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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, ὀλβιος 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, ὀλβιος, εὐτυχής.
INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION................................................................................................................. 1

2. HAPPINESS IN THE EPIC GENRE.................................................................................. 2
   2.1. Happiness in Homer...................................................................................................... 2
   2.2. Happiness in Hesiod................................................................................................. 10

3. HAPPINESS IN THE LYRIC GENRE............................................................................ 15
   3.1. Happiness in Solon................................................................................................. 15
   3.2. Happiness in Sappho.............................................................................................. 18
   3.3. Happiness in Pindar.............................................................................................. 20

4. HAPPINESS IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY GENRE................................................... 27
   4.1. Happiness in Herodotus........................................................................................... 27

5. HAPPINESS IN PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY................................................................... 34
   5.1. Happiness in Democritus......................................................................................... 34

6. CONCLUSIONS.............................................................................................................. 36
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, εὐδαίμονία 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.”¹ Bailly defines it as, “celui qui distribue à chacun son lot, son sort.”² 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, εὐδαίμονία 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 life³. In addition because Aristotle thinks that εὐδαίμονία 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 εὐδαίμονία. Without certain resources, it is hard to carry out good deeds and without these a person cannot experience true εὐδαίμονία. However, even if someone is very wealthy this will not make them εὐδαίμονων. 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 γὰρ, ὅσπερ εἴπομεν, καὶ ἀρετῆς τελείας καὶ βίου τελείου (Nicomachean Ethics, 1100a).

³ Here is the original text from Nicomachean Ethics, 1100a.1-1100a.5: that explains this: διὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν αὐτίκαν οὐδὲ παῖς εὐδαίμονον εἰσίν οὖπον γὰρ πρακτικὸς τῶν τοιούτων διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν οἱ δὲ λεγόμενοι διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα μακαρίζονται. δεῖ γὰρ, ὅσπερ εἴπομεν, 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 εὐδαίμον, μάκαρ, ὀλβιός 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.

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

---

4 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. 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.”

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.”

---

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 (δοοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείμεναι ἐν Διός οὐδὲι δόρων οἶα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἔτερος δὲ ἕαων). Zeus generally dispenses a mix of the good and the bad to humans (ὁ μὲν κ΄ ἀμμίξας δῶῃ Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος, ἄλλοτε μὲν τε κακῷ δὲ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ’ ἐσθλῶ), even though he can give more bad happenings than good to some. Andersen puts forward the verses 210-12\(^8\) 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’ ὀπαζόν ὀϊζόν, οἳ νόιν ἀγάσαντο παρ’ ἄλληλοισι μένοντε ἥβης ταρπήναι καὶ γήραος οὐδόν 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.” To begin with, in Homer, there is no trace of the noun εὐδαμονία or of the adjective εὐδαίμων. The two principal words that are widely translated as ‘happy’ are the adjectives, μάκαρ and ὀλβιος.

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: τὸ δ’ αἰτῶ μάρτυροι ἐστον πρός τε θεῶν μακάρων πρός τε θνητῶν ἄνθρώπων. 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 ἡδ’ ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοί αἰέν ἐόντες. Here, it is interesting to point out the adverb, αἰέν. 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

---

\(^8\) Andersen, Øivind (2011), p. 6.

Olympus, an abode that is always safe (ἀσφαλὲς). Wind, rain or snow never have an impact (οὔτε ἀνέμοις τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ᾽ ὀμβρῷ δεόται οὔτε χιῶν ἐπιπύλναται) and the sky is always clear (μᾶλ᾽ αἰθρῇ πέπταται ἀνέφελος). The gods enjoy their lives there and are always μάκαρ (τῷ ἕνι τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ήματα 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 ήματα πάντα represents this stability in the same way the adverb αἴεν 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’, ὡς τ´ ἁμητήρες ἐναντίοι ἀλλήλοις ὁγμοῖν ἐλαύνωσιν ἀνδρός μάκαρος κατ´ ἄρουραν πυρὸν ἢ κριθὸν). 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.”

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 ὁ μάκαρ Ατρείδη μοιρηγενές ὀλβιόδαμιον. These adjectives are used in a context of praise and of admiration towards Agamemnon. The adjective μοιρηγενές is formed by Μοῖρα and γενές. 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,
who decide the destiny of both gods and mortals. The Μőιρα 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 Μőιρα. Όλβιόδαμιον is formed by the adjective ὀλβιός and the noun δαίμων which refers to a divinity. Autenrieth (Autenrieth et al., 1891) provides this definition: “ὁλβιο-δαίμων: blessed by the deity, II. 3.182.” It can be seen that Agamemnon is μάκαρ due to the fact that he is μοιρηγενὲς and ὀλβιόδαμιον 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 Moira in destiny or by a deity in happiness. 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’, Αχιλλείῳ, οὗ τὰς ἀνήρ προσπάροιθε μακάρτατος οὔτ᾽ ἥπερ ὀπίσσω) because when he was alive he was worshipped like a god by the people of Argos (πρὶν μὲν γὰρ σε ζωὸν ἐτίμομεν Ἰσά θεοῖσιν Ἁργεῖοι) and now that he is in the underworld, he continues to be admired in the underworld (νῦν οὕτε μέγα κρατέεις νεκύεσσιν ἐνθάδ’ ἑὼν).

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 κτερέον, καὶ μεν κλέος ἴγγον Ἀχιλλείοι). Odysseus, in contrast, thinks that he has been assigned an unheroic death (νῦν δὲ λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ εἶμαι ἀλλὰν) 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.”

---

12 See page 8 for how Priam was once ὀλβιός 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.
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 (τρὶς μάκαρες μὲν σοί γε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ, τρὶς μάκαρες δὲ κασίγνητοι). However, he who is the most μάκαρ is the man who can win her heart (κεῖνος δ’ αὖ περί κήρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων, δς κε σ’ ἐξόνυσι βρίσας οἱκόνδ’ ἀγάγηται). This is an example of “makarismoi embedded in epic”\(^{14}\). Wasdin says: “the makarismos is connected with the good fortune of reciprocal charis\(^{15}\). Not only do the gods bestow beauty and luck upon lovers, they also grant temporarily elevated status to those they favor.”\(^{16}\) 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.\(^{17}\)

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 γνοίς φιλότητά τε πολλά τε δόρα εξ ἐμεδ, ὡς ἄν τίς σε συναντόμενος μακαρίζει. 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 ὀλβίος 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 


\(^{15}\) In short, χάρις is the force of favour and blessing. For more see Chapter 6 Divine Reciprocity of Wasdin, Katherine. (2018).


ὄλβος and πλοῦτος of the Mirmidons (πάντας γὰρ ἐπ᾽ ἁνθρώπους ἐκέκαστο ὠλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε, ἀνασσε δὲ Μυρμιδόνεσσι). It can be seen that the adjective ὠλβος seems to denote a materialistic happiness. This happiness is also dispensed by the gods (ὅς μὲν καὶ Πηλῆι θεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δόρα ἐκ γενετῆς). Achilles goes on to say that he knows Priam once surpassed others in being ὠλβος (καὶ σὲ γέρον τὸ πρίν μὲν ἀκούομεν ὁλβον εἰναι) because of his wealth and sons (τὸν σὲ γέρον πλούτῳ τε καὶ υἱᾶσι φασι γεκάσθαι). Achilles uses ὠλβος 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 ὁλβος due to the loss of his sons.

The word ὠλβος is repeatedly used in wishes for the future for the gods to grant ὠλβια. 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 ὠλβια: ποιήσει καὶ φίλα δῶρα, τὰ μοι θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες ὠλβια ποιήσειν.

It is important to point out verse 377 of Book XXIV of the Iliad, when Odyssey greets Achilles as: ὠλβιε Πηλέος υἱε, θεοῖς ἐπείκελ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ. De Heer explains that this exemplifies the vagueness between the uses of μάκαρ and ὁλβος. However, Nagy explores the meaning of the word ὠλβος18 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 […]”19 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 practice20. So in this sense, Nagy thinks that the use here of ὠλβος 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 Ἀργεοὺς) 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 (ἄλβος).

The adjective, ὀλβιος is also used for Odysseus. Nagy\textsuperscript{21} also sees this as a reference to hero cult and puts forward, as an example, verses 136-137 of Book XI of the \textit{Odyssey}, that mention Odysseus’ death and implicitly reference his tomb: θάνατος δὲ τοι ἔλλος αὐτῷ ἀβληχρός μᾶλα τοῖος ἔλευσεται, δὲ κέ σε πέφνῃ γήραι ὕπο λιπαρῷ ἀρημένον. ἂμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ ὀλβιοι ἔσσονται. Here it is said that those who are close to Odysseus’ tomb will be ὀλβιοι and is clearly another allusion to hero cult. As Nagy explains\textsuperscript{22}, not only are those heroes who are immortalized ὀλβιοι, but even those who worship a cult hero at their tomb can become ὀλβιοι.

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 andfortunate 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 ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος in the past, it can be deduced that ὀλβιος is not a permanent state. The word ὀλβία is found in wishes for the future and the gods are referred to as dispensers of ὀλβος. Nagy points out that ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος by worshipping a cult hero at their grave. Even though


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 ὡτυχής 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: ὡτυχής, μάκαρ and εὐδαιμόν.23

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.

23 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”\textsuperscript{24} and “What makes our age so difficult is its intermediate status between justice and its opposite, hybris.”\textsuperscript{25} 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 μετείναιανδράσιν, ἀλλ’ ἢ πρόσθε θανείν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι. νῦν γάρ δὴ γένος ἐστὶ σιδήρεοι οὐδὲ ποτ’ ἦμαρ παύονται καμάτου καὶ οἰζόος, οὐδὲ τί νῦκτωρ 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.”\textsuperscript{26}

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: μάκαρας τε θεοὺς, οἳ Ὅλυμποιν ἔχουσιν. In verse 139 of Works and Days, the same usage is evident: οὐκ ἔδιδον μακάρεσσι θεοῖς, οἳ Ὅλυμπον ἔχουσιν. Verses 80-81 of The Shield of Heracles demonstrate an identical application of this adjective: ἢ τε μέγ᾽ ἀθανάτους μάκαρας, τοῖ Ὅλυμπον ἔχουσιν, ἥλιτεν Ἀμφιτρύῶν. 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 ὀλβίος was dictated by a scruple and constituted a deliberate departure from the epic usage found so far”\textsuperscript{27}.

\textsuperscript{24} Clay, Jenny Strauss. (2009), p. 93.
\textsuperscript{25} Clay, Jenny Strauss. (2009), p. 84. For more about the importance of ὀλβίος in the Works and Days see Gagarin, Michael (1973).
\textsuperscript{26} Clay, Jenny Strauss. (2009), p. 95.
\textsuperscript{27} 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 ἔσθολοι. However, in verses 140-141, the Silver Age, after being killed by Zeus, turn into spirits related to the night called μάκαρες: ἀφτάρ ἔπει καὶ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖ’ ἐκάλυψε, τοί 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.”

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.

Ὅλβιος is the second highest form of happiness and is the highest form accessible to humans. Hesiod uses the word ὅλβιος to refer to himself as a poet in verses 96-97 of the Theogony: δ’ ὅλβιος, ὅν τινα Μοῦσαι φιλῶνται γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ρέει αὐθή. 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’ ἄν’ ἀγώνα θεοῦ δῶς ἱλάσκονται αἰδοῖ μελιχή, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισιν τοῖς Μουσῶν ἱερή δόσις ἀνθρώποισιν. The adjective ὅλβιος 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: ἄψ’ ὅ γε δυσφοροσυνέσεων ἐπιλήθεται οὖδὲ τι κηδέων μέμνηται ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δόρα θεῶν. Here, it can be seen that Hesiod is ὅλβιος because he does not suffer like other humans thanks to his divine gift. It is important to point out that this

29 The adjective ὅλβιος 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 ὀλβιος 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: ὀλβιος, δς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἄθανάτοισιν ἀνόσσας ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήρας ἔρωμα 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.”

In verses 170-173 of Works and Days, ὀλβιοι also accompanies heroes: καὶ τοι μὲν ναίουσιν ἀκηδέα θυμόν ἔχοντες ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι. Ἡράκλειον βαθυδίνην, ὀλβιοι ἥρωες.

The use of ὀλβιοι 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 ὀλβιος 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.” 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 εὐδαιμόν 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

---

verses 5-6, starts by warning how Zeus can change human fate as he wishes: ῥέα μὲν γὰρ βριάει, ῥέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει, ῥεῖα δ᾽ ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἀδήλον 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 νεμεσόσι καὶ ἄνέρες, ὡς κεν ἀεργὸς ζῷῃ, κηρήνεσσι κοθούροις εἰκελος όργῆν, 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: ἔργαν δ᾽ ἄνδρες πολύμηλοι τ᾽ ἀφνειοί τε καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι πολὺ φίλτεροι ἀθανάτοισιν. ἔργον δ᾽ οὐδὲν οὖν ἄνειδος, ἀεργήτη δὲ τ᾽ ὀνείδος. 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 ὀλβίος: εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὀλβίος, ὃς τάδε πάντα εἰδὼς ἐργάζηται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, ὄρνηθας κρίνον καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων. As explained before, Hesiod’s age, the Iron Age, is watched over by the gods, the δαιμόνες 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 ὀλβίος 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 ὀλβίος 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 ὅλβιος and when it refers to heroes it could be alluding to hero cult. These ὅλβιοι 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 εὐδαίμονιον is also used for humans, but represents a different kind of happiness. This happiness is related purely to living a life avoiding the δάίμονες. A human who is εὐδαίμονιον 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 δάίμονες 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 εὐδαίμονιον 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.² = 36W.²: θεσμοῦς δ’ ὁμοίως τῷ κακῷ τε κάγαθῷ εὐθέαν εἰς ἐκαστὸν ἄρμόσας 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.³² 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

---

³² 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.\textsuperscript{33}

In Solon’s works, there are three concepts relating to happiness: μάκαρ, ὀλβίος and ὀλβος\textsuperscript{34}. 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.\textsuperscript{2} = 4 W.\textsuperscript{2}: ἡμετέρη δὲ πόλεις κατὰ μὲν Δίος οὔποτ’ ὀλέιται αἶσαν 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.\textsuperscript{2} = 14 W.\textsuperscript{3} 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, ὃς θυτηοὺς ἕλλος καθορᾶ. 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.\textsuperscript{2} = 13 W.\textsuperscript{2}, Solon invokes the Muses to ask them to grant him, what seems to be, two very important things, to have ὀλβίος and αἰεὶ δόξαν ἀγαθὴν. In verses 2-4, Solon asks the Muses to be granted ὀλβιον from the gods and eternal fame from humans: Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, κλητῆς μοι εὐχομένων: ὀλβιον μοι πρὸς θεῶν μακάρων δότε καὶ πρὸς ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων αἰεὶ δόξαν ἔχειν ἀγαθὴν.\textsuperscript{35} It seems that this type of happiness can only be dispensed by the gods. Due to the fact that, later on, he introduces χρῆματα, 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: χρῆματα δ’ ἱμεῖρο μὲν ἔχειν, ἀδίκως δὲ πεπάσθαι οὐκ ἐθέλω· πάντως ὑστερον ᾦδὲ δίκη. Having ὀλβιον 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 (ἵν’ ὀβριος) 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 ὀλβιος an ethical connotation in addition to the one of wealth.”\textsuperscript{36}

\begin{itemize}
\item[33] Irwin, Elizabeth. (2005), p. 2.
\item[34] There is no trace of the adjectives εὐδαίμων nor εὐτυχής, nor of the verb μακαρίζω.
\item[35] Here, the contrast between θεῶν μακάρων and ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων is appreciated.
\end{itemize}
Thirdly, ὀλβιος is used only once. In fragment 17 G.-P.² = 23 W.², Solon describes how a man is ὀλβιος if he has παῖδες: ὀλβιος, ὦι παῖδες τε φίλοι καὶ μόνον ής ὑποι καὶ κόνες ἄγενται καὶ ξένοις ἀλλοδαπός. On the one hand, this παῖδες could be interpreted as having one’s own offspring. However, in her commentary, Noussia compares this fragment to fragment 16 G.-P.² = 25 W.²: ἐσθ’ ἡβης ἐρατοίσιν ἐπ’ ἀνθρώποι παιδοφιλής, μηρόν ἢμείρον καὶ γλυκεροῦ στόματος. Noussia states that these are “some glimpses into the often-lauded activities of the lives of elite male Greeks.”

It seems that, according to Solon, the love of boys or pederasty, was also something that made a man ὀλβιος. Here this is a different sense of ὀλβον, but they are related. As mentioned before ὀλβον 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.² = 15 W.², he states how lots of bad men are rich, but good men are poor: πολλοί 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’ ἡμείς αὐτοὶ οὐ διαμειψόμεθα τῆς ἁρετής τον πλοῦτον, ἐπεὶ τὸ μὲν ἐμπεδον αἰεί, χρήματα δ’ ἀνθρώπον 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 ὀλβος. In verses 5-8 of fragment 3 G.-P.² = 4 W.² Solon criticizes those who destroy the city because they are easily persuaded by money because of their greed: αὐτοὶ δὲ φθείρειν μεγάλην πόλιν ἀφραδής ἄστοι βούλονται χρήματα πειθόμενοι, δήμου θ’ ἡγεμόνον ἄδικος νός, οἶνον ἐτοίμον ὑβριος ἐκ μεγάλης ἄλγεια πολλὰ παθεῖν. Negative connotations are evident because the idea of having money unjustly is related to the idea of ὑβρις.

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

39 For more about δική and ὑβρις 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 ὅλβιος. In relation to ὅλβιος, it is clear that this happiness has to be given by the gods so that it is deemed just. This moral implication to ὅλβιος 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, ὅλβιος 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 Lebos, and she speaks as their main choral personality.” 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.

---

Firstly, Sappho uses the adjectives, μάκαρ and ὀλβιος.\footnote{There is no use of the adjective εὐδαιμονίας in Sappho. However, in fragment 148 L.-P., there is a use of εὐδαιμονίας: ἦν ὁ πλοῦτος ἀρέτας σοὶ ἀπειλοῦν μακάρων ἔχεται καὶ ἀπυστρέφονται. 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 Robfert, it is still interesting to comment on these verses. The idea of εὐδαιμονίας is clearly related to the idea of wealth (πλοῦτος) with virtue (ἀρέτας). These verses do not transmit the same idea of happiness, as seen in the above with the adjectives μάκαρ and ὀλβιος and do not fit into Sappho’s context. De Heer suggests that these verses date from the late fifth century. Given that these verses seem clearly spurious, this instance of εὐδαιμονίας will not be taken into account in the conclusion.} In verses 3-6 of fragment 63 L.-P. μάκαρ seems to refer to the gods: γλύκως ἣ δείν’ ὄνιας μ’ ἵνα χώρις ἔχην τάν δυναμ[ ἐλπὶς ἐξ ἂν ἰδεῖ].\footnote{The Greek text is taken from The Digital sappho: https://digitalsappho.org/fragments/fr1/} 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 ἡκτενία. 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 μάκαραί for the Graces: σὺ δὲ στεφάνοις, ὁ Δίκα, πέρθεσθ’ ἐράταις φόβαις ὠρκακας ἀνήτω συν(α)έρραις’ ἀπάλαισι χέρσιν· εὐάνθεα †γάρ πέλεταί καὶ Χάριτες μάκαραι μᾶλλον προτόρην, ἄστεφανότοισι δ’ ἀπωυστέρωνται. 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. (ἐχεί μὲν Ἀνδρομέδα κάλαν ἔμοιβαν... Ψάψοι, τί τάν πολύολβον Αφροδίταν…). 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 ὀλβες γάμβρε, σοὶ μὲν δὴ γάμος ὡς ἁραίο ἐκτετελεστ’, ἐχείς δὲ πάρθενον ἢν ἁραίο. The final verse reiterates this idea that Aphrodite blesses the newly-wed: τετίμακ’ ἐξοχὰ 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: φάινεται μοι κήνος ἦς θέοισιν ἐμμεν ὁνερ, ὅτες ἐναντίος τοι ἱσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἄρω φοινείας 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 manifest in the ritual convention of imagining the bridegroom not only as a god, but also as a hero especially as Achilles.”\footnote{Nagy, Gregory. (2020), p. 115.} The bridegroom resembles Achilles because he is the patron of newly-weds because he dies just when he was about to get married. “There
are two divine models for Achilles as an ideal bridegroom: Ares and Apollo. The expression ἵσος θεοῖς θέουσιν ὄνεφρ 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.

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 ὀλβιος. The adjective ὀλβιος 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, ὀλβιος, from Aphrodite who is πολύολβος. The bridegroom is called ὀλβιος 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 Olympic 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 (μήμησις). 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

---

44 Fragment 111 L.-P. is a clear example of the comparison of the bridegroom to Ares: ἢσοι ὁ τὸ μέλαθρον, ὑμήνων, ἀέρρετε, τέκτονες ἄνδρες ὑμήνων. γάμφρος ἡ ἀρσενική ὁ Άρης ἀρσενικός ἀδόρος μεγάλω πόλο μάκαρ. ὑμήνων. Aphrodite is Sappho’s ally in love and aids her in matters of unrequited love.


46 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.⁴⁷

In Pindar’s works, the following concepts relating to happiness are found: the adjectives μάκαρ, μακάρως, εὐτυχίας and δλβίος; the nouns εὐδαιμονία, δλβον and εὐνυχία and the verbs μακαρίζω and εὐνυχέω⁴⁸.

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 ἐμέμναι ἁγοραί) 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’ ἀπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν’ εἰπεῖν. 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 ἄφωναν ἱκομένους μάκαραν Ἱέρωνος ἑστίαν. 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 (ἄφωνα) and is wealthy, his home could be compared to that of the gods.⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰

---

⁴⁸ There is no trace of the adjective εὐνυχίας in Pindar.
⁵⁰ In Isthmian VII, verse 1, ὁ μάκαρα Θῆβα 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 μακάρον νήσσος), 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: ὅ μάκαρ ὑιὲ 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.”

The only other use of μάκαρ as an adjective for a human is for Battus’ son, Arcesilas, in verses 20-23 of Pythian V: μάκαρ δὲ καὶ νῦν, κλεεννάς ὦτι εὐχρος ἥδη παρὰ Πυθιάδος ἵπποις ἐλὼν δέδεξαι τόνδε κῶμον ἀνέρων, Απολλώνιον 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.” 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´ ἡδόμοι τίρεντοι Χάριτες, μακάριος, δς ἐχεις καὶ πεδα μέγαν κάματον λόγον φερτάτων μναμή’. Pindar has earlier called the King Battus and Battus’ son, Arcesilas, 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.”

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 ἔχων. 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 δὲ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφά παραμεύσεται ἄλλους, ἐν τ´ ἀέθλοισιν ἄριστοις ἐπέδειξεν βίαν, θνατὰ μεμνάσθω περιστέλλων μέλη, καὶ τελευτάν ἀπάντων γὰν ἐπεισοδευνόν. 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.

---

The closest that humans can come to achieving 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: θεῶς εἰς ἀπήμων κέαρ εὐδαίμων δὲ καὶ ὑμνητῶς οὐτος ἀνήρ γίγνεται σοφοῖς, ὡς ἂν χερσίν ἢ ποδὸν ἄρετὰ κρατήσαις τὰ μέγιστ᾽ ἄέθλων ἐλη τόλμῃ τε καὶ σθένει, καὶ ζώων ἐτι νεαρόν κατ᾽ αἴσιον υἱὸν ἵδι 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.”\(^{54}\) In the following verses 27-29, it is made evident that being εὐδαίμων is the closest that humans can become to a divine happiness: ο χάλκεος οὐρανος οὐ ποτ᾽ ἄμβατος αὐτῷ. ὁσίας δὲ βροτὸν ἔθνος ἄγλαϊας ἀπόμεσθα, περαίνει πρός διάχατον πλῶν.

In Nemean VII, verses 98-101, Pindar asks Heracles to grant the victor a stable life with good fortune making his life εὐδαίμων: ει γάρ σφισιν ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίοτον ἀρμόσαις ἃβα λιπαρῷ τε γήρατι διαπλέκοις εὐδαίμων ἔόντα, παῖδων δὲ παῖδες ἔχοιεν αἰεὶ γέρας τὸ περ νῦν καὶ ἄρειον ὅπιθεν. 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: ὃ μὲν τά, τά δ᾽ ἄλλοι: τυχεῖν δ᾽ ἔν ἀδύνατον εὐδαιμονίαν ἀπασαν 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᾽ ἀξιωμα, φθόνον ἀμεβόμενον τά καλά ἔργα. Then he goes on to say how εὐδαιμονία brings both good things and bad things for man: φαντὶ γε μὲν οὐτω κεν ἀνδρὶ παρμονίμαι θάλλοσαν εὐδαιμονίαν τά καὶ τά 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 (ἔν παρ᾽ ἐσλὸν

πήματα σύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς ἀθάνατοι. τὰ μὲν οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κόσμῳ φέρειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀγαθοί, τὰ καλὰ τρέψαντες ἔξω. τίν ὁ δὲ μοῖρ᾽ εὐδαιμονίας ἐπεται. 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 ἂπασαν.

In contrast to εὐδαιμονία that seems impossible to achieve completely, ὡλβος 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᾽ ἄλκα διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν. δὸν δὲ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνει τὸν ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ σὼν ὡλβῷ, εἰ τις εὐ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἄκοὐ. μή μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι πάντ᾽ ἔχεις, εἰ σε τούτων μοῖρ᾽ ἐφίκοιτο καλόν. 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 εὐδαιμόνιοι, ὡλβὸς 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.”55 As it can be seen above, the noun ὡλβὸς is related to having good fortune (εὐ πάσχων) and to being honoured (λόγον ἐσλὸν ἄκοὐ). In Phythian XII, verses 28-32, Pindar states how ὡλβὸς cannot come without toil: εἰ δὲ τις ὡλβὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι, ἀνευ 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: “ὁ λβος is the best man hope may attain, while to be εὐδαιμονι is the highest he may hope for, yet his achievement is beyond his reach.”56 Lastly, Pindar, in verses 105-109 of Pythian III, talks about how this happiness is not permanent and that human affairs are always changing: ὡλβος οὐκ ἐς μακρὸν ἀνδρῶν ἐρχεται σάος, πολὺς εὑ ἐν ἐπιβρίσιας ἐπηται. σμικρός ἐν σμικροῖς, μέγας ἐν μεγάλοις ἐσσομαι τὸν ἀμφέποντ᾽ ἀεὶ φρασίν δαίμον᾽ ἀσκῆσι χατ᾽ ἐμῶν 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.

In relation to the use of ὀλβίος, 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 ὀλβίοις ἐν δόμαισι: αὐτὸν μᾶν ἐν εἰράνας καμάτων μεγάλων ἐν σχερῷ ἁσυχίαν τὸν ἀπαντὰ χρόνον ποινᾶν λαχόντ’ ἐξηρέσον ὀλβίος ἐν δόμαισι.

De Heer explains this use as following: “the transfer is from the person who is ὀλβίος to that which makes him so, his possessions, whether physical, such as buildings, or people, such as kinsmen, children.”

Heracles is ὀλβίος because he possesses a secure home with his long-term wife, Hebe. This idea of ὀλβίος being a happiness related to possession is evidenced in verses 10-12 of *Olympian VII*: ὁ δ’ ὀλβίος, ὃν φαίμα κατέχοντ’ ἀγαθαί. ἀλλοτε δ’ ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ξωθάλμιος ἀδυμελεῖ θαμά μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισι τ’ ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλόν. 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 ὀλβίος has a relation to material possession. Also, it has to be secured by a divinity, in this case, the Grace (Χάρις).

Lastly, the verb εὐτυχέω and εὐτυχία will be examined together because they represent ultimately the same concept. In verses 1-3 of *Isthmian III* there is: εἴ τις ἄνδρὸν εὐτυχήσως ἦ σών εὐδόξοις ἀέθλοις ἦ σθένει πλούτιος κατέχει φρασιν αἰανὴ κόρον, ἄξιος εὐλογίαις ἄστον μεμίθηαι. Here, two possibilities of prospering (εὐτυχέων) 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 (εὐτυχέων), Diagoras has been crowned several times at different games: τὸν ἄνθεσι Διαγόρας ἐστεφανώσατο δις, κλεινῇ τ’ ἐν Ἰσθμῷ τετράκις εὐτυχέων, Νεμέα τ’ ἄλλαν ἐπ’ ἄλλα, καὶ κρανααῖς ἐν Αθήνας. In Pindar’s odes, there is a clear relationship between εὐτυχέω 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: ἄστι δ’ ἐν εὐτυχία πανδοξίας ἄκρον μεγάλον δ’ ἄεθλων Μοίσα μεμνᾶσθαι φύλε, 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 νυκτάσσοντες ἐδώρησαν θεῶν κάρυκα λιταῖς θυσίαις πολλὰ δὴ πολλαίστε Ἑρμᾶν εὐσεβεῖς, ἃς ἁγιόνας ἐχει μοῖραν τ’ ἄεθλων Ἀρκαδίαν τ’ εὐάνορα τιμᾶ κεῖνος, ὁ παῖ Σωστράτου, σῶν βαρυγδούπῳ πατρί 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.

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 θέος. 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 ὀλβος. While achieving complete εὐδαιμονία is impossible for humans, ὀλβος 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 ὀλβος 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 ὀλβος for places consists of a shift from the individual who is ὀλβος 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, εὐτυχέω 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\(^59\). 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 ὑδαίμος, 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 εὐδαιμόνες 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 εὐδαιμόνες αὐτῶν βρῶν καὶ ἵππον καὶ κάμηλον καὶ ὄνον προτίθεσαι ὀλους ὅπτος 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

\(^{59}\) 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 συνοικίσι. ὤσι μὲν δὴ ἔσκον εὐδαίμονες τῶν Βαβυλωνίων ἐπίγαμοι, ὑπερβάλλοντες ἄλλημος ἔξωνέντο τὰς καλλιστευούσας). However, the ὤσι δὲ τοῦ δήμου are the ones who are left with the less attractive maidens (ὁσι δὲ τοῦ δήμου ἔσκον ἐπίγαμοι, οὕτω δὲ εἴδεος μὲν οὐδὲν ἔδέντο χρηστοῦ). The contrast with ὤσι 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 (παντοία σφαξαντες ἀρήμα εὐσχέονται) and celebrate all kinds of contests (ἄγγον παντοῖον), it can be seen as a further use of εὐδαίμονων 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 ὀλβιος, 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 ὀλβιώτατα 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 νοῦσο τελευτήσαντα οὐ κατασιτέονται ἄλλ᾽ γῇ κρύπτουσι, συμφορὴν ποιεύμενοι ὃτι οὐκ ἦκετο 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 ὀλβιος 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 γῆραί μέγα ὀλβιος ἐὼν ἐπελεύθησεν ἐν Πέρσῃ). 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 ὀλβιος is employed to convey the concept of an
enduring state of wealth that permits him to live a good life. So, effectively, being ὀλβιώτατος 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 (καὶ κως τὸν Ἀμασίν εὐτυχέων μεγάλως ὁ Πολυκράτης οὕκ ἔλανθανε). Amasis expressed his happiness for Polycrates’ prosperity, but also conveyed his concern over the dangers of such continuous good fortune. He explained his belief that the gods are jealous of those who are εὐτυχής (ἐμοὶ δὲ αἱ μεγάλαι εὐτυχία οὕκ ἀφέσκουσι, τὸ θεῖον ἐπισταμένῳ 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 ἐναλλὰξ πρήσσον ἢ εὐτυχέειν 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 οἴδα ἀκούσας ὅτι εὐτυχία ἐρείσθη ἡ 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 [...] ὃτι οὐκ εὔ τελευτήσειν μέλλοι Πολυκράτης εὐτυχέων τὰ πάντα, δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀποβάλλει εἰρίσκει) Polycrates was definitely a very lucky person, εὐτυχής, but to such an extent that he would be punished by the gods and he would never be considered to have lived a good life, ὀλβιώτατος.

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 I. 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, ὀλβιώτατος. 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, ὀλβιώτατος, he knows is Tellus from Athens because Tellus had a good life, good children, died honourably for his

---

60 For the entire passage see Annex, Chapter 40-43 of Book III.
61 Herodotus in Book III, Chapter 125 explains how Polycrates was assassinated by the satrap of Sardis, Oroetes, in Magnesia.
62 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 ὀλβιος 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, ὀλβιος 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.”63 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.”64 The different understanding of ὀλβιος 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.”65

Croesus says that Solon despises his happiness (ἡμετέρη ἐυδαιμονίη) 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 ὀλβιος than one who has just enough to live on (οὐ γὰρ τι ὁ μέγα πλοῦς μᾶλλον τοῦ ἐπ’ ἡμέρην ἔχοντος ὀλβιώτερος ἔστι, εἰ μὴ οἱ τύχῃ ἐπίσποιτο πάντα καλὰ ἔχοντα εὖ τελευτήσαι τὸν βίον). Being rich does not necessarily mean having good luck. He says that if a poor man has

no illnesses, has good children and dies happily, he is a satisfied man and can be called ὀλβιῶς. In passage 32, 6 Solon gives a clear contrast for being ὀλβιῶς with being πλοῦσιος (ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγα πλοῦσιος ἀνόλβιος δὲ δυσώσει προέχει τοῦ εὐτυχέος μοῦνον, οὕτως δὲ τοῦ πλοῦσιου καὶ ἀνόλβου πολλοῖς). He mentions a man who is very rich πλοῦσιος, but at the same time ἀνόλβιος, meaning that he certainly does not see ὀλβιῶς as a synonym of πλοῦσιος. Solon explains that even though the rich, πλοῦσιος, 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 ὀλβιῶς, but if not, he can only be called ‘lucky’ (πρὶν δ᾽ ἂν τελευτήσῃ, ἐπισχεῖν, μηδὲ καλέειν κω ὀλβιῶν 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 (οὔτω δὲν Κροῖσε πᾶν ἐστὶ ἄνθρωπος συμφορή) and cannot be called the happiest man (ἀλβιῶτατος) without having finished his life happily (ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ εἰρεό με, οὐκό σε ἐγώ λέγω, πρὶν τελευτῆσαντα καλὸς τὸν αἰῶνα τῷ θάνατοι). 36

Herodotus’ meaning of ὀλβιῶς 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, 37 where ὀλβιῶς is qualified by χρήμασι to give it the meaning of being fortunate in money, so in no way does ὀλβιῶς by itself have anything to do with wealth. De Heer’s way of explaining this difference in meaning of ὀλβιῶς 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.” 38

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 I. 39 Cyrus feels pity for Croesus because he considers that he is a man equal to him in εὐδαιμονία: καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἀκούσαντα τῶν ἐρωτών τὰ Κροῖσος ἐπε, μετεγράντα τε καὶ ἐννώσαντα ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐων ἄλλον ἄνθρωπον, γενόμενον ἐωτοῦ εὐδαιμονία οὐκ ἑλάσσω. It seems that Cyrus’ understanding of εὐδαιμονία is also equivalent to possessions because they are both men of great wealth. Also,

36 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.
37 Here is the Greek text as context for this use: τὸ όνομα μὲν ἦν Σίκιννος, οἰκέτης δὲ καὶ αὐθάγονος ἦν τῶν Θεσπικέλεος παῖδον τὸν δὴ ὡσπορὸν τούτῳ τῶν πρηγμάτων Θεσπικέλεης Θεσπίων τῇ ἐποίησι, ὡς ἐπεδόκην οἱ Θεσπίων πολίταις, καὶ χρήμασι ὀλβιῶν.
39 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 εἰη τὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀσφαλέως ἔχον). Cyrus then explains to him how he has contributed to Croesus’ εὐδαιμονίᾳ, but how he, Cyrus, is causing his own κακοδαιμονίῃ: ὁ δὲ εἶπε ἓδε βασιλεῦ, ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἐπρήξα τῇ σῇ μὲν εὐδαιμονίῃ, τῇ ἐμεωυτοῦ δὲ κακοδαιμονίῃ. In this instance, εὐδαιμονίᾳ 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 (εὐδαιμονίᾳ), Cyrus contributes to Croesus’ favourable outcome (related to ὀλβίος). 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 ὀλβίος because it alters the natural order of things.

Herodotus also uses μακαρίζω70 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 ὡρα πάντα μὲν τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ὑπὸ τῶν νεῶν ὀποκεκρυμμένον, πάσας δὲ τὰς ἀκτὰς καὶ τὰ Ἀβυδηνῶν πεδία ἐπίπλεα ἄνθρωπον, ἠπήκουτα ὁ Ξέρξης ἐντὸν 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 ἑσῆλθε γὰρ με λογισάμενον κατοικτεῖραι ὡς βραχὺς εἰη ὁ πᾶς ἄνθρωπον αἰεικοῦς, εἰ τοῦτον γε ἑόντων τοσοῦτον οὐδεὶς ἐξ ἐκατοστὸν ἠτὸς 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 (εὐδαιμονίαν) that he does not come to wish to be dead at some point: ἐν γὰρ οὕτω βραχὺ βίῳ οὐδεὶς οὕτω ἄνθρωπος οὗτος εὐδαιμονίᾳ τεφυκε οὕτε τούτων οὕτε τῶν ἄλλων, τῷ οὗ παραστήσεται πολλάκις καὶ οὐκ ἠταξὶ 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: ἄι τε γὰρ συμφοραὶ προσπίπτουσι καὶ αἱ νοῦσοι συνταράσσουσαι καὶ βραχὺν ἐόντα μακρὸν δοκεῖν εἶναι ποιεῖσθι τὸν βιον. Artabanus says that death is the most wanted refuge for humans: οὕτω

---

70 It is important to note that there is no use of the adjective μάκαρ in Herodotus.
ὁ μὲν θάνατος μοχθηρῆς ἐούσης τῆς ζωῆς καταφυγὴ αἱρετωτάτη 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 dismissed71. 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.”72

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.73

Through these passages, Herodotus offers us a glimpse into the ancient Greek worldview of what is considered happiness. Firstly, the adjective εὐδαίμον is closely related to wealth and it be could 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 ὀλβιος which, according to Herodotus, implies living a fulfilling life and then dying an honorable death. Simply being rich πλοῦσιος does not equate to being ὀλβιος as Croesus believes. A person who has just enough to live on can be lucky εὐτυχής in avoiding

adversities and be considered ὀλβιος if they have good health, children and a peaceful death. Herodotus’ use of ὀλβιος seems to align with Solon’s idea. If ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος. 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 ὀλβιος, 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 ὀλβιος 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. 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’ and was known for being joyous in every matter.

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

74 The Greek text and numbering is extracted from Taylor, Christopher Charles Whiston. (2010).
75 As seen in Seneca’s De Ira Book 2 Chapter 10 Section 5: Democritum contra aiunt numquam sine risu in publico fuisset; 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 Haereticorum Book 1 Chapter 13 Section 2 DK 68A40: οὖν οὐ εὐθημία πάντα, ὡς γελῶτος ἄξιον πάντων τῶν ἐν αὐθρόποις.
having a good spirit. Further demonstration of Democritus’ understanding of this word can be seen in passage D55: ἄνθρωποι γὰρ εὐθυμίη γίνεται μετριότητι τέρψιος καὶ βίων συμμετρίᾳ τὰ δὲ ἐλείστοντα καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντα μεταπίπτειν τε φιλεῖ καὶ μεγάλας κινήσισις ἐμποιεῖν τῇ ψυχῇ. αἱ δὲ ἐκ μεγάλων διαστημάτων κινούμεναι τοῖς ψυχέων οὔτε εὐσταθεῖς εἰσίν οὔτε εὐθυμοῖ. 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 εὐδαιμονία78 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 ψυχῆ οἰκτήριον 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 δαίμον is. As De Heer says: “It implies that the δαίμον element of the noun εὐδαιμονία is internal, so that man is not dependent on external influences for achieving this condition.”79 De Heer also puts forward Fragment C 380 which makes this idea evident: ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνα γελό τὸν ἄνθρωπον [...] πείρατα γῆς καὶ ἄφιξιος μυχοῦς ἀμέτροσιν ἐπιθυμίησιν ὁδεύοντα, ἄργυρον τήκοντα καὶ χρυσόν, καὶ μὴ παυόμενον τῆς κτήσιος ταύτης, αἰεὶ δὲ θορυβεύμενον περὶ τὸ πλέον, 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 μετρίωσι χρήσαι 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.”81

---

78 In Democritus, there is no use of the adjective μάκαρ or δλῆς.
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 εὐδαιμόνων, μάκαρ, ὀλβίος and εὐτυχής. This research has analysed the evolution of these terms, as well as that of their respective cognates such as εὐδαιμονία, μακαρίζω, μακάριος, ὀλβίος, 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 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. In Herodotus, μάκαρ is not used, he only employs the verb μακαρίζω that portray a feeling of momentary happiness. In Democritus, there is no use of μάκαρ or of μακαρίζω.

The first appearance of the adjective εὐδαιμόνων 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

82 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.

83 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 εὐδαιμόνων 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 ὀλβιος, 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 ὀλβιος 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, ὀλβιος also alludes to heroes immortalized through cults who dwell on the Blessed Islands. In Solon’s works, the adjective ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος and ὀλβιον which represent a moral pleasure secured by the gods. In Sappho, ὀλβιος represents a type of happiness that comes from the love that arises in marriage. Aphrodite bestows ὀλβιον upon the bride and bridegroom and they attain a god-like status. In Pindar, to be ὀλβιος is to be granted by a δαίμων either wealth or glory. In this sense, ὀλβιος is the material proof of divine favour. In Herodotus, the duality of this adjective appears once again in the passage of Solon and Croesus. Being ὀλβιος, implies living a fulfiling 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 ὀλβιος is a hero that has been immortalized through

---

84 In Pindar, a novelty in the usage of ὀλβιος is that it is used for places due to a shift from the person who is ὀλβιος to his possessions, such as a building, that contribute to him being ὀλβιος.
worship. A person cannot be addressed as ὀλβιος until they fulfil their life with an honourable death. It is interesting to point out that the use of ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος, but, to Solon the character, wealth has nothing to do with being ὀλβιος. 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 ὀλβιος. In Democritus, there is no use of ὀλβιος. In Solon, Sappho, Pindar and Herodotus to be ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος 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 ὀλβιος 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 εὐδαίμονια 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 ὀλβιος clearly had an impact on Aristotle. Aristotle dismisses Herodotus’ meaning of εὐδαιμονία that directly relates to wealth and focuses on his meaning of ὀλβιος. Herodotus shows a clear presocratic nature in the dialogue between Solon and Croesus and Aristotle draws on this meaning of ὀλβιος and utilizes it for his definition of εὐδαιμονία. Similarly to being ὀλβιος, to be εὐδαιμονων also necessitates a whole lifespan to achieve. As Solon says, even if one is εὐτυχής one will not necessarily be ὀλβιος. Aristotle says that a degree of εὐτυχία is needed to be εὐδαιμονων, 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.
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Chapter 30-33 of Book I: Croesus and Solon


Chapter 86 of Book 1: Croesus’ realization

οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι τὰς τε δὴ Σάρδις ἔσχον καὶ αὐτὸν Κροίσον ἐξώρισαν, ἀρζαντα ἐτεσσερεσκαίδεκα καὶ τεσσερεσκαίδεκα ἡμέρας πολυρκηθέντα, κατὰ τὸ χρηστηρίοιν τε καταπαύσαντα τὴν ἐσούτῃ μεγάλῃ ἁρχὴν. λαβόντες δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ Πέρσαι ἤγαγον παρὰ Κῦρον. ὦ δὲ συννήσας πορην μεγάλην ἀνεβίβασε ἐπὶ αὐτήν τὸν Κροίσον τε ἐν πέδησι δεδεμένον καὶ δὲ ἐπὶ Λυδῶν παρ᾽ αὐτῶν παῖδας, ἐν νόῳ ἔχων εἶτε ὅ ἂν ἀκροδίναια ταῦτα καταγείνθαι ὦς ὑπερδή, εἰτε καὶ εὐχὴν ἐπιτελέσασθαι θέλων, εἰτε καὶ πυθόμενος τὸν Κροίσον εἶναι θεοσβέβαιοι τοῦδε εἶνεκεν ἀνεβίβασε ἐπὶ τὴν πορην, βουλόμενος εἰδέναι εἰ τίς μιν δαμιόν δύσει τοῦ μὴ ἐξόντα κατακαυθήναι. τὸν μὲν δὴ ποιεῖν ταῦτα: τῷ δὲ Κροίσῳ ἐστειδετι ἐπὶ τῆς πορης ἐσελθεῖν, καὶ μεγάλην ἐπιτελέσαι δὲ ἐσελθεῖν, σφίσι πάντων ἄτοι ἐμαθεὰς ἀνεβίβασε. ὥς ὡς ἐν κακῷ ἐόντι τοσοῦτον, τῷ τοῦ Σόλωνος ὄς οἱ εἰς σὺν θεοὺς εἰρημένον, τὸ μὴ δὲν εἶναι τῶν ἔχων ὄλβιον. ὡς ὓπαρ μιν προστήνως τοῦτο, ἄνενεκάμενον τε καὶ ἀναστήνασαν τὰς πολλὰς ἐσχήν ἐς τρὶς ὄνομας ἡ πόλις Σόλων. καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἀκούσαντα κελεῦσαν τοὺς ἐρμηνεύσας ἐπιτερέσας τὸν Κροίσον τὴν τοῦτον ἐπικαλέσει, καὶ τοὺς προσελθόντας ἐπειροτῶν: Κροίσον δὲ τέως μὲν σηγὴν ἔχαι εἰρωτώμενον, μετὰ δὲ ὡς ἴσον ἔγχειν, εἰπεῖν 'τὸν ὅ ἂν ἐγὼ θάρσης τρισεκατόμοις μεγάλον χρηματόν ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν.' ὥς ὅ σφι ἐστίν ἐφαρμάζεται, πάλιν ἐπιστρέφων τὰ λεγόμενα. λιπαροτῶν δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ οἰχλον παρεχόντων, ἔλεγε δὴ ὅς ἢδε ἀρχὴν ὁ Σόλων εὸν Αθηναῖος, καὶ θεσμόνεος πάντα τὸν ἐσωτέρου ὄλβον ἀποφλαναρίσεις οία δὴ εἶπε, ὅς δὲ αὐτὸ πάντα ἀποβεβήκοι τῇ περ ἐκείνον εἴπε, οὐδὲν τὸ μᾶλλον ἐς ἐσωτέρου λέγων ὑ ὕμνι ὅπως ἄπαν τὸ ἄνθρωπον καὶ μάλλα τοὺς παρά σφια αὐτοῦ ὀλβίους δοκέοντας εἶναι τὸν μὲν
Κροῖσον ταῦτα ἀπηγέεσθαι, τῆς δὲ πυρῆς ἡδη ἀμμένης καίεσθαι τὰ περιέσχατα. καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἀκούσαντα τὸν ἐρμηνεύον τὰ Κροῖσος εἶπε, μεταγινόντα τε καὶ ἐννώσαντα ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν ἄλλον ἄνθρωπον, γενόμενον ἑωυτοῦ εὐδαιμονῆ ὡς ἐλάσσω, ξόντα πυρὶ διδοίῃ, πρὸς τοὺς δείσαντα τὴν τίσιν καὶ ἐπιλεξάμενον ὡς οὐδὲν εἴη τῶν ἐν ἄνθρώποις ἀσφαλέως ἔχον, κελεύειν ὑπεννύναι τὴν ταχύτατη τὸ καιόμενον πῦρ καὶ καταβιβάζειν Κροῖσὸν τε καὶ τοὺς μετὰ Κροῖσου. καὶ τοὺς πειρωμένους οὔ δύνασθαι ἐτὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐπικρατῆσαι.