

**Zeitschrift:** Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique  
**Band:** 52 (2006)

**Artikel:** Poet and audience : from Homer to Hesiod  
**Autor:** Tsagalis, Christos C.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660727>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 22.11.2024

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

### III

CHRISTOS C. TSAGALIS

#### POET AND AUDIENCE: FROM HOMER TO HESIOD

The influence Homeric epic has exercised on its Hesiodic counterpart has been at the focus of scholarly research for a number of years. The majority of Hellenists have zoomed their scientific lens on the treatment of myth,<sup>1</sup> the language, style and motifs employed in Homer and Hesiod. This contribution to the ongoing dialogue concerning the relationship of the two oldest Greek epic traditions aims otherwise. I will set out to explore the way the Homeric and Hesiodic epic traditions deal with matters of poetics, such as poet and audience. By studying how these two traditions deal with themselves, namely what they consider themselves to be, we may be able to arrive at a reappraisal of their relationship. Rigid genre classification tends to screen out the evolutionary process of dealing with generic conventions,<sup>2</sup> which may be altered by the poet or the tradition<sup>3</sup> (for those who side with hard-core oralists) in order to create a special effect on the audience. To this end, I will try to show that by studying the representations of poet and audience in the Hes-

<sup>1</sup> For a recent reappraisal of 'Hesiodic' mythology with special emphasis on the *WD*, see W. BLÜMER, *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung. Die mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods I-II* (Münster 2001).

<sup>2</sup> On the 'genre' of didactic poetry and Hesiod as its initiator, see F. MONTANARI, *Introduzione a Omero, con un'appendice su Esiodo* (Firenze 1990), 135-137.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed presentation of questions dealing with the Hesiodic tradition from the point of view of oral theory, see R. LAMBERTON, *Hesiod* (New Haven and London 1988), 1-37.

iodic tradition and by comparing them to its Homeric predecessor, one is able to re-determine their relation and arrive at a better understanding of generic limits, especially if genre-cohesion does not exclude shifts from a traditional model but must be rather seen as a more fluid framework.

## 1. *The Poet*

I will, therefore, first study the representation of the poet in the Homeric and Hesiodic epic traditions by focusing my interest on the following three aspects: (a) the proems, (b) what the science of narratology calls “commentary”, i.e. “speech acts that go beyond narrating, describing, or identifying”<sup>4</sup> and which strongly suggest the implied author’s own persona,<sup>5</sup> and (c) common metaphors used for the poet and his craft.

### 1.1 *The Proems: Beginning a song, introducing a song-tradition*

The presence of the Muses in the proem of the *Theogony* is of crucial importance for understanding the aims of Hesiodic poetry. Addressing the Muse is, needless to say, a typologically established song-beginning pattern, bearing the trademark of the two Homeric epics.<sup>6</sup> A closer look, though, shows that the

<sup>4</sup> See S. CHATMAN, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structures in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY 1978), 228.

<sup>5</sup> K. STODDARD, *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod* (Leiden-Boston 2004), 162.

<sup>6</sup> For the proem of the *Iliad*, see J. GRIFFIN, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980), 118 ff.; G.S. KIRK, *The Iliad. A Commentary* (Cambridge 1985), 51-53; J. LATACZ, *Homer. Der erste Dichter des Abendlands* (München-Zürich 1997 [1985]), 98-104; *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar* I.1.2 (München-Leipzig 2000), 11-23. For the proem of the *Odyssey*, see: S.E. BASSETT, “The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*”, in *AJPh* 44 (1923), 339-348; A. VAN GRONINGEN, “The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*”, in *Meded. Koninkl. Ned. Akad. van Wetensch. Afd. Letterkunde* N.R. 9.8 (1946), 279-294; K. RÜTER, *Odysseeinterpretationen. Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch und zur Phaiakis* (Göttingen 1969), 28-52; Δ.Ν. ΜΑΡΩΝΙΤΗΣ, *Ἀναζήτηση καὶ νόστος τοῦ Ὀδυσσεύα. Ἡ διαλεκτικὴ τῆς Ὀδύσσειας* (Ἀθήνα 1971), 73-91; J.S. CLAY, “The Beginning of the *Odyssey*”, in *AJPh* 97 (1976), 313-326; A. LENZ, *Das Proem des frühen griechischen Epos. Ein Beitrag zum*

invocation of the Muses in the proems of the two major Hesiodic epics is much more systematically and thoroughly pursued. Whereas the Iliadic and Odyssean proems restrict themselves to one (*Il.* 1.1: θεά) and two (*Od.* 1.1: Μοῦσα, 1.10: θεά) references to the Muse respectively, the proems of the *Theogony* and of the *WD* develop these invocations, the former into a divine epiphany, the latter into a systematic hymnic invocation.

In the *Theogony* proem (1-115), the Muses who inhabit mount Helicon are presented as dancing around a spring and the altar of Zeus (3-4). Their carefully described localization is at odds with their vague invocation in the Iliadic and Odyssean proems. The plural ἀρχώμεθ' (*Th.* 1: Μουσάων Ἐλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' αἰεῖδεν), which is opposed to the present ἄρχομαι employed in the proem of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*<sup>7</sup> (as well as in the proem of 7 of the shorter Homeric Hymns),<sup>8</sup> should not be regarded as grammatical trivia. In *Iliad* 2.485-486: ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστε τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα, | ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, and in *Odyssey* 1.10: τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπέ καὶ ἡμῖν, where poet and

*poetischen Selbstverständnis* (Bonn 1980), 49-64; J.S. CLAY, *The Wrath of Athena. Gods and Men in the Odyssey* (Princeton 1983), 9-53; G.E. DIMOCK, *The Unity of the Odyssey* (Princeton 1989), 5-12; A. FORD, *Homer. The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca-London 1992), 18-31; V. PEDRICK, "The Muse Corrects: The Opening of the *Odyssey*", in *YCS* 29 (1992), 39-62; T.R. WALSH, "*Odyssey* 1.6-9: a Little more than Kine", in *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995), 392-403; P. PUCCI, *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer* (Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford 1998), 11-29; I.J.F. DE JONG, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2001), 5-8; C.C. TSAGALIS, "Detextualizing Homer: Intonation Units, Background Knowledge, and the Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*", in *EEAth* 36 (2004-2005), 281-291.

<sup>7</sup> *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 2.1: Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον σεμνήν θεὸν ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν.

<sup>8</sup> *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 11.1: Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην ἐρυσίπτολιν ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν — *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 13.1: Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον σεμνήν θεὸν ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν — *Homeric Hymn to Asclepius*, 16.1: Ἴητῆρα νόσων Ἀσκληπιὸν ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν — *Homeric Hymn to Poseidon*, 22.1: Ἀμφὶ Ποσειδάωνα, μέγαν θεόν, ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν — *Homeric Hymn to the Muses and Apollo*, 25.1: Μουσάων ἄρχομαι Ἀπόλλωνος τε Διός τε — *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, 26.1: Κισσοκόμην Διόνυσον ἐρίβρομον ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν — *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 28.1: Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην, κυδρὴν θεόν, ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν.

audience seem to converge at the end of the proem, the poetic voice employs the plural 'we' in contrast to the plural 'you'. In the aforementioned examples from the Homeric epics the plural highlights the antithesis between human inability and divine omniscience in respect of poetics. Conversely, in Hesiod the plural ἀρχώμεθ'(α) aims at enlarging the proem's scope by including both poet and Muses, who initially shared a tutor-student relation. Hesiodic song will be verbalized by a common voice, the voice of the inspired poet who, having received the gift of song from the Muses, is able to sing *with* them and *through* them. Thus, the plural ἀρχώμεθ'(α), prepares the ground for a meticulous description of the process of poet-Muse convergence through the presentation of their meeting in mount Helicon and the ensuing *Dichterweihe*. Under this light, the plural ἀρχώμεθ'(α) acquires a secondary, figurative meaning, which becomes all the more important within the framework of a poem like the *Theogony* that is especially concerned with the first beginnings of the world. In this way, the Hesiodic tradition emphatically deviates from its Homeric counterpart, not only in respect of the poet-Muse relation but also in determining the song's starting point. By making within the framework of song the beginning of the *Theogony* coincide with the beginnings of the world this epic describes, the Hesiodic tradition makes a profound statement that distinguishes it from its Homeric rival, since neither the *Iliad* nor the *Odyssey* take up the story *ab ovo*.

The choice of Helicon for the shepherd's initiation into poetry is indicative of the poetic targeting of the theogonic proem. The non-Olympian localization of the Muses aims at highlighting their distinction from the well-known Olympian Muses of Homeric song. The epithet Ὀλυμπιάδες will be later on employed in the *Theogony* (25, 52) but only in retrospect, within the analeptic reference to the shepherd's poetic initiation. The first verse of the *Theogony* is verbalized by the united voice of poet and Muses, who acquired their new identity and are called Heliconian, just as the unknown shepherd has become

Hesiod, 'the one who utters or emits song'.<sup>9</sup> Under this light, Helicon is not a simple geographical location but a term of Hesiodic poetic topography, the birthplace of the Hesiodic tradition, which needs its own Muses for its own special kind of epic song.

The ensuing activity of the Muses is divided into two songs, one pre- (2-21) and the other post-initiatory (36-52). This distinction is narratively underscored by the timelessness of the first song and the temporal aspect of the second.<sup>10</sup> Whereas the first song is void of temporal references, the second one is replete with temporal markers placed at marked positions within the hexameter line (45: ἐξ ἀρχῆς ..., 46: οἳ τ' ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο ..., 47: δεύτερον αὖτε ..., 48: [ἀρχόμεναί θ' ... λήγουσαί τ' ...], 50: αὖτις). The narrative fissure between the two songs is further effectuated by the cryptic formula about "the oak and the rock". The question-shaped form of this stereotypical expression paves the way for the temporalization of the second song, which is made possible only *after* and *because* of the divine epiphany of the Muses and the *Dichterweihe*. The words of the Muses are presented as secondary focalization embedded in direct speech. This choice increases their special weight as it makes possible the presentation of the poetic initiation not only from the primary narrator's point of view in indirect discourse (30-34) but also from that of the Muses in direct speech (26-28). In a nutshell, on the one hand the theogonic proem deliberately encapsulates the derogatory comments of the Muses against the shepherds, whereas it downplays on the other their positive advice concerning the poetic inspiration of the initiated shepherd. The relevant passage reads as follows (*Th.* 24-29):

τόνδε δέ με πρώτιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπον,  
 Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο·  
 "ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,  
 ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,

<sup>9</sup> See G. NAGY, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca and London 1990), 47. On insightful criticism of the use and abuse of the Hesiodic landscape as 'historical' reality by the so-called 'biographists', see LAMBERTON 1988, 27-37.

<sup>10</sup> See STODDARD 2004, 131-133.

ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι."  
ὥς ἔφασαν κοῦραι μεγάλου Διὸς ἀρτιέπειαι.

The repetitive (25 & 29) reference to the divine identity of the Muses and the underscoring of their origin from Zeus, emphatically placed in the speech introduction and closure, frame their speech and acquire their full semantical potential only when compared with the three-colon address to the shepherds (ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον). The plural used to designate both the Muses, who are considered to be a unified, single group of divinities, and the shepherds, the derogatory tone of the Muses' speech that levels all differences between humans and the animals they look after by attributing to them characteristics of these animals (26: γαστέρες οἶον), and last but not least the antithesis between the ἔτυμα (27) and the ἀληθέα (28), clearly show that the Hesiodic tradition aims at making the distinction between gods and men the main motif of the *Dichterweihe*. This last observation is crucial for the poetics of the *Theogony* as illustrated in the programmatic proem of this epic. The terms ἔτυμα and ἀληθέα designate human and divine truth respectively, i.e. they refer to two different forms of truth, human truth (ἔτυμα), which depends on limited knowledge of physical reality, and divine truth (ἀληθέα), which is completely independent from any physical constraints.<sup>11</sup> The aforementioned distinction is very different from that between truth and lies in the *Odyssey*, since it introduces into the language of the *Theogony* a sort of relativism, since human truth (ἔτυμα) is presented as something unstable, changing and, therefore, as a form of falsehood.

<sup>11</sup> The term ἔτυμα is related to the verb 'to be' and, therefore, indicates 'real' things, i.e. things perceived as real by humans, whereas ἀληθέα designate things, which are deprived of the element of oblivion (λήθη) and stretch beyond human knowledge. The Muses are capable not only of saying many lies which are similar to human truth (ἔτυμα) but also of uttering, in the form of authority-conferring religious language (γηρύσασθαι), eternal truth transcending human knowledge, a form of truth immune to deception. For ἔτυμα and ἀληθέα, see L.H. PRATT, *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar. Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics* (Ann Arbor 1993), 95-113.

This distinction is reinforced by the use of different verbal forms in respect to ἔτυμα and ἀληθέα. The verb λέγειν, which is used with ἔτυμα, simply refers to the utterance of speech, not to its evaluation, as is the case with the infinitive γηρύσασθαι that belongs to religious language, which is, by definition, authoritative. In this post-Promethean world, divine speech is often an unsolvable riddle, a semantical conundrum whose content humans will always struggle to decypher. Thus, verse 27 (ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα) despite its dictional similarities with *Od.* 19.203 (ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα), where the external narrator reminds his audience that Odysseus is capable of employing false or fictional stories (his famous *Trugrede*) to achieve his goal, follows a different orbit from its Homeric counterpart. Keeping its distance from the absolute distinction between truth and falsehood the *Odyssey* is so fond of, the speech of the Muses indicates that the language of the *Theogony* will indeed be a jigsaw puzzle deliberately hard to solve.<sup>12</sup>

It is within this interpretive framework that we must place the aorist tenses devoted to the *Dichterweihe*, which are attested in verses 22-33. The Hesiodic tradition amply uses the aorist, a pseudo-past tense, in order to point to the performance *per se* of the *Theogony*. Drawing on the powerful insights of Bakker,<sup>13</sup> who

<sup>12</sup> See PRATT 1993, 110-111, who rightly observes that the slippery and evasive language of the Muses is a riddle the initiated poet needs to solve. The language of the Hesiodic Muses reflects the dual nature of poetic speech, whose enchantment is based on the blurring of truth and fiction. See P. PUCCI, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore and London 1977), 8-16. On the meaning of ἔτυμος, see T. KRISCHER, "ETYMOΣ und ΑΛΗΘΗΣ", in *Philologus* 109 (1965), 161-173; H. HOMMEL, "Wahrheit und Gerechtigkeit. Zur Geschichte und Deutung eines Begriffspaars", in *Antike und Abendland* 15 (1969), 159-186; J.S. CLAY, *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge 2003), 60-61, 78.

<sup>13</sup> See E.J. BAKKER, "Storytelling in the Future: Truth, Time and Tense in Homeric Epic", in *Written Voices, Spoken Signs. Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*, ed. by E.J. BAKKER & A. KAHANE (Cambridge, Mass.-London 1997), 11-36; "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer", in *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, ed. by J.N. KAZAZIS and A. RENGAKOS (Stuttgart 1999), 50-65; "Similes, Aug-



has shown that the augment was not a temporal marker but a deictic prefix designating the act described by the verb in respect of place, I would like to argue that these aorists are a sophisticated mechanism of creating vividness (ἐνάργεια), the very means epic poetry amply uses to present past events, as if they are actually happening in front of the audience's eyes, at the moment the bard is singing his song. The alternation between unaugmented and augmented past tenses in Homeric poetry is reflected in their distribution in speeches and main narrative. If we extend these observations to Hesiodic poetry and in particular to the proem of the *Theogony*, we can plausibly argue that the aorists of the *Dichterweihe* do not simply underline the Muses' subjugation to human temporality, but function as a means of asserting that the *Theogony* is the par excellence reenactment of this divine epiphany. Under this light, the very utterance of this particular theogonic song acquires an almost ritual-cultic status: the Hesiodic *Theogony* reenacts through its very performance the divine epiphany of the Muses, which is conjured up from poetic memory and is 'reiterated' in place and time, during the *hic et nunc* of the performance, in front of a real audience.

The poetic effect of this process is noteworthy. Handling time becomes the poetic metalanguage of the *Theogony* in order to 'translate' divine timelessness or extra-timeness into a linear sequence of genealogies that is about to begin. The transformation of divine a-temporality into human time, which progresses in a vertical manner, is facilitated by the use of catalogues organized according to the model of genealogies, with which the audience would be familiar enough.

The proem of the *WD* is much shorter than that of the *Theogony* but its poetological interest is undeniable. Its principle features can be summarized in the following list: two addressees (the Muses, 1-2 and Zeus, 9-10), emphatic reitera-

ment, and the Language of Immediacy", in *Speaking Volumes. Orality and Literacy in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, ed. by J. WATSON (Leiden 2001), 1-23. See also STODDARD 2004, 135-136.

tion of Zeus' ease to offer justice and punishment, and a remarkably clear declaration of the poetic 'I' as well as of the internal addressee of the epic.

Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν, ἀοιδῆσι κλείουσαι,  
 δεῦτε, Δί' ἐννέπετε σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνείουσαι,  
 ὄν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε  
 ῥητοί τ' ἄρρητοί τε Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔκητι.  
 ῥέα μὲν γὰρ βριάει, ῥέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει,  
 ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἄδηλον ἀέξει,  
 ῥεῖα δέ τ' ἰθύνει σκολιὸν καὶ ἀγήνορα κάρφει  
 Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίει.  
 κλυθι ἰδὼν αἰῶν τε, δίκη δ' ἴθυνε θέμιστας  
 τύνη· ἐγὼ δέ κε Πέρση ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην.

These features show that the role of the narrator will be very different from that of the *Theogony*. The speaking voice in the *WD* is an internal narrator, one who will participate in the epic's plot and will relate 'in his own name' events directly linked to him. I will return to this characteristic of the *WD*, which permeates the entire poem and finds numerous manifestations in the 'I-you' interaction, in the apostrophes to the narratee, in the second person verbal forms and in the stark imperatives employed throughout this epic. The proem of the *WD*, despite its limited length, is programmatic in respect to the role both of the speaking 'I' and of his internal audience in the poem. Diverging not only from the *Theogony*, where the speaking voice disappears after the lengthy proem but also from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, where the 'I' of the narrator is almost covert as it is just mentioned by the datives of the personal pronoun, the proem of the *WD* inaugurates a poem characterized by the bold step towards the creation of an internal narrator.

## 1.2 'Commentary'

By 'commentary', I designate "speech acts that go beyond narrating, describing, or identifying"<sup>14</sup> and "strongly suggest the

<sup>14</sup> CHATMAN 1978, 228.

implied author's own persona".<sup>15</sup> These speech acts take the form of direct comments offered by the narrator, who is constantly commenting on his own narrative.<sup>16</sup> Stoddard has recently argued that the narrator of the *Theogony* employs 'commentary' both on the level of the 'story' and on the level of the 'discourse'<sup>17</sup> in order to allude to his own persona.<sup>18</sup> When commenting on the 'story', the narrator pauses only to offer his own view about his text, by engaging himself in explaining, judging, or interpreting his own words. When commenting on the 'discourse', the narrator freely indulges in making "explicit reference to his activity as narrator".<sup>19</sup> Let us first deal with 'commentary' concerning the *story*.

One form of 'commentary', happily coined 'explanatory',<sup>20</sup> is used in order to supply the audience with information that the narrator has acquired through his divine inspiration by the Muses. Such are the cases of name-etymologizing, which is based on knowledge that the poet could otherwise not have possibly possessed. The audience would, at all probability, comprehend that this etymologizing obsession is a hint offered by the narrator, as textual representative of the poet, showing that he has been divinely inspired, that he is no longer the ignorant shepherd in Helicon but the omniscient mouthpiece of the Muses. At the same time, etymologies of proper names help the narrator disclose the poetic persona hiding behind him. Etymologizing<sup>21</sup> *per se* confirms a process of name-memorization, posi-

<sup>15</sup> STODDARD 2004, 162.

<sup>16</sup> See R. NÜNLIST, "Hesiod", in *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. by I.J.F. DE JONG, R. NÜNLIST & A. BOWIE, *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative I* (Leiden-Boston 2004), 25-34 [29].

<sup>17</sup> S. RICHARDSON, *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville, Tenn. 1990), 140.

<sup>18</sup> STODDARD 2004, 162.

<sup>19</sup> STODDARD 2004, 163.

<sup>20</sup> RICHARDSON 1990, 141-143.

<sup>21</sup> On etymologizing in Hesiod, see K.VON FRITZ, "Das Hesiodische in den Werken Hesiods", in *Hésiode et son influence*, Fondation Hardt, *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 7 (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1962), 53-58. The impressive density of etymologies attested in Hesiod cannot, in my opinion, be explained either through his desire to disclose some hidden reality concerning the nature of the

tively evaluating catalogs and lists. In oral composition in front of a real-time audience, names do not simply function as in a written text. By recalling creatures of the past or summoning creatures of a non-human time and place in present time and place, the narrator makes them tangible realities at the very moment of the performance of his song. Under this scope, etymologizing reinforces their existence in the present of the performance. The singer shows to his audience that 'his' theogonic version of the creation of the divine world is the most authoritative, since it does not simply refer to some gods or semi-divine creatures but revives through language integral parts of their existence or shape. When the audience hears that the Cyclopes had acquired their name because of a huge, round eye in their forehead (*Th.* 144-145: Κύκλωπες δ' ὄνομ' ἦσαν ἐπώνυμον, οὐνεκ' ἄρα σφρων / κυκλοτερῆς ὀφθαλμὸς ἔεις ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ), we can plausibly argue that the singer is showing to his listeners not only his ability to refer to the Cyclopes, but also that he is aware of the unbreakable link between language and meaning, since the name Cyclops is a dictional icon of an anatomic characteristic of the Cyclopes, their round eye. Needless to say, the mental image of a huge giant with a round eye in the forehead would easily come to the audience's mind, who would appreciate the singer's ability to make them visualize the content of his narrative.

Another form of 'commentary' is the so-called 'judgement' or 'critical commentary'.<sup>22</sup> In this case, the narrator is not addressing directly his audience but employs evaluative language expressing his view or opinion about a character of the 'story'. These narrative tactics are common in the Homeric epics, taking the form of epithets modifying a character of the plot. In the *Odyssey* proem, the evaluative term *nepioi* (1.8: νήπιοι) may

gods or by his interest in newly invented deities. Etymologizing has to be examined within a performance-based framework, i.e. as an authority-conferring process for the singer.

<sup>22</sup> RICHARDSON 1990, 158; STODDARD 2004, 167.

be considered an early case of 'critical commentary', which functions like a narrative hybrid, as it is later on constantly employed throughout the entire epic. In Hesiodic epic, the function of critical comments of this sort is twofold: first, it is a gesture on the part of the narrator towards his audience, as he allows himself to intrude in the 'story' and influence their judgement, and secondly, it is a sophisticated authority-conferring means to Hesiodic song. By fostering a technique of 'critical commentary' established by Homeric epic, Hesiodic tradition exploits at full length the status of its famous predecessor and makes its own identity recognizable through the usurpation of status-conferring narrative tactics. The 'neutral' name-listing and catalogue-offering is interrupted by the intrusion of a personal voice, as in the following example from the *Theogony* (950-955):

Ἦβην δ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱός,  
 Ἰς Ἡρακλῆος, τελέσας στονόεντας ἀέθλους,  
 παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἥρης χρυσοπεδίλου,  
 αἰδοίην θέτ' ἀκοίτιν ἐν Οὐλύμπῳ νιφόεντι·  
 ὄλβιος, ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας  
 ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἡματα πάντα.

The mythological item Ἦβη in the divine catalogue of the *Theogony* is organized, as other mythological items of the same or equivalent content, on the basis of the marriage of this 'lemmatized' goddess with Heracles, son of Zeus and Alcmena. The narrator exploits the occasion offered by such a famous hero as Heracles, a symbol of the world of humans in the *Theogony*, whose special role in the poem the audience is well aware of due to the narrative digressions concerning the descendants of Keto and the excursus on Prometheus. By embedding a personal comment in the item Ἦβη, which stands outside the limits of the plot, the Hesiodic tradition lets its audience infer that 'this tradition' has absolute control of the mythical variants it avails itself of, that what seems a *prima facie* mythological companion in verse bears the lasting imprint of a carefully planned and scrupulously executed personal selection. By using the epithet ὄλβιος, the Hesiodic song 'looks in perspective at' the

mythological material it lemmatises, it actually views it backwards, from the future, which, needless to say, is possible only for the external narrator, the textual representative of the poet. Should we examine the 'lemmata' or items devoted to divinities in this part of the *Theogony*, we will notice that only in this 'lemma' the focus, as it can be inferred from the deification process, is not on a female figure, but on a male character. The special emphasis laid on Heracles (further underscored not only by the critical comment ὄλβιος but also by the relative expansion ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας) triggers a personal comment made by the narrator. This highlighting of Heracles and his privileging by the narrator must be connected with the special weight Heracles has as a mediator between the world of the humans and the world of the immortals, a topic belonging to the thematic kernel of the *Theogony*. By interrupting the monotonous sequence of lemmatised figures with the insertion of a critical comment, the Hesiodic song leaves its trademark on its proposed theogonic version. Placed at the end of the epic, the Heracles comment allows the Hesiodic tradition to make its presence strongly felt.

Another form of commentary may be called 'interpretive'.<sup>23</sup> It consists of remarks the narrator makes, aiming at convincing his audience to adopt his hermeneutical stance. According to Stoddard,<sup>24</sup> the passage devoted to the myth of Typhoeus, followed by a description of the disastrous consequences the winds have for mortal men, is a kind of 'interpretive' commentary, since the narrator attempts to attribute meaning to the present state of things by using mythical material pertaining to an immortal-mortal conflict. In *Theogony* 869-880, the narrator embarks on a description of divine activity and continues by an exposition of its results for both the divine and human worlds. In this way, he assumes the role of a mediator between the divine and human spheres, bringing his audience closer to a

<sup>23</sup> RICHARDSON 1990, 148; STODDARD 2004, 170-176.

<sup>24</sup> STODDARD 2004, 171-172.

world that only 'he' of all people is able to know, due to the mediation of the Muses. What the Muses have offered to him, he is now offering to his audience.

Narratorial comments on the 'discourse' are also attested in the Hesiodic poems. In his list of direct comments offered by the narrator, Nünlist<sup>25</sup> mentions statements of 'eternal truths', such as maxims and aetiological explanations. Comments of this kind are regularly found in the Homeric epics, but the extent of narratorial interruption is much greater in Hesiod, as can be observed in the following passage (*Th.* 556-557):

ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φύλ' ἀνθρώπων  
καίους' ὅστέα λευκὰ θυγέντων ἐπὶ βωμῶν.

The narrator's insistence on the continuity of cult practice down to his own and the audience's time bridges the gap between the remote past of the narrative and the 'present' of the performance. By doing so, the Hesiodic narrator not only intrudes in the discourse, but also indirectly asserts his own undisputed command over the entire performance. He implies to his audience that it is his own *Theogony* that explains a reality surrounding them and, therefore, its supremacy is confirmed by this same reality the audience are aware of. In other words, the narrator figuratively 'allows' the audience to check the accuracy of his song by connecting it with what is familiar to them.

Like his Homeric counterpart, the Hesiodic narrator marks the end of a narrative section by offering a short summary.<sup>26</sup> *Theogony* 362-363 is a typical example:

αὗται ἄρ' Ὀκεανοῦ καὶ Τηθύος ἐξεγένοντο  
πρεσβύταται κοῦραι· πολλαί γε μὲν εἰσι καὶ ἄλλαι.

If we paraphrase the content of these two verses, then the purpose of the summary becomes obvious: 'These were the oldest daughters born to Oceanos and Tethys; there are, of course,

<sup>25</sup> NÜNLIST 2004, 29; STODDARD 2004, 54-55.

<sup>26</sup> See also *Th.* 263-264, 362-363, 448-449, 613.

many others'. By marking the end of a section with such a 'selection'-based statement, the narrator indicates to his audience that it is his own decision to include in his list only a limited number of Oceanids. His version is selective, bearing the seal of the tradition he belongs to. Summarizing comments of this kind are also known from Homer. At the end of the Catalogue of Ships, by far the longest catalogue in Homeric epic, the narrator marks its closure with the following verse (*Il.* 2.760): οὗτοι ἄρ' ἠγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν. The same is the case with statements indicating that the narrator has offered only a selection from a much longer list. At the end of the Catalogue of Nereids in *Il.* 18.49, the audience is informed by the narrator that 'there also were other Nereids at the bottom of the sea', but the narrator refrains from mentioning nominatim: ἀλλάί θ' αἰ' κατὰ βένθος ἄλδος Νηρηΐδες ἦσαν.<sup>27</sup>

One last category of 'commentary' on the level of 'discourse' occurs when the narrator makes direct references to the very act of poetic composition and performance of his song. A *locus communis* is *Th.* 369-370:

τῶν ὄνομ' ἀργαλέον πάντων βροτὸν ἄνδρα ἐνισπεῖν,  
οἱ δὲ ἕκαστοι ἴσασιν, ὅσοι περιναιετάουσι.

In these two verses, the narrator makes his presence strongly felt. His inability to recall all the names of the rivers constitutes a typologically established technique of epic poetry, whose Homeric echoes are easily discernible (*Il.* 2.489-490: οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν, / φωνή δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη). This narrative technique does not only aim at an implicit recognition of the importance of the Muses' gift but also at evaluating the act of narrative itself.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> I have deliberately excluded from my study introductory statements because they are all attested in the *WD*, where there is an internal narrator, 'Hesiod', who according to my non-autobiographical reading of the Hesiodic poems is distinct from the poet or the tradition he represents.

<sup>28</sup> NÜNLIST 2004, 29.



The above examination of several categories of 'commentary' both on the level of the 'story' and on the level of 'discourse' shows that the Hesiodic narrator, with greater intensity and, sometimes, different focus, avails himself of narrative techniques Homeric epic occasionally employs. These techniques are perhaps more crucial to the *Theogony* than to the Homeric poems. This is due to the fact that the *Theogony* is practically deprived of an internal audience in the form of narratee or narratees. One needs only to bring in mind the multiple internal audiences the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* dispose of to comprehend the difference. Lack of narratees necessarily robs the *Theogony* of alternate means through which the Homeric narrator makes his presence felt: presentation through negation (*Th.* 488, 529, 687) is less frequent than in Homer, an 'if-not situation' occurs only once (*Th.* 836-838), temporal anachronies are basically excluded because of the strictly genealogical and chronological blueprint the *Theogony* follows.<sup>29</sup> Despite all these narrative deficiencies, the Hesiodic tradition has taken great pains to build upon a solid genealogical scaffolding an epic composition of considerable merit.

### 1.3 *Common metaphors for poet and poetry: the poet as farmer and seafarer*<sup>30</sup>

One of the most noteworthy forms of metaphor in epic poetry is the one concerned with the presentation of the poet as a skilled artisan. Scholars, like Schmitt<sup>31</sup> and Campanile have convincingly shown that this attitude towards poetry reflects, in fact, an old indoeuropean tradition. The poet is a τέκτων ἐπῶν and his activity is equal to that of a professional.

<sup>29</sup> See NÜNLIST 2004, 28.

<sup>30</sup> See X.K. ΤΣΑΓΓΑΛΗΣ, "Ποίηση και ποιητική στο ησιόδαιο corpus", in *Μουσάων Ἀρχώμεθα: ο Ησίοδος και η αρχαϊκή ἐπική ποίηση*, ed. by N.Π. ΜΠΕΖΑΝΤΑΚΟΣ & X.K. ΤΣΑΓΓΑΛΗΣ (Ἀθήνα 2006), 139-255.

<sup>31</sup> R. SCHMITT, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1967), 295-306; E. CAMPANILE, *Ricerche di cultura poetica indoeuropea* (Pisa 1977), 35-54.

Hesiodic poetry, especially in the *WD*, consistently shows a certain poetological concern, mainly through metaphors concerning two of its core sections, the 'Agriculture' and the 'Nautilia'. The 'Agriculture' section (383-617) contains such an extensive network of similarities between the lives of farmer and poet, that certain scholars have suggested a figurative reading of this entire part of the *WD*.<sup>32</sup> By presenting the specialized knowledge the farmer possesses as analogous to that of the poet and by connecting the skills of both these craftsmen to Zeus, the guiding principle permeating the entire poem, the Hesiodic tradition is able to introduce itself in stark manner, assimilating the poet to a craftsman whose work is familiar to the audience.

The 'labor and beggary' sub-section (383-404) begins by determining the right season for undertaking farming activities, such as ploughing and harvesting. The initial phrase Πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομένων / ἄρχεσθ' ἀμῆτου, ἀρότιο δὲ δυσομένων (383-384) contains the verb ἄρχομαι and therefore recalls its programmatic use at the proem of the *Theogony* and the proems of the *Homeric Hymns*.<sup>33</sup> The poetological function of ἄρχομαι is guaranteed by its traditional referentiality, its metonymic use in epic poetry. Thus, the 'Agriculture' section begins in the same way as Hesiodic poetry, an observation that plausibly points to the 'farmer-poet' scenario. Moreover, the disappearance of the Pleiads in the sky for a period of forty days and nights must be interpreted by the means of the Hesiodic poetic metalanguage, as indicating a negative condition the farmer has to endure until he is allowed to begin cultivating the land and living a prosperous life. The appearance of the Pleiads in the sky (*WD* 387: φαίνονται) is expressed in terms analogous

<sup>32</sup> New studies have deepened our knowledge of the importance of the 'Agriculture' section for Hesiodic poetry. See D.W. TANDY & W.C. NEALE, *Hesiod's Works and Days. A Translation and Commentary for the Social Sciences* (Berkeley 1996); S. NELSON, *God and the Land. The Metaphysics of Farming in Hesiod and Vergil*, with a translation of Hesiod's *Works and Days* by D. GRENE (New York-Oxford 1998).

<sup>33</sup> See section 1.1.

to the appearance of the Muses in mount Helicon at the moment of Hesiod's *Dichterweihe*. The farmer is advised to plough the land after the rise of the Pleiads in the sky, just as the poet Hesiod begins his song only after the divine epiphany of the Muses in Helicon.

The analogy between farming and poetry is also implied by the expressions οὗτός τοι πεδίων πέλεται νόμος (388) and ἀχρεῖος δ' ἔσται ἐπέων νομός (403).<sup>34</sup> Of these two verses the former determines how agriculture is practiced, whereas the latter refers to Perses' 'meadow of words', which will be completely useless when he (Perses) asks for his neighbours' assistance. In other words, Hesiodic tradition sets land cultivation (denoted by the former expression) on the antipods of beggary (delineated by the latter). At the same time the semantical and aural interplay, within this limited space of a few verses, between νόμος and νομός 'legitimizes' the metaphorical interpretation of the aforementioned passage. The language of Perses, his ἔπεα, being that of beggary will be rejected both by his brother Hesiod (396-397: ... ἐγὼ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω / οὐδ' ἐπιμετρήσω ...) <sup>35</sup> and by his neighbours. Being ἀχρεῖος, the 'meadow of words' Perses is using will not yield any products, whereas the undertaking of agricultural work at the right season (394: ὥρι' ἀέξηται), which the internal narrator's voice suggests, will eventually lead to a decent life. Extending this figurative antithesis

<sup>34</sup> See *Hesiod. Works and Days*, ed. with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. WEST (Oxford 1978), 259, who offers the following parallel passages: *Il.* 20.248-249: στρεπτή δὲ γλῶσσ' ἐστὶ βροτῶν, πολέες δ' ἐνὶ μῦθοι / παντοῖοι, ἐπέων δὲ πολὺς νομός ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα, *Hom. Hymn to Apollo* 3.20-21: πάντη γὰρ τοι, Φοῖβε, νομός βεβλήσεται ᾠδῆς, / ἡμὲν ἀν' ἠπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἠδ' ἀνά νήσους, *PIND. Nem.* 3.82: κραγέται δὲ κολιοῖοι ταπεινὰ νέμονται, *AESCHYL. Ag.* 685: γλῶσσαν ἐν τύχα νέμων. Agriculture is used as a metaphor for poetry not only in Greek but also in Vedic tradition. See R. NÜNLIST, *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998), 135, who refers to ploughing, sowing (*Rigveda* 10.101.3-4) and pasturing (*Rigveda* 1.114.9) as metaphors for the language of poetry.

<sup>35</sup> See *WD* 648: δείξω δὲ τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης & *WD* 694: μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι.

further, one may plausibly argue that the πεδίων νόμος in the 'Agriculture' section is a trace of the poetological dialect of the *WD* in epic and didactic disguise. By inventing a language which befits work instead of beggary, the Hesiodic tradition shows that it is only this poetical dialect that is able to create an analogy between farmer and poet, and is, therefore, entitled to expect, farmer-like, a rich harvest from its own metaphorical meadow of song.<sup>36</sup>

Another aspect of the analogy between farming and poetry is the meticulous description of making a ploughshare. The insistence of the Hesiodic text on the importance for the farmer of selecting the right material in given quantities is so typical, that it has been interpreted as a 'working' analogy for the process of selecting the right dictional material (words, expressions etc.) by the poet.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Apart from the 'meadow of words', archaic epic employs two other 'agricultural' metaphors for poetic speech, that of καρπός (a) and that of ploughing, sowing or pasturing (b). See NÜNLIST 1998, 135-141 and 214, who offers the following examples: (a) PIND. *Ol.* 7.7-8: καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις / ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, PIND. *Isthm.* 8.46-46a: ἐπέων δὲ καρπός / οὐ κατέφθινε; (b) PRATINAS, *PMG* 710: οὐ γὰρ αὐλακισμένην / ἀρῶν, ἀλλ' ἄσκαφον ματεύων, PRATINAS, *PMG* 712a: μήτε σύντονον δίωκε / μήτε τὰν ἀνειμένην [[Ἰαστί]] / μοῦσαν, ἀλλὰ τὰν μέσαν / νεῶν ἄρουραν αἰόλιζε τῷ μέλει, *Mel. Adesp.* 923.4: ἀλλοτρίοις δ' οὐ μίγνυται μοῦσαν ἀρούραις, *Mel. Adesp.* 947a (= Simonides?): ἃ Μοῦσα γὰρ οὐκ ἀπόρως γεύει τὸ παρὸν μόνον ἀλλ' ἐπέρχεται πάντα θεριζομένα, PIND. *Ol.* 9.25-26: εἰ σὺν τινι μοιριδίῳ παλάμα / ἐξαιρέτον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον, PIND. *Ol.* 11.8-9: τὰ μὲν ἀμετέρα / γλῶσσα ποιμαίνειν ἐθέλει, PIND. *Pyth.* 6.1-3: Ἀκούσατ' ἤ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας / ἄρουραν ἢ Χαρίτων / ἀναπολίζομεν ..., PIND. *Nem.* 1.13: σπεῖρέ νυν ἀγλαῖαν - τινὰ νάσῳ ..., PIND. *Nem.* 6.31-33: Βασίδαισιν ἅ τ' οὐ σπανίζει, παλαίφατος γενεά, / ἴδια ναυστολέοντες ἐπι-κώμια, Πιερίδων ἀρόταις / δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολὺν ὕμνον ἀγερώχων ἐργμάτων, PIND. *Nem.* 7.104-105: ταῦτά δὲ τρεῖς τετράκι τ' ἀμπολεῖν / ἀπορία τελέθει, τέκνοι-σιν ἄτε μαψυλάκας "Διὸς Κόρινθος", PIND. *Nem.* 8.37-39: ... χρυσὸν εὐχον-ται, πεδίον δ' ἕτεροι / ἀπέραντον, ἐγὼ δ' ἄστοις ἀδῶν καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι, / αἰνέων αἰνητά, μομφὰν δ' ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς, PIND. *Nem.* 10.25-26: ἐκράτησε δὲ καὶ ποθ' Ἑλλα-να στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, τύχα τε μολῶν / καὶ τὸν Ἴσθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέα στέφανον, Μοί-σαισί τ' ἔδωκ' ἀρόσαι.

<sup>37</sup> See M.S. MARSILIO, *Farming and Poetry in Hesiod's Works and Days* (Lanham-New York 2000), 15-21.

## WD 422-436:

τῆμος ἄρ' ὕλοτομεῖν μεμνημένος, ὄριον ἔργον.  
 ὄλμον μὲν τριπόδην τάμνειν, ὕπερον δὲ τρίπηχυ,  
 ἄξονα δ' ἑπταπόδην· μάλα γάρ νύ τοι ἄρμενον οὕτω·  
 εἰ δέ κεν ὀκταπόδην, ἀπὸ καὶ σφῦράν κε τάμοιο.  
 τρισπίθαμον δ' ἄψιν τάμνειν δεκαδώρῳ ἀμάξῃ.  
 πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα· φέρειν δὲ γύην ὅτ' ἂν εὖρης  
 εἰς οἶκον, κατ' ὄρος διζήμενος ἢ κατ' ἄρουραν,  
 πρίνινον· ὃς γὰρ βουσὶν ἀροῦν ὀχυρώτατός ἐστιν,  
 εὖτ' ἂν Ἀθηναίης δμῶδες ἐν ἐλύματι πήξας  
 γόμοφοισιν πελάσας προσαρήρεται ἰστοβοῆϊ.  
 δοιὰ δὲ θέσθαι ἄροτρα πονησάμενος κατὰ οἶκον,  
 αὐτόγυον καὶ πηκτόν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ λώιον οὕτω·  
 εἴ χ' ἕτερον ἄξαις, ἕτερόν κ' ἐπὶ βουσὶ βάλοιο.  
 δάφνης ἢ πτελέης ἀκιώτατοι ἰστοβοῆες,  
 δρυὸς <δ'> ἔλυμα, πρίνου δὲ γύης ...

The most impressive feature of the above passage is neither knowledge nor accuracy of information but rather the emphasis on the importance of selecting and measuring the proper wood. Marsilio<sup>38</sup> has convincingly argued that the poet chooses for himself those mythical versions he is going to employ in his song. Like the farmer who selects the appropriate material in order to make a ploughshare, the singer, having at his disposal a wealth of mythical variants whose authority is undisputed, must select the material that is appropriate to his own song in order to meet the needs of his audience.

The study of Hesiodic language<sup>39</sup> has shown that the most 'innovative' or 'neoteristic' part in the entire Hesiodic corpus are verses 401-600 of the *WD*, which represent a significant part of the 'Agriculture' section. In particular, verses 421-430 offer impressive examples of the way Hesiodic poetry reshapes traditional material also attested in Homeric poetry. The words ὄλμον (423), ἑπταπόδην (424), γόμοφοισιν (431) are also attested in

<sup>38</sup> MARSILIO 2000, 18-19.

<sup>39</sup> G.P. EDWARDS, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford 1971), 30-39; see also MARSILIO 2000, 19.

Homer, where they occupy exactly the same part of the verse.<sup>40</sup> Edwards has shown that this is the case not only with identical but also with similar words or expressions attested in Homer and Hesiod. A good example is that of the forms ὑλοτόμοι (*Il.* 23.123) and ὑλοτόμους (*Il.* 23.114), which correspond to 'Hesiodic' ὑλοτομεῖν (*WD* 422) and are placed between positions 3-5 in the dactylic hexameter, i.e. they occupy the entire second foot down to the penthemimeral caesura. According to Edwards, Homeric and Hesiodic language place the same or similar dictional forms, more or less, in the same verse-position. These observations are very crucial for the following reason. Despite the fact that the 'Agriculture' section contains subject matter that is not appropriate to the Homeric epics due to thematical restrictions, it nevertheless draws, whenever possible, dictional material attested in Homer and uses it in more or less the same metrical manner. Sometimes, it makes bold new steps deviating from its Homeric counterpart. Verse 427 offers a remarkable example of such differentiation. Γύην and ὄτ' ἄν are placed in such a way that they ignore Hermann's bridge by creating a trochaic caesura in the fourth foot of the hexameter line. By placing the word γύην in this particular slot, the Hesiodic tradition highlights its use for the narrative to follow. In fact, γύης will become an important thematic element in the ensuing verses.<sup>41</sup>

Furthermore, the 'Agriculture' section displays a special interest in creating an analogy between the literal storing of the harvest by the farmer and the metaphorical 'storing' of Hesiod's advice in Perses' mind. This analogy is exemplified by the use of the following terms:

(a) the verb φράζεσθαι is employed both for the advice given to Perses (404: φράζεσθαι χρεῖων τε λύσιν λιμοῦ τ' ἀλεωρήν) and

<sup>40</sup> *Il.* 11.147: ὄλμον δ' ὡς ἔσσευε κυλίνδεσθαι δι' ὀμίλου; *Il.* 15.729: θρηῖνον ἔφ' ἑπταπόδην, λίπε δ' ἴκρια νηὸς ἔτσης; *Od.* 5.248: γόμφοισιν δ' ἄρα τήν γε καὶ ἀρμονίησιν ἄρασσαν. See MARSILIO 2000, 19, 74, ft. 90.

<sup>41</sup> See EDWARDS 1971, 35; B. PEABODY, *The Winged Word* (Albany, NY 1975), 183; WEST 1978, 266.

for the advice offered to the farmer (448: φράζεσθαι δ' εὔτ' ἄν γεράνου φωνὴν ἐπακούσεις);

(b) the apostrophe νήπιε/μέγα νήπιε is employed both for Perses (286: σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ ἐσθλὰ νοέων ἐρέω, μέγα νήπιε Πέρση, 396-397:... ἐγὼ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω / οὐδ' ἐπιμετρήσω· ἐργάζεο, νήπιε Πέρση, 633: ὡς περ ἐμός τε πατήρ καὶ σὸς μέγα νήπιε Πέρση) and for the farmer (456: νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδ'· ...);<sup>42</sup>

(c) the verb τίθεμαι is employed not only in respect to Perses (27: ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα τεῶ ἐνικάτθεο θυμῷ) but also in reference to storing at home what is needed for building a carriage (456-457: νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδ'· ἑκατὸν δέ τε δούρατ' ἀμάξης. / τῶν πρόσθεν μελέτην ἐχέμεν οἰκῆια θέσθαι);

(d) the underscoring of the importance of reciprocity in farming activities (349-350: εὔ μὲν μετρεῖσθαι παρὰ γείτονος, εὔ δ' ἀποδοῦναι, / αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ, καὶ λώιον, αἴ κε δύνηαι) as well as in recognizing Hesiod's debt to the Muses (656-659: ἄθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορος· ἐνθά μὲ φημι / ὕμνω νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὠτώεντα. / τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσης Ἑλικωνιάδεσσι ἀνέθηκα, / ἐνθά με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς).

The metaphorical overtones of the 'Agriculture' section can be also seen through the highlighting of Zeus. He is responsible for raining (415-416, 488), it is he to whom the farmer must address his prayers (465), he will offer abundance of goods (474) but also hardships to mortal men (483), such as the winter season (565). Zeus is then presented in the 'Agriculture' section as both the cause of both benefaction and hardships for mankind. Given that this ability of the supreme deity has been programmatically underscored in the proem, where one encounters similar vocabulary concerning the activity of Zeus, who is able to increase and let grow the good man and destroy the arrogant one, we are entitled to believe that the *WD* use Zeus as a link

<sup>42</sup> On the address νήπιος, νήπιε, μέγα νήπιε in Hesiodic poetry, see J.S. CLAY, "The Education of Perses: From 'Mega Nepios' to 'Dion Genos' and Back", in *Mega Nepios: il destinatario nell' epos didascalico*, ed. by A. SCHIESARO, Ph. MITTIS, J.S. CLAY, in *MD* 31 (Pisa 1993), 23-33.

between the poetological connotations of the proem and the 'Agriculture' section. In fact, as Marsilio<sup>43</sup> has rightly observed, the verbs μινύθω, ἀέξω (*WD* 6) and κάρφω (*WD* 7) belong to farming vocabulary and are found in the 'Agriculture' section, in verses 409, 394, and 575 respectively. Under this light, one can see that agricultural vocabulary has been deliberately employed in the proem, where the Hesiodic tradition presents itself before it leaves the floor to Hesiod, the internal narrator of the *WD*. In other words, the farming metaphor of the proem is rounded off by its literal use in the 'Agriculture' section,<sup>44</sup> making Zeus the link between the narrative agenda presented in the proem and its practical manifestation in the farming section.

Finally, another aspect of the poetological connotations of the 'Agriculture' is the cicada imagery (582-584), which employs poetical vocabulary to suggest a two-edged analogy, the positive side of which refers to the Hesiodic poet, the negative side to Perses. The relevant verses run as follows:

ἦμος δὲ σκόλυμός τ' ἀνθεῖ καὶ ἡχέτα τέττιξ  
 δενδρέω ἐφεζόμενος λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' ἀοιδὴν  
 πυκνὸν ὑπὸ πτερύγων θέρεος καματώδεος ὥρη

Both intratextual associations such as (1: ἀοιδῆσι κλείουσαι — 583: ἀοιδὴν, 583: λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' ἀοιδὴν — 659: ἔνθά με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς, 583: δενδρέω ἐφεζόμενος — 593: ἐν σκιῇ ἐζόμενον) and intertextual analogies such as (582: ἡχέτα τέττιξ — Archilochus 223 W: τέττιγος ἐδράζω πτεροῦ, Callimachus, fr. 1.29-30 Pfeiffer: τῷ πιθόμη]ν· ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ ἀείδομεν οἱ λιγὺν ἦχον / τέττιγος, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων) clearly show the metaphorical connection between poet and cicada.<sup>45</sup> Petropoulos has even suggested that this analogy may

<sup>43</sup> MARSILIO 2000, 25-27.

<sup>44</sup> MARSILIO 2000, 26. It is noteworthy that Perses is apostrophized as δῖον γένος (299), in contrast to the internal narrator and the farmer who are closer to Zeus as they obey his orders. See MARSILIO 2000, 76-77, ft. 111.

<sup>45</sup> See G. NAGY, *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek*



be alluding through the notorious laziness and lack of prudence of the cicada to a negative comment concerning Perses.<sup>46</sup>

The cicada passage leads to further considerations concerning the poetics of the 'Agriculture' section. Ornithological (γέρανος, κόκκυξ) or insecticidal (τέττιξ) imagery is used as an indication of seasonal change: the crane (448-452) is associated with winter, the cuckoo (486-490) with spring, and the cicada (582-596) with summer time. In addition to the mechanisms used to link these three examples of ornithological or entomological imagery found in the 'Agriculture' section, the activity of these three birds 'replays' on the level of poetics what happens in respect of farming as seasons change. Beginning with the winter and the crane, moving on to the cuckoo and the spring, the internal narrator is clearly heading towards the summer and the cicada being the only bird its activity he is willing to assimilate to that of the singer. The selection of the summer is not a random choice. It functions as a proleptic advance mention of the analogy that will be suggested in the ensuing 'Nautilia' section between the literal sea journey and the metaphorical sailing at the sea of poetry, activities which must take place at summer time. If we press the point a bit more, following the steps of Rosen, who drew an analogy between bad weather-good weather on the one hand and poetical immaturity and maturity on the other in the 'Nautilia' section, we can then interpret Hesiodic preference for summer time not in terms of working advice but of poetic metaphor.

All the above observations show that the *WD* exploit a thick web of associations between farming and poetry, which the Homeric poems are unaware of. Before drawing any more thorough conclusions, we need to turn our attention to the 'Nautilia' section.

*Poetry* (Baltimore-London 1979), 302 ft. 11; R. ROSEN, "Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's *Works and Days*", in *Classical Antiquity* 9 (1990), 99-113 [107-109]; MARSILIO 2000, 77, ft. 113.

<sup>46</sup> See J.C.B. PETROPOULOS, *Heat and Lust. Hesiod's Midsummer Festival Scene Revisited* (Lanham 1994), 77, ft. 29.

The 'Nautilia' (618-694) contains in its larger part advice concerning the time and means that Perses, Hesiod's alleged brother, should use in order to gain profit from seafaring. However, the 'Nautilia' has gained its own poetic profit because of a famous self-referential statement of poetics made by 'Hesiod' himself, a statement directly linked to his receiving a poetic award, which virtually amounts to a remarkable acknowledgment of his poetic skills. In particular, 'Hesiod' explicitly refers to a song-contest he participated and won in Chalkis, in the funeral games of Amphidamas. He amply states that this was the only time he traveled by sea and that after winning this contest by singing a hymn (657: ὕμνῳ νικήσαντα), he dedicated his prize, a tripod, to the Heliconian Muses. The brief reference to his short journey over a limited stretch of water from Aulis to Chalkis becomes the stepping stone to a daring poetological leap: the bay of Aulis is explicitly connected to the sailing out of the Achaean army for Troy and implicitly to those epic poems dealing with the Trojan War.

This poetological reading of the aforementioned section was first proposed by Nagy<sup>47</sup> but it was systematically pursued by Rosen,<sup>48</sup> who convincingly showed that the 'Nautilia' functions as a "pictorial triptych", where the first and the third part refer literally to commercial activity at sea, whereas the second part, the centrally located *sphragis*, explains through an effective poetic metaphor the other two parts.

<sup>47</sup> G. NAGY, "Hesiod", in *Ancient Writers. Greece and Rome*, ed. by T.J. LUCE (New York 1982), I 43-73 [66]. R. HAMILTON, *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry* (Baltimore-London 1989), 69 argues that the reference to the Trojan expedition in the 'Nautilia' section must be linked to the passage dealing with the heroes in the Myth of Races. I do not agree with W. NICOLAI, *Hesiods Erga. Beobachtungen zum Aufbau* (Heidelberg 1964), 126-127, who has argued that verses 631-662 form a coherent unit, since the very text of Hesiod employs specific and clear-cut ways in order to separate the first part of the 'Nautilia' (618-645) from the second, i.e. the self-referential *sphragis*, and from the third (663-694). See HAMILTON 1989, 68. WEST's view (1978, 55) that the *sphragis* has been composed as an alternative proem to the 'Nautilia' seems far-fetched, but is useful in the sense that it, too, underscores the programmatic style of verses 646-662.

<sup>48</sup> ROSEN 1990, 99-113.

Rosen<sup>49</sup> plausibly argued that expressions like ναυτιλίας δυσπεμφέλου ἡμερος αἰρεῖ (618), νηὸς πτερὰ ποντοπόροιο (628), μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (648) - μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι (694), ἔργων μεμνημένος εἶναι / ὠραίων πάντων (641-642), οὔτε τι ναυτιλίας σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν (649), τόσσόν τοι νηῶν γε πεπεύρημαι πολυγόμεφων (660), λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' αἰοιδῆν (583) - λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν αἰοιδῆς (659), the interrelation between

<sup>49</sup> WD 624-628: νῆα δ' ἐπ' ἠπείρου ἐρύσαι πυκάσαι τε λίθοισιν / πάντοθεν, ὄφρ' ἴσχωσ' ἀνέμων μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων, / χεῖμαρον ἐξερύσας, ἵνα μὴ πύθη Διὸς ὄμβρος. / ὄπλα δ' ἐπάρμενα πάντα τεῶν ἐγκάτθεο οἴκω, / εὐκόσμως στολίσας νηὸς πτερὰ ποντοπόροιο. For the figurative wings of poetry, see ROSEN (1990, 109), who brings attention to verse 237-254 from the *Corpus Theognideum*: σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρω ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷς ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον / πωτήσῃ καὶ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀειρόμενος / ῥηιδίως· θοίνης δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνησι παρέσση / ἐν πάσαις, πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν, / καὶ σε σὺν αὐλίσκοισι λιγυφθόγγους νέοι ἄνδρες / εὐκόσμως ἔρατοὶ καλὰ τε καὶ λιγέα / αἰσονται. καὶ ὅταν δνοφερῆς ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης / βῆις πολυκωκύτους εἰς Αἴδαο δόμους, / οὐδέποτ' οὐδὲ θανάων ἀπολεῖς κλέος, ἀλλὰ μελήσεις / ἀφθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων ὄνομα / Κύρνε, καθ' Ἑλλάδα γῆν στρωφόμενος ἦδ' ἀνὰ νήσους / ἰχθυόεντα περῶν πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον, / οὐχ ἵππων νώτοισιν ἐφήμενος, ἀλλὰ σε πέμψει / ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα ἰοστεφάνων / πᾶσι δ' ὅσοισι μέμηλε καὶ ἐσομένοισιν αἰοιδῆ / ἔσση ὁμῶς, ὄφρ' ἂν γῆ τε καὶ ἠέλιος / αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὀλίγης παρὰ σεῦ οὐ τυγχάνω αἰδοῦς, / ἀλλ' ὥσπερ μικρὸν παῖδα λόγους μ' ἀπαταῖς. For the same metaphor, see also NÜNLIST 1998, 277-283, whence the followings examples: ANACREON, *PMG* 376: ἀρθεῖς δηῦτ' ἀπὸ Λευκάδος / πέτρης ἐς πολιὸν κύμα κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι, ANACREON, *PMG* 378: ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον πετερύγεσσι κούφης / διὰ τὸν Ἑρωτ' οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ < - υ > θέλει συνηβᾶν, TELESTES, *PMG* 805b: ἀλλὰ μάταν ἀχόρευτος ἄδε ματαιολόγων / φάμα προσέπειτα Ἑλλάδα μουσολόγων / σοφᾶς ἐπιφθονον βροτοῖς τέχνας ὄνειδος, *mel. adesp.*, *PMG* 954b: μέλεα μελιπτέρωτα Μουσᾶν, PIND. *Ol.* 9.11-12: πετερόεντα δ' ἴει γλυκύν / Πυθῶνάδ' οἰστόν· οὔτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψαι, PIND. *Pyth.* 5.114-115: ἐν τε Μοῖσαισι ποτανὸς ἀπὸ ματρὸς φίλας, / πέφανται θ' ἀρματηλάτας σοφός, PIND. *Pyth.* 8.32-34:... τὸ δ' ἐν ποσί μοι τράχον / ἴτω τὸν χρέος, ὦ παῖ, νεώτατον καλῶν, / ἐμᾶ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶ, PIND. *Nem.* 6.48-49: πέταται δ' ἐπὶ τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσης τηλόθεν / ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν, PIND. *Nem.* 7.20-23:... ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι / λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν - διὰ τὸν ἀδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὀμηρον / ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσσι οἱ ποτανᾶ <τε> μαχανᾶ / σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι, PIND. *Isthm.* 1.64-66· εἶη νιν εὐφώνων πετερύγεσσι ἀερθέντ' ἀγλααῖς / Πιερίδων, ἔτι καὶ Πυ-θῶθεν Ὀλυμπιάδων τ' ἐξαιρέτοις / Ἀλφειοῦ ἔρνεσι φράξαι χεῖρα, PIND. *Isthm.* 5.63: καὶ πετερόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ὕμνον, PIND. *fr.* 227:... νέων δὲ μέριμναι σὺν πόνοις εἰλισσόμεναι / δόξαν εὐρίσκοντι· λάμπει δὲ χρόνῳ / ἔργα μετ' αἰθέρ' ἀερόθεντα, BACCH. *fr.* 20B. 3-5:... ὀρμαίνω τι πέμπ[ειν] / χρύσειον Μουσᾶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πετερόν / καὶ συμποσ[ίαι]σιν ἄγαλμ' [ἐν] εἰκάδεσ[σιν], PRATINAS, *PMG* 708.3-5:... ἐμὲ δεῖ κελαδεῖν, ἐμὲ δεῖ παταγεῖν / ἀν' ὄρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναϊάδων / οἶά τε κύκνον ἄγοντα ποικιλόπτερον μέλος.

literal poverty and poetic destitution (*WD* 20-26) and the metaphor of the ship and wings (624-629) amply show that the entire 'Nautilia' section should be interpreted as a bold manifestation of Hesiodic poetics.

## 2. Audience

### 2.1 Creating an internal audience (*Phaeacians-Perses*)

The *Odyssey* and the *WD* insist on poetological signs, as one can infer from the special concern they show in respect of creating a chief internal narrator and a main internal addressee. Homeric epic is characterized by the presence of an omniscient external narrator who controls the action and decides about the rhythm and deployment of the plot. Various characters function as secondary narrators-focalizers (to employ the apt narratological term of de Jong), who have their own internal audiences. But the *Odyssey* despite this rather strict narratological framework, makes a daring step of unprecedented size and weight by creating a chief internal narrator, the poem's principal hero, Odysseus, who relates to an internal audience, the Phaeacians, his own version of his wanderings, from his departure from Troy to his arrival at the island of Calypso. This is effectuated through the so-called 'Apologoi', his extensive embedded narrative in Books 9-12. *Mutatis mutandis*, the *WD* show a similar concern with poetics which, with the exception of the proem, is absent from the *Theogony*. Moreover, the *WD* exploit Odyssean concerns about poetics, especially in the *sphragis* (646-662), the most heavily loaded with poetological overtones passage of the entire epic.

In the light of the multiple poetical strands of this section, let us now turn to the *sphragis* (646-662) and compare it with a dictionally relevant passage from the *Odyssey* (8.159-164). The *sphragis* constitutes an 'autobiographical' section within a poem, voiced in a distinct narrative tone, signaling through self-referential statements the author's (if we are dealing with a histori-

cal author) or the tradition's personal trademark. Given the strictly determined narrative agenda of the *sphragis*, it is worth considering the diction of this personally charged sub-section, the more so since it shares certain features with the way the *Odyssey* depicts Alcinous' sponsoring of the games in Scheria, which included athletic and musical contests.<sup>50</sup>

WD 646-662 (*sphragis*):

εὖτ' ἂν ἐπ' ἐμπορίην τρέψας ἀεσίφρονα θυμόν  
 βούλῃαι χρέα τε προφυγεῖν καὶ λιμὸν ἀτερπέα,  
 δείξω δὴ τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης,  
 οὔτε τι ναυτιλίας σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν·  
 οὐ γάρ πώ ποτε νηὶ γ' ἐπέπλων εὐρέα πόντον,  
 εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὐβοίαν ἐξ Αὐλίδος, ἧ ποτ' Ἀχαιοὶ  
 μείναντες χειμῶνα πολὺν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν  
 Ἑλλάδος ἐξ ἱερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναικα.  
 ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼν ἐπ' ἄεθλα δαΐφρονος Ἀμφιδάμαντος  
 Χαλκίδα τ' εἰς ἐπέρησα· τὰ δὲ προπεφραδμένα πολλὰ  
 ἄθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορος· ἔνθα μέ φημι  
 ὕμῳ νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὠτώεντα.  
 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσης Ἑλικωνιάδεσσ' ἀνέθηκα,  
 ἔνθα με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς.  
 τόσσόν τοι νηῶν γε πεπεύρημαι πολυγόμφων·  
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧς ἐρέω Ζηνὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο·  
 Μοῦσαι γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξαν ἀθέσφατον ὕμνον αἰεΐειν.

*Odyssey* 8.159-164:

“οὐ γάρ σ' οὐδέ, ξεῖνε, δαήμονι φωτὶ εἴσκω  
 ἄθλων, οἷά τε πολλὰ μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται,  
 ἀλλὰ τῷ ὅς θ' ἅμα νηὶ πολυκληῖδι θαμίζων,  
 ἀρχὸς ναυτῶν οἷ τε πρηκτῆρες ἕασι,  
 φόρτου τε μνήμων καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἧσιν ὀδαίων  
 κερδέων θ' ἀρπαλέων· οὐδ' ἀθλητῆρι ἔοικας.”

In the *Odyssey* (8.159-164), the ἄθλα/ἄεθλα refer to athletic contests, while Odysseus is compared to a man of the sea who cares about his cargo and aims at acquiring profit greedily. In

<sup>50</sup> See R. SCODEL, *Listening to Homer. Tradition, Narrative, and Audience* (Ann Arbor 2002), 178.

like manner, Perses must turn his mind to seafaring (*WD* 642-643) taking care of his cargo. In contrast to this initial analogy, Perses' cargo soon becomes figurative, as it designates Hesiodic poetry and, likewise, the ἄθλα/ἄεθλα do not indicate martial or athletic events but poetical *contests* (654-655: ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼν ἐπ' ἄεθλα δαΐφρονος Ἀμφιδάμαντος / Χαλκίδα τ' εἰς ἐπέρησα) and *prizes* (655-656: τὰ δὲ προπεφραδμένα πολλά / ἄθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορος). Unlike the *Odyssey*, the *WD* present a framework of contest and rivalry which is colored neither by the aristocratic ideal of reciprocity nor the beguiling greed of deceit, but rather by the σοφία and knowledge of commercial antagonism, which necessitates the opening up of Hesiodic song to a larger audience, no more in miserable Ascra, but in Chalkis, the metaphorical gateway to poetical recognition and fame. The poetical contest in which Hesiod excels and the prize of his victorious performance presuppose the ruseful mind of the traveling merchant, who knows the *metra of the turbulent sea*, i.e. the rules of poetry, and is able to escape poetical isolation. In this way, Hesiodic poetry introduces for the first time in ancient Greek literature a new, complex but fascinating definition of a poetry-prize. Exploiting at length the figurative aspect of κέρδος, Hesiodic song redefines poetic κλέος, evaluating it not through Homeric standards but by means of a metaphor taken from the world of economic and commercial activity.

The *Odyssean* presentation of sea-trade and the general tenor of the Hesiodic 'Nautilia' set the tone for elaborating the aforementioned comparison even further. The *Odyssey* capitalizes on the emphatically stressed polarity between two versions of sea-trade activity, narratively epitomized in two distinct seafaring communities, the Phaeacians and the Phoenicians. Dougherty has carefully presented the two communities, which share certain common features, such as possession of wealth, excellence in weaving, and, most importantly, ships and sailing.<sup>51</sup> At the

<sup>51</sup> C. DOUGHERTY, *The Raft of Odysseus. The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford 2001), 102-121 and, in particular, 112.

same time, the two peoples are strongly differentiated in respect to the manner they perform trade. In fact, the *Odyssey* depicts Phaeacians and Phoenicians as belonging to opposite ends of the spectrum: the former do not engage in profit-bringing activities, despite their excellence in seafaring, whereas the latter are famous traders, merchants, and overseas sailors. Phaeacian proficiency in ships is reflected in their very names, which are derived from the world of the sea, whereas Phoenician talent is deflected in their manipulative greed for profit at all expense. Conducting an almost altruistic gift exchange, the Phaeacians inhabit an ideal world of unceasing agricultural productivity, while the Phoenicians seem to have turned themselves to seafaring activities because of the pressure of dire necessity. Dougherty has convincingly shown that the *Odyssey* "attempts to carve out a position for the Greeks somewhere between the idealized model of gift exchange represented by the Phaeacians and the negative image of trade as a kind of piracy projected by the Phoenicians".<sup>52</sup> Setting the Hesiodic picture of seafaring activity next to this Odyssean tableau, one can see that the *WD* negotiate for the same middle ground between the two extremes. This time however, the middle ground is defined in terms of a personalized conflict between two brothers, Hesiod and Perses. Whereas the *Odyssey* fuses Phaeacian and Phoenician elements in the amalgamated personality of the epic's principal hero, Odysseus, the *WD* consciously indulge in highlighting a dynamic tension between productive labor and carefully planned seafaring activity on the one hand, and idleness and risky, profit-yielding sailing undertakings on the other. What is more, the *WD* exploit this motif even further, as they use it as a pretext for poetical considerations lying at the heart of the poem's reconceptualization of a rival Odyssean tradition.

This line of interpretation is decisively reinforced by the reference to Hesiod's victory in verses 656-659. In an athletic contest, the victor used to dedicate the laurel-crown of his athletic

<sup>52</sup> DOUGHERTY 2001, 112.

triumph to his own city, as a sign of recognition of the city's participation in his victory but also as a kind of protection, an almost magical *aegis* fending off any sort of danger. In Hesiodic poetry, the dedication of the tripod the poet won at the funeral games of Amphidamas in Chalkis to the Heliconian Muses is also a symbolic acknowledgment of his debt to them, who first taught him the art of song. Kurke<sup>53</sup> has plausibly argued that the epinician poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides has reappropriated and adjusted Homeric κλέος to the political framework of κῦδος by substituting the Homeric king with the city, which does not only receive but also shares the victor's fame.<sup>54</sup> Under this light, the use of athletic terminology (ἄθλα/ἄεθλα, νικήσαντα), the dedication of the victor's prize, the tripod, to the Heliconian Muses, and last but not least, the framework of commodity trade by sea, which the 'Nautilia' successfully advertizes, are harmoniously orchestrated in order to promote *a symbolic economy of Hesiodic κλέος*.

Seafaring trade, profit-gaining commercial antagonism, cargo-carrying ships, choosing a season suitable for sailing enterprises, all these issues allude to poetical value.<sup>55</sup> Hesiodic poetry in its

<sup>53</sup> L. KURKE, "The Economy of *Kudos*", in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics*, ed. by C. DOUGHERTY & L. KURKE (Cambridge 1993), 131-163 [137-138].

<sup>54</sup> See PIND. *Ol.* 5.1-8: Ὑψηλᾶν ἀρετᾶν καὶ στεφάνων ἄωτον γλυκύν / τῶν Οὐλυμπία, Ὀκεανοῦ θύγατερ, καρδίᾳ γελανεῖ / ἀκαμαντόποδός τ' ἀπήνας δέκευ Ψαύμιός τε δῶρα / ὃς τὰν σὰν πόλιν αὖξων, Καμάρινα, λαοτρόφον, / βωμοὺς ἔξ διδύμους ἐγέραρεν ἑορταῖς θεῶν μεγίσταις / ὑπὸ βουθυσίαις ἀέθλων τε πεμπαμέροις ἀμίλλαις, / ἵπποις ἡμιόνις τε μοναμπυκία τε. τὴν δὲ κῦδος ἄβρόν / νικάσας ἀνέθηκε, καὶ ὃν πατέρ' Ἄ-κρων' ἐκάρυξε καὶ τὰν νέοικον ἔδραν.

<sup>55</sup> A.T. EDWARDS, *Hesiod's Ascra* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2004), 44-62 offers a detailed economic analysis of Hesiod's presentation of trade and κέρδος. He maintains (61) that "Hesiod expresses an ambivalent attitude towards trade". The author is certainly right when he argues that "[t]he possibility of *kerdos* is offset by the risks presented by sea-voyaging to life and goods" (61). According to my argument, this analysis should be placed within the context of poetical references 'Hesiod' makes in the 'Nautilia'. The "continuity between trading and farming and the subordination of both to the self-sufficiency of the *oikos*", as EDWARDS 2004, 61 has argued, does not only refer to the interrelation between trading and farming for the community of Ascra, but it also connotes the continuity of Hesiodic song.



struggle to utter its own, distinct and identifiable voice, to sing its own song, constructs a metapoetic language aiming at being both traditional and innovative. In this respect, the metaphor of the right season for sailing is useful and instructive. Hesiod argues that one should not start his poetic career on the figurative wings of epic poetry, but should wait for the *ώραῖος πλόος*, the period of fruitful inspiration, after having mastered the technique of sailing. Under this scope, singing the *Theogony*, which at all probability lies under the general term *ῥυμος* (657) Hesiod employed to refer to his song in Chalkis, is a much more prudent choice than the risky business of singing a long and demanding epic poem, in the manner of the Homeric epics. Appropriating imagery stemming from the world of economic activity may seem strange, to say the least, but in fact its function has to be conceived in relation to the position Hesiodic poetry ambitiously claims for itself.

The *ἄθλα/ἄεθλα* stand both for the song contest and for the victor's poetic prize, and in that way, the funeral games in honor of Amphidamas in Chalkis constitute an excellent opportunity for Hesiod to make his song known to a larger audience. Clay<sup>56</sup> has rightly emphasized the fact that the autobiographical references to 'Hesiod' throughout the *WD* have a metaphorical, rather than a literal meaning. Even the mentioning of Cyme as the birthplace of Hesiod's father may be concealing an allusion to the common origin of Homer (according to the Herodotean life of Homer)<sup>57</sup> and Hesiod, as well as to their ensuing poetic differentiation. Extending Clay's argument further, one may argue that the negative portrait of Ascrea as a miserable dwelling place throughout the entire year must not be interpreted in terms of geographical and historical accuracy but as a poetic metaphor. By mapping out the perils of poetic isolation, Hesiodic poetry attempts to trace its opening towards a larger audi-

<sup>56</sup> CLAY 2003, 181.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. 1-3. See also *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*, ed. and transl. by M.L. WEST (Cambridge, Mass.–London 2003), 371, ft. 21.

ence. It is not inferior to Homeric poetry, only to its widespread fame. Ascra and Chalkis, poetic isolation and advertisement respectively, constitute the two poles of Hesiodic poetic topography. The journey from Ascra to Chalkis is therefore a metaphorical *iter* to poetic fame, a transition from the local, epichoric community of Ascra to a pan-Hellenic<sup>58</sup> audience in Chalkis. Hesiodic song is equally well equipped with its famous Homeric rival, as it also knows of well-bolted ships (660: τόσσόν τοι νηῶν γε πεπεύρημαι πολυγόμφων) and the measures of the loud-roaring sea (648: δείξω δὴ τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης), and is able to sail successfully to the sea of archaic Greek epic.

In respect to Perses as internal addressee of the *WD*, the following observations should be made. Obbink has argued that “in the archaic and early classical period such extreme *sphragidization*, which we may define as the embedded assertion of the identity of the poet with his narrative persona, betrays anxieties over the ownership of poetry and its status as property. The introduction of addressee(s) is one way in which the relationship between the poet and his audience may be articulated or negotiated, in such a way that the poet nominally retains control over the poem as created artifact, but initiates its transfer to a general audience through the mediation of an elite, exclusive addressee”. The ‘obsession’ of the *WD* with a dispute between Hesiod and Perses over property issues should be seen in a double perspective: the tradition our poem belongs to aims both at consolidating its status and identity and also at addressing a larger audience. The property quarrel should be

<sup>58</sup> The pan-Hellenic scope of the *WD* can be seen in the themes this epic develops. One, often neglected theme, is its very subject matter and, in particular, the emphasis laid on the *oikos* as the only remaining community, now that polis and periphery are not operating by the old set of rules. This ‘social’ aspect of the poem is applicable to all peripheral communities experiencing tensions with the polis-center and so its applicability dovetails well with the pan-Hellenic aim of Hesiodic song. See D.W. TANDY, *Warriors into Traders. The Power of the Market in Early Greece* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1997), 214–215.

interpreted in similar manner to Hesiod and Perses, who are fictive characters of the plot, mere masks under which the Hesiodic tradition of didactic poetry, usurping the epic and lyric constraints of its age, carefully discloses its face, its addressees, and its aims. The property dispute between the two brothers is not textually asserted autobiographical trivia, at least not more than Hesiod himself and Perses. By “inventing” the property dispute with its *special* addressee, Perses, the Hesiodic tradition of didactic epic mirrors on the level of the plot a typical poetic strategy. The fraternal relation between Hesiod and Perses is, in fact, an effective way to represent the audience on the level of the plot. By creating a fictive addressee, Perses,<sup>59</sup> to whom a fictive poet, Hesiod, addresses his advisory song, the tradition of didactic poetry, which we may call Hesiodic, is able to make its message successful and much more effective.

Greek and Roman poetry make ample use of fictive addressees, somehow related to the speaking ‘I’, such as Cynros in the *Corpus Theognideum*, Pausanias in Empedocles, Theodoros in Dionysius Chalkous, Moschos in Arcestratus of Gela, Memmius in Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*. In contrast to Eastern traditions, where the addressee is often the son of the man who advises, the aforementioned examples indicate that an addressee ‘socially equivalent’ to the master or wise advisor is of prime importance for the effectiveness of the poem’s *didache*. In fact, Hesiod’s superficially distinct personae as mouthpiece of the Muses in the *Theogony* and as counselor in the *WD* are interrelated through the appropriation of a seemingly autobiographical detail, namely his status as a *metanastes*. Martin<sup>60</sup> has rightly

<sup>59</sup> See scholia vetera [PERTUSI], Prolegomena, B 9-16: Μετά τὴν ἡρωϊκὴν γενεαλογίαν καὶ τοὺς καταλόγους ἐπεζήτησε καινουργῆσαι πάλιν ἑτέραν ὑπόθεσιν· καὶ δὴ καταχρησθέντων τῶν εἰς πολέμους καὶ μάχας, καὶ τῆς γεωργίας διδασκαλίαν εἰσφέρει καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὴν κρᾶσιν, πρόσωπον ἀναπλάσας καὶ παραλαβῶν <τὸ> τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Πέρσου, εἴτε κατ’ ἀλήθειαν, εἴτε κατὰ τὸ εὐπρόσωπον καὶ ἀρμόζον τῇ ὑποθέσει, ὡς ἂν μὴ δυσπρόσωπον εἶη καὶ ἵνα δόξη ἐξ ἔριδος τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐληλυθέναι.

<sup>60</sup> R.P. MARTIN, “Hesiod’s Metanastic Poetics”, in *Ramus* 21 (1992), 11-33.

argued that certain features of the *WD*, such as (a) autobiographical information concerning Hesiod, his brother, and their father, (b) certain aeolisms popping up in 'Hesiodic' dialect, (c) incorporation of verse-long maxims in the text, and finally (d) preference for rare dictional coins instead of more common ones (*ἀνόστεος*, *φερέρικος*), must be reevaluated in relation to the audience this song is addressed to. By presenting himself as the son of an immigrant from Asia Minor, Hesiod assumes the persona of a foreigner, a *metanastes*, aiming at making his advice more persuasive to his audience. The authority of didactic epic is considerably strengthened, as Hesiod presents himself speaking as some 'other', who, by extension, holds a superior position to those he is advising. A good analogy is that of Phoenix in the *Iliad*, who arrives at Phthia as a *metanastes*, only to become at a later stage the educator of Achilles. Concocting specific 'plot-conditions' for transmitting a didactic message constitutes an indispensable and well established method used by a poetic tradition, in order to create the necessary framework for expressing its *didache*. Under this scope, Perses as Hesiod's brother is a much more effective choice than the invention of, say, a hypothetical son. Perses has the advantage of belonging to the same generation with Hesiod and so his brother's *σοφία* need not be presented as belonging to an older and more experienced person. This strategy would have been completely incompatible with the position of *metanastes* Hesiod desires to assume. Hesiodic poetry boldly replaces the typical didactic pair of master-student, father-son, old-young, for it aims at emitting its message from the position of a *metanastes*, an outsider, a wandering bard, not from the point of view of a wise old man. By fostering the *σοφία* of a *metanastes*, Hesiodic poetry is able to put its lasting mark on its didactic song and claim future success by addressing different and varied audiences. To accomplish this goal, it needs a song wider in scope, a pan-Hellenic didactic epic, whose *didache* will not be limited in miserable Ascra but will address, traveling as a *metanastes*, an itinerant bard, the whole of Hellas.

## 2.2 *The pan-Hellenic scope of Hesiodic poetry*

The pan-Hellenic perspective of Hesiodic poetry can be best exemplified in the way this epic deals with mythical variants. I have selected the so-called 'Hymn to Hecate', a passage which has attracted time and again scholarly interest. Hellenists have focused their attention on the following topics: (a) the size of the 'hymn', (b) its insertion in the midst of genealogical catalogues, and (c) its peculiar encomiastic tone for a 'second-category' deity, such as Hecate. I begin by offering a brief presentation of the various theories proposed:

(1) The analytical theory: its supporters have argued that the 'Hymn to Hecate' is an interpolation, a later addition to the main body of an *Ur-Theogonie* (like the *Ur-Ilias*), which would bear the undisputed trademark of one and single poet, the historically determined Boeotian poet Hesiod. The arguments of the analysts are of two kinds: dictional eccentricities or deviations from Hesiodic diction or Hesiodic semantics showing that the hymn may have been added later to the main body of the *Theogony* either by propounders of orphism<sup>61</sup> or by someone who was familiar with such a tradition from the area of Eastern Asia Minor (this is the place Hesiod's father came from).<sup>62</sup> Sellschopp<sup>63</sup> has argued that the word *τιμή* is twice attested in the 'Hymn to Hecate' with a meaning that deviates from regular practice. In verses 414 (*ἡ δὲ καὶ ἀστερόεντος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἔμμορε τιμῆς*) and 418 (... *πολλή τέ οἱ ἔσπετο τιμή*), the word *τιμή* does not designate Hecate's position in divine hierarchy but the special place she occupied for mortal men. Most of this argumentation has been successfully dealt with already in the 19th century,<sup>64</sup> and West in his commented

<sup>61</sup> A. FICK, *Hesiods Gedichte* (Göttingen 1887), 17.

<sup>62</sup> U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I (Berlin 1931), 169 ff.

<sup>63</sup> I. SELLSCHOPP, *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod* (Hamburg 1934), 52, ft. 83.

<sup>64</sup> See *Hesiod. Theogony*, edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. WEST (Oxford 1966), 278.

edition of the *Theogony*<sup>65</sup> removes once and for all the suspicions raised by Kirk<sup>66</sup> concerning the authenticity of this passage. In this case, a general observation concerning the use of stylistic criteria for deciding about the genuineness of a given passage in Hesiodic poetry might be expressed in the following way: determining Hesiodic style is extremely hard and the limits of 'normality' or 'regularity' in respect to vocabulary, syntax, and semantics are a slippery concept. Moreover, if any deviation from regular use is considered the privileged ground of an imitator or some sort of Hesiodic *Bearbeiter*, then it is clear that we are following the wrong path. The chimaeric search for dictional uniformity may end up in an obsessive linguistic determinism, which is at odds with the very nature of oral poetry such as Hesiodic song.

(2) The 'biographical' theory: according to the scholars who have fostered this interpretation, the 'Hymn to Hecate' reflects, through the emphasis it places on certain elements pertaining to the actual cult of this goddess, Hesiod's personal connection with her. Aly has argued that the hymn shows that Hecate belonged to an unofficial private cult.<sup>67</sup> Along these lines, Pfister<sup>68</sup> has even maintained that the Hesiodic *Theogony* devotes considerable space to a lesser deity belonging to the lower classes because, contrary to the Homeric epics, it does not address aristocratic circles but the lower peasantry. The social dimension of Hesiodic poetry has been interpreted by the biographists as indicating the social reality a historical Hesiod belonged to. The biographists do not simply believe in a historical poet, creator of the *Theogony* and the *WD*, but they also take for granted the convergence of physical and poetical

<sup>65</sup> WEST 1966, 276-280.

<sup>66</sup> G.S. KIRK, "The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*", in *Hésiode et son influence*, Entretiens Hardt 7 (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1962), 63-107 [80].

<sup>67</sup> W. ALY, "Hesiodos von Askra und der Verfasser der *Theogonie*", in *Hesiod*, ed. by E. HEITSCH, Wege der Forschung 44 (Darmstadt 1966), 65, ft. 23.

<sup>68</sup> F. PFISTER, "Die Hekate-Episode in Hesiods *Theogonie*", in *Philologus* 84 (1928), 1-15 [8].

reality. What the school of Neoanalysis has successfully done in the case of Homeric poetry by drawing the line between physical and poetical reality, the supporters of the 'biographical' theory in Hesiodic poetry have failed even to comprehend. And what is even worse, this *a priori* belief has led them to argue that Hesiodic poetry is the degraded counterpart of Homeric epic, the poetry of the poor and the socially weak. West has claimed that the use of the same name, Perses, both for Hesiod's brother and for Hecate's father is not a coincidence but must be interpreted in biographical terms, since it shows the special importance the goddess Hecate had for Hesiod's family.<sup>69</sup> Despite the fact that this view does not end up in the textual dissecting of the analysts, it virtually endorses their pattern of reasoning, i.e. that the 'Hymn to Hecate' bears a close relation to the personal life of Hesiod. Mazon has, more or less on the same tone, maintained that the *Theogony* has been composed for some festival in honor of Hecate, who must have been worshipped in Ascra as a local variant of the πότνια θηρῶν.<sup>70</sup> The same view has been also adopted by Van Groningen, who has thus attempted to cater for the privileged place Hecate occupies within the *Theogony*.<sup>71</sup> Inextricably linked to Hesiod, his personality, his family, his place of origin or, last, the cultic practice of his region, the 'Hymn to Hecate' became for the supporters of the 'biographical' theory the *lydian stone* for a historically-based interpretation of Hesiodic poetry, an interpretation which is nothing more than a predicted reshuffling of the cards of historical determinism.

(3) The 'religious' theory: the definite advantage of this theory is the use of interpretive criteria which are not historically

<sup>69</sup> WEST 1966, 276-280.

<sup>70</sup> *Hésiode. Théogonie, les Travaux et les Jours, le Bouclier*. Texte établi et traduit par P. MAZON (Paris 1928), 5.

<sup>71</sup> B.A. VAN GRONINGEN, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958), 269-270.

determined. Judet de la Combe<sup>72</sup> and Wismann<sup>73</sup> think that Hecate is representing chthonic powers, whose ultimate origin is Gaia. Therefore, Hecate is a relic from the older generation of the Titans, but nevertheless is part of the world of Zeus, whose kingdom the *Theogony* celebrates. Boedeker<sup>74</sup> underlines the tri-functionalism of Hecate (authority, power, productivity) that virtually reflects the three basic functions of the proto-indoeuropean religious world and the proto-indoeuropean heroic pantheon. According to Boedeker,<sup>75</sup> Hecate is the transformation of an older indoeuropean divinity, the female equivalent of Zeus, who is, of course, the par excellence representative of tri-functionalism.

(4) The 'gender-oriented' theory: Zeitlin<sup>76</sup> has argued that the principal feature of the 'Hymn to Hecate' is its opposition to the myth of Pandora, which will soon follow as the *Theogony* goes on. The 'Hymn to Hecate' must be seen as the positive side within a series of negative female creatures of the *Theogony*, Pandora being the most negative example. From a purely structural point of view, this theory is corroborated by the fact the Hecate and Pandora frame the passage devoted to the birth of Zeus, the key figure in the entire epic.

(5) The 'textual' theory: the main supporter of this theory is Clay<sup>77</sup> who has laid emphasis on the 'wilfullness' of Hecate, her

<sup>72</sup> P. JUDET DE LA COMBE, "La dernière ruse: Pandore dans la *Théogonie*", in *Les métiers du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, ed. by F. BLAISE, P. JUDET DE LA COMBE, Ph. ROUSSEAU (Villeneuve d'Ascq 1996), 263-299.

<sup>73</sup> H. WISMANN, "Propositions pour une lecture d'Hésiode", in *Les métiers du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, ed. by F. BLAISE, P. JUDET DE LA COMBE, Ph. ROUSSEAU (Villeneuve d'Ascq 1996), 15-24 [21].

<sup>74</sup> D. BOEDEKER, "Hecate: A Transfunctional Goddess in the *Theogony*?", in *TAPhA* 113 (1983), 79-93 [85].

<sup>75</sup> BOEDEKER 1983, 92.

<sup>76</sup> F. ZEITLIN, "Signifying Difference: The Case of Hesiod's Pandora", in *Playing the Other. Gender and Society in Classical Greek Society* (Chicago 1996), 53-86.

<sup>77</sup> J.S. CLAY, "The Hecate of the *Theogony*", in *GRBS* 25 (1984), 27-38 [34-37].



mediating ability between mortals and immortals, so that the former may receive from the latter what they ask during the ritual sacrifice. Clay's analysis is heavily text-based but at the same time she makes good use of certain aspects of the 'religious' theory of Judet de la Combe and Wismann, who also see Hecate as a bridge between the human and divine worlds. In fact, this function of Hecate must be textually linked to the episodes of Prometheus and Pandora that follow. Rudhardt's analysis is also textually oriented despite the fact that it is heavily depended on the religious aspect of Hecate.<sup>78</sup> According to this view, Hecate owes her privileged treatment in the *Theogony* to her ability to benefit and harm at the same time.

(6) The poetological theory: the principal supporters of this theory are Griffith and Nagy. Griffith has convincingly argued that Hecate stands for the transition from an older state of the world to the new one, which the Hesiodic *Theogony* strongly promotes. Hecate's role should be seen, according to Griffith, as poetical, not as biographical reflection of a historical poet in the text. According to Nagy, Hecate is a 'synthetic' deity with a pan-Hellenic scope. Her presence in the Hesiodic *Theogony*, which Nagy believes was performed in a pan-Hellenic festival, is consonant with the deliberate effort on the part of the Hesiodic tradition to reach out to a wider audience interested in a song of pan-Hellenic range. The same view is accepted by Stoddard,<sup>79</sup> who oscillates between the poetological and the textual theory. This balance between these two aforementioned theories is probably the most crucial contribution to decyphering the function of this riddling hymn.

My own contribution to this ongoing dialogue concerning the 'Hymn to Hecate' attempts to put into good use most of the aforementioned analyses with the exception of the 'analytical' and 'biographical' theories. I would like to make it clear that the

<sup>78</sup> J. RUDHARDT, "À propos de l'Hécate hésiodique", in *MH* 50 (1993), 204-213 [211-213].

<sup>79</sup> STODDARD 2004, 7-11.

poetological aspect of the 'Hymn to Hecate' is, in fact, consonant both with the 'textual' theory, which explains the placement of the hymn, and with the 'gender-oriented' and 'religious' theories, which underscore the hymn's relation to Zeus. On the other hand, none of these theories is able to explain the size or the structure of the 'Hymn to Hecate'. Given the pan-Hellenic scope of the *Theogony*, we should 'read' the hymn as an effort made by the tradition this epic represents to become 'recognizable' as a tradition trying to reach a pan-Hellenic audience. The hymn is, in my view, an early form of *sphragidization*, which I define as an internal indication that this specific *Theogony*, is the Hesiodic *Theogony*, the most authoritative version among other rival theogonies. This argument is based on the following: (a) The so-called 'rhetorical' features of the 'Hymn to Hecate' (noticed by Friedländer<sup>80</sup> and Solmsen<sup>81</sup>) may be seen as an effort (also observable at the proem of the *WD*) to make this passage 'Hesiodic', as a trademark of its authenticity and personal character; (b) by inserting a hymn of such length within the rather monotonous genealogical lists, the *Theogony* shows considerable maturity in dealing with traditional material, which it is able to appropriate to its own purpose; (c) the use of the name Perses both for Hesiod's brother and for Hecate's father shows that if Hesiod and Perses represent the chief internal narrator and internal addressee respectively, then the 'Hymn to Hecate' may well stand for another poetological strategy of the Hesiodic tradition to create for its audience recognizable links between its subject matter and its own performance conditions. In other words, it would have been a very effective policy of poetic promotion to address the advice contained in the poem to a fictive addressee, Perses, whom the song itself would 'introduce' to its audience by a name that the father of a pan-Hellenic deity, Hecate, also bears. To ensure that the connection between the two is made, the Hes-

<sup>80</sup> P. FRIEDLÄNDER, "Das prooemium der *Theogonie*", in *Hermes* 49 (1914), 1-16 (= *Hesiod*, ed. by E. HEITSCH, WdF 44 [Darmstadt 1966], 277-294).

<sup>81</sup> F. SOLMSEN, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca, NY 1949), 51f., ft. 169.

iodic tradition would have taken great pains to offer this information to its audience, by inserting it in the 'Hymn to Hecate'; (d) the reference to *ἄεθλα* (*Th.* 435-438: *ἔσθλη δ' αὔθ' ὀπότη' ἄνδρες ἀεθλεύωσ' ἐν ἀγῶνι, / ἔνθα θεὰ καὶ τοῖς παραγίνεται ἡδ' ὀνίνησι, / νικήσας δὲ βίη καὶ κάρτει, καλὸν ἄεθλον / ῥεῖα φέρει χαίρων τε, τοκεῦσι δὲ κῦδος ὀπάζει*) indicates the existence of an agonistic context, pointing to that of the 'Nautilia', where Hesiod refers to his victory in the poetic contest in Chalkis. The analogy is remarkable: as the Muses through their divine epiphany inspired Hesiod and made possible, in the long run, his distinguished performance in the funeral games for Amphidamas, so Hecate stands by those who participate in contests and helps them win; (e) the use of diction which is employed in poetically colored passages: *δυσπέμφελος* (*Th.* 440) — (*WD* 618), *ῥεῖα* (*Th.* 419, 438, 443), *ῥηιδίως* (*Th.* 442) — *ῥέα / ῥεῖα* (*WD* 5, 6), *ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης* (*Th.* 413) — *πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης* (*WD* 648). Needless to say, I am not arguing for any poetological connotations inherent in the aforementioned diction. I am simply highlighting the fact that passages of poetological coloring display, on a secondary level, equivalent dictional features, triggered by the analogous function of these passages; (f) the honor (*τιμή*) Zeus has bestowed to Hecate may be seen as an internally expressed encomium to that poetic tradition which treated this divinity in such a privileged manner. A great theogonic poem needs great deities, identifiable by all audiences, standing beyond the borders occupied by local gods and goddesses. The 'Hymn to Hecate' may be seen as the trademark of Hesiodic poetic credo, which desires to surpass the limits of Boeotia and become the par excellence theogonic song of the Greek world.

### 2.3 *Epic rivalry*

One of the basic tenets of oral poetics is that poetic traditions tend to shape themselves through a dynamic process, namely through their acquisition of a recognizable identity that would differentiate them from other traditions belonging to the same

genre. Stability is thus acquired through a process of ‘marking’ certain features, passages, characters with a personal poetic stamp that would at once make them identifiable as belonging to this and no other poetic tradition. This dynamic, ‘synthetic’ process leading to an obsession with surpassing rival epic traditions extends to other song-traditions (external) but also involves epics belonging to the same tradition (internal). I will first deal with external epic rivalry, i.e. with cases where the Hesiodic tradition ‘confronts’ its Homeric counterpart.

### 2.3.1 *External epic rivalry*

The ‘Nautilia’ section has been recognized as the *locus classicus* for this sort of epic rivalry. The Hesiodic tradition employs the well-known reference to the sailing of the Greek fleet from Aulis to Troy as the ‘Homericly colored’, mythical catch-episode, and turns it into a background reference to an epic tradition from which it deviates. What is of particular interest and has not been, to my knowledge, carefully studied, is ‘how’ this reference is treated by the Hesiodic tradition. This would, of course, lead to another, equally important question: does Hesiodic tradition treat references to rival traditions in the same way Homeric tradition deals with references to other, say Cyclic, traditions? An interesting case-study is that of the second ‘Nekyia’ in *Odyssey* 24 and especially the speech of Agamemnon to Amphimedon in verses 192-202:

“ὄλβιε Λαέρταο πάϊ, πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεῦ,  
 ἦ ἄρα σὺν μεγάλῃ ἀρετῇ ἐκτήσω ἄκοιτιν  
 ὡς ἀγαθαὶ φρένες ἦσαν ἀμύμονι Πηνελοπείῃ,  
 κούρη Ἰκαρίου· ὡς εὖ μέμνητ’ Ὀδυσῆος,  
 ἀνδρὸς κουριδίου. τῷ οἱ κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται  
 ἦς ἀρετῆς, τεύξουσι δ’ ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδὴν  
 ἀθάνατοι χάριεσαν ἐχέφρονι Πηνελοπείῃ,  
 οὐχ ὡς Τυνδαρέου κούρη κακὰ μήσατο ἔργα,  
 κουρίδιον κτείνασα πόσιν, στυγερὴ δέ τ’ ἀοιδὴ  
 ἔσσειτ’ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους, χαλεπὴν δέ τε φῆμιν ὀπάσσει  
 θηλυτέρησι γυναιξί, καὶ ἦ κ’ εὐεργὸς ἔησιν.”

As I have extensively argued elsewhere<sup>82</sup> this “highly sophisticated passage (24. 192-202) has a special importance for the poetics of the *Odyssey*, since it deals with κλέος which ‘entails not only a relationship between heroes, but one between poems as well’”.<sup>83</sup> In this passage, it becomes clear that “Penelope is not simply the model of the loyal wife, the good queen who waits for Odysseus to come home; she is the vehicle that redefines κλέος in such a way that it becomes a condition for the creation of the poem’s own subject-matter. As a result, in this highly sophisticated passage Penelope emerges in a metapoetic cloth becoming the emblem of the poetics of the Odyssean κλέος”.<sup>84</sup> This example shows that the *Odyssey* inscribes the contrast between Penelope and Clytaemestra and, in consequence, between Odysseus and Agamemnon within a framework of epic rivalry, of contrasting its song with other epic songs, in this case with the *Nostoi*. The supremacy of the *Odyssey* is thus established through a process not of ‘condemning’ other rival traditions to silence but by hinting, *en passant*, to them, only to certify its own poetic supremacy.

Revisiting the Hesiodic epic of the *WD*, one can detect a truly remarkable analogy between the Hesiodic expression κέρδος ἄρῃαι and its Homeric equivalent κλέος ἀρέσθαι,<sup>85</sup> as well as its formulaic allomorphs εὖχος/κῦδος ἀρέσθαι.<sup>86</sup> In the ‘Nautilia’

<sup>82</sup> C.C. TSAGALIS, “*Odyssey* 24, 191-202: A Reconsideration”, in *WS* 116 (2003), 43-56 [54].

<sup>83</sup> A.T. EDWARDS, *Achilles in the Odyssey. Ideologies of Heroism in the Homeric Epic* (Meisenheim am Glan 1985), 90.

<sup>84</sup> TSAGALIS 2003, 53-54.

<sup>85</sup> See C.C. TSAGALIS, “The Metaphor of Sailing and the *Athlon* of Song: Reconsidering the ‘Nautilia’ in Hesiod’s *Works and Days*”, in *Άθλα και Έπαθλα στα Ομηρικά Έπη, Πρακτικά του 10<sup>ου</sup> Διεθνούς Ομηρικού Συνεδρίου (Ιθάκη, 16-18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2004)*, forthcoming.

<sup>86</sup> Κλέος, εὖχος, κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 7.203: δὸς νίκηην Αἴαντι καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 12.407: χάζετ’, ἐπεὶ οἱ θυμὸς ἐέλπετο κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 16.88: δῶγ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἥρης / *Il.* 17.16: τῷ με ἕα κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσιν ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 17.287: ἄστυ πότι σφέτερον ἐρύειν καὶ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 17.419: ἄστυ πότι σφέτερον ἐρύσαι καὶ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 20.502:... ὃ δὲ ἴετο κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 21.297:... δίδομεν δέ τοι εὖχος ἀρέσθαι / *Il.* 21.543:... μενέαινε δέ

section, the expression κέρδος ἄρηαι (WD 632) is directly linked to the metaphorical use of cargo (WD 631-632: καὶ τότε νῆα θοὴν ἄλαδ' ἐλκόμεν, ἐν δέ τε φόρτον / ἄρμενον ἐντύνασθαι, ἴν' οἴκαδε κέρδος ἄρηαι), which has been regarded as a disguised formula pointing to poetics.<sup>87</sup> Once we have established a figurative use of cargo, then it is much easier to understand that the 'cargo-dependent' formula κέρδος ἄρηαι alludes to poetical profit. According to the findings of historical linguistics, the connection between κέρδος and a poet's profession was initially self-evident. The pathbreaking studies of Watkins<sup>88</sup> and Campanile<sup>89</sup> in Celtic and Welsh traditions have amply shown that *cerdd*, the equivalent of Greek κέρδος, was the standard form expressing not only the idea of 'job', 'profession', but, specifically, 'a poet's profession', 'poetry', and 'music'. "It is obvious", as Campanile rightly argues,<sup>90</sup> that "initially poetry was conceived under the light of a professional activity, as profit bringing labor".

In fact, the dictional convergence between Hesiodic κέρδος ἄρηαι and Homeric κλέος ἀρέσθαι may be interpreted as a *read-*

*κῦδος ἀρέσθαι* / *Il.* 21.596: ... οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔασεν Ἀπόλλων *κῦδος ἀρέσθαι* / *Od.* 22.253: δῶη Ὀδυσσεῆα βλῆσθαι καὶ *κῦδος ἀρέσθαι* / *Theog.* 628: σὺν κείνοις νίκην τε καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὐχος ἀρέσθαι / *Sc.* 107: σὰς ἐς χεῖρας ἄγουσιν, ἵνα κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄρηαι / fr. 75.19 Merkelbach-West (*Catalogue of Women sive Ehoiai*): νικῆσθαι καὶ οἱ δῶη Ζεὺς] *κῦδος ἀρέσθαι*.

<sup>87</sup> See B. GENTILI, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece. From Homer to the Fifth Century* (Baltimore-London 1988 [transl. by A.Th. COLE]), 64, who, setting performance poetry in its social context, rightly remarks: "What is involved is a different perspective on reality, and a new measure of man, more suited to the changed political conditions of Greek society and to the continuing development of the new exchange economy that had replaced the landed wealth (*ploutos*) of the past with a new wealth derived from colonial expansion and business (*kérdos*). In many cases the prerogatives to be claimed on the basis of inherited, inalienable power, capacity, and wealth were diminished or profoundly altered. The new plutocratic *agathoi*, unlike the aristocratic *agathoi* of an earlier age, could only boast the unstable wealth acquired through the toils and risks of trade".

<sup>88</sup> C. WATKINS, *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford 1995), 76.

<sup>89</sup> CAMPANILE 1977 (note 31 above), 37.

<sup>90</sup> CAMPANILE 1977, 37.

*ing-guide* for Hesiodic poetics. In this way, a clear authorial voice begins to be heard, aiming at promoting a new form of poetical profit: not Homeric κλέος, κῦδος, εὖχος ἀρέσθαι any more, but an equally inspired Hesiodic κλέος.

The Hesiodic tradition employs in the 'Nautilia' section the same rival tactics as its Homeric counterpart. It does not 'condemn' the Homeric tradition to silence but uses it as the necessary background against which it will 'issue' its poetical *manifesto*. The fact that both traditions, Homeric and Hesiodic, deal in the same way with matters of external epic rivalry is very important. By using either an episode (the sailing from Aulis) or a character of the plot (Penelope and Clytaemestra) as a means to allude to an epic tradition, the Homeric and Hesiodic songs offer an internal testimony about the way we should treat them. This sort of allusion shows that an ancient audience would identify the sailing to Aulis with the tradition of the Trojan War, while the reference to Clytaemestra would point to the direction of the *Nostoi*. This common way of creating intertextual allusion is a sophisticated means of epic indexing and may well be regarded as a trademark of the genre of Archaic Greek song.

### 2.3.2 *Internal epic rivalry*

The *Theogony* and the *WD* show traces of a deliberate tradition-internal rivalry, as it is also the case with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Pucci has shown that the *Odyssey* employs in the song of the Sirens Iliadic diction and formulas in order to make the Sirens' call to Odysseus not only literal but also figurative.<sup>91</sup> By refusing to set foot on their island and by rejecting the content of their song, Odysseus rejects the Iliadic tradition and decides to stay on his Odyssean ship and remain the hero of the *Odyssey*.

<sup>91</sup> P. PUCCI, *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer* (Lanham–Boulder–New York–Oxford 1998), 1-9 (= "The Song of the Sirens", in *Arethusa* 12 [1979], 121-132).

Likewise, Segal has convincingly argued that in the Cyclops' episode in *Od.* 9, Odysseus alters Iliadic formulas designating κλέος in order to define, his own, new, Odyssean κλέος.<sup>92</sup> Odysseus and, through him, the Odyssean tradition even comments on Iliadic κλέος, by implying that it is problematic in the world of the *Odyssey*, since by acting as an Iliadic warrior and killing the Cyclops, Odysseus will find himself trapped in the giant's cave, as nobody is able to remove the huge rock from the cave's entrance. By reshaping the κλέος-formulas, Odysseus denotes a different kind of κλέος, not one depending on martial power as propagated by the *Iliad*, but one of wit, δόλος, and, most of all, of cunning intelligence (μῆτις) the *Odyssey* has profusely bestowed its principal hero with.

Hesiodic tradition displays the same kind of internal rivalry between the *Theogony* and the *WD*. The Prometheus and Pandora digressions are good examples concerning the way the *WD* considerably deviate from the treatment of the same myths by the *Theogony*.

In the *Theogony*, the Prometheus myth is extensively narrated and is followed by a rather brief reference to Pandora. In the *WD*, it is limited in size but still anticipates the Pandora digression. In the *Theogony*, the Prometheus myth interrupts the sequence of the genealogically organized catalogues letting the audience infer that it is the Hesiodic tradition which is in control of the mythical apparatus it refers to, that what seems a *prima facie* lemmatized mythological companion bears its own lasting imprint. The Prometheus myth functions like an *aition* in the *Theogony*, in order to create a link between the divine and human worlds: offering sacrifices to the gods, stealing the fire, Pandora the first woman, all these features show that this epic aims not at mythologizing history but at historicizing myth.

In the *WD*, scholars have argued that the Pandora myth has been embedded in the plot as an *aition* for the *pithos*, which is

<sup>92</sup> C. SEGAL, "Kleos and Its Ironies in the *Odyssey*", in *L'Antiquité Classique* 52 (1983), 22-47.



absent from the *Theogony* but is of crucial importance for the *WD*, as it is inextricably linked to *Elpis* remaining at the bottom of the jar.<sup>93</sup> My own approach aims at highlighting the connection between the Prometheus and Pandora digressions in the *WD*, which is fundamental to the theme of internal epic rivalry.

Despite the fact that the myth of Prometheus anticipates that of Pandora in the *WD*, as in the *Theogony*, the son of Iapetos plays an indirect role in the Pandora myth, since his advice to Epimetheus not to accept any gift from Zeus is not followed. *Mutatis mutandis*, Prometheus acts very differently in the Zeus and Pandora episodes: in the former he deceives, in the latter he is, even indirectly, deceived. The emphasis lies in both cases on the motif of deception, which is of fundamental importance for the *WD*, since it underscores the strife between Hesiod and his brother Perses from the beginning of the poem. Under this light, one can see that the digressive function of the Prometheus-Pandora myths in the *WD* systematically promotes speech as the means through which deception is effectuated: Zeus offers Pandora the gift of human voice (61), Peitho participates in Pandora's preparation (73-74), Hermes 'translates' Zeus' advice to give Pandora κύνεόν τε νόον καὶ ἐπίκλοπον ἦθος (67) into ψεύδεά θ' αἰμυλίου τε λόγους καὶ ἐπίκλοπον ἦθος (78). This insistence on the importance of speech as a means of deceit is not only an effort to connect the main theme of the epic with the Prometheus-Pandora digressions, but also a poetological gesture on the part of Hesiodic song, an implied self-referential statement concerning the very subject-matter of the epic. This observation is reinforced by the fact that Zeus' advice is expressed in indirect discourse, against the traditional epic practice of giving orders or advice in direct speech.<sup>94</sup> This narrative trick is in stark contrast to the Prometheus episode, which is

<sup>93</sup> I. MUSÄUS, *Der Pandoramythos bei Hesiod und seine Rezeption bis Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Göttingen 2004), 51. For the Pandora myth as a whole, see MUSÄUS 2004, 13-66.

<sup>94</sup> PUCCI 1977, 87-88.

expressed in the form of a symmetrically balanced dialogue between Zeus and Prometheus. The antithetical juxtaposition of the two myths in terms of syntactical techniques points both to the devaluation of Zeus' role in the Pandora myth and to a significant promotion of Pandora. The use of indirect discourse decreases the authority of Zeus, distributing his orders to various gods who interpret them at will. But if Pandora is the mythical paragon of deceit through speech, then this may well be a self-referential statement concerning the *WD* at large, the more so since this epic is programmatically and systematically concerned with speech, it is after all a didactic epic. What is the value of Hesiod's advice to Perses in a poem, where mortals hear that speech can both persuade and deceive, argue and seduce? These highly sophisticated digressions delineate the framework within which the self-conscious didactic tradition of Hesiodic song places itself. By making such a daring statement of poetics, the *WD* allude to the *Theogony*, where the same myths were employed as a trademark of supremacy against other rival theogonic traditions.<sup>95</sup> Internal epic rivalry acquires here an extremely revealing aspect, since the poem of the *WD* uses material familiar to the *Theogony* not to propagate its supremacy, as is the case with the *Odyssey* vs. *Iliad* rivalry, but to disclose a self-conscious, almost ironical glance at its own subject-matter, the true mark of all great poetry.

### *Concluding remarks*

Hesiodic poetry has often been regarded as 'secondary-level' poetry, whose belonging to the same genre with its Homeric

<sup>95</sup> See G.W. MOST, "Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality", in *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*, ed. by G. ARRIGHETTI & F. MONTANARI (Pisa 1993), 73-92. MOST (91) argues that "Hesiodic autobiography not only represents the self textually: it constructs the self intertextually". He thus interprets autobiographical elements in the two major Hesiodic poems as a revision and correction on the part of the *WD* of material treated in the *Theogony*.

counterpart must be based purely on employing the same meter, the dactylic hexameter. Oral Poetics have opened the door to a new world, that of oral or oral-based cultures and have subsequently paved the way for understanding and appreciating a new form of Poetics, long needed, in order to disclose the fascinating world of Archaic Greek Epic. Under this scope, Hesiodic poetry is representing a tradition of epic song, which has been crystallized in the course of the Archaic Period in a corpus of given texts, which we call Hesiodic. The profound analysis of Homeric epic under the light of Oral Poetics allows for an extended comparison between the two traditions, Homeric and Hesiodic, in matters of poetics. As far as the figure of the poet is concerned, Hesiodic song shows a deeper interest in presenting the process of acquiring authority to sing. The detailed description of the *Dichterweihe* in the *Theogony* is unprecedented and bears fruitful narrative results. The obsession with the 'first beginnings' of things is reflected in the narrative trick of making the beginning of the world and the beginning of song converge. By adopting the focus of a mortal man who is narratively 'glancing at' the world of the immortals, the Hesiodic tradition diverges from its Homeric rival, declaring that linearity and genealogical taxonomy will become its principal guiding strategies. The proem of the *WD* diverges not only from the *Theogony*, where the speaking voice disappears after the lengthy proem but also from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, where the 'I' of the narrator is almost covert as it is only mentioned by the datives of the personal pronoun. The proem of the *WD* inaugurates a poem stamped by the bold step towards the creation of an internal narrator, a preoccupation the *Odyssey* has masterly directed towards transforming its main hero, Odysseus, into an authoritative internal narrator of only part of the plot, the famous 'Apologoi'. In respect to what we have called 'commentary', the Hesiodic narrator employs with greater intensity and, sometimes, different focus narrative techniques Homeric epic is aware of. These techniques are perhaps more crucial to the *Theogony* than to the Homeric poems. This is due to the fact

that the *Theogony* is practically deprived of a narratee or narratees, an internal audience. One needs only to bring in mind the multiple internal audiences the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* dispose of to comprehend the difference. Lack of narratees necessarily robs the *Theogony* of alternate means through which the Homeric narrator makes his presence felt: presentation through negation (*Th.* 488, 529, 687) is less frequent than Homer, an 'if-not situation' occurs only once (*Th.* 836-838), temporal anachronies are basically excluded because of the strictly genealogical and chronological blueprint the *Theogony* follows. Despite all these narrative deficiencies, the Hesiodic tradition has taken great pains to build upon a solid genealogical scaffolding an epic composition of considerable merit. Hesiodic song uses a thick web of associations between farming and poetry the Homeric poems are unaware of. This is not the case with metaphors concerning the analogy between sailor and poet, which both the *Odyssey* and the 'Nautilia' section in the *WD* exploit at great length.

In respect to the audience, both the *Odyssey* and the *WD* show consistent interest in creating internal audiences, the Phaeacians and Perses respectively. This is not the case with the *Iliad* and the *Theogony*. Like the Homeric poems, Hesiodic tradition aims at a pan-Hellenic audience. The 'Hymn to Hecate' may be seen as the trademark of Hesiodic poetic *credo*, which desires to surpass the limits of Boeotia and become the par excellence theogonic song of the Greek world. Hesiodic and Homeric poetry show the same preoccupation either externally with other rival epic traditions or internally between the poems belonging to a given tradition. Through my analysis I have made two new suggestions: (a) that the *WD* show significant similarities with the *Odyssey* in respect to several issues: an internal narrator, an internal audience, common metaphors for the sailor-poet, the postponing of the internal narrator's coming into the plot (Hesiod begins to offer his advice to Perses, only after the mythological part, just as the *Odyssey* 'allows' Odysseus to narrate his tales to the Phaeacian audience only in Book 9); (b) in many respects the *WD* are to the *Theogony* what the *Odyssey* is

to the *Iliad*. In both cases the later epic, even if this is a belief of historical positivism refuted by oral poetics, seems to rival the older one in a way that makes one think about the coincidence of this analogy, which may be explained as the by-product of genre-internal transformation, from martial (*Iliad*, *Theogony*) to non-martial epic (*Odyssey*, *Works and Days*).

## DISCUSSION

*E.J. Bakker* : You argue that the *WD* in its poetological stance adopts a strategy different from the Homeric poems, in equaling poetry with the ruseful mind of the traveling merchant. But isn't that rather Odyssean? I'm thinking of Odysseus' second speech on his *gaster* in which he states that the *gaster*, called οὐλομένη just as Achilles' μῆνις, is what drives people to piracy and risky commercial adventures.

*Chr. Tsagalis* : Building on the foundations of Dougherty's work on the Greeks standing somewhere between the Phaeacians' idyllic world and the Phoenicians' greed for profit, I argued that the *WD* try to carve out an analogous place for the poem's διδασχῆ, i.e., between productive labor and carefully planned seafaring activity on the one hand, and idleness and risky, profit-yielding sailing undertakings on the other. I agree with Edwards who expresses the view that Hesiod has an ambivalent attitude towards trade.

*M. Fusillo* : I would have a question regarding the category of commentary on the 'story'. Your use of this narratological concept is absolutely correct, and the results are certainly stimulating. But I think that it would be maybe better to distinguish between various degrees of this notion. The examples of Greek archaic epic seem in fact still embryonic: a kind of micro-level of commentary, especially if we compare them with the praxis of Hellenistic poetry. Apollonius, for example, clearly comments his own narration, expressing his personal vision of the events (e.g. on the death of Apsyrtus or on the magical elimination of Talos), and fully exploiting what Genette calls the "ideological" (or "interpretative") function of the narrator.

Moreover, I do not see a clear connection between the “greater intensity” and “different focus”, employed by the Hesiodic narrator in comparison to Homeric narrative techniques, and the lack of an internal audience in the *Theogony*. Could you please explain a little bit more this point?

*E.J. Bakker* : In the case of this etymologizing ‘comment’, there may also be a polemic involved, an explanation of a ‘difficult’ word integrated *within* the poetic text. Modern linguists at least do not take Hesiod’s  $\text{Kύκλ-}\omega\psi$  (wheel-eye) for granted, thinking instead of an ancient and original  $\text{κν-κλω}\psi$ . Would Hesiod’s comment reflect this semantic issue?

*Chr. Tsagalis* : You are very right to draw my attention on the various degrees of commentary ‘in the story’. We should see this narratorial intervention working vertically, not only horizontally. Of course, when the comparison is made in reference to Hellenistic epic, all this seems embryonic.

In respect to your question concerning the connection between “greater intensity” and “different focus” or rather “greater focus” because of the lack of an internal narrator in the *Theogony*, I was simply wondering what means the narrator of the *Theogony* would employ to make his presence felt, now that he cannot address an internal audience.

*A. Sens* : Can I ask you to expand a bit on your observation that the *WD*, like the *Od.*, is concerned with “poetological signs” inasmuch as it creates an internal audience. It seems to me that the presence of an internal narrator is not ipso facto necessarily a mark of poetic self-reflexivity. When Odysseus delivers a mini-epic narrative in Books 9-12, I can see that that might call attention to the performance of epic as a genre. But can the same thing be said about the very fact that Hesiod addresses himself to Perses?

A propos of  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\mu\alpha$  v.  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\eta\acute{\varsigma}$  it strikes me that the real opposition is between the infinitives, that is between those who speak

ordinary things (λέγειν) and privileged poets like Hesiod who will be able to deliver a marked type of poetry (γηρύσασθαι).

Also, a point of clarification. Can I ask about whether it is really possible to speak about 'timelessness' in reference to the gods of the epic world? After all, the poetry we have places them exclusively in a markedly temporal framework.

*G. Danek* : Ich glaube nicht, dass für die Aussage der Musen in *Th.* 27f. der Gegensatz zwischen ἔτυμος und ἀληθής entscheidend ist, sondern der zwischen ψευδής und ἀληθής. Wenn wir die Wortbildung von ἀ-ληθής als "nicht-verbergend" verstehen, so lautet die Aussage der Musen: "Wir können viele Dinge sagen, die betrügerisch sind (ψεύδεα) und den realen Dingen ähnlich sind; wir können aber auch, wenn wir wollen, Dinge verkünden, die nicht-verbergend (ἀληθέα) sind".

*E.J. Bakker*: Λέγειν in the first colon deserves more attention than it has received so far. The term does not, I think, designate a 'generic' sense of speaking; it is in fact highly marked in epic diction, and is not one of the usual verbs for speaking. It denotes speaking as "merely speaking", "just words", without substance, which in fact makes the deceptive nature of even ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα more remarkable.

*Chr. Tsagalis* : The *Odyssey* is the only archaic epic where an internal narrator is privileged in such a way. The fact that Odysseus tells his Phaeacian audience (Books 9–12) all his adventures from Troy to the island of Calypso and — moreover — the fact that he is also the central hero of the poem, the principal plot agent is, in my view, a profound poetic statement. By endowing its hero with exceptional poetic abilities, the *Odyssey* or the tradition it represents, displays its special concern about these issues. The *Works and Days*, in opposition to the *Theogony*, have a main internal addressee, Perses: My analogy has to be seen in the light of the antithesis these 'later' epics show in respect to their 'earlier predecessors, the *Iliad* and the *Theogony*



respectively. The *Odyssey* is clearly more interested in poetological issues (there are two bards, Demodocus in Scheria and Phemius in Ithaca ) than the *Iliad*. Mutatis mutandis the analogy is valid for the *Works and Days* in respect to the *Theogony*, where there is not an internal narratee.

In respect to the ἔτυμα/ἄληθέα antithesis that was also supported by Bakker's comments but refuted by Danek's argumentation, I would like to say that (1) the words are not synonymous, (2) that the fact that they are placed in two continuous verses may be indicative of the poem's will to draw a semantical line between them, (3) that they are accompanied by λέγειν and γηρύσασθαι, different (in fact very different) 'speaking' verbs. Bakker is very right to underscore the fact that λέγειν is a highly marked verb in epic diction, it means 'just uttering words' (note the adjective πολλά in πολλά λέγειν), whereas γηρύσασθαι is imbued with authoritative force as it is employed in religious language.

Finally, in respect to the question of 'timelessness'. Translating divine into human time is one of the aims of the *Theogony*. The genealogical organization of the past is the standard way to 'historicize' myth.

*E.J. Bakker* : You observe that the *Theogony* is more concerned than the Homeric poems with 'starting point' (ἀρχώμεθ'). I don't deny of course that the *Theogony* with its interest in 'birth' and 'origins' is different from Homer, but a factor seems to me also that the beginnings of the *Theogony* and of the *Iliad* are typologically different: the one is a hymn, to the Muses, and should as such be compared to the *Homeric Hymns* (that are concerned with 'starting from the God', just as the *Theogony*) and that served as 'proems' to an epic performance.

*Chr. Tsagalis* : I fully agree with your point. Further study on the *Theogony*'s relation to the *Homeric Hymns* would be very interesting. Let me just remark that the *Theogony* is a collective presentation of the divine word, which has embedded and re-shaped a great amount of hymnic material (Hecate, Zeus etc.).