ἐτίμεν ἴσα θεοῖσιν Ἀργεῖοι) and now that he is in the underworld, he continues to be admired in the underworld (νῦν αὖτε μέγα κρατέεις νεκύεσσιν ἐνθάδ’ ἐόν).

In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus in verses 306-312 reflects on how his companions who died during the Trojan War are μάκαρ and contemplates on the κλέος that comes with dying honourably in war (τῷ κ’ ἔλαχον κτερέων, καί μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί). Odysseus, in contrast, thinks that he has been assigned an unheroic death (νῦν δέ λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ εἴμαρτο ἀλῶναι) without the opportunity of reaching κλέος, that which all heroes wish for. Odysseus considers μάκαρ those who ultimately accomplish a heroic life, they fight in war and then they are buried and celebrated. Here μάκαρ seems to be related to the idea of living a fulfilled life and as a hero it is related to living a heroic one. De Heer interprets it in the following way: “His dead comrades no longer have to face perils, to fight for their lives. They are μάκαρες because they have ceased to be insecure.”<sup>13</sup> This means that μάκαρ here continues to have the sense of

---

<sup>12</sup> See page 8 for how Priam was once ὄλβιος himself a long time ago, but is no longer so due to his bad fortune and this is where his admiration for Agamemnon comes from.

<sup>13</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 11.

admiration towards beings who are superior due to their means in life. The dead are superior because they no longer have to suffer, in the same way that gods do not suffer.

In the *Odyssey*, there is an interesting use of μάκαρ in verses 149-160 of Book VI, when Odysseus addresses Nausicaa expressing his awe at her beauty to the point where he does not know if she is a deity or a mortal. Odysseus says that if she is a goddess, she is like Artemis and remarks that, if she is a mortal, her father, mother and brothers are three times μάκαρ (τρις μάκαρες μὲν σοί γε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ, τρις μάκαρες δὲ κασίγνητοι). However, he who is the most μάκαρ is the man who can win her heart (κεῖνος δ' αὖ περὶ κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων, ὅς κέ σ' ἐέδνοισι βρῖσας οἴκονδ' ἀγάγηται). This is an example of “makarismoi embedded in epic”<sup>14</sup>. Wasdin says: “the *makarismos* is connected with the good fortune of reciprocal *charis*”<sup>15</sup>. Not only do the gods bestow beauty and luck upon lovers, they also grant temporarily elevated status to those they favor.”<sup>16</sup> Wasdin also explains how Odysseus, as a way to flatter Nausicaa, blesses a fictitious happy lover whose circumstances contrast with those of the speaker, in a similar manner to the love poets.<sup>17</sup>

When considering the verb μακαρίζω, it can be seen to be closely related to μάκαρ. It is used for humans and for gods, but it is connected to the divine in the sense that it is used for humans who accomplish a divine-like status. It is only found three times in the *Odyssey* and not at all in the *Iliad*. The three appearances (verses 537-38 of Book XV, verses 164-165 of Book VII, verses 310-311 of Book XIX) consist of the same formula: τῷ κε τάχα γνοίης φιλότητά τε πολλά τε δῶρα ἐξ ἐμεῦ, ὡς ἂν τίς σε συναντόμενος μακαρίζοι. Here, from the idea that the receiving of gifts makes the person worthy of being called μάκαρ, it can be gathered that the verb is also related to material possessions. It has to be considered that these gifts are thought to make the person’s life easier and thus similar to the gods and that is why they are ultimately worthy of being called μάκαρ. The verb denotes a sense of admiration towards someone who lives a more comfortable life thanks to their resources.

The use of ὄλβιος in Homer, seems to be related to a materialistic happiness due to the fact that it is found repeatedly with πλοῦτος. In the *Iliad*, it is used in the meeting of Achilles and Priam in Book XXIV, where Achilles talks about his father, Peleus, surpassing others in

---

<sup>14</sup> Wasdin, Katherine. (2018), p. 185.

<sup>15</sup> In short, χάρις is the force of favour and blessing. For more see Chapter 6 Divine Reciprocity of Wasdin, Katherine. (2018).

<sup>16</sup> Wasdin, Katherine. (2018), p. 184.

<sup>17</sup> Wasdin, Katherine. (2018), p. 186.

ὄλβος and πλοῦτος of the Mirmidons (πάντας γὰρ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους ἐκέκαστο ὄλβω τε πλούτῳ τε, ἄνασσε δὲ Μυρμιδόνεσσι). It can be seen that the adjective ὄλβιος seems to denote a materialistic happiness. This happiness is also dispensed by the gods (ὥς μὲν καὶ Πηληϊθεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα ἐκ γενετῆς). Achilles goes on to say that he knows Priam once surpassed others in being ὄλβιος (καὶ σὲ γέρον τὸ πρὶν μὲν ἀκούομεν ὄλβιον εἶναι) because of his wealth and sons (τῶν σε γέρον πλούτῳ τε καὶ υἰάσι φασὶ κεκάσθαι). Achilles uses ὄλβιος also in a sense of admiration, but now this type of happiness is linked to having power (in this case it is shown through wealth and having several heirs that can perpetuate his power as a ruler). Achilles no longer considers Priam ὄλβιος due to the loss of his sons.

The word ὄλβος is repeatedly used in wishes for the future for the gods to grant ὄλβια. This means that the gods are the dispensers of this type of happiness and it is up to them to secure it. De Heer puts forward, as an example, the verses 41-42 of Book XIII of the *Odyssey* where it is clear how gods are bestowers of ὄλβια: πομπὴ καὶ φίλα δῶρα, τὰ μοι θεοὶ Οὐρανίῳνες ὄλβια ποιήσειαν.

It is important to point out verse 377 of Book XXIV of the *Iliad*, when Odysseus greets Achilles as: ὄλβιε Πηλέος υἱέ, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ. De Heer explains that this exemplifies the vagueness between the uses of μάκαρ and ὄλβιος. However, Nagy explores the meaning of the word ὄλβιος<sup>18</sup> and states that this word has two meanings: “One meaning belongs to the sacred world of cult heroes, while the other meaning belongs to the non-sacred world of ephemeral mortals [...]”<sup>19</sup> Nagy notes that while explicit allusions to hero worship are frequently avoided, the language used in such references is consistent with how cult figures were traditionally regarded. These implicit references are due to the fact that the Homeric tradition is Panhellenic and hero cult is a local practice<sup>20</sup>. So in this sense, Nagy thinks that the use here of ὄλβιος for Achilles is in the sense of hero cult, he is a mortal who is immortalized after death, honoured with funerals and worshipped at his tomb following hero cult. In verse 37 of Book XXIV of the *Odyssey*, there is a reference to the place where he was slain (ὅς θάνεσ ἐν Τροίῃ ἐκάς Ἄργεος) where, from what can be gathered, the hero is worshipped. Achilles represents the culmination of what being a Greek hero is because while he is alive he gains honour (κλέος) and after dying a heroic death he is immortalized in an epic poem and therefore is also immortalized through hero cult (ὄλβιος).

---

<sup>18</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 314.

<sup>19</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 369.

<sup>20</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 331.

The adjective, ὄλβιος is also used for Odysseus. Nagy<sup>21</sup> also sees this as a reference to hero cult and puts forward, as an example, verses 136-137 of Book XI of the *Odyssey*, that mention Odysseus' death and implicitly reference his tomb: θάνατος δέ τοι ἐξ ἄλδος αὐτῶ ἀβληγρὸς μάλα τοῖος ἐλεύσεται, ὅς κέ σε πέφνη γήραι ὕπο λιπαρῶ ἀρημένον. ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ ὄλβιοι ἔσσονται. Here it is said that those who are close to Odysseus' tomb will be ὄλβιοι and is clearly another allusion to hero cult. As Nagy explains<sup>22</sup>, not only are those heroes who are immortalized ὄλβιοι, but even those who worship a cult hero at their tomb can become ὄλβιοι.

To conclude, through the analysis of these passages, it can be gathered that the adjective μάκαρ conveys a sense of admiration towards beings who are superior in terms of their resources in life that allow them to live comfortably. In a world of uncertainty and war transmitted by the Homeric poems, the heroes admire those who live easier lives than they do whether they are gods, rich people with property who are self-sustaining without toiling, or more powerful and fortunate people, an example of this can be seen in Priam's praises for Agememnon. Μάκαρ refers to a type of happiness that is connected to stability in the face of hardship, similar to the security that the gods always enjoy. Overall, the use of μάκαρ highlights the importance of security, comfort and stability in achieving the state of happiness that gods usually enjoy. The verb μακαρίζω is very connected to the term μάκαρ and is used to describe those who, like the gods, attain a divine status as a result of their materialistic wealth or power that makes their lives easier. It only appears three times in the *Odyssey* and never at all in the *Iliad*. It constantly uses the same formulaic line about how someone is deserving of praise and being called μάκαρ because of their gifts and favours. The word ὄλβιος in Homer seems to represent a materialistic happiness, often associated with both economic power and wealth, πλοῦτος. In the *Iliad*, Achilles uses it to show appreciation for those with qualities of power and wealth like his father, Peleus, as well as Priam. From the idea that Priam used to be ὄλβιος in the past, it can be deduced that ὄλβιος is not a permanent state. The word ὀλβία is found in wishes for the future and the gods are referred to as dispensers of ὄλβος. Nagy points out that ὄλβιος is also part of the language utilized in reference to hero cult. This adjective is used for Achilles and Odysseus, both mortals who are immortalized after death, honoured with funerals, and worshipped at their tombs as part of hero cult. One can also become ὄλβιος by worshipping a cult hero at their grave. Even though

---

<sup>21</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 330.

<sup>22</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 314.

the Homeric tradition is Panhellenic and hero cult is local and the references to hero cult are only implicit, these allusions are definitely identifiable as consistent with the conception of hero cult. A duality in meaning of the word ὄλβιος can be appreciated. On the one hand, it is used to reference a happiness that comes from being rich and powerful and, on the other hand, it is used in a context of hero cult for heroes who are immortalized after death or for those who worship these heroes.

## 2.2. *Happiness in Hesiod*

Hesiod is one of the earliest known Greek poets whose works date back to the 7th century BC. He was born in the town of Ascra in Boeotia, central Greece. He is best known for his two major works, *Theogony* that describes genealogies of the Greek gods and *Works and Days* which is a poem dedicated to his brother Perses, that instructs him on how to live a virtuous life through hard work. In Hesiod, the following words relating to happiness are used: ὄλβιος, μάκαρ and εὐδαίμων.<sup>23</sup>

Before entering into Hesiod's idea of happiness, it is important to contextualize his world. Hesiod's works present a darker world in comparison to Homer. To understand his concept of happiness, it is essential to focus on *Works and Days* which portrays to a greater degree the times of Hesiod than the *Theogony*. The protagonists are no longer heroes and divinities as found in Homer, but human beings. Firstly, to understand Hesiod's world, it is essential to start with the myth of the ages described in *Works and Days*. The myth of the ages describes how humanity has gone through different stages of existence, each characterized by a different level of prosperity. According to Hesiod, there were five ages of humanity, the first ruled by Cronos and the others by Zeus. The first was the Golden Age when people lived in peace and harmony with each other and the gods. They had infinite access to food with no need to work for it. There was no need for laws because everyone was virtuous and just and lived happily and peacefully. The second age was the Silver Age in which humans lived longer childhoods and had to be looked after by their mothers. Also, they refused to worship the gods, and as a result of their impiety, Zeus destroyed them. In the third age, the Bronze Age, humans fought each other constantly and, they too, were eventually destroyed. The Heroic Age is the only age that is not named after a metal and this is the age of Homer's famous heroes.

---

<sup>23</sup> There is no use of the adjective εὐτυχής nor of the verb μακαρίζω.

The fifth and final age is the Iron Age, which is the current age according to Hesiod and the age of interest in this work. In *Hesiod's Cosmos*, Clay describes it as follows: “We, who belong to the race of iron, are the decadent heirs of the heroes, in whom the divine blood has become diluted”<sup>24</sup> and “What makes our age so difficult is its intermediate status between justice and its opposite, *hybris*.”<sup>25</sup> Hesiod himself says, in verses 174-178, that he would have preferred to either die before or been born after: μηκέτ’ ἔπειτ’ ὄφελλον ἐγὼ πέμπτοισι μετεῖναι ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ’ ἢ πρόσθε θανεῖν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι. νῦν γὰρ δὴ γένος ἐστὶ σιδήρεον οὐδέ ποτ’ ἤμαρ παύονται καμάτου καὶ οἰζύος, οὐδέ τι νύκτωρ φθειρόμενοι. Hesiod describes the age as full of constant struggle and suffering to the point that he would have preferred to have lived at another time. With the Iron Age, Zeus creates a race of humans who are inferior, but self-sufficient and do not require divine intervention to procreate, unlike the heroes. Due to the fact that this race is inferior to the heroes, it is less likely to challenge the power of the gods. They worship the gods instead of seeking to overthrow them. As Clay states: “The purpose of the gods in fashioning mankind was to create a race not only inferior to the gods, but also conscious of that inferiority.”<sup>26</sup>

This sense of inferiority is conveyed by the specific usage of the adjective *μάκαρ* because in Hesiod’s works it is primarily employed for only gods and divinities. Hesiod’s deliberate choice of his usage of *μάκαρ* suggests a clear division between the human and the divine realm. Here is as an example of this use in a passage of each of his works, including the *Shield of Heracles*. In verse 101 of *Theogony*, Hesiod demonstrates a propensity for using it as an adjective for the Olympian gods: *μάκαράς τε θεούς, οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν*. In verse 139 of *Works and Days*, the same usage is evident: *οὐκ ἔδιδον μακάρεσσι θεοῖς, οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν*. Verses 80-81 of *The Shield of Heracles* demonstrate an identical application of this adjective: *ἦ τε μέγ’ ἀθανάτους μάκαρας, τοῖ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν, ἧλιτεν Ἀμφιτρύων*. Hesiod is very rigorous in his usage and, unlike in Homer, there are no instances of *μάκαρ* as an adjective for humans. De Heer describes Hesiod’s usage as follows: “Hesiod had an aversion from the use of the word *μάκαρ* and therefore it seems certain that his choice of *ὄλβιος* was dictated by a scruple and constituted a deliberate departure from the epic usage found so far”.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Clay, Jenny Strauss. (2009), p. 93.

<sup>25</sup> Clay, Jenny Strauss. (2009), p. 84. For more about the importance of *δική* in the *Works and Days* see Gagarin, Michael (1973).

<sup>26</sup> Clay, Jenny Strauss. (2009), p. 95.

<sup>27</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 20.

There is another interesting use of μάκαρ that is completely unrelated to the standard use accompanying the adjective θεός. The Golden Age, after death, turn into benevolent spirits of the underworld called δαίμονες ἐσθλοί. However, in verses 140-141, the Silver Age, after being killed by Zeus, turn into spirits related to the night called μάκαρες: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖ' ἐκάλυψε, τοὶ μὲν ὑποχθόνιοι μάκαρες θνητοῖς καλέονται. This usage is interesting because μάκαρ generally either accompanies the adjective ἀθάνατος or the noun θεός and here it is completely the opposite. However, if those who are happiest are the gods because they are free from the toil and torment of life, then could it not also be interpreted that those who pass away are blessed in the sense that they no longer have to experience the anxieties of the living. De Heer puts forward another interpretation of this use of μάκαρ: “he calls them by the most honorific name, which may have the effect of avoiding unwanted attention and of placating a potentially hostile power. [...] The subterranean mortals are powers of the dark like those associated with night and they need to be placated in the same manner.”<sup>28</sup> In this way, giving them the adjective μάκαρ, is a way to make peace with these creatures in fear of the consequences of offending them. This shows just how powerful the adjective μάκαρ is as the highest form of happiness in that, just by using it, it keeps these spirits at bay.

Ὀλβιος<sup>29</sup> is the second highest form of happiness and is the highest form accessible to humans. Hesiod uses the word ὄλβιος to refer to himself as a poet in verses 96-97 of the *Theogony*: ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν τινα Μοῦσαι φίλωνται γλυκερὴ οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδὴ. This use can be explained by verses 91-93 where Hesiod explains how a poet is admired in a similar way as humans look up to gods because he possesses a unique gift of the Muses: ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀν' ἀγῶνα θεὸν ὧς ἰλάσκονται αἰδοῖ μειλιχίη, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισιν τοίη Μουσάων ἱερὴ δόσις ἀνθρώποισιν. The adjective ὄλβιος is used for a human who reaches a status similar to that of the gods. A poet, with his ability of composing poetry given by the Muses, is unique and enjoys a superiority to other humans, as the gods do. Not only are poets superior for how they are admired, but also they are superior because they live an easier life. According to Hesiod, in verses 102-103 of the *Theogony*, the gift of the Muses makes a poet forget about his sorrows: αἴψ' ὃ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων μέμνηται ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων. Here, it can be seen that Hesiod is ὄλβιος because he does not suffer like other humans thanks to his divine gift. It is important to point out that this

<sup>28</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 23.

<sup>29</sup> The adjective ὄλβιος appears in the *Theogony* and *Works and Days* but does not appear in Hesiod's other work, the *Shield of Heracles*.



divine gift is also Hesiod's way of surviving. He has been granted the opportunity to earn his living without having to suffer any physical toil. Hesiod avoids the use of μάκαρ once again because he is aware that even his exceptional ability does not make him anywhere near the realm of divine happiness.

Ultimately, it seems that ὄλβιος is related to having an easier life than average humans do due to superior abilities and this could be an explanation as to why it is used for heroes. In verses 954-955 of the *Theogony*, it is used for Heracles who has finished his tasks and resides alongside the immortal gods enjoying a life free from toil: ὄλβιος, ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἥματα πάντα. Heracles is a hero who fully experiences this highest form of human happiness because he is a human that gets the closest to the godly permanent. This seems to demonstrate how precise Hesiod is with his usage of the adjective that not even a human that has been granted the status of the gods can be called μάκαρ. De Heer explains this use the following way: "The story of Heracles' ascent to the Olympus to enjoy eternal leisure and youth portrays the fulfilment of hopes and desires which are human."<sup>30</sup> In verses 170-173 of *Works and Days*, ὄλβιοι also accompanies heroes: καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι παρ' Ὀκεανὸν βαθυδίνην, ὄλβιοι ἦρωες.

The use of ὄλβιοι for heroes is approached differently by Nagy. Nagy does not see it as a representation of a superior human happiness, but he explains it as the meaning of ὄλβιος in relation to hero cult, in the same way as shown in the previous section on Happiness in Homer. It is used because these heroes are cult heroes who are immortalized after death and live ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι. Nagy describes these islands as follows: "a paradisiacal setting that transcends the temporal and the special constraints of mortality."<sup>31</sup> This definition helps to explain the use of μάκαρ here. These islands are god-like, a place free from human toil similar to the Olympus.

The first use of εὐδαίμων in Greek literature is to be found in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. It is essential to note that in *Works and Days*, Hesiod defends the art of labour as a form of avoiding punishment from the gods. *Works and Days* is a poem dedicated to his brother Perses who, unlike Hesiod, seems to have wasted his inherited money and property and has now started a legal procedure against Hesiod to take over his inheritance unjustly. Hesiod, in

---

<sup>30</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 21.

<sup>31</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 320.

verses 5-6, starts by warning how Zeus can change human fate as he wishes: *ρέα μὲν γὰρ βριάει, ρέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει, ρεῖα δ' ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἄδηλον ἀέξει*. Then, Hesiod, in verses 303-306 of *Works and Days*, explains how a man who lives idly is despised by both gods and people because he does not contribute to society at all: *τῷ δὲ θεοὶ νεμεσῶσι καὶ ἄνδρες, ὅς κεν ἀεργὸς ζῶη, κηφήνεσσι κοθούροις εἵκελος ὀργήν, οἳ τε μελισσάων κάματον τρύχουσιν ἀεργοὶ ἔσθοντες*. This idleness is hated by the gods and can lead to punishment. In verses 308-310, Hesiod explains how, through work, men become wealthy in material possessions and this work makes them beloved by the immortals and thus, favoured by them: *ἔργων δ' ἄνδρες πολύμηλοί τ' ἀφνειοὶ τε καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι πολὺ φίλτεροι ἀθανάτοισιν. ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν ὄνειδος, ἀεργίη δέ τ' ὄνειδος*. Lastly, in verses 826-828, Hesiod says that he who possesses the knowledge to perform his duties without angering the divinities and without committing transgressions is *εὐδαίμων* and *ὄλβιος*: *εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὄλβιος, ὃς τάδε πάντα εἰδὼς ἐργάζεται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεινών*. As explained before, Hesiod's age, the Iron Age, is watched over by the gods, the *δαίμονες* and the *μάκαρες* and the purpose of a human is to pass through life without offending the gods. In this way, Hesiod's world emanates a sense of insecurity and anxiety because one bad move can lead to punishment by the gods. Humans have to deal with this feeling of insecurity which is ultimately a part of human toil. The adjective *μάκαρ* cannot be used for humans because they will never experience the easy life that gods do.

The analysis of these passages provides a window into Hesiod's idea of happiness. He is the first to introduce the adjective *εὐδαίμων* and also uses *ὄλβιος* and *μάκαρ* as concepts relating to happiness. First and foremost, *μάκαρ* is used strictly for divinities and seems to be a happiness that is only accessible to gods. It is the highest form of happiness and comes from being free of the toil and torment of the human world. It is a permanent happiness that gods experience due to their easy living in a secure and stable place. They enjoy infinite access to food and have no worries. The humans of Hesiod's time, the Iron Age, look back to the Golden Age when they experienced a similar leisurely lifestyle and wish they could return to it. This adjective is so strong in meaning that it is even used to placate divinities of the underworld so they will be more benevolent. Secondly, the adjective *ὄλβιος* represents the greatest type of happiness that is attainable to humans. Hesiod does not use it for regular human beings, he uses it for heroes that are superior to humans in their means and for poets who also have an exceptional gift given to them by the Muses. These superior humans are admired, similarly to the admiration for the gods, for their facilities in life and their proximity

to the gods in their easy-living. There is also a duality in the meaning of ὄλβιος and when it refers to heroes it could be alluding to hero cult. These ὄλβιοι ἥρωες are those who have been immortalized through hero cult and now live on the Blessed Islands enjoying a perpetual state of comfort and ease. Thirdly, the adjective εὐδαίμων is also used for humans, but represents a different kind of happiness. This happiness is related purely to living a life avoiding the δαίμονες. A human who is εὐδαίμων has a good relationship with the divinities and thus, lives an easier life without torment or punishment from them. Hesiod defends work as the best way to keep the gods and δαίμονες happy and also the most effective way of keeping at bay the μάκαρες of the underworld. For Hesiod, it is important to work diligently because people, through hard work, can accumulate wealth and possessions and gods will appreciate and cherish them more. Effectively, the concept of εὐδαιμονία in Hesiod is closely linked to the etymology of the word described in the Introduction: a happiness which involves having a good relationship with a divine power and, thus, living an easier life.

### 3. HAPPINESS IN THE LYRIC GENRE

#### 3.1. *Happiness in Solon*

Solon was an Athenian politician, legislator and poet who lived during the 6th century BC. This was a time of political instability and there were developing hostilities between the aristocracy and the common people. Solon tried to write just laws that would lessen the inequality and favour those who were carrying heavy debt. Solon describes his politics as follows in verses 18-20 of fragment 30 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 36W.<sup>2</sup>: θεσμοὺς δ' ὁμοίως τῷ κακῷ τε κάγαθῷ εὐθείαν εἰς ἕκαστον ἀρμόσας δίκην ἔγραψα. However, Solon was criticized by the rich for favouring the common classes but, at the same time, the poorer classes complained that his actions were not progressive enough in addressing the social and economic inequalities of the time. As part of his reforms, Solon was known for his categorization of the Athenians into four property classes which depended on their amount of wealth and dictated their level of participation in politics. Solon is regarded as one of the Seven Sages and was crucial to the transformation of Athens from an oligarchic administration to a democratic one.

Unfortunately, only fragments of Solon's works have survived.<sup>32</sup> Solon used his Iambic and Elegiac writings as a form of expression of his political ideas and as a way to justify his actions. Irwin describes the context of Solon times as follows: "Elegiac poets frequently

---

<sup>32</sup> The Greek text and the numbering is extracted from Noussia-Fantuzzi, Maria. (2010).

purport to address their immediate audience in their capacities as citizens of a polis, and thus the fragments are replete with political material, a feature that has led scholars to reconstruct a strong civic function behind elegy.”<sup>33</sup>

In Solon’s works, there are three concepts relating to happiness: μάκαρ, ὄλβιος and ὄλβος<sup>34</sup>. Firstly, the use of μάκαρ in Solon, seems to be strictly used for gods. It is employed as an epithet of the gods in verses 1-2 of fragment 3 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 4 W.<sup>2</sup>: ἡμετέρη δὲ πόλις κατὰ μὲν Διὸς οὐποτ’ ὀλεῖται αἴσαν καὶ μακάρων θεῶν φρένας ἀθανάτων. There are no instances where μάκαρ is used for humans because Solon sees a barrier between humans and gods. Fragment 19 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 14 W.<sup>2</sup> makes Solon’s use of the word clear when he says that no human can be μάκαρ, mortals are destined to live miserably: οὐδὲ μάκαρ οὐδεὶς πέλεται βροτός, ἀλλὰ πονηροὶ πάντες, ὅσους θνητοὺς ἡέλιος καθορᾷ. It seems that the adjective μάκαρ is used exclusively as an adjective for the gods and that there is an evident separation between the two. Humans can never achieve the state of happiness that the gods have.

Secondly, in *Elegy to the Muses*, fragment 1 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 13 W.<sup>2</sup>, Solon invokes the Muses to ask them to grant him, what seems to be, two very important things, to have ὄλβος and αἰεὶ δόξαν ἀγαθὴν. In verses 2-4, Solon asks the Muses to be granted ὄλβον from the gods and eternal fame from humans: Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, κλυτὲ μοι εὐχομένωι· ὄλβον μοι πρὸς θεῶν μακάρων δότε καὶ πρὸς ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων αἰεὶ δόξαν ἔχειν ἀγαθὴν<sup>35</sup>. It seems that this type of happiness can only be dispensed by the gods. Due to the fact that, later on, he introduces χρήματα, it can be deduced that this happiness also has to do with possessions. In verses 7-8, Solon asks for wealth, but he remarks that he only wants it if it is just: χρήματα δ’ ἰμείρω μὲν ἔχειν, ἀδίκως δὲ πεπᾶσθαι οὐκ ἐθέλω· πάντως ὕστερον ἦλθε δίκη. Having ὄλβον implies having a level of material possessions that has been given by the gods justly. When it is bestowed by the gods, there is a sense of security related to it. This is made clear when Solon states that those who possess wealth unfairly or unjustly (ὕφ’ ὕβριος) end up being confronted with ἄτη. In contrast to righteous wealth, unjust wealth is never long-lasting and Zeus is the god who will be in charge of administering justice. De Heer states: “this warning imparts to the meaning of ὄλβος an ethical connotation in addition to the one of wealth.”<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Irwin, Elizabeth. (2005), p. 2.

<sup>34</sup> There is no trace of the adjectives εὐδαίμων nor εὐτυχής, nor of the verb μακαρίζω.

<sup>35</sup> Here, the contrast between θεῶν μακάρων and ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων is appreciated.

<sup>36</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 33.

Thirdly, ὄλβιος is used only once. In fragment 17 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 23 W.<sup>2</sup>, Solon describes how a man is ὄλβιος if he has παῖδες: ὄλβιος, ὅτι παῖδες τε φίλοι καὶ μώνυχες ἵπποι καὶ κύνες ἀγρευταὶ καὶ ξένος ἀλλοδαπός. On the one hand, this παῖδες could be interpreted as having one's own offspring<sup>37</sup>. However, in her commentary, Noussia compares this fragment to fragment 16 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 25 W.<sup>2</sup>: ἔσθ' ἥβης ἐρατοῖσιν ἐπ' ἄνθεσι παιδοφιλήσῃ, μηρῶν ἰμείρων καὶ γλυκεροῦ στόματος. Noussia states that these are “some glimpses into the often-lauded activities of the lives of elite male Greeks.”<sup>38</sup> It seems that, according to Solon, the love of boys or pederasty, was also something that made a man ὄλβιος. Here this is a different sense of ὄλβιον, but they are related. As mentioned before ὄλβιον relates to a happiness that comes from having material possessions that are secured by the gods. With this wealth comes access to the aristocratic circle and the opportunity to enjoy pederastic love. Moreover, if this wealth is secured because it is granted by the gods, the pleasure of pursuing young boys is also unrestricted. There is a component of pleasure in these two words and this comes from wealth that at the same time permits certain activities. Solon points out that this aristocratic enjoyment is only laudable when it is just.

Solon repeatedly criticizes those who are wealthy unjustly. In verses 9-13 of fragment 6 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 15 W.<sup>2</sup>, he states how lots of bad men are rich, but good men are poor: πολλοὶ γὰρ πλουτέουσι κακοί, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ πένονται. Above all, Solon esteems virtue as the most important thing, more than πλοῦτον, because virtue is long-lasting, but money passes from one man to another: ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς οὐ διαμειψόμεθα τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸν πλοῦτον, ἐπεὶ τὸ μὲν ἔμπεδον αἰεὶ, χρήματα δ' ἀνθρώπων ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει. It is important to note that when Solon uses χρήματα and πλοῦτον, they are related to unjust wealth. The righteous form of material possessions is ὄλβος. In verses 5-8 of fragment 3 G.-P.<sup>2</sup> = 4 W.<sup>2</sup> Solon criticizes those who destroy the city because they are easily persuaded by money because of their greed: αὐτοὶ δὲ φθείρειν μεγάλην πόλιν ἀφραδίησιν ἄστοι βούλονται χρήμασι πειθόμενοι, δήμου θ' ἡγεμόνων ἄδικος νόος, οἷσιν ἐτοῖμον ὕβριος ἐκ μεγάλης ἄλγεα πολλὰ παθεῖν. Negative connotations are evident because the idea of having money unjustly is related to the idea of ὕβρις<sup>39</sup>.

Through the analysis of these fragments, it is possible to understand Solon's idea of happiness. Due to his restricted use of μάκαρ only for the gods, it is evident that Solon

<sup>37</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 33.

<sup>38</sup> Noussia-Fantuzzi, Maria. (2010), p. 343.

<sup>39</sup> For more about δίκη and ὕβρις in Solon's poetry see García, Héctor. (2006).

reveals a distinct separation between the mortal and the divine realms. While the gods are described as *μάκαρες*, this happiness is completely unattainable for humans. Humans are limited in their happiness and can only be deemed *ὄλβιος*. In relation to *ὄλβος*, it is clear that this happiness has to be given by the gods so that it is deemed just. This moral implication to *ὄλβος* is backed up by his constant attack on those who have possessions unjustly. Solon does not desire simply material possessions, he wishes to be deemed worthy of being granted it by the gods and thus, enjoy it perpetually. What comes with this type of wealth is obviously access to pleasure and a very common aristocratic activity was pederasty. Therefore, in this sense, *ὄλβος* is a type of ethical pleasure that can be enjoyed with no limits or punishment because it is secured by the gods. And in this sense, it can be understood that it is also a pleasure that comes with no guilt or shame. It is a pleasure that is *δίκαιος* and does not come from excess, *ὑβρις*.

### 3.2. *Happiness in Sappho*

Sappho is a Greek poetess from the Island of Lesbos who lived in the sixth century BC. There is limited information about her life, but she is known for her formation of choruses of women. “Sappho in her songs is conventionally pictured as the lead singer of a chorus that consisted of the women of Lesbos, and she speaks as their main choral personality.”<sup>40</sup> Her only complete work that has survived is *Ode to Aphrodite*. Sappho’s works were composed to be performed and they include songs that are either monodic or choral. The oldest type of monody that has survived is that by Alcaeus and by Sappho. It is generally said that love is the main theme of Sappho’s works but, in reality, they have a deeper meaning and consist of the transmission of religious and civic values to young girls, *παρθένοι*. There is clearly an instructional element to her songs and *μουσική* is her form of expression. This educational component entails learning how to sing in a chorus, as well as an initiation ritual into becoming wives that integrate into the community.

---

<sup>40</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 118.

Firstly, Sappho uses the adjectives, μάκαρ and ὄλβιος.<sup>41</sup> In verses 3-6 of fragment 63 L.-P. μάκαρ seems to refer to the gods: γλύκυς θ[έ]ος ἢ δεῖν' ὀνίας μ] ζά χῶρις ἔχην τάν δυναμ[ ἔλπις δέ μ' ἔχει μὴ πεδέχη[ν] μηδὲν μακάρων ἐλ[.<sup>42</sup> Here, Sappho admires how gods are distanced from pain and she states how she has no hope to be a part of the μακάρων. Here it can be deduced that Sappho is referring to the gods because earlier she uses θ[έ]ος. The use of μάκαρ seems to be clearly for the gods and Sappho points out the barrier between human happiness and divine happiness. Verses 4-7 of fragment 81 L.-P. demonstrate the use of μάκαιραι for the Graces: σὺ δὲ στεφάνοις, ὦ Δίκα, πέρθεσθ' ἐράτοις φόβαισιν ὄρπακας ἀνήτω συν(α)έρραισ' ἀπάλαισι χέρσιν· εὐάνθεα †γὰρ πέλεται† καὶ Χάριτες μάκαιραι μᾶλλον προτόρην, ἀστεφανώτοισι δ' ἀπυστρέφονται. In this instance, Sappho is saying that those who marry are favoured by the Graces and those who do not are ignored by them. It seems that, in Sappho's works, divine favour only comes to those who marry.

Ὅλβος is a favour that is god-given as made clear by the fact that Aphrodite is called πολύολβος in fragment 133 L.-P. (ἔχει μὲν Ἀνδρομέδα κάλαν ἀμοιβαν... Ψάπφοι, τί τὰν πολύολβον Ἀφροδίταν...). Aphrodite gives this divine favour to the bridegroom as can be seen in verses 1-2 of fragment 112 L.-P. where he is called ὄλβιος for getting married: ὄλβιε γάμβρε, σοὶ μὲν δὴ γάμος ὡς ἄραο ἐκτετέλεσθ', ἔχης δὲ πάρθενον ἂν ἄραο. The final verse reiterates this idea that Aphrodite blesses the newly-wed: τετίμακ' ἔξοχά σ' Ἀφροδίτα.

This divine favour which is given to the bridegroom makes them closer to the divinity as seen in verses 1-4 Fragment 31 L.-P: φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν ἔμμεν ὄνερ, ὅττις ἐναντίος τοι ἰσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἄδν φωνείσας ὑπακούει. All bridegrooms are equal to a god when they get married. As Nagy explains: “the identity of the god who is being compared to the bridegroom is manifested in the ritual convention of imagining the bridegroom not only as a god, but also as a hero especially as Achilles.”<sup>43</sup> The bridegroom resembles Achilles because he is the patron of newly-weds because he dies just when he was about to get married. “There

---

<sup>41</sup> There is no use of the adjective εὐτυχής in Sappho. However, in fragment 148 L.-P., there is a use of εὐδαιμονία: ὁ πλοῦτος ἄνευ ἀρέτας οὐκ ἀσίνης πάροικος, ἃ δ' ἀμφοτέρων κρᾶσις εὐδαιμονίας ἔχει τὸ ἄκρον. As De Heer (1969) explains on page 38: “there is indeed a frigid quality in these two lines which gives a decidedly un-Sapphic impression”. Even though De Heer mentions how these verses are considered to be spurious by scholars Treu Diehl and Robferr, it is still interesting to comment on these verses. The idea of εὐδαιμονία is clearly related to the idea of wealth (πλοῦτος) with virtue (ἀρετή). These verses do not transmit the same idea of happiness, as seen in the above with the adjectives μάκαρ and ὄλβιος and do not fit into Sappho's context. De Heer suggests that these verses date from the late fifth century at the earliest. Given that these verses seem clearly spurious, this instance of εὐδαιμονία will not be taken into account in the conclusion.

<sup>42</sup>The Greek text is taken from *The Digital sappho*: <https://digitalsappho.org/fragments/fr1/>

<sup>43</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 115.

are two divine models for Achilles as an ideal bridegroom: Ares<sup>44</sup> and Apollo.”<sup>45</sup> The expression ἴσος θείοισιν ὄνερ shows that the bridegroom breaks the boundaries between men and the gods. In fragment 31, it can be deduced that Sappho, a mortal, is observing the divinized bridegroom, as evidenced by the contrast between the participle γελαίσας, which is used for humans, and the participle μεδαίσας, which refers to the way gods smile. Sappho, as a mortal, in front of the deified bridegroom suffers a series of symptoms.<sup>46</sup>

Effectively, in Sappho’s works, there is a clear difference between divine and human happiness. The adjective μάκαρ is only used for the gods and Graces. Sappho herself sees it as impossible to reach this divine happiness. While the gods are depicted as being μάκαρες, the highest form of human happiness is to be ὄλβιος. The adjective ὄλβιος represents a type of happiness that comes from the love that arises in these arranged marriages that Sappho promotes. The bride and bridegroom are bestowed divine favour, ὄλβος, from Aphrodite who is πολύολβος. The bridegroom is called ὄλβιος upon getting married and he is distinguished and honoured. This divine favour elevates the bridegroom to the level of a god to the point that Sappho explains how she suffers an epiphany when she sees the bridegroom.

### 3.3. *Happiness in Pindar*

Pindar was a Greek lyric poet who lived during the 5th century BC. He was most famous for his odes dedicated to athletes’ victories, ἐπινίκια. Pindar composed *Olympian Odes*, *Pythian Odes*, *Nemean Odes*, and *Isthmian Odes*. In these odes, Pindar praised and lauded the feats of athletes and winners of the ancient Greek games. Each of these games was dedicated to a god. The Olympian and Nemean were dedicated to Zeus, the Pythian to Apollo and the Isthmian to Poseidon. The athlete’s labour in the games lacks significance without the poet’s reflection and praise in song. These games were held in homage to a fallen hero and the athlete impersonates him and reenacts his acts (μίμησις). The athletes do not actually pass away, but they experience a ritualistic death as they turn into this new persona of a hero. There is a clear relation between myth and reality in these games and this transformation of the athlete is a clear example of an initiatory ritual. Gildersleeve manages to summarize the meaning of these ancient games perfectly: “The epinikion lifts the temporary victory to the

---

<sup>44</sup> Fragment 111 L.-P. is a clear example of the comparison of the bridegroom to Ares: Ἴψοι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον, Ὑμήναον, ἀέρρετε, τέκτονες ἄνδρες· Ὑμήναον. γάμβρος † (εἰσ)έρχεται ἴσος † Ἄρει, Ὑμήναον. ἄνδρος μεγάλῳ πόλῳ μέσδων. Ὑμήναον. Aphrodite is Sappho’s ally in love and aids her in matters of unrequited love.

<sup>45</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 116.

<sup>46</sup> These symptoms have been interpreted as symptoms of love and attraction. However, Nagy explains that these are the symptoms of witnessing a divine epiphany that leads Sappho to suffer a near-death experience. In initiation rituals, there is always a form of psychic death to then be reborn.



high level of the eternal prevalence of the beautiful and the good over the foul and the base, the victor is transfigured into a glorious personification of his race, and the present is reflected, magnified, illuminated in the mirror of the mythic past.”<sup>47</sup>

In Pindar’s works, the following concepts relating to happiness are found: the adjectives μάκαρ, μακάριος, εὐδαίμων and ὄλβιος; the nouns εὐδαιμονία, ὄλβον and εὐτυχία and the verbs μακαρίζω and εὐτυχέω<sup>48</sup>.

Firstly, his use of the adjective μάκαρ is specific and is mostly only used for the gods, apart from two exceptions that will be analysed further on. To exemplify the use of μάκαρ for gods, two passages will be put forward as an example. *Isthmian VIII*, verse 27 (ταῦτα καὶ μακάρων ἐμέμναντ’ ἀγοραί) is a very clear example of how exclusive the use of this adjective in Pindar’s odes is to the point that there is no need to put θεῶν. The use of the adjective μάκαρ is enough for the reader to know that Pindar is referring to the gods. In verse 52 of *Olympian III*, after the gods consume Tantalus’s son, Pelops, Pindar says that he would not dare call the gods gluttons: ἐμοὶ δ’ ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν’ εἶπεῖν. Here the same use of μάκαρ without θεῶν is appreciated, but Pindar is clearly referring to the gods. The fact that μάκαρ is only applied to the gods, emphasizes the sharp contrast between the divine bliss and the trials of human existence.

It is important to mention that there is a remarkable use of μάκαρ, in Pindar’s works, because he seems to use it for places rather than people. For example, in verses 10-11 of *Olympian I*, this use is evident: Κρόνου παῖδ’ ἐς ἀφνεᾶν ἰκομένους μάκαιραν Ἰέρωνος ἐστίαν. De Heer discusses this use in two ways, on the one hand, he claims that a home is both the goddess Hestia’s dwelling place and a site of devotion. On the other hand, it could be that because Hiero lives a secure life (ἀφνεᾶν) and is wealthy, his home could be compared to that of the gods.<sup>49</sup> However, this could also be a way for Pindar to imply that someone is close to a divine happiness, but because he is reticent to call a human μάκαρ, this is an alternative approach, calling his abode μάκαρ instead.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Gildersleeve, Basil. (2010), p. 18.

<sup>48</sup> There is no trace of the adjective εὐτυχής in Pindar.

<sup>49</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 30.

<sup>50</sup> In *Isthmian VII*, verse 1, ὦ μάκαιρα Θήβα is also appreciated, but this use is a lot more evident due to Thebes being the abode of the heroes and, thus making it close to the god’s home. Another possibility is that similarly to how the dwelling place of the heroes was also called the Island of the “happy” (ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι), in Homer and Hesiod, in this case the transfer is from the heroes, that are μάκαρ for resting in a god-like place, to the abode itself being μάκαρ.

However, in only two occasions, Pindar does use μάκαρ for humans. In *Pythian IV*, verse 59, it is used for Battus: ὦ μάκαρ υἱὲ Πολυμνάστου. De Heer explains this use by saying that Battus was favoured by Apollo when he was alive and, because he is a hero, he was also worshipped like a god. “This intimate link with the divine gives him a title to the epithet.”<sup>51</sup> The only other use of μάκαρ as an adjective for a human is for Battus’ son, Arcesilaus, in verses 20-23 of *Pythian V*: μάκαρ δὲ καὶ νῦν, κλεεννᾶς ὅτι εὖχος ἤδη παρὰ Πυθιάδος ἵπποις ἐλῶν δέδεξαι τόνδε κῶμον ἀνέρων, Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα. De Heer explains that: “two reasons can be adduced to account for its usage in *Pyth. V*, 20 are his heroic ancestry and the emotive force which is part of the epithet, expressing admiration for his victory.”<sup>52</sup> As it can be seen, μάκαρ is intricately related to a sense of admiration.

In the next verses of *Pythian V*, the only use of the adjective μακάριος is found. Pindar calls the son of Alexibias, Carrhotus, μακάριος in verses 45-49: Ἀλεξιβιάδα, σὲ δ’ ἠὔκομοι φλέγοντι Χάριτες, μακάριος, ὃς ἔχεις καὶ πεδὰ μέγαν κάματον λόγων φερτάτων μναμήϊ’. Pindar has earlier called the King Battus and Battus’ son, Arcesilaus, μάκαρ but now, for the chariot driver, an adjective with less weight in meaning is needed. It is clear that Pindar cannot use the same adjective for the King as for the driver. There is no doubt that μακάριος still conserves a sense of admiration, but it is in a much lesser sense. De Heer describes μακάριος as following: “one who shares to a certain extent in the distinction of being μάκαρ.”<sup>53</sup>

The verb μακαρίζω appears only once in Pindar’s works. In *Nemean II*, verses 11-16: ἄνδρα δ’ ἐγὼ μακαρίζω μὲν πατέρ’ Ἀγησίλαν, καὶ τὸ θαητὸν δέμας ἀτρεμίαν τε ζύγγονον. Pindar uses μακαρίζω for Hagesilas and not μάκαρ. It is clear that this use is intentional because the verses that follow are a sombre reminder of mortality: εἰ δέ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφᾷ παραμεύσεται ἄλλους, ἔν τ’ ἀέθλοισιν ἀριστεύων ἐπέδειξεν βίαν, θνατὰ μεμνάσθω περιστέλλων μέλη, καὶ τελευτὰν ἀπάντων γᾶν ἐπιεσσόμενος. It implies that even if someone achieves ὄλβον, or if they exceed in physical beauty or if they thrive athletically and demonstrate their prowess, they should not forget that they are still human and mortal. Pindar is reticent to use μάκαρ for a human because it is a type of happiness only achievable by gods. His way around this is with the use of μακαρίζω that does not carry the same level of significance as μάκαρ.

---

<sup>51</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 30.

<sup>52</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 30.

<sup>53</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 31.

The closest that humans can come to achieve this type of divine happiness is being εὐδαίμων. In verses 21-26 of *Pythian X*, Pindar states that even though gods live a life free from toil, a human can come close to this happiness by being εὐδαίμων by succeeding in physical ability and emerging victorious in athletic tournaments and thus, being lauded by poets: θεὸς εἶη ἀπήμων κέαρ εὐδαίμων δὲ καὶ ὑμνητὸς οὗτος ἀνὴρ γίγνεται σοφοῖς, ὃς ἂν χερσὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶ κρατήσῃς τὰ μέγιστ' ἀέθλων ἔλη τόλμα τε καὶ σθένει, καὶ ζῶων ἔτι νεαρὸν κατ' αἴσαν υἱὸν ἴδη τυχόντα στεφάνων Πυθίων. There is no doubt that being εὐδαίμων comes with the experience of being the victor first-hand, but Maravela also comments that these last two verses exemplify that “eudaimonia [...] may be complemented, and allegedly reach its culmination, in witnessing the success of one’s offspring.”<sup>54</sup> In the following verses 27-29, it is made evident that being εὐδαίμων is the closest that humans can become to a divine happiness: ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτ' ἀμβατὸς αὐτῶ. ὅσαις δὲ βροτὸν ἔθνος ἀγλαΐαις ἀπτόμεσθα, περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον πλόον.

In *Nemean VII*, verses 98-101, Pindar asks Heracles to grant the victor a stable life with good fortune making his life εὐδαίμων: εἰ γὰρ σφισιν ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίωτον ἀρμόσαις ἦβρα λιπαρῶ τε γήραϊ διαπλέκοις εὐδαίμων' ἐόντα, παίδων δὲ παῖδες ἔχοιεν αἰεὶ γέρας τό περ νῦν καὶ ἄρειον ὄπιθεν. As it can be seen, Pindar also asks Heracles to grant the sons of the victor honour and even more so than the father. This passage expresses the aspiration of the victor to accomplish an ongoing legacy of respect and distinction with each subsequent generation surpassing the achievements of the previous one.

Considering the meaning of εὐδαιμονία, this noun is used in *Nemean VII*, verses 55-56, when Pindar states how no human can reach full εὐδαιμονία: ὁ μὲν τά, τὰ δ' ἄλλοι: τυχεῖν δ' ἔν' ἀδύνατον εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπασαν ἀνελόμενον. Also, in *Pythian VII*, verses 18-22, Pindar talks about how he fears that Megacles' noble actions will be punished by the envious gods: τὸ δ' ἄχγνυμαι, φθόνον ἀμειβόμενον τὰ καλὰ ἔργα. Then he goes on to say how εὐδαιμονία brings both good things and bad things for man: φαντί γε μὰν οὕτω κεν ἀνδρὶ παρμονίμαν θάλλοισαν εὐδαιμονίαν τὰ καὶ τὰ φέρεσθαι. As can be seen above, even though εὐδαιμονία is given by the gods, it still is not secure and can change at any time. In *Pythian III*, verses 81-84, Pindar states how the immortals give two bad things for every good thing and those who are ignorant are unable to endure their suffering gracefully, while those who are of noble character can tolerate the bad because they can find the good in the bad (ἐν παρ' ἐσλὸν

---

<sup>54</sup> Maravela, Anastasia. (2011), p. 35.

πήματα σύνδου δαίονται βροτοῖς ἀθάνατοι. τὰ μὲν ὧν οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κόσμῳ φέρειν, ἀλλ' ἀγαθοί, τὰ καλὰ τρέψαντες ἔξω. τιν δὲ μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίας ἔπεται). Here it is evident that the gods dispense good and bad and that humans have to be wise enough to know how to adapt to the constant change. Pindar says that Hieron is only worthy of a part of εὐδαιμονία. Here, it is made clear again that humans cannot achieve εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπασαν.

In contrast to εὐδαιμονία that seems impossible to achieve completely, ὄλβος is the material proof of divine favour. In *Isthmian V*, verses 11-15, Pindar says how the δαίμονες are the ones to judge human courage: κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν. δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ, εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούη. μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι πάντ' ἔχεις, εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν. Pindar makes clear the line between humans and gods and how this barrier should not be crossed. Humans cannot reach the happiness related to μάκαρ but, apart from being εὐδαίμων, ὄλβος can also be bestowed upon them. As De Heer states: “Mortals must not attempt to pass beyond this line, but they can approach it through their natural endowments and with the aid of divine favour.”<sup>55</sup> As it can be seen above, the noun ὄλβος is related to having good fortune (εὖ πάσχων) and to being honoured (λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούη). In *Pythian XII*, verses 28-32, Pindar states how ὄλβος cannot come without toil: εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου οὐ φαίνεται. Also, he says how even though a δαίμων is in charge of dispensing it, ultimately fate is always more powerful than the gods: ἐκ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν ἦτοι σάμερον δαίμων - τὸ δὲ μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτόν. This type of happiness seems to be a lower form of εὐδαιμονία, but it is still up to the gods to dispense it. De Heer explains perfectly the difference in meaning: “ὄλβος is the best man may hope to attain, while to be εὐδαίμων is the highest he may hope for, yet his achievement is beyond his reach.”<sup>56</sup> Lastly, Pindar, in verses 105-109 of *Pythian III*, talks about how this happiness is not permanent and that human affairs are always changing: ὄλβος οὐκ ἐς μακρὸν ἀνδρῶν ἔρχεται σάος, πολὺς εὖτ' ἂν ἐπιβρίσαις ἔπηται. σμικρὸς ἐν σμικροῖς, μέγας ἐν μεγάλοις ἔσσομαι τὸν ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ φρασὶν δαίμων' ἀσκήσω κατ' ἐμὰν θεραπεύων μαχανάν. In these verses, there is a certain resignation in accepting the inability to alter destiny and relying on the benevolence of the gods to bestow or withhold prosperity as they wish. Humans are intrinsically destined to be subordinate to the gods and it is critical that they embrace and adapt to the changes that are imposed upon them.

---

<sup>55</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 40.

<sup>56</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 50.

In relation to the use of ὄλβιος, there is an exceptional use for describing places, for example, in *Nemean I*, verses 69-72, Pindar explains how Heracles is granted an ever-lasting peaceful life for his hardship and will live in ὄλβιοις ἐν δώμασι: αὐτὸν μὲν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καμάτων μεγάλων ἐν σχερῶ ἄσυχίαν τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ποινὰν λαχόντ' ἐξάιρετον ὄλβιοις ἐν δώμασι. De Heer explains this use as following: “the transfer is from the person who is ὄλβιος to that which makes him so, his possessions, whether physical, such as buildings, or people, such as kinsmen, children.”<sup>57</sup> Heracles is ὄλβιος because he possesses a secure home with his long-term wife, Hebe. This idea of ὄλβιος being a happiness related to possession is evidenced in verses 10-12 of *Olympian VII*: ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχοντ' ἀγαθαί. ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάμιος ἀδυμελεῖ θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφόνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν. Due to the fact that the poem starts with a description of an image (a golden goblet filled with wine at a symposium) that denotes opulence, De Heer gathers that to be ὄλβιος has a relation to material possession. Also, it has to be secured by a divinity, in this case, the Grace (Χάρις)<sup>58</sup>.

Lastly, the verb εὐτυγέω and εὐτυχία will be examined together because they represent ultimately the same concept. In verses 1-3 of *Isthmian III* there is: εἴ τις ἀνδρῶν εὐτυχήσῃς ἢ σὺν εὐδόξοις ἀέθλοισι ἢ σθένει πλούτου κατέχει φρασὶν αἰανῆ κόρον, ἄξιός ἐστι εὐλογίαις ἀστῶν μεμίχθαι. Here, two possibilities of prospering (εὐτυγέω) are presented, either in athletic games or by the power of wealth. In verses 81-83 of *Olympian VII*, Pindar explains how, due to prospering (εὐτυγέω), Diagoras has been crowned several times at different games: τῶν ἄνθεσι Διαγόρας ἐστεφανώσατο δῖς, κλεινᾷ τ' ἐν Ἴσθμῶ τετράκις εὐτυγέων, Νεμέῃ τ' ἄλλαν ἐπ' ἄλλα, καὶ κρῆνααῖς ἐν Ἀθήναις. In Pindar's odes, there is a clear relationship between εὐτυγέω and victory in the athletic games. It is to have good fortune in the competitions, thus becoming victor. It is through this luck in the athletic games that fame and glory can be achieved through praise in song: ἔστι δ' ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ πανδοξίας ἄκρον μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ, verses 10-12 of *Nemean I*. In verses 77-81 of *Olympian I*, it is made clear that this prosperity is god-given: μάτρωες ἄνδρες ναιετάοντες ἐδώρησαν θεῶν κάρυκα λιταῖς θυσίαις πολλὰ δὴ πολλαῖσιν Ἑρμῶν εὐσεβέως, ὃς ἀγῶνας ἔχει μοῖραν τ' ἀέθλων Ἀρκαδίαν τ' εὐάνορα τιμᾷ κείνοιο, ὃ παῖ Σωστράτου, σὺν βαρυγδούπῳ πατρὶ κραίνει σέθεν εὐτυχίαν. Pindar explains how Hagesias' antecedents gave many gifts, prayed and made sacrifices to Hermes, the messenger of the gods, who is in charge of organizing the contests.

<sup>57</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 37.

<sup>58</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 37.

Correspondingly, Hermes and Zeus are in charge of dispensing εὐτυχία upon Hagesias. It is clear that this luck in the games, εὐτυχία, is bestowed by the gods so that the athlete succeeds in the games. In this sense, it can be understood that the victor is chosen by the gods. They choose who is worthy of being momentarily given εὐτυχία for them to come out victorious. The athlete owes their victory and also their glory to the gods.

In conclusion, through an in-depth examination of the concept of happiness in his works, Pindar reveals complicated concepts that defy simple answers. Firstly, the adjective μάκαρ is primarily reserved for the deities to the point where the use of μάκαρες already makes it clear that Pindar is referring to the gods without it having to accompany the noun θεός. In Pindar's works, there is a clear barrier between gods and humans. Humans admire gods because they enjoy divine happiness. This sense of admiration linked to μάκαρ is made clear in the two exceptional uses of the adjective for humans. It is used for King Battus and his son, Arcesilaus, to show admiration for their heroic ancestry and for their victory. Due to the fact that Pindar is reticent to use μάκαρ for humans, his way around this is using the verb μακαρίζω and the adjective μακάριος that have much less weight in meaning. They both still carry a sense of admiration, but it is in a reduced manner. The highest level of happiness that humans can aspire to is to be εὐδαίμων. This type of happiness is bestowed by the gods and supposedly comes with being physically gifted, taking first place in sporting competitions and receiving acclaim from poets. Witnessing the success of one's offspring further complements and enhances εὐδαιμονία. Pindar underlines that it is impossible for humans to achieve total eudaimonia. Pindar emphasizes how unstable it is, since it is a gift from the gods and, if they become envious, they might take it away at any moment. Pindar also asserts that the gods bestow both good and bad and that humans have to bear the trials and make the most of the good circumstances. Pindar distinguishes between εὐδαιμονία and ὄλβος. While achieving complete εὐδαιμονία is impossible for humans, ὄλβος serves as tangible evidence of divine favor. Pindar admits that this happiness is dispensed by a δαίμων and is related to possession, either wealth or glory. A remarkable new use of μάκαρ and ὄλβιος is for places. The use of μάκαρ for places is to imply that that place is akin to a divine realm. Alternatively, it could be another way to suggest that a human is close to divine happiness without using the adjective μάκαρ for humans, by labelling his abode as μάκαρ instead. The use of ὄλβιος for places consists of a shift from the individual who is ὄλβιος to the elements that contribute to him enjoying this type of happiness, which can be material possessions or individuals such as relatives and offspring. Lastly, εὐτυχεῖω and εὐτυχία are closely connected, representing the

concept of prospering. This good luck is bestowed by the gods in the moment of competing to make humans come out as victorious. The victory of the athletes and the glory that they achieve are owed to the gods. Effectively, it seems that all types of happiness and prosperity attainable to humans in Pindar's odes are bestowed by the gods and none of them are ever-lasting. In Pindar's works, there is a sense of acceptance of human helplessness in the face of the ever-changing nature of human affairs that are controlled by the gods.

#### 4. HAPPINESS IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY GENRE

##### 4.1. *Happiness in Herodotus*

Herodotus was a Greek historian who lived during the 5th century BC in Halicarnassus. He is acknowledged as “The Father of History” (*pater historiae*) by Cicero<sup>59</sup>. Herodotus is most known for his work, *The Histories*, which is considered one of the most significant pieces of classical historical writing. In his work, Herodotus focuses primarily on the Greco-Persian Wars, as well as the early stages leading up to the conflict. The lives of prominent kings and famous battles like Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis and Plataea are also featured in the *Histories*. In what at first glance seems a purely historiographical writing, Herodotus often reflects on the essence of morality, human nature and the role of divine involvement in historical events. His emphasis on the human experience opens a window into the analysis of his work from a philosophical standpoint. Herodotus' writings have sparked ongoing philosophical discussions including political theory, ethics, and cultural studies. Here, Herodotus' idea of happiness will be examined, which he explores through various chapters of his work. In his writings, Herodotus presents happiness as a multifaceted concept and he uses the following words related to this idea: the adjectives ὄλβιος, εὐτυχής and εὐδαίμων; the noun εὐδαιμονία and the verb μακαρίζω.

Firstly, the adjective εὐδαίμων refers to happiness relating to material possessions and wealth. An example of this use is clear in Book 1 chapter 133 of *The Histories* which talks about the customs of the Persians for their birthday celebrations. Herodotus explains how the εὐδαίμονες are those who have the money to be able to serve an abundant meal with different kinds of meat on their birthdays (ἐν τῇ οἱ εὐδαίμονες αὐτῶν βοῦν καὶ ἵππον καὶ κάμηλον καὶ ὄνον προτιθέεται ὄλους ὀπτούς ἐν καμίνοισι). It is used in opposition to the adjective πένης which refers to those who are poorer and serve cheaper kinds of meat (οἱ δὲ πένητες αὐτῶν τὰ

---

<sup>59</sup> See *De legibus*, I, 5.

λεπτὰ τῶν προβάτων προτιθέαται). From this contrast, it is possible to deduce that εὐδαίμων takes a similar meaning to πλούσιος. Another example of this use of εὐδαίμων is found in chapter 196 of Book 1 when Herodotus describes the customs of the Eneti in Illyria. Every year maidens are auctioned off and the εὐδαίμονες τῶν Βαβυλωνίων are the ones who outbid the others and can marry the prettiest (ἐπωλέοντο δὲ ἐπὶ συνοικίῃσι. ὅσοι μὲν δὴ ἔσκον εὐδαίμονες τῶν Βαβυλωνίων ἐπίγαμοι, ὑπερβάλλοντες ἀλλήλους ἐξωνέοντο τὰς καλλιστευούσας). However, the ὅσοι δὲ τοῦ δήμου are the ones who are left with the less attractive maidens (ὅσοι δὲ τοῦ δήμου ἔσκον ἐπίγαμοι, οὗτοι δὲ εἶδος μὲν οὐδὲν ἐδέοντο χρηστοῦ). The contrast with ὅσοι δὲ τοῦ δήμου makes it clear that the εὐδαίμονες are those who are wealthy and from the upper classes. Lastly, in Book V, chapter 8, Herodotus describes the Thracian funeral rituals of those who are εὐδαίμονες. From the fact that the εὐδαίμονες have feasts (παντοῖα σφάζαντες ἰρήια εὐωχέονται) and celebrate all kinds of contests (ἀγῶνα τιθεῖσι παντοῖον), it can be seen as a further use of εὐδαίμων with a sense of happiness that comes from wealth. Therefore, it can be concluded that the adjective εὐδαίμων is closely tied to being wealthy, πλούσιος. The man who is wealthy is considered εὐδαίμων, probably because he has the means to fulfil his everyday desires and live a comfortable life.

The adjective ὄλβιος, however, is used by Herodotus to denote a state of happiness that endures throughout one's lifetime and is intricately linked to the manner of one's passing. As such, it is intimately connected with living a good life and dying a good death. For example, in chapter 216 of Book 1, Herodotus describes the customs of the Massagetae people. The Massagetae do not have a set lifespan, but when a man becomes very old, his family comes together to kill him and eat his flesh during a feast. This death is considered the happiest way to die (ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ὄλβιώτατά σφι νενόμισται), the culmination of a good life for the Massagetae. If a man dies from an illness, the Massagetae people do not consume his flesh, but instead bury him in the ground (τὸν δὲ νοῦσῳ τελευτήσαντα οὐ κατασιτέονται ἀλλ' γῆ κρύπτουσι, συμφορὴν ποιούμενοι ὅτι οὐκ ἴκετο ἐς τὸ τυθῆναι). They express sadness that he did not have the opportunity to be killed and eaten, which is considered a happier and more honourable way to die in their society. The use of ὄλβιος in chapter 24 of Book VI expresses a type of happiness relating to the idea of permanent fortune where Herodotus explains how the monarch Scythes ended his life in Persia with great wealth (ἐς ὃ γήραϊ μέγα ὄλβιος ἐὼν ἐτελεύτησε ἐν Πέρσῃσι). Since a monarch is the subject, it may be supposed that Herodotus is simply talking about wealth, however, he is not referring to his state of wealth, but riches that endured until his old age. The adjective ὄλβιος is employed to convey the concept of an



enduring state of wealth that permits him to live a good life. So, effectively, being ὄλβιος is always related to stability and permanence.

In relation to εὐτυχής, Herodotus manifestly uses it to convey a notion of luckiness. The passage relating to Amasis and Polycrates serves as an example of this meaning and also refers to the dangers of being too εὐτυχής. In chapter 40 of Book III, Amasis writes a letter to Polycrates, who was experiencing great success (καί κως τὸν Ἄμασιν εὐτυχέων μεγάλως ὁ Πολυκράτης οὐκ ἐλάνθανε). Amasis expressed his happiness for Polycrates' prosperity, but also conveyed his concern over the dangers of such continuous good fortune<sup>60</sup>. He explained his belief that the gods are jealous of those who are εὐτυχής (ἐμοὶ δὲ αἱ σαὶ μεγάλαι εὐτυχίαι οὐκ ἀρέσκουσι, τὸ θεῖον ἐπισταμένω ὡς ἔστι φθονερόν). He advised Polycrates that it would be better to experience both successes and failures in life, rather than being lucky all the time (καὶ οὕτω διαφέρειν τὸν αἰῶνα ἐναλλάξ πρήσσων ἢ εὐτυχεῖν τὰ πάντα). Amasis suggested that Polycrates should consider what he valued most and willingly give it up so that he could experience a mixture of success and failure. This would help him avoid the dangers of continuous good fortune, which Amasis believes ultimately leads to destruction (οὐδένα γὰρ κω λόγῳ οἶδα ἀκούσας ὅστις ἐς τέλος οὐ κακῶς ἐτελεύτησε πρόρριζος, εὐτυχέων τὰ πάντα). Polycrates followed the advice and threw a valuable ring into the sea. However, later a fisherman caught a fish and Polycrates shared the fish with his cooks, who discovered the ring inside. When Amasis learned of Polycrates' continued good fortune, he broke off their alliance, believing that such luck would eventually lead to disaster (ἔμαθε [...] ὅτι οὐκ εἴ τελευτήσῃν μέλλοι Πολυκράτης εὐτυχέων τὰ πάντα, ὅς καὶ τὰ ἀποβάλλει εὐρίσκει) Polycrates was definitely a very lucky person, εὐτυχής, but to such an extent that he would be punished by the gods<sup>61</sup> and he would never be considered to have lived a good life, ὄλβιος.

In light of the foregoing analysis, it is now possible to appreciate more fully the nuances of these concepts in the famous dialogue between Croesus and Solon in Chapter 32 of Book 1<sup>62</sup>. Croesus invites Solon into his opulent palace and orders his servants to show Solon all his treasures. Croesus then asks Solon who he thinks is the happiest person of all, ὄλβιώτατος. It is clear that Croesus expects Solon to name him given the wealth and treasures that he has just witnessed. However, Solon responds that the happiest man, ὄλβιώτατος, he knows is Tellus from Athens because Tellus had a good life, good children, died honourably for his

---

<sup>60</sup> For the entire passage see Annex, [Chapter 40-43 of Book III](#).

<sup>61</sup> Herodotus in Book III, Chapter 125 explains how Polycrates was assassinated by the satrap of Sardis, Oroetes, in Magnesia.

<sup>62</sup> For the entire passage see Annex, [Chapter 30-33 of Book I](#).

country and the Athenians gave him a funeral. Solon says that the second happiest men he knows are Cleobis and Biton, brothers born in Argos. They offered to pull the cart and they transported their mother in order to fulfil the rituals. The Argives congratulated the young men and praised the mother for having such sons. The mother asked the goddess to grant Cleobis and Biton the most valuable thing there was which was death and they died. The Argives dedicated statues to them.

It can be deduced, therefore, that Solon's idea of the meaning of ὄλβιος has little to do with wealth and is related to having lived a fulfilling life. Gregory Nagy gives a deeper understanding to the difference in meaning between Solon and Croesus. As it was seen in the section of Homer, for those who have knowledge of the mysteries of hero cult, ὄλβιος denotes the meaning 'blessed'. However, for those who are not initiated in hero worship it means only 'happy'. Tellus was killed fighting with the Athenians, they honoured him (ἐτίμησαν μεγάλως) and buried him at public expense where he fell (Ἀθηναῖοι δημοσίη τε ἔθαψαν αὐτοῦ τῇ περ ἔπεσε καὶ). Nagy explains how: "timé can refer to the honor of hero cult that a cult hero receives after death."<sup>63</sup> Also, Cleobis and Biton sacrifice themselves for the good of the community and they are granted death. In the sense of hero cult, it is one of the highest achievements to die and be immortalized as a hero. Nagy states: "For the uninitiated, this wording means that you are better off dead – that you might as well choose to be put out of your misery instead going on with life. For the initiated, this same wording means that a life after death will be better for you than the life you are living now."<sup>64</sup> The different understanding of ὄλβιος between Croesus and Solon ultimately comes from the fact that "only those who are initiated into the mysteries of hero cult can understand the sacral meaning of olbios."<sup>65</sup>

Croesus says that Solon despises his happiness (ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονίη) to the point where he uses an example of two humble young men when he is rich and possesses great fortune. He thinks Solon is insulting him and demands an explanation. Solon says that human life is entirely up to chance and that a man who has a lot of wealth is no more inherently ὄλβιος than one who has just enough to live on (οὐ γάρ τι ὁ μέγα πλούσιος μᾶλλον τοῦ ἐπ' ἡμέρην ἔχοντος ὀλβιώτερος ἐστί, εἰ μὴ οἱ τύχη ἐπίσποιτο πάντα καλὰ ἔχοντα εὖ τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον). Being rich does not necessarily mean having good luck. He says that if a poor man has

---

<sup>63</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 576.

<sup>64</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 586.

<sup>65</sup> Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 576.

no illnesses, has good children and dies happily, he is a satisfied man and can be called ὄλβιος. In passage 32. 6 Solon gives a clear contrast for being ὄλβιος with being πλούσιος (ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγα πλούσιος ἀνόλβιος δὲ δυοῖσι προέχει τοῦ εὐτυχέος μούνον, οὗτος δὲ τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ ἀνόλβου πολλοῖσι). He mentions a man who is very rich πλούσιος, but at the same time ἀνόλβιος, meaning that he certainly does not see ὄλβιος as a synonym of πλούσιος. Solon explains that even though the rich, πλούσιος, are more prepared for adversities, the εὐτυχής man is lucky enough to avoid them. If this εὐτυχής man ends his life well, then he can be called ὄλβιος, but if not, he can only be called ‘lucky’ (πρὶν δ’ ἂν τελευτήσῃ, ἐπισχεῖν, μηδὲ καλέειν κω ὄλβιον ἀλλ’ εὐτυχέα). In this sense, Solon sees Croesus as only worthy of being called εὐτυχής, because his life has not ended yet. He says that human life is all chance (οὕτω ὧν Κροῖσε πᾶν ἐστὶ ἄνθρωπος συμφορῆ) and cannot be called the happiest man (ὀλβιώτατος) without having finished his life happily (ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ εἶρεό με, οὐκω σε ἐγὼ λέγω, πρὶν τελευτήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι)<sup>66</sup>.

Herodotus’ meaning of ὄλβιος seems, therefore, to coincide with Solon’s idea. De Heer also puts forward as an example of this Section 1 of Chapter 75 of Book VIII,<sup>67</sup> where ὄλβιος is qualified by χρήμασι to give it the meaning of being fortunate in money, so in no way does ὄλβιος by itself have anything to do with wealth. De Heer’s way of explaining this difference in meaning of ὄλβιος between Solon and Croesus is as a dialectal misunderstanding between Oriental and Greek. “This meaning, which he (Solon) believes to have a higher, moral value than the primary one of popular currency, refers to the performance of one’s duty as a citizen, a sense which is patently unknown to an Oriental monarch, instead of the pursuit of wealth for the sake of gratifying personal ambitions.”<sup>68</sup>

Croesus does not understand what Solon means until he finds himself tied to a pyre and about to be set fire by Cyrus in Chapter 86 of Book 1.<sup>69</sup> Cyrus feels pity for Croesus because he considers that he is a man equal to him in εὐδαιμονίη: καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἀκούσαντα τῶν ἑρμηνέων τὰ Κροῖσος εἶπε, μεταγρόντα τε καὶ ἐνώσαντα ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν ἄλλον ἄνθρωπον, γενόμενον ἐωυτοῦ εὐδαιμονίη οὐκ ἐλάσσω. It seems that Cyrus’ understanding of εὐδαιμονίη is also equivalent to possessions because they are both men of great wealth. Also,

<sup>66</sup> The irony here is that Solon is anticipating that Croesus is a very rich man, but that his fortune will not avoid him becoming ἀνόλβιος. Croesus will lose tragically his only son and slowly become less rich and powerful.

<sup>67</sup> Here is the Greek text as context for this use: τῷ οὐνομα μὲν ἦν Σίκιννος, οἰκέτης δὲ καὶ παιδαγωγὸς ἦν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος παίδων τὸν δὴ ὕστερον τούτων τῶν πρηγμάτων Θεμιστοκλέης Θεσπία τε ἐποίησε, ὡς ἐπεδέκοντο οἱ Θεσπίες πολιήτας, καὶ χρήμασι ὄλβιον.

<sup>68</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 71.

<sup>69</sup> For the entire passage see Annex, [Chapter 86 of Book 1](#).

Cyrus fears that he will be punished by the gods if he kills Croesus because he is aware that human affairs are up to chance (ὡς οὐδὲν εἶη τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι ἀσφαλῆως ἔχον). Cyrus then explains to him how he has contributed to Croesus' εὐδαιμονίη, but how he, Cyrus, is causing his own κακοδαιμονίη: ὁ δὲ εἶπε 'ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἔπραξα τῇ σῆ μὲν εὐδαιμονίη, τῇ ἐμεωυτοῦ δὲ κακοδαιμονίη. In this instance, εὐδαιμονίη has a meaning beyond simple wealth because Cyrus allows Croesus to live and avoid a bad death. Instead of acting for his fortune and wealth (εὐδαιμονίη), Cyrus contributes to Croesus' favourable outcome (related to ὄλβιος). Then Cyrus goes on to reflect about the war and states that no rational person would prefer war over peace because war leads to the death of young people, while peace leads to the natural order of older people passing away first. Here there is the idea that war hinders a permanent state of happiness related to ὄλβιος because it alters the natural order of things.

Herodotus also uses μακαρίζω<sup>70</sup> and its meaning seems to be made clear during the speech between Artabanus and Xerxes. This verb seems to portray the feeling of being happy momentarily. In passages 45-46 of Book VII, Xerxes feels happiness, ἐμακάρισε, upon seeing a vast army of ships and soldiers on the shores of Abydos, however, he then burst into tears: ὡς δὲ ὦρα πάντα μὲν τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ὑπὸ τῶν νεῶν ἀποκεκρυμμένον, πάσας δὲ τὰς ἀκτὰς καὶ τὰ Ἀβυδηγῶν πεδία ἐπίπλεα ἀνθρώπων, ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Ξέρξης ἐωυτὸν ἐμακάρισε, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐδάκρυσε. Xerxes' uncle, Artabanus, notices the sudden change in Xerxes' emotions from feeling blessed to weeping and questions how his emotions altered so quickly from his earlier declarations of happiness. Xerxes explained to his uncle Artabanus that his tears were due to his realization of the brevity of human life: ὁ δὲ εἶπε 'ἐσῆλθε γάρ με λογισάμενον κατοικτεῖραι ὡς βραχὺς εἶη ὁ πᾶς ἀνθρώπινος βίος, εἰ τούτων γε ἐόντων τοσοῦτων οὐδεὶς ἐς ἑκατοστὸν ἔτος περιέσται.' Xerxes feels compassion for the soldiers and their families, knowing that none of them would be alive in a hundred years' time. Artabanus responds to Xerxes, saying that the brevity of life is not the only source of sorrow and that there is no man so blessed in terms of wealth (εὐδαίμων) that he does not come to wish to be dead at some point: ἐν γὰρ οὕτω βραχεὶ βίῳ οὐδεὶς οὕτω ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν εὐδαίμων πέφυκε οὔτε τούτων οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων, τῷ οὐ παραστήσεται πολλάκις καὶ οὐκὶ ἅπαξ τεθνάναι βούλεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ζῶειν. He believes that everyone, regardless of their station in life, will experience times of misery and hardship that may make life seem unbearable, even if it is short: αἴ τε γὰρ συμφοραὶ προσπίπτουσαι καὶ αἱ νοῦσοι συνταράσσουσαι καὶ βραχὺν ἐόντα μακρὸν δοκέειν εἶναι ποιεῦσι τὸν βίον. Artabanus says that death is the most wanted refuge for humans: οὕτω

---

<sup>70</sup> It is important to note that there is no use of the adjective μάκαρ in Herodotus.

ὁ μὲν θάνατος μοχθηρῆς ἐούσης τῆς ζῆς καταφυγὴ αἰρετωτάτη τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γέγονε. This refers back to Cleobis and Biton who are granted death as the most valuable thing. This portrays the idea that those who are dead are happier than those who are alive because they are free from suffering.

Turpin talks about how Croesus and Xerxes are both reminded that death is unavoidable for all human beings, but that neither of them fully understands that they are equally as fragile. Turpin explains how Xerxes comments on the imminent death of others, but does not actually stop to comment on his own. Artabanus tries to convince Xerxes in the same way Solon tries to convince Croesus, but Artabanus and Solon are simply dismissed<sup>71</sup>. Carolyn Dewald explains that there are two central truths about happiness in Herodotus' *Histories*. Dewald observes how human life is always changing right up until death and she states the following, "wealthy, powerful people, kings, generals, politicians and the like - both Greek and barbarian, often do not understand this truth, and often make decisions that bring them down, based on their confidence in their own resources and trust in the fact of their own past success."<sup>72</sup>

The idea that human affairs are changing is a central topic and Carolyn Dewald points out that this is made clear by the fact that it is to be found in the conclusion of the proem. Herodotus says that human circumstances are not stable or durable. Herodotus explains how states gain importance and then lose it, thus circumstances are always changing. Here is evidence of another use of εὐδαιμονία with the meaning of wealth, that of the prosperity of a state.<sup>73</sup>

Through these passages, Herodotus offers us a glimpse into the ancient Greek worldview of what is considered happiness. Firstly, the adjective εὐδαίμων is closely related to wealth and it could be translated as 'fortunate'. It describes those who are fortunate thanks to their material possessions. Secondly, the adjective εὐτυχής implies a momentary fortune, which could be translated as 'lucky'. Thirdly, the verb μακαρίζω represents a momentary feeling of happiness that can change at any moment. Effectively, the most important concept relates to the adjective ὄλβιος which, according to Herodotus, implies living a fulfilling life and then dying an honorable death. Simply being rich πλούσιος does not equate to being ὄλβιος as Croesus believes. A person who has just enough to live on can be lucky εὐτυχής in avoiding

---

<sup>71</sup> Turpin, William. (2014), pp. 539-540.

<sup>72</sup> Carolyn Dewald (2011), p. 57.

<sup>73</sup> Carolyn Dewald (2011), p. 56.

adversities and be considered ὄλβιος if they have good health, children and a peaceful death. Herodotus' use of ὄλβιος seems to align with Solon's idea. If ὄλβιος is understood in the sense of hero cult, it can be understood that Solon, who is initiated in hero cult, considers that he who is ὄλβιος is a hero that has been immortalized and is worshipped as a hero like Tellus, and Cleobis and Biton. As Solon says, it is not until a person is immortalized through worship that they can be addressed as ὄλβιος. Another hypothesis is that the difference in meaning between Solon and Croesus may be due to a dialectal misunderstanding between Oriental and Greek cultures or it could be due to their difference in status. Those who are wealthy often believe that their wealth makes them worthy of being ὄλβιος, but they are unaware of how fragile they really are. This is exemplified by Croesus, who dismissed Solon's beliefs but later realizes that they were true. A central point in Herodotus is that life is constantly changing for rich and for poor and only those who die can truly escape the mutability of life. Ultimately, the gods are those who decide who will live a fulfilling life and they grant this type of fulfilment to only a few people. Cleobis and Biton are rewarded with what is considered the most valuable thing the gods can give, an honourable death that seals a good life. The adjective ὄλβιος is one that ultimately belongs in the realm of the dead because to consider a life as fulfilled it necessarily has to culminate in a good death.

## 5. HAPPINESS IN PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

### 5.1. *Happiness in Democritus*

Democritus was an ancient Greek philosopher who is thought to have been born in the fifth century BC in Abdera and is generally classified among the presocratics. Unfortunately, none of his work has survived and his way of thinking is only known from references<sup>74</sup>. Even though he is most known for his revolutionary contributions to the development of atomic theory, the focus of this section will be on his reflections on happiness. Democritus is often referred to as “the laughing philosopher”<sup>75</sup> and was known for being joyous in every matter<sup>76</sup>.

Democritus introduces a new concept that is εὐθυμία that is formed by εὖ and θύμος, which Beeks describes as ‘spirit, courage, anger, sense’<sup>77</sup>. So this type of contentment comes from

<sup>74</sup> The Greek text and numbering is extracted from Taylor, Christopher Charles Whiston. (2010).

<sup>75</sup> As seen in Seneca's *De Ira* Book 2 Chapter 10 Section 5: *Democritum contra aiunt numquam sine risu in publico fuisse ; adeo nihil illi videbatur senum eorum quae serio gerebantur. Ubi istic irae locus est? Aut ridenda omnia aut flenda sunt.* Or as seen in Hippolytus' *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* Book 1 Chapter 13 Section 2 DK 68A40: οὗτος ἐγέλα πάντα, ὡς γέλωτος ἀξίων πάντων τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

<sup>76</sup> Chitwood, Ava. (2004), p. 129.

<sup>77</sup> Beeks, Robert. (2010). θύμος. *In Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Brill.

having a good spirit. Further demonstration of Democritus' understanding of this word can be seen in passage D55: ἀνθρώποισι γὰρ εὐθυμῆ γίνεται μετριότητι τέρψιος καὶ βίου συμμετρίη τὰ δ' ἔλλείποντα καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντα μεταπίπτειν τε φιλεῖ καὶ μεγάλας κινήσιας ἐμποιεῖν τῆ ψυχῆ. αἱ δ' ἐκ μεγάλων διαστημάτων κινούμεναι τῶν ψυχέων οὔτε εὐσταθέες εἰσὶν οὔτε εὐθυμοί. Democritus says that this type of happiness comes from moderation in pleasure and way of life. It is clear that this sense of good spirit is directly related to stability, but this stability comes from within. It is up to humans to accomplish this state of good spirit where they are calm and stable. To attain this state, it is important to separate oneself from external matters that can disrupt one's emotions.

Democritus' references to εὐδαιμονία<sup>78</sup> seem to portray similar nuances to that found in the concept of εὐθυμία. From fragment D24 εὐδαιμονίη ψυχῆς καὶ κακοδαιμονίη, it can be deduced that, for Democritus, this type of happiness does not depend on external circumstances, but it is in the soul. In fragment D25 (εὐδαιμονίη οὐκ ἐν βοσκήμασιν οἰκεῖ οὐδὲ ἐν χρυσῷ ψυχὴ οἰκτῆριον δαίμονος), Democritus states that happiness has nothing to do with possessions. Instead, he is suggesting that the achievement of happiness and unhappiness is to do with the soul where the δαίμων is. As De Heer says: "It implies that the δαίμων element of the noun εὐδαιμονία is internal, so that man is not dependent on external influences for achieving this condition."<sup>79</sup> De Heer also puts forward Fragment C 3<sup>80</sup> which makes this idea evident: ἐγὼ δὲ ἕνα γελῶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον [...] πείρατα γῆς καὶ ἀορίστους μυχούς ἀμέτροισιν ἐπιθυμίησιν ὀδεύοντα, ἄργυρον τήκοντα καὶ χρυσόν, καὶ μὴ παυόμενον τῆς κτήσιας ταύτης, αἰεὶ δὲ θορυβεύμενον περὶ τὸ πλεόν, ὅκως αὐτοῦ ἐλάσσων μὴ γένηται· καὶ οὐδὲν αἰσχύνεται λεγόμενος εὐδαίμων. Democritus criticizes how humans constantly pursue external assets like material possessions but, despite this, they constantly want more.

Democritus uses the adjective εὐτυχῆς in the fragment D151: εὐτυχῆς ὁ ἐπὶ μετρίοισι χρήμασιν εὐθυμεόμενος, δυστυχῆς δὲ ὁ ἐπὶ πολλοῖσι δυσθυμεόμενος. Democritus considers fortunate those who are content with moderate wealth and he thinks that those who are dissatisfied with great wealth are unfortunate. As De Heer states: "Instead of allowing εὐτυχῆς to be the result of fortuitous circumstances, of accepting it in its usual passive sense, he gives it an active content. The finding is good through one's own efforts."<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> In Democritus, there is no use of the adjective μάκαρ or ὄλβιος.

<sup>79</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 79.

<sup>80</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 79.

<sup>81</sup> De Heer, Cornelis. (1969), p. 80.

Effectively, all types of contentment referred to by Democritus are internal and not dependent on any external influences. Democritus believed that εὐδαιμονία was not dependent on outside factors or the acquisition of possessions. Instead, it stems from a person's inner temperament. He held the view that the balance and harmony within one's soul was what determined their level of happiness and well-being. This balance and harmony can only come from learning how to live a moderate life with little wants or needs. In regards to the adjective εὐτυχής, Democritus believed that being fortunate comes from within and has nothing to do with possessions. He emphasizes the importance of being internally satisfied rather than constantly striving for more material possessions.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

In the Archaic Period, the main adjectives relating to happiness which are used are εὐδαίμων, μάκαρ, ὄλβιος and εὐτυχής. This research has analysed the evolution of these terms, as well as that of their respective cognates such as εὐδαιμονία, μακαρίζω, μακάριος, ὄλβος, εὐτυχέω and εὐτυχία.

Firstly, the use of μάκαρ is used to express admiration towards beings who are superior. This superiority is always related to stability. Homer uses this word for gods but also for humans who live easier lives due to their wealth or power<sup>82</sup> and he considers it to be the highest form of human happiness. However, Hesiod uses μάκαρ strictly for divinities because he considers that this happiness is only accessible to gods. Humans are destined to live a life full of toil and will never be able to enjoy the stability gods enjoy. Another novelty about Hesiod's use is that, for him, the adjective carries so much meaning that he even uses it to placate divinities of the underworld. In Solon and Sappho, μάκαρ is once again used exclusively for divinities. This specific use of μάκαρ continues in Pindar's works to the point that the adjective is used without the need of the noun θεός to indicate that he is referring to the gods.<sup>83</sup> In Herodotus, μάκαρ is not used, he only employs the verb μακαρίζω that portrays a feeling of momentary happiness. In Democritus, there is no use of μάκαρ or of μακαρίζω.

The first appearance of the adjective εὐδαίμων can be found in Hesiod and its meaning is linked to its etymology. He considers it to be the highest form of happiness attainable to

---

<sup>82</sup> In Homer, the verb μακαρίζω is employed to describe individuals who achieve a divine-like state through their materialistic wealth or power which makes their lives easier.

<sup>83</sup> Since Pindar is reluctant to use μάκαρ for humans, he gets around this by employing the verb μακαρίζω and the adjective μακάριος which carry considerably less significance. However, Pindar does use the adjective μάκαρ for places.



humans. It is used for humans who have a good relationship with the gods and, as a result, do not suffer from their wrath, thus, making their lives much easier. There is no specific reference to the concept εὐδαιμονία in Solon's or Sappho's works. For Pindar, this meaning varies. He still considers εὐδαιμονία to be the highest form of human happiness, but he does not consider it to be fully attainable. It seems to be a type of happiness dispensed by the gods for being physically talented, being victorious and winning praise from poets. This sense of happiness is further complemented and strengthened by seeing one's children succeed. In Herodotus, εὐδαιμονία is closely associated with being wealthy. Someone who is wealthy is regarded as εὐδαίμων presumably because he has the resources to satisfy his basic needs and lead a more comfortable life than those who are poor. However, in Democritus's works, εὐδαιμονία is a type of happiness that is internal and not dependent on material possessions. Happiness and sadness are achieved in the soul. According to Democritus' the δαίμων element of the term εὐδαιμονία is internal.

With regards to the adjective ὄλβιος, Homer employs this term in two distinct ways: firstly, it is used to describe a sense of materialistic happiness relating to wealth and power and secondly, in the context of hero worship, it is used as an adjective for heroes who have been immortalized after their death. In Hesiod, there is also this duality in meaning although it is slightly different. On the one hand, the adjective ὄλβιος is reserved for superior beings like heroes or, indeed, for Hesiod himself, who as a gifted poet is admired like a god and enjoys a divine lifestyle. On the other hand, ὄλβιος also alludes to heroes immortalized through cults who dwell on the Blessed Islands. In Solon's works, the adjective ὄλβιος represents someone who enjoys wealth that has been bestowed by the gods, thus, granting them access to the aristocratic circle and pederastic love. In Solon, there is a new ethical nuance to the words ὄλβιος and ὄλβον which represent a moral pleasure secured by the gods. In Sappho, ὄλβιος represents a type of happiness that comes from the love that arises in marriage. Aphrodite bestows ὄλβον upon the bride and bridegroom and they attain a god-like status. In Pindar, to be ὄλβιος is to be granted by a δαίμων either wealth or glory. In this sense, ὄλβος is the material proof of divine favour.<sup>84</sup> In Herodotus, the duality of this adjective appears once again in the passage of Solon and Croesus. Being ὄλβιος, implies living a fulfilling life and then dying an honorable death. If it is understood in the context of hero cult, Solon, who is an initiate, is implying that he who is ὄλβιος is a hero that has been immortalized through

---

<sup>84</sup> In Pindar, a novelty in the usage of ὄλβιος is that it is used for places due to a shift from the person who is ὄλβιος to his possessions, such as a building, that contribute to him being ὄλβιος.

worship. A person cannot be addressed as ὄλβιος until they fulfil their life with an honourable death. It is interesting to point out that the use of ὄλβιος in Solon's actual works is very different to that of the character Solon in Herodotus' *Histories*. For Solon the author, there is a component of wealth to ὄλβιος, but, to Solon the character, wealth has nothing to do with being ὄλβιος. Herodotus is clearly influenced by the epic interpretation of this word and chooses Solon as a character through whom he can express this interpretation of ὄλβιος. In Democritus, there is no use of ὄλβιος. In Solon, Sappho, Pindar and Herodotus to be ὄλβιος is the highest type of happiness fully attainable to humans.

Neither the adjective εὐτυχής nor its derivations appear in either Homer's, Hesiod's, Solon's or Sappho's works. Pindar uses the verb εὐτυχέω and εὐτυχία that both represent the idea of thriving. This good fortune and luck is bestowed by the gods so that the athlete can triumph in competition. The athlete's victory is ultimately due to the gods bestowing upon them εὐτυχία. In Herodotus, the adjective εὐτυχής has a similar meaning to εὐτυχέω and εὐτυχία in Pindar. It represents a momentary fortune, in other words, it is similar to our idea of having luck. This fortune is not stable and it is up to the gods to dispense it or take it away as they wish. In Democritus, the meaning of εὐτυχής is completely different. To be εὐτυχής is up to one's own conception and it has nothing to do with possessions. If one is internally satisfied with what one has, one is εὐτυχής. Even if one is wealthy, one will never be εὐτυχής if one is constantly wanting more.

Effectively, it is evident that these words evolved in their usage. In Homer, being μάκαρ was also accessible to humans and it was the highest form of bliss. The adjective μάκαρ becomes more specific as time goes on and ends up representing a happiness exclusively accessible to the gods. The adjective ὄλβιος represents a duality in meaning in Homer and Hesiod, but then the usage relating to immortalized heroes is lost in Sappho, Solon and Pindar. Herodotus, influenced by the epic genre, brings back this duality with even more force. The adjective ὄλβιος represents the highest form of human happiness from Solon to Herodotus. However, Hesiod regards the highest form of happiness to be εὐδαίμων according to its etymological meaning. Pindar abandons the etymological meaning and considers that this happiness comes from being victorious in games, but does not consider this happiness to be fully attainable to humans, only partly. In Herodotus, the etymological meaning is also lost and being εὐδαίμων is equal to being wealthy. However, Democritus respects the etymological meaning, but switches the δαίμων element of the term εὐδαιμονία from external to internal. Lastly, it can

be said that εὐτυχής is a lower form of happiness for all the authors. In Pindar and Herodotus, being εὐτυχής represents momentary luck that is dispensed by the gods. However, Democritus gives this luck an active meaning and it no longer depends on the gods, one is lucky through one's own perception of one's situation. Democritus' switch from the idea that happiness comes from external elements to the idea that happiness comes from within in both εὐδαιμονία and εὐτυχία, seems to have clearly influenced Aristotle's later understanding of εὐδαιμονία, that happiness depends on oneself and one's actions and way of thinking. Moreover, the passage where Solon and Croesus discuss the meaning of ὄλβιος clearly had an impact on Aristotle. Aristotle dismisses Herodotus' meaning of εὐδαιμονία that directly relates to wealth and focuses on his meaning of ὄλβιος. Herodotus shows a clear presocratic nature in the dialogue between Solon and Croesus and Aristotle draws on this meaning of ὄλβιος and utilizes it for his definition of εὐδαιμονία. Similarly to being ὄλβιος, to be εὐδαίμων also necessitates a whole lifespan to achieve. As Solon says, even if one is εὐτυχής one will not necessarily be ὄλβιος. Aristotle says that a degree of εὐτυχία is needed to be εὐδαίμων, but it does not bring happiness in itself. Here, Aristotle understands being εὐτυχής in the passive sense and not the active one that Democritus introduces. This analysis of these selected words and authors does not only show every author's individual use and how the words change in meaning, it also gives the broader picture of what these words meant in the Archaic Period. This examination of the evolution of the concepts relating to happiness gives an understanding of Aristotle's intellectual background which leads him to define εὐδαιμονία in his own way.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adrados, Francisco. (2010). *Líricos Griegos: Elegiacos y Yambógrafos Arcaicos, (Siglos VII-V A.C.)*. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Andersen, Øivind. (2011). "Happiness in Homer". *Symbolae Osloenses*, 85(1), 2-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679.2011.631355>
- Autenrieth, Georg. (1891). *An Homeric dictionary for Schools and colleges*. Harper & Brothers.
- Bailly, Anatole. (2000). *Dictionnaire Grec-Français*. Hachette.
- Beeks, Robert. (2010). *Etymological dictionary of greek*. Brill.
- Bywater, I. (1890). *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Capuccino, Carlotta. (2013). "Happiness and Aristotle's Definition of Eudaimonia". *Philosophical Topics*, 41(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtopics20134111>
- Chitwood, Ava. (2004). *Death by Philosophy: The Biographical Tradition in the Life and Death of the Archaic Philosophers Empedocles, Heraclitus, and Democritus*. University of Michigan Press.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. (2009). *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge University Press.
- De Heer, Cornelis. (1969). *ΜΑΚΑΡ - ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ - ΟΛΒΙΟΣ - ΕΥΤΥΧΗΣ*. Hakkert.
- Dewald, Carolyn. (2011). "Happiness in Herodotus". *Symbolae Osloenses*, 85(1), 52-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679.2011.631357>
- Finkelberg, Margalit. (1995). "Odysseus and the genus 'hero'". *Greece and Rome, Second Series*, 42 (1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383500025183>
- Gagarin, Michael (1973). "Dikē in the *Works and Days*." *Classical Philology*, 68(2), 81-94. <https://doi.org/10.1086/365942>
- García, Héctor. (2006). "Dikh y Ubris en contrapunto a la poética de Solón". *Analecta: revista de humanidades*, 1, 59-92.

- Gerber, Douglas. (2011). *A companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Brill.
- Gildersleeve, Basil. (2010). *Pindar: Olympian and Pythian Odes: With an Introductory Essay, Notes, and Indexes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Godley, Alfred Denis. (1920). *Herodotus' Histories*. Harvard University Press.
- Griffin, Jasper. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford University Press.
- Irwin, Elizabeth. (2005). *Solon and early Greek poetry: The politics of exhortation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Liddell, Henry; Scott, Robert; Jones, Henry. (1958). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Clarendon Press.
- Macías, Juan Manuel. (2017). *Poesías Safo*. Oficina de Arte y Ediciones.
- Maravela, Anastasia. (2011). "The athlete's "Happiness": *eudaimonia* in archaic Greek epinicians". *Symbolae Osloenses*, 85(1), 33-51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679.2011.606138>
- Most, Glenn. (2006). *Hesiod*. Harvard University Press.
- Murray, Augustus Taber. (1924). *Homer. The Iliad: With an English translation*. William Heinemann.
- Murray, Augustus Taber. (1919). *Homer. The Odyssey: With an English translation*. William Heinemann.
- Nagel, Thomas (1972). "Aristotle on Eudaimonia". *Phronesis*, 17(3), 252-259. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156852872X00079>
- Nagy, Gregory. (2004). *Homeric responses*. University of Texas Press.
- Nagy, Gregory. (2020). *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Noussia-Fantuzzi, Maria. (2010). *Solon the Athenian, the poetic fragments*. Brill.
- Race, William. (1997). *Pindar I: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*. Harvard University Press.
- Race, William. (1997). *Pindar II: Nemean odes, Isthmian odes, Fragments*. Harvard

University Press.

Taylor, Christopher Charles Whiston. (2010). *The Atomists: Leucippus and Democritus: Fragments; a text and translation with a commentary*. University of Toronto Press.

*The Digital sappho*. The Fragments. (n.d.). <https://digitalsappho.org/fragments/fr1/>

Turpin, William. (2014). "Croesus, Xerxes, and the Denial of Death (Herodotus 1.29–34; 7.44–53)". *Classical World*, 107(4), 535-541. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2014.0023>

Wasdin, Katherine. (2018). *Eros at Dusk*. Oxford University Press.

## ANNEX

### Chapter 40-43 of Book III: Amasis and Polycrates

[40] καὶ κως τὸν Ἄμασιν εὐτυχέων μεγάλως ὁ Πολυκράτης οὐκ ἐλάνθανε, ἀλλὰ οἱ τοῦτ' ἦν ἐπιμελής. πολλῶ δὲ ἔτι πλεῦνός οἱ εὐτυχίης γινομένης γράψας ἐς βυβλίον τάδε ἐπέστειλε ἐς Σάμον. Ἄμασις Πολυκράτει ὧδε λέγει. [2] ἦδὺ μὲν πυνθάνεσθαι ἄνδρα φίλον καὶ ξεῖνον εὖ πρήσσοντα: ἐμοὶ δὲ αἰ σαὶ μεγάλαί εὐτυχίαι οὐκ ἀρέσκουσι, τὸ θεῖον ἐπισταμένῳ ὡς ἔστι φθονερόν: καὶ κως βούλομαι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τῶν ἂν κήδωμαι τὸ μὲν τι εὐτυχέειν τῶν πρηγμάτων τὸ δὲ προσπταίειν, καὶ οὕτω διαφέρειν τὸν αἰῶνα ἐναλλάξ πρήσσω ἢ εὐτυχέειν τὰ πάντα. [3] οὐδένα γάρ κω λόγῳ οἶδα ἀκούσας ὅστις ἐς τέλος οὐ κακῶς ἐτελεύτησε πρόρριζος, εὐτυχέων τὰ πάντα. σύ νυν ἐμοὶ πειθόμενος ποιήσον πρὸς τὰς εὐτυχίας τοιάδε: [4] φροντίσας τὸ ἂν εὖρης ἐόν τοι πλείστου ἄξιον καὶ ἐπ' ὃ σὺ ἀπολομένῳ μάλιστα τὴν ψυχὴν ἀλγήσεις, τοῦτο ἀπόβαλε οὕτω ὅκως μηκέτι ἤξει ἐς ἀνθρώπους: ἦν τε μὴ ἐναλλάξ ἤδη τῶπὸ τούτου αἰ εὐτυχίαι τοι τῆσι πάθῃσι προσπίπτωσι, τρόπῳ τῷ ἐξ ἐμεῦ ὑποκειμένῳ ἀκέο.'

[41] ταῦτα ἐπιλεξάμενος ὁ Πολυκράτης καὶ νόῳ λαβὼν ὡς οἱ εὖ ὑπετίθετο Ἄμασις, ἐδίξητο ἐπ' ὃ ἂν μάλιστα τὴν ψυχὴν ἀσηθείῃ ἀπολομένῳ τῶν κειμηλίων, διζήμενος δὲ εὗρισκε τόδε. ἦν οἱ σφρηγὶς τὴν ἐφόρει χρυσόδοτος, σμαράγδου μὲν λίθου ἐοῦσα, ἔργον δὲ ἦν Θεοδώρου τοῦ Τηλεκλέος Σαμίου. [2] ἐπεὶ ὧν ταύτην οἱ ἐδόκεε ἀποβαλεῖν, ἐποίηε τοιάδε: πεντηκόντερον πληρώσας ἀνδρῶν ἐσέβη ἐς αὐτήν, μετὰ δὲ ἀναγαγεῖν ἐκέλευε ἐς τὸ πέλαγος: ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου ἐκὰς ἐγένετο, περιελόμενος τὴν σφρηγίδα πάντων ὀρώντων τῶν συμπλόων ρίπτει ἐς τὸ πέλαγος. τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσας ἀπέπλεε, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐς τὰ οἰκία συμφορῇ ἐχρᾶτο.

[42] πέμπτη δὲ ἢ ἕκτη ἡμέρη ἀπὸ τούτων τάδε οἱ συνήνεικε γενέσθαι. ἀνὴρ ἀλιεὺς λαβὼν ἰχθὺν μέγαν τε καὶ καλὸν ἠξίου μιν Πολυκράτει δῶρον δοθῆναι: φέρων δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας Πολυκράτει ἔφη ἐθέλειν ἐλθεῖν ἐς ὄψιν, χωρήσαντος δὲ οἱ τούτου ἔλεγε διδοῦς τὸν ἰχθύν [2] ὃ βασιλεῦ, ἐγὼ τόνδε ἐλὼν οὐκ ἐδικαίωσα φέρειν ἐς ἀγορὴν, καίπερ ἐὼν ἀποχειροβίτος, ἀλλὰ μοι ἐδόκεε σεῦ τε εἶναι ἄξιος καὶ τῆς σῆς ἀρχῆς: σοὶ δὲ μιν φέρων δίδωμι.' ὁ δὲ ἠσθεὶς τοῖσι ἔπεσι ἀμείβεται τοῖσιδε. 'κάρτα τε εὖ ἐποίησας καὶ χάρις διπλῆ τῶν τε λόγων καὶ τοῦ δώρου, καὶ σε ἐπὶ δεῖπνον καλέομεν.' [3] ὁ μὲν δὲ ἀλιεὺς μέγα ποιεύμενος ταῦτα ἦε ἐς τὰ οἰκία, τὸν δὲ ἰχθὺν τάμνοντες οἱ θεράποντες εὐρίσκουσι ἐν τῇ νηδίῳ αὐτοῦ ἐνεοῦσαν τὴν Πολυκράτεος σφρηγίδα. [4] ὡς δὲ εἶδόν τε καὶ ἔλαβον τάχιστα, ἔφερον κεχαρηκότες παρὰ τὸν Πολυκράτεα, δίδόντες δὲ οἱ τὴν σφρηγίδα ἔλεγον ὅτεῳ τρόπῳ εὐρέθη. τὸν δὲ ὡς ἐσῆλθε

θεῖον εἶναι τὸ πρῆγμα, γράφει ἐς βυβλίον πάντα τὰ ποιήσαντά μιν οἷα καταλελάβηκε, γράψας δὲ ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἐπέθηκε.

[43] ἐπιλεξάμενος δὲ ὁ Ἄμασις τὸ βυβλίον τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Πολυκράτεος ἦκον, ἔμαθε ὅτι ἐκκομίσαι τε ἀδύνατον εἶη ἀνθρώπῳ ἀνθρώπον ἐκ τοῦ μέλλοντος γίνεσθαι πρήγματος, καὶ ὅτι οὐκ εὔτελευτήσιν μέλλοι Πολυκράτης εὐτυχέων τὰ πάντα, ὅς καὶ τὰ ἀποβάλλει εὐρίσκει. [2] πέμψας δὲ οἱ κήρυκα ἐς Σάμον διαλύεσθαι ἔφη τὴν ξεινίην. τοῦδε δὲ εἵνεκεν ταῦτα ἐποίησε, ἵνα μὴ συντυχίης δεινῆς τε καὶ μεγάλης Πολυκράτεα καταλαβούσης αὐτὸς ἀλγήσειε τὴν ψυχὴν ὡς περὶ ξείνου ἀνδρός.

### Chapter 30-33 of Book I: Croesus and Solon

[30] αὐτῶν δὴ ὧν τούτων καὶ τῆς θεωρίας ἐκδημήσας ὁ Σόλων εἵνεκεν ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἀπῆκετο παρὰ Ἄμασιν καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς Σάρδις παρὰ Κροῖσον. ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐξεινίζετο ἐν τοῖσι βασιλῆιοισι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κροῖσου: μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρη τρίτη ἢ τετάρτη κελεύσαντος Κροῖσου τὸν Σόλωνα θεράποντες περιῆγον κατὰ τοὺς θησαυρούς, **καὶ ἐπεδείκνυσαν πάντα ἔοντα μεγάλα τε καὶ ὄλβια.** [2] θεησάμενον δὲ μιν τὰ πάντα καὶ σκεψάμενον ὥς οἱ κατὰ καιρὸν ἦν, εἶρετο ὁ Κροῖσος τάδε. ‘ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, παρ’ ἡμέας γὰρ περὶ σέο λόγος ἀπῆκται πολλὸς καὶ σοφίης εἵνεκεν <sup>1</sup> τῆς σῆς καὶ πλάνης, ὡς φιλοσοφῶν γῆν πολλὴν θεωρίας εἵνεκεν ἐπελήλυθας: νῦν ὧν ἐπειρέσθαι με ἵμερος ἐπῆλθέ σε εἴ τινα ἤδη πάντων εἶδες ὀλβιώτατον.’ [3] ὁ μὲν ἐλπίζων εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ὀλβιώτατος ταῦτα ἐπειρώτα: Σόλων δὲ οὐδὲν ὑποθωπεύσας ἀλλὰ τῷ ἔοντι χρησάμενος λέγει ‘ὦ βασιλεῦ, Τέλλον Ἀθηναῖον.’ [4] ἀποθωμάσας δὲ Κροῖσος τὸ λεχθὲν εἶρετο ἐπιστρεφένως: ‘κοίη δὴ κρίνεις Τέλλον εἶναι ὀλβιώτατον;’ ὁ δὲ εἶπε ‘Τέλλῳ τοῦτο μὲν τῆς πόλιος εὔηκούσης παῖδες ἦσαν καλοὶ τε κάγαθοί, καὶ σφι εἶδε ἅπασι τέκνα ἐκγενόμενα καὶ πάντα παραμείναντα: τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ βίου εὔηκοντι, ὡς τὰ παρ’ ἡμῖν, τελευτῆ τοῦ βίου λαμπροτάτη ἐπεγένετο: [5] γενομένης γὰρ Ἀθηναίοισι μάχης πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας ἐν Ἐλευσίनि, βοηθήσας καὶ τροπὴν ποιήσας τῶν πολεμίων ἀπέθανε κάλλιστα, καὶ μιν Ἀθηναῖοι δημοσίη τε ἔθαψαν αὐτοῦ τῆ περ ἔπεσε καὶ ἐτίμησαν μεγάλως.’

[31] ὡς δὲ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Τέλλον προετρέψατο ὁ Σόλων τὸν Κροῖσον εἶπας πολλά τε καὶ ὄλβια, ἐπειρώτα τίνα δεύτερον μετ’ ἐκεῖνον ἴδοι, δοκέων πάγχυ δευτερεῖα γῶν οἴσεσθαι. ὁ δ’ εἶπε ‘Κλέοβιν τε καὶ Βίτωνα. [2] τούτοισι γὰρ ἐοῦσι γένος Ἀργεῖοισι βίος τε ἀρκέων ὑπῆν, καὶ πρὸς τούτῳ ῥώμη σώματος τοιήδε: ἀεθλοφόροι τε ἀμφοτέροι ὁμοίως ἦσαν, καὶ δὴ καὶ λέγεται ὅδε ὁ λόγος. ἐούσης ὀρθῆς τῆ Ἥρη τοῖσι Ἀργεῖοισι ἔδεε πάντως τὴν μητέρα



αὐτῶν ζεύγει κομισθῆναι ἐς τὸ ἱρόν, οἱ δὲ σφι βόες ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ οὐ παρεγίνοντο ἐν ὄρῃ: ἐκκληϊόμενοι δὲ τῇ ὄρῃ οἱ νεηνιαὶ ὑποδύντες αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ζεύγλην εἶλκον τὴν ἄμαξαν, ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης δὲ σφι ὠχέετο ἡ μήτηρ: σταδίους δὲ πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα διακομίσαντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὸ ἱρόν. [3] ταῦτα δὲ σφι ποιήσασι καὶ ὀφθεῖσι ὑπὸ τῆς πανηγύριος τελευτῆ τοῦ βίου ἀρίστη ἐπεγένετο, διέδεξέ τε ἐν τούτοισι ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἄμεινον εἶη ἀνθρώπῳ τεθνάναι μᾶλλον ἢ ζῶειν. Ἀργεῖοι μὲν γὰρ περιστάντες ἐμακάριζον τῶν νεηνιέων τὴν ῥώμην, αἱ δὲ Ἀργεῖαι τὴν μητέρα αὐτῶν, οἶων τέκνων ἐκύρησε: [4] ἡ δὲ μήτηρ περιχαρῆς ἐοῦσα τῷ τε ἔργῳ καὶ τῇ φήμῃ, σᾶσα ἀντίον τοῦ ἀγάλματος εὐχετο Κλεόβι τε καὶ Βίτωνι τοῖσι ἐωυτῆς τέκνοισι, οἳ μιν ἐτίμησαν μεγάλως, τὴν θεὸν δοῦναι τὸ ἀνθρώπῳ τυχεῖν ἄριστον ἐστί. [5] μετὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν εὐχὴν ὡς ἔθυσάν τε καὶ εὐωχήθησαν, κατακοιμηθέντες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἱρῷ οἱ νεηνιαὶ οὐκέτι ἀνέστησαν ἀλλ' ἐν τέλει τούτῳ ἔσχοντο. Ἀργεῖοι δὲ σφέων εἰκόνας ποιησάμενοι ἀνέθεσαν ἐς Δελφοὺς ὡς ἀριστῶν γενομένων.'

[32] Σόλων μὲν δὴ εὐδαιμονίης δευτερεῖα ἔνεμε τούτοισι, Κροῖσος δὲ σπερχθεις εἶπε 'ὦ ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, ἡ δ' ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονία οὕτω τοι ἀπέρριπται ἐς τὸ μηδὲν ὥστε οὐδὲ ἰδιωτέων ἀνδρῶν ἀξίους ἡμέας ἐποίησας;' ὁ δὲ εἶπε 'ὦ Κροῖσε, ἐπιστάμενόν με τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐὼν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες ἐπειρωτᾶς ἀνθρωπῆϊων πρηγμάτων πέρι. [2] ἐν γὰρ τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ πολλὰ μὲν ἐστὶ ἰδεῖν τὰ μὴ τις ἐθέλει, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ παθεῖν. ἐς γὰρ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτεα οὖρον τῆς ζῆς ἀνθρώπῳ προτίθημι. [3] οὗτοι ἐόντες ἐνιαυτοὶ ἑβδομήκοντα παρέχονται ἡμέρας δικησῖας καὶ πεντακισχιλίας καὶ δισμυρίας, ἐμβολίμου μηνὸς μὴ γινομένου: εἰ δὲ δὴ ἐθέλησει τούτερον τῶν ἐτέων μηνὶ μακρότερον γίνεσθαι, ἵνα δὴ αἱ ὄραι συμβαίνωσι παραγινόμεναι ἐς τὸ δέον, μῆνες μὲν παρὰ τὰ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτεα οἱ ἐμβόλιμοι γίνονται τριήκοντα πέντε, ἡμέραι δὲ ἐκ τῶν μηνῶν τούτων χίλια πενήκοντα. [4] τουτέων τῶν ἀπασέων ἡμερέων τῶν ἐς τὰ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτεα, ἐουσέων πενήκοντα καὶ δικησιέων καὶ ἑξακισχιλιέων καὶ δισμυριέων, ἡ ἕτερη αὐτέων τῆ ἕτερη ἡμέρη τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲν ὅμοιον προσάγει πρῆγμα. οὕτω ὦν Κροῖσε πᾶν ἐστὶ ἄνθρωπος συμφορῆ. [5] ἐμοὶ δὲ σὺ καὶ πλουτέειν μέγα φαίνειαι καὶ βασιλεὺς πολλῶν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων: ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ εἶρεό με, οὐκῶ σε ἐγὼ λέγω, πρὶν τελευτήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι. οὐ γάρ τι ὁ μέγα πλούσιος μᾶλλον τοῦ ἐπ' ἡμέρην ἔχοντος ὀλβιώτερος ἐστί, εἰ μὴ οἱ τύχη ἐπίσποιτο πάντα καλὰ ἔχοντα εὖ τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον. πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ζᾶπλουτοὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀνόλβιοι εἰσὶ, πολλοὶ δὲ μετρίως ἔχοντες βίου εὐτυχέες. [6] ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγα πλούσιος ἀνόλβιος δὲ δυοῖσι προέχει τοῦ εὐτυχέος μόνον, οὗτος δὲ τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ ἀνόλβου πολλοῖσι: ὁ μὲν ἐπιθυμίην ἐκτελέσαι καὶ ἄτην μεγάλην προσπεσοῦσαν ἐνεῖκαι δυνατώτερος, ὁ δὲ τοῖσιδε προέχει ἐκεῖνον: ἄτην μὲν καὶ ἐπιθυμίην οὐκ ὁμοίως δυνατὸς ἐκείνῳ ἐνεῖκαι, ταῦτα δὲ ἡ

εὐτυχίῃ οἱ ἀπερύκει, ἄπηρος δὲ ἐστί, ἄνουσος, ἀπαθῆς κακῶν, εὖπαις, εὐειδῆς. [7] εἰ δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ἐτι τελευτήση τὸν βίον εὖ, οὗτος ἐκεῖνος τὸν σὺ ζητέεις, ὁ ὄλβιος κεκλησθαι ἄξιος ἐστί: πρὶν δ' ἂν τελευτήση, ἐπισχεῖν, μηδὲ καλέειν κω ὄλβιον ἀλλ' εὐτυχέα. [8] τὰ πάντα μὲν νυν ταῦτα συλλαβεῖν ἄνθρωπον ἔοντα ἀδύνατον ἐστί, ὥσπερ χωρῆ οὐδεμία καταρκέει πάντα ἐωυτῆ παρέχουσα, ἀλλὰ ἄλλο μὲν ἔχει ἐτέρου δὲ ἐπιδέεται: ἡ δὲ ἂν τὰ πλεῖστα ἔχη, αὕτη ἀρίστη. ὥς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπου σῶμα ἐν οὐδὲν αὐταρκες ἐστί: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔχει, ἄλλου δὲ ἐνδεές ἐστί: [9] ὃς δ' ἂν αὐτῶν πλεῖστα ἔχων διατελέῃ καὶ ἔπειτα τελευτήση εὐχαρίστως τὸν βίον, οὗτος παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ οὖνομα τοῦτο ὧ βασιλεῦ δίκαιος ἐστί φέρεσθαι. σκοπέειν δὲ χρῆ παντὸς χρήματος τὴν τελευτήν, κῆ ἀποβήσεται: πολλοῖσι γὰρ δὴ ὑποδέξας ὄλβον ὁ θεὸς προρρίζους ἀνέτρεψε.'

[33] ταῦτα λέγων τῷ Κροῖσῳ οὐ κως οὔτε ἐχαρίζετο, οὔτε λόγου μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται, κάρτα δόξας ἀμαθέα εἶναι, ὃς τὰ παρεόντα ἀγαθὰ μετεῖς τὴν τελευτήν παντὸς χρήματος ὁρᾶν ἐκέλευε.

#### Chapter 86 of Book 1: Croesus' realization

οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι τάς τε δὴ Σάρδις ἔσχον καὶ αὐτὸν Κροῖσον ἐζώγησαν, ἄρξαντα ἔτεα τεσσερεσκαίδεκα καὶ τεσσερεσκαίδεκα ἡμέρας πολιορκηθέντα, κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριόν τε καταπαύσαντα τὴν ἐωυτοῦ μεγάλην ἀρχήν. λαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ Πέρσαι ἤγαγον παρὰ Κῦρον. ὁ δὲ συνήσας πυρὴν μεγάλην ἀνεβίβασε ἐπ' αὐτήν τὸν Κροῖσόν τε ἐν πέδησι δεδεμένον καὶ δις ἑπτὰ Λυδῶν παρ' αὐτὸν παῖδας, ἐν νόῳ ἔχων εἴτε δὴ ἀκροθίνια ταῦτα καταγιεῖν θεῶν ὄτεω δὴ, εἴτε καὶ εὐχὴν ἐπιτελέσαι θέλων, εἴτε καὶ πυθόμενος τὸν Κροῖσον εἶναι θεοσεβέα τοῦδε εἵνεκεν ἀνεβίβασε ἐπὶ τὴν πυρὴν, βουλόμενος εἰδέναι εἴ τις μιν δαιμόνων ρύσεται τοῦ μὴ ζῶντα κατακαυθῆναι. τὸν μὲν δὴ ποιέειν ταῦτα: τῷ δὲ Κροῖσῳ ἐστεῶτι ἐπὶ τῆς πυρῆς ἐσελθεῖν, καίπερ ἐν κακῷ ἔοντι τοσοῦτω, τὸ τοῦ Σόλωνος ὡς οἱ εἶη σὺν θεῷ εἰρημένον, τὸ μηδένα εἶναι τῶν ζώντων ὄλβιον. ὡς δὲ ἄρα μιν προσστῆναι τοῦτο, ἀνενεικάμενόν τε καὶ ἀναστενάξαντα ἐκ πολλῆς ἡσυχίης ἐς τρεῖς ὀνομάσαι 'Σόλων.' καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἀκούσαντα κελεῦσαι τοὺς ἐρμηνέας ἐπειρέσθαι τὸν Κροῖσον τίνα τοῦτον ἐπικαλέοιτο, καὶ τοὺς προσελθόντας ἐπειρωτᾶν: Κροῖσον δὲ τέως μὲν σιγὴν ἔχειν εἰρωτώμενον, μετὰ δὲ ὡς ἠναγκάζετο, εἰπεῖν 'τὸν ἂν ἐγὼ πᾶσι τυράννοισι προετίμησα μεγάλων χρημάτων ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν.' ὡς δὲ σφι ἄσημα ἔφραζε, πάλιν ἐπειρώτων τὰ λεγόμενα. λιπαρεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ὄχλον παρεχόντων, ἔλεγε δὴ ὡς ἦλθε ἀρχὴν ὁ Σόλων ἐὼν Ἀθηναῖος, καὶ θεησάμενος πάντα τὸν ἐωυτοῦ ὄλβον ἀποφλαυρίσειε οἷα δὴ εἶπας, ὡς τε αὐτῷ πάντα ἀποβεβήκοι τῆ περ ἐκεῖνος εἶπε, οὐδὲν τι μᾶλλον ἐς ἐωυτὸν λέγων ἢ οὐκ ἐς ἅπαν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς παρὰ σφίσι αὐτοῖσι ὄλβιους δοκέοντας εἶναι. τὸν μὲν

Κροῖσον ταῦτα ἀπηγέεσθαι, τῆς δὲ πυρῆς ἤδη ἀμμένης καίεσθαι τὰ περιέσχατα. καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἀκούσαντα τῶν ἐρμηνέων τὰ Κροῖσος εἶπε, μεταγνόντα τε καὶ ἐννώσαντα ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν ἄλλον ἄνθρωπον, γενόμενον ἐωυτοῦ εὐδαιμονίῃ οὐκ ἐλάσσω, ζῶντα πυρὶ διδοίη, πρὸς τε τούτοισι δείσαντα τὴν τίσιν καὶ ἐπιλεξάμενον ὡς οὐδὲν εἴη τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι ἀσφαλῶς ἔχον, κελεύειν σβεννύναι τὴν ταχίστην τὸ καιόμενον πῦρ 1 καὶ καταβιβάζειν Κροῖσόν τε καὶ τοὺς μετὰ Κροῖσου. καὶ τοὺς πειρωμένους οὐ δύνασθαι ἔτι τοῦ πυρὸς ἐπικρατῆσαι.