Introduction

This study examines the reception of Hesiod's poetry and poetic authority in the fifth century BCE with particular focus on lyric poetry and drama. My aim is to explore how and to what effect major performative genres of this era invited their audiences to evoke the Hesiodic tradition. I have chosen to pursue this question through a series of case studies that demonstrate the richness and breadth of Hesiodic reception within a wide range of works composed for performance in diverse contexts. My analyses will expose the reader to varied, creative, and often critical engagements with the many aspects of the Hesiodic tradition that were culturally relevant to fifth-century audiences throughout the Greek world. This study does not aspire to offer an exhaustive survey of the topic or a taxonomy at the cost of nuance;[1] yet I hope that it contributes something new and useful to the ongoing exploration of Hesiodic reception in antiquity.[2]

Before delving into close readings, however, we need to understand what the Hesiodic tradition entailed for fifth-century audiences. Whether or not a poet named Hesiod ever existed is a question that cannot be answered and has no bearing upon the reception of the Hesiodic tradition.[3] For a fifth-century

[1] For a survey of Hesiodic reception in fifth-century literature, see Buzio 1938: chapter 4 and now Scully 2015: chapter 4 on the reception of (mainly) the *Theogony* in the archaic and classical eras. See also van der Kolf 1923 with focus on the Pindaric corpus, and Schwartz 1960: 549–608. On Solmsen 1949 regarding Hesiod and Aeschylus, see Chapter 4, p. 122.

[2] Musäus 2004 on the reception of Hesiod's Pandora from the Hellenistic scholars to Erasmus; Boys-Stones and Haubold 2010 on Hesiodic reception in Plato; Ziogas 2013 on Hesiodic reception in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*; Hunter 2014 on the ancient reception of the *Works and Days*; van Noorden 2015 on the Myth of the Races in Plato and later literature. See also Koning 2010a, who surveys Hesiodic reception in a broad literary corpus, including classical poetry and prose (chapters 1–6 and 9). Koning's study offers numerous excellent observations, not least with regard to Hesiodic reception in Parmenides, Empedocles, and Xenophanes, whose philosophical poetry is beyond the scope of my book. Koning, however, largely ignores the fragmentary part of the Hesiodic corpus and pays virtually no attention to the reception of Hesiodic poetry in drama. As for fifth-century lyric poetry, Koning's readings are limited in scope and, as I discuss in Chapter 1, somewhat problematic.

[3] Modern editors and commentators who discuss Hesiod as a historical figure include West 1966 and 1978, Colonna 1977: 9–12 and 37–38 with proposed dates, Marg 1984², Most 2006, Ercolani 2010.

audience, 'Hesiod' was the poetic figure that emerged from the self-referential statements of the narrator in the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* and that was shaped further through related biographical fictions.[4] The 'autobiographical' passages within Hesiodic poetry present the narrator as a shepherd who was transformed into a poet by the Muses on Mount Helicon (*Th.* 22–34). It is in the context of this poetic initiation that the narrator reveals his name (Ἡσίοδον, *Th.* 22), which both ancient and modern readers have considered a *nomen loquens* although proposed etymologies and meanings vary.[5] In the *WD*, we learn that the speaker is the son of a man who migrated from Aeolian Cyme to Ascra, a wretched Boeotian town, in order to avoid poverty (*WD* 633–40).[6] We also hear that he had a dispute with his brother, Perses, which was overseen by corrupt local authorities (*WD* 27–41). Finally, while otherwise confident in his knowledge of human matters (*WD* 9–10), the narrator admits to having no expertise in sailing (*WD* 646–49) and recounts that his only trip on a boat was to Euboea, where he participated successfully at the poetic contest at the funerary games of Amphidamas in Chalcis (*WD* 650–62).[7] The account of his poetic victory, albeit brief, concludes with a reminder of his initiation by the Muses on Helicon (*WD* 658–59). This reference reaffirms the exceptional origins of his poetic skill and authority; it also establishes the continuity of the *persona loquens* and a temporal sequence between the two poems.[8]

The poetic *persona* that emerges only piecemeal in the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* was developed into a fully fledged individual in the context of ancient biography. As recent scholarship has demonstrated, Hesiod's biographies are fictions based on material drawn from

Stoddard 2004: 1–33 offers a survey of biographical approaches towards the narrator of the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*; cf. Koning 2010a: 31–32 with ample bibliography in n.24.

[4] Some of these biographical stories were circulating at least by the sixth century BCE. See Richardson 1981: 1–3; cf. Ibycus S151 *PMGF* with Steiner 2005: 353–54 and Chapter 1, pp. 49–51.

[5] On ancient etymologies of Ἡσίοδος, see T27–28 Most with Most 2006: xiv and Kivilo 2010: 9–10. The modern etymology of the name derives Ἡσίοδος from ἵημι and the root of αὐδή ("he who emits the voice"); the name is thus fitting for a poetic *persona* in the context of traditional oral poetry, as Nagy 1979: 296–97 and 1990a: 47–48, 58–59 has pointed out. See also Nagy 2009: 287–88 with a comparison between "Homer" and "Hesiod" as *nomina loquentia*; cf. Most 2006: xiv–xvi, who nonetheless prefers an historicizing approach.

[6] On the significance of the father's migration, see Martin 1992 and, differently, Clay 2003: 180–81.

[7] For an overview of the Hesiodic *persona*, see the seminal article by Griffith 1983a. See also Nagy 1990a: 36–82, esp. 44–61 and 63–82.

[8] Most 1993. Also establishing the continuity between the *Th.* and the *WD* is the revision of *Th.* 225–32 in *WD* 11–26.

the poetic corpus attributed to him with the addition of invented elements.[9] The (re)construction of Hesiod's family offers a good case study for the various degrees of invention that define ancient biographical traditions. The migration from Cyme, which became an intrinsic part of the poet's background in his biographies, is drawn directly from *WD* 633–40.[10] By the fifth century BCE, the poet's father was thought to be called Dios even though he remains anonymous in the *WD*; this name is almost certainly derived from a creative reading of *WD* 299 (Πέρση, δῖον γένος).[11] The figure of Hesiod's mother, by contrast, is based entirely on fabrication: since there is no information about her in Hesiodic poetry, the biographical tradition invented a woman called Πυκιμήδη. Judging by her *nomen loquens*, it appears that the woman who bore the wise poet was herself constructed as a wisdom figure.[12] At least one source grants Pycimede a divine pedigree: in *Cert.* 51–52 she is said to be Apollo's daughter, i.e. the product of a sexual union between a god and a mortal woman that evokes the core narrative of Hesiodic genealogical poetry (see below). By casting Hesiod as the grandson of Apollo, this tradition makes a strong statement about his skills, legitimacy, and authority as a poet. Moreover, the divine pedigree of Hesiod's mother indirectly confirms his superiority over Homer: even though both poets, who are envisioned as kinsmen in this biographical tradition, share a remote genealogical connection with Apollo through one parent, Hesiod has additional and more direct ties to the god of poetry. Already established by the fifth century BCE,[13] this genealogical link between Homer and Hesiod reconstructs them as roughly contemporary, thus probably encouraging the reception of their poetic corpora as complementary but also facilitating the fiction of their competition, to which I will return shortly. Evidently, the biographical traditions that transformed the narrative voice of Hesiodic poetry into a

[9] On biographical narratives about Hesiod, see extensively Kivilo 2010: 7–61 and 201–20, Lefkowitz 2012²: 6–13, and Nagy 2009; cf. Graziosi 2002: 168–80 and Stamatopoulou 2016 on the omission of the fraternal dispute in extant biographies.

[10] *Cert.* 2–6 and Tz. *Proleg.* Hes. *WD* 78–81 Colonna. Contrast Ephor. (*FGrH* 70 F 100), who accepts the migration story but assumes that it was motivated by a murder, not by an attempt to avoid poverty as the Hesiodic text claims.

[11] Proclus *Vit. Hom.* 4 West (= Hellanic. fr. 5b, Pherecyd. fr. 167 and Damastes fr. 11b Fowler).

[12] On her *nomen loquens*, see Kivilo 2010: 9.

[13] Proclus *Vit. Hom.* 4 West. On kinship and other personal ties in ancient biography, see the survey in Kivilo 2010: 212–13. According to Ephorus, Homer is born of the daughter of Hesiod's paternal uncle, and is thus one generation younger than Hesiod (*FGrH* 70 F 1, despite F 101b); cf. *Cert.* 51–53. For a different genealogy that envisions Homer and Hesiod as second cousins and traces their origins to Atlas, see Suda *s.v.* Ἡσίοδος.

full character use genealogy to establish poetic authority and make subtle points about literary criticism.[14]

Hesiodic biography engages in literary criticism not only through genealogy but also through its reception of *WD* 646–62, the account of the poetic *agon* in Chalcis. The biographical tradition reconceptualized this contest, which the Hesiodic narrator claims to have won, as a contest between Homer and Hesiod. The *Works and Days* does not reveal who competed against Hesiod; the fictional narrative that emerged from *WD* 646–62, however, identified Homer as the other contestant, possibly due to an interpretation of the Hesiodic passage as polemical towards Homeric epic.[15] The story survives with some variation in post-classical sources.[16] The most extensive account is embedded in the second-century CE biographical compilation entitled *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, but can be traced back to the *Mouseion* by Alcidamas, a fourth-century BCE sophist.[17] While Alcidamas used the story to support his own intellectual agenda, he almost certainly did not invent it,[18] but worked with a preexisting narrative that was circulating in the fifth century and perhaps as early as the sixth century BCE.[19] In addition to the competition at Chalcis, the Hesiodic tradition preserves traces of another poetic encounter of the two poets on the island of Delos. In Hes. fr. 357 MW, the speaker, presumably Hesiod himself, recalls the

[14] Hesiod is also credited with poetic offspring: Stesichorus and Terpander. On Stesichorus, see Tz. *Proleg.* Hes. *WD* 153–57 Colonna based on information found in the Aristotelian Constitution of Orchomenus (fr. 565 Rose); cf. Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 213 and Suda *s.v.* Στησίχορος. Cicero's *Rep.* (2.20) seems to discuss whether Stesichorus was Hesiod's grandson (*nepos*); see Zetzel 1995: 176–77. As for Terpander, according to the Suda *s.v.* other traditions make him the descendant of Homer. See Kivilo 2010: 35 and 211–12, as well as Koning 2010a: 41.

[15] On the engagement with Homeric poetics in *WD* 646–62 and its immediate context, see Nagy 1982: 66 and 1990a, Rosen 1990 and 1996: 477–88 (whose discussion encompasses other passages beyond *WD* 646–62), Graziosi 2002: 168–70, Tsagalis 2009: 152–55. I discuss anti-Homeric readings of *Th.* 26–28 in Chapter 1, pp. 19–21.

[16] Koning 2010a: 259–66 offers a useful survey. Only Plutarch's version of the story in *Mor.* 153E–154C deviates significantly from the other extant accounts of the story. Heldmann 1982: 53–57 has argued that Plutarch's text reflects the original story of the poetic competition; see, however, Stamatopoulou 2014: 534–48.

[17] On the biographical tradition surrounding the poetic competition between Homer and Hesiod, see West 1967, Richardson 1981, Heldmann 1982, O'Sullivan 1992: 63–105, Rosen 1996: 473–77, Graziosi 2002: 168–80, Kivilo 2010: 19–24, Koning 2010a: 245–68, Stamatopoulou 2014: 534–36.

[18] Contrast West 1967, who argued that the entire *Certamen* was Alcidamas' invention. Cf. O'Sullivan 1992: 63–105.

[19] Richardson 1981: 1–3 has suggested that the story is a product of the sympotic culture of the sixth century BCE. Lamberton 1988: 6 also thinks that the story originates in the archaic period. On the other hand, Graziosi 2002: 174–80 argues that the story reflects the rhapsodic culture of the fifth century and its interaction with the sophists. On earlier scholarship, see Koning 2010a: 245 n.18.

time when he and Homer stitched together their song in the manner of rhapsodes and sang for Delian Apollo for the first time. The fragment replicates the first-person narrative style of *WD* 646–62, but it either disregards the narrator's commentary about his limited seafaring experience (*WD* 650–55) or defines itself as post-*WD*. The context of the performance is not explicitly defined, but it is very likely that Hes. fr. 357 MW recounts an *agon*.[20]

By the end of the fifth century BCE, therefore, Hesiod was established in people's imagination as a Boeotian man who was initiated to poetry by the Muses themselves and who won a poetic competition against Homer. As for his death, Thucydides (3.96.1) attests that there was already an established narrative that situated Hesiod's death in Locris and involved the misinterpretation of an oracle.[21] According to more extensive treatments of this biographical episode (including the one attributed to Alcidamas in *Cert.* 238–40),[22] Hesiod was thought to have been murdered in retaliation for the (actual or alleged) rape of a maiden. Discarded by the killers, the poet's body was miraculously recovered; furthermore, his murderers received harsh punishment, and the poet was buried in Locrian Oenoe.[23] Later, when the Orchomenians received refugees from Ascra after its destruction by the Thespians, Hesiod's bones were exhumed from Locris and reburied in Orchomenos. The Aristotelian *Constitution of Orchomenus* (Arist. fr. 565 Rose), the earliest attested source for the transference of Hesiod's bones, is said to have quoted an epigram that commemorated the poet's double burial.[24] While the attribution of this epigram to Pindar in later sources is probably invented,[25] the story about the poet's double burial may have been very old local lore and was possibly connected with hero-cult.[26]

[20] On Hes. fr. 357 MW, see Cingano 2009: 92 and, regarding the agonistic context, Martin 2000: 410–23 and Nagy 2010: 70–73; cf. Chapter 1, pp. 48–49. *Cert.* 54–55 report an *agon* between Homer and Hesiod in Aulis; this tradition stems from a (mis)interpretation of *WD* 651. If it was ever fully developed, it has left no other trace.

[21] This is a *topos* in ancient biography, as Kivilo 2010: 213–14 shows.

[22] It is quite possible that the story was already circulating by Alcidamas' time. The *Certamen* (240–47) also summarizes another version of the story, which is attributed to Eratosthenes.

[23] *Cert.* 215–54, Tz. *Proleg.* Hes. *WD* 163–85 Colonna; cf. Paus. 9.31.6, Plut. *Mor.* 162C–F, 969D–E, 984D, Pollux 5.42. Kivilo 2010: 25–35 surveys the stories of Hesiod's death.

[24] *Coll. proverb. cod. Vat. et Bodl.* (App. 4.92 ed. Gott. I p. 456) *s.v.* τὸ Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας.

[25] Tz. *Proleg.* Hes. *WD* 183–85 Colonna and the Suda (*s.v.* τὸ Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας). I am reluctant to follow Kivilo 2010: 25 in considering the epigram's attribution of the epigram to Pindar as evidence that the story of the double burial dates to the fifth century BCE.

[26] Brelich 1958: 320–22; cf. Nagy 1990a: 49–51, who suggests that rhapsodes organized around a poet's hero-cult, such as the Homeridae, may have contributed significantly to the expansion and the crystallization of certain poetic corpora. There is no evidence, however, that there ever was such a

Finally, there is evidence in fifth-century authors that there were already efforts to date Hesiod. For instance, Herodotus dates him jointly with Homer to no more than four hundred years prior to his own time (2.53.2). For the study of Hesiodic reception, however, the quest to pinpoint Hesiod in time is not as important as the relative dating of Homer and Hesiod. Aside from Herodotus' testimony, there are further indications that, in the classical era, the two poets were considered contemporaries. We have already discussed the circulation of stories about their agonistic encounter(s) as well as their alleged kinship. Judging by the sequence in which Hesiod and Homer are mentioned by Herodotus, Hippias, and Aristophanes, it is plausible to assume that, of the two contemporary poets, Hesiod was generally considered the older.[27] At any rate, the theory that the two poets were several generations apart seems to have emerged later, possibly in the third century BCE.[28]

The Hesiodic Corpus

Just as the figure of Hesiod is a construct that evolved through time, the poetic corpus of dactylic hexameters attributed to him resulted from a gradual process of accumulation. An important catalyst in this process seems to have been the association of Hesiod's authority with certain themes and genres. The two poems that include the narrator's self-referential

guild of rhapsodes devoted to the performance of Hesiodic poetry. Furthermore, as Kivilo 2010: 35–36 points out, we cannot determine with certainty when Hesiod's cult was established, since there is no solid evidence for it before the Hellenistic times.

[27] Hdt. 2.53.2 and 4.32; cf. Hippias B 6 DK, Ar. *Av.* 1030–36, as well as Pl. *Ap.* 41a6-7 and *R.* 363a8–b1 and 377d4. Simonides is said to have viewed Hesiod as a predecessor of Homer (Sim. T91b Poltera), while the *Marmor Parium* (*FGrH* 239 A 28–29) considers Hesiod only a few decades older than Homer. On the other hand, according to Gellius *NA* 3.11.2, Xenophanes wrote that Homer was older than Hesiod. This is probably a later extrapolation from Xenophanes' poetry, esp. B 10 and 11.1 DK. Given Gellius' formulation (*in quis Philochorus et Xenophanes*), it is likely that this interpretation of Xenophanes' poetry belongs to Philochorus himself or a source of his, perhaps Heraclides of Pontus (third century BCE). On the relative dating of Homer and Hesiod, see also Graziosi 2002: 106–10 and Koning 2010a: 52–55.

[28] Tz. *Proleg.* Hes. *WD* 139–53 Colonna and Suda *s.v.* Ἡσίοδος; cf. Paus. 9.30.3 and T5–9 Most. In his commentary on the *Marmor Parium* (*FGrH* 239) and on Philochorus of Athens (*FGrH* 328), Jacoby suggests that the two poets were considered contemporaries until Heraclides of Pontus (third century BCE) argued that Homer was older in his Περὶ τῆς Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου ἡλικίας. This dating was subsequently adopted by Chamaeleon (cf. D.L. 5.92), Philoch. (*FGrH* 328 F 210), and others. Yet the old view of Homer and Hesiod as contemporaries persisted, as we can deduce from the continued popularity of the *Certamen* story attested by *P. Flinders Petrie* (third century BCE) and by the numerous treatments of the story during the Imperial Era (Plut. *Mor.* 153E–154A, 674A; Dio *Or.* 2.2–13; Philostr. *Her.* 43.7; Themist. *Or.* 30.348; Lib. *Decl.* 1.65; cf. the jibe in Lucian *VH* 2.22).

statements and thus present themselves as markedly "Hesiodic" belong to two different generic categories. The *Theogony* is formally a genealogical poem, enriched with embedded narratives that become extensive and consecutive after the emergence of Iapetus' progeny.[29] These narratives complement the poem's genealogies by integrating the various stages of the Succession Myth within the gradual population of the cosmos,[30] thus contributing significantly to the overall aetiological function of the poem. The *Works and Days*, on the other hand, can be described as a didactic epic in so far as the narrator has the explicit intent to instruct and admonish his audience, and this protreptic agenda lends structure and unity to the (admittedly varied) whole.[31]

The *WD* establishes Hesiod as an expert on human affairs and practices. Unambiguously didactic in his rhetoric and intent, the poet of the *WD* instructs his audience (internal and external) how to live their lives in a manner that guarantees their survival and pleases the gods, thus benefiting both the individual and the community.[32] While moral behavior is a central preoccupation of the *WD*, however, the poem also provides practical information and crucial advice about surviving in the natural world and exploiting its resources. In this context, the poem regularly incorporates elements of meteorology and astronomy, especially as it marks the appropriate time (καιρός) for specific agricultural and nautical activities by recourse to the movement of celestial bodies.[33] It is very likely that the inclusion of such information in the *WD*

[29] *Th.* 154–210, 386–403, 412–52, 459–506, 513–616, 617–725, 822–85; cf. the description of the underworld in *Th.* 726–819. See Schwenn 1934: 81–106, Philippson 1936: 7–42, West 1966: 31–34, Hamilton 1989: 23–40, Clay 2003: 13, and the overview in Pucci 2009. Unlike Hamilton 1989: 29–32, I do not consider the race of monsters in *Th.* 270–336 a digression and I read the brief proleptic accounts in *Th.* 289–94, 316–18, and 328–32 as an integral component of their respective genealogical entries.

[30] Ford 1996: 407.

[31] Clay 1994 offers an excellent discussion of the student–teacher constellation(s) in the *WD*. My (admittedly) minimalist definition of didactic poetry applies at least to the *WD*, to the *Chironos Hypothekai*, and to the *Megala Erga*, possibly also to the *Ornithomanteia* and the *Astronomia*. See West 1978: 3–25, who discusses the *WD*, the *Megala Erga*, the *Chironos Hypothekai*, and the *Astronomia* as "didactic poems" and contextualizes them within the broader category of wisdom poetry; cf., Most 2006: xlvi–xlvii, Ercolani 2010: 39–42, Scodel 2014, and Canevaro 2015: 123–42. On the *WD* as protreptic didactic through the lens of reception, see Hunter 2014 (esp. 40–122). However, 'didactic' as a generic category is not without problems, as Heath 1985 has shown in his discussion of both the *WD* and the *Theogony*. Broader discussions of didactic poetry as a genre and Hesiod's place in it can be found in Effe 1977: 1–26, Toohey 1996: 1–19, and Volk 2002: 34–43; cf. Fowler 2000 with useful observations even though his focus is on Roman didactic. For an alternative generic identification of archaic hexameter poems, including the *Th.* and the *WD*, see Pavese 1998: 85–86.

[32] See, e.g., Clay 2003: 31–48 and, much more extensively, Canevaro 2015.

[33] *WD* 383–87, 417–19, 479, 526–28, 563–67, 597–99, 609–10, 619–21, 663–65; cf. the effect of Sirius on men in *WD* 586–88. Signs in the *WD* are also drawn from the animal world: 448–51, 486–87, 524–25, 529–33, 568–69, 571–72, 582–84 (with a complementary detail from the world of plants), 679–81.

prompted the attribution of a poem entitled Ἀστρονομία (or Ἀστρολογία) to Hesiod. This hexameter poem was probably a catalogue of constellations enriched with details about their shape, location, and movement in the sky (frs. 288–90, 292–93 MW). Much like the *WD*, therefore, it divulged crucial information for the success of human activities such as agriculture and navigation, although it remains unknown whether the *Astronomia* made this point explicitly. It is possible – though not entirely certain – that this poem also included mythological information and aetiologies connected with the constellations, hence the inclusion of fr. 291 MW among its fragments.[34]

The didactic corpus attributed to Hesiod also encompassed a poem entitled Ὀρνιθομαντεία (*Bird Divination*) and another identified as Μεγάλα Ἔργα (*GW*). The *Ornithomanteia* must have been preoccupied with the interpretation of bird omens. The concluding lines of the *WD* (826–28) point out the importance of "discerning birds of omen" (ὄρνιθας κρίνων, *WD* 828) in the context of achieving happiness. It is possible that the *Ornithomanteia* was performed as a sequel to the *WD* at least until it was deemed spurious (cf. sch. Hes. *WD* 828a).[35] As for the *Megala Erga* (*GW*), very little is known.[36] The title suggests that the poem was similar to the *Works and Days* in content and form, but longer. Perhaps it was an expanded version of the *WD* or even an inclusive poem that encompassed other didactic poems of the Hesiodic corpus, possibly the *WD*, the *Ornithomanteia*, and the *Chironos Hypothekai*.[37]

[34] Cingano 2009: 129–30 entertains the possibility that this was not an independent poem but a section in an expanded version of the *WD*.

[35] Cf. the exhortation in *WD* 800–01. On the *Ornithomanteia* as the sequel of the *WD* and on its athetesis by Apollonius of Rhodes, see Schwartz 1960: 245–46, and Cingano 2009: 103 (cf. 130 on *WD* 828 as a transition to the *Ornithomanteia*). West 1966: 354–65 was rather skeptical about how much weight Apollonius' doubts could carry. The connection between Hesiod and μαντική τέχνη in Paus. 9.31.5 may be a reference to the *Ornithomanteia* but also the *Melampodia*; see already Marckscheffel 1840: 89. No Hesiodic fragments can be identified as parts of the *Ornithomanteia* securely, although fr. 312 MW and especially fr. 355 MW may belong to it.

[36] Schwartz 1960: 245–46 and Cingano 2009: 129. Hes. fr. 286 MW offers a two-line formulation of the so-called *lex talionis*. Aristotle cites the second line and attributes it to Rhadamanthys (*EN* 1132b25); despite Cingano 2009: 129, however, it does not necessarily follow that Rhadamanthys featured as a didactic voice in the Hesiodic *GW*. Another fragment explicitly attributed to the *GW* traces the origins of silver to Ge herself (Hes. fr. 287 MW); cf. *Th*. 161–62 and the *Idaioi Dactyloi*, a poorly attested poem attributed to Hesiod that included origin stories pertaining to metallurgy (Hes. fr. 282 MW).

[37] Marckscheffel 1840: 89 and 188–89. The association of Hesiod with practical expertise underlies the attribution of a poem on preserved foods (Περὶ ταρίχων) to him. According to the only extant testimony for this poem (Ath. *Deipn.* 3.116b), the attribution is false; nonetheless, it reflects the prestige and legitimacy associated with Hesiodic authorship.

In the *Chironos Hypothekai,* Chiron, the legendary centaur and teacher of heroes par excellence, offers his wise teachings to young Achilles in the form of precepts (Hes. fr. 283 MW).[38] It is not certain that the poem included a Hesiodic sphragis; the fact that it was invested with Hesiodic authorship may be due mainly to the authoritative status of Hesiodic didactic. I discuss the *Chironos Hypothekai* extensively in Chapter 3, but here I want to draw attention to some additional factors that probably encouraged and solidified the association of this poem with Hesiod. To begin with, the *WD* and the *Chironos Hypothekai* do not simply belong to the same genre but, in fact, they can be viewed as complementary. The *WD* is firmly rooted in the poet's here and now, and the instructions aim at securing survival in the harsh world of the Iron Age. The *Chironos Hypothekai*, on the other hand, situates itself in the Heroic Age: the didactic voice belongs to a hybrid creature that no longer exists (Hes. fr. 283 MW; cf. Pi. *P.*6.19–27) and the precepts are meant to meet the needs of none other than Achilles. According to sch. Pi. *P.*6.22, the first three lines of the poem underlined the necessity for piety. Admittedly, in terms of content, this passage could have been part of the *WD*, but one would expect that, overall, the precepts of *Chironos Hypothekai* privileged values and ideals that would befit a heroic figure rather than an ordinary man laboring in the fields. At least by the time of Pindar's *Pythian* 6, the *Chironos Hypothekai* was circulating and consumed as part of the education of aristocratic men (see Chapter 3). One may argue, therefore, that the *Chironos Hypothekai* not only complemented the *WD* but also offered an excellent alternative to it in contexts that called for authoritative didactic but promoted aggressively the values of the aristocratic elite. It is worth noting that, as a poem featuring Chiron and Achilles, the *Chironos Hypothekai* also complements other parts of the Hesiodic corpus in which the Heroic Age is viewed through generic frames that are distinct from the grand-scale epic about war and *nostos* associated with the Homeric corpus. *Th.* 1006-07 recounts Achilles' birth (cf. *Cat.* frs. 98–100 H/211-13 MW), while the *Catalogue of Women* justifies his absence from the long list of Helen's suitors by pointing out that at the time he was still a child and under the tutelage of Chiron on Mount Pelion (Hes. fr. 110/204.87–92). The *Chironos Hypothekai*, then, explores an aspect of Achilles' life that the *Catalogue* only mentions in passing, and enriches the multifaceted Hesiodic perspective on the heroic era.

[38] The poem is included in Pausanias' list of Hesiodic works (παραινέσεις τε Χείρωνος ἐπὶ διδασκαλίᾳ δὴ τῇ Ἀχιλλέως, 9.31.5); cf. sch. Pi. *P.*6.22, Phryn. *Eclog.* p. 91 Lobeck, and esp. Quintilian *Inst.*1.1.15, according to which Aristophanes of Byzantium was the first to deny the poem's Hesiodic authorship. On *Chironos Hypothekai*, see Friedländer 1913: 571–72, Schwartz 1960: 228–44, and, more recently, Cingano 2009: 128–29. See also Chapter 3, pp. 114–15.

In addition to this cluster of didactic poems, there is another set of poems that was invested with Hesiodic authorship in antiquity. Focusing exclusively on the mythical past, this group relates genealogical information and stories pertaining to the divine realm and to the successive generations of the heroic race. As mentioned earlier, the *Theogony* is a combination of genealogical catalogues and narratives that reflects the gradual population of the cosmos and the establishment of Zeus's rule. This poem was complemented by the *Ehoiai* or *Catalogue of Women* (*Cat.*),[39] a longer genealogical poem that was either conceptualized from the beginning as the continuation of the *Theogony*, or was attached to it as a sequel at some later point (*Th.* 1021–22 = *Cat.* fr. 1.1–2).[40] The *Catalogue* integrates and organizes both chronologically and geographically a massive pool of traditional genealogical information pertaining to the heroes, i.e. mortals born of gods and mortal women, as well as their offspring.[41] The fundamental structure of the poem is matrilinear and it is possible that the *Catalogue* evolved partly from poetic aretalogies in honor of mythical women. In its current form, however, the poem often uses the genealogical frame to celebrate stories about men rather than women.[42] Through its interconnected genealogical catalogues,[43] this poem traces the various generations of the heroic race from Deucalion, son of Prometheus, and his progeny until the wooing of Helen (Hes. frs. 104–110.95/196–204.95) and the impending Trojan War, a conflict that served Zeus's plan to exterminate the heroes (Hes. fr. 110/204.96–123).[44] The genealogical catalogues

[39] According to the current scholarly consensus, the two titles in all their variations correspond to the same poem, an idea first proposed by Leo 1894; see Cohen 1983: 111–13, Hirschberger 2004: 26 n.35 and 27 n.36. For a survey of the scholarship on this issue, see Hirschberger 2004: 26–30.

[40] See West 1966: 48–49 and 437, 1985a: 2–3, and Arrighetti 1998: 447–49. On the complementarity of the two poems, see, e.g., Clay 2003: 162–67. Cingano 2009: 107 points out that the *Th.*, the *Cat.*, and the *WD* were circulating widely as a set triad until the fourth century CE.

[41] On the symbolic value and the sociopolitical function of Hesiodic genealogical poetry, see Chapters 2 (pp. 94–96) and 4 (pp. 170–78).

[42] On the generic archaeology of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, see Rutherford 2000: 89–96; cf. 86 on embedded male stories. Skempis 2011: 254–58 offers an illuminating juxtaposition between male heroic epic and *ehoie*-poetry in terms of their themes and motifs; we should not overlook, however, that Hesiodic genealogical poetry is infused with elements from heroic epic.

[43] On the ἢ οἵη formula and its function in the structure of Hesiodic genealogical poetry, see West 1985a: 167, Rutherford 2000: 83–85, Hirschberger 2004: 30–31, and Nasta 2006: 59–64.

[44] Cf. *WD* 161–68. The end of the Heroic Age in the *Cat.* also involves changes in the natural order of the world (Hes. fr. 110/204.124–80). On the various visions regarding the past of humankind in the Hesiodic corpus and the challenges involved in any effort to integrate them, see, e.g., Schmitt 1975, Koenen 1994, Mayer 1996, Arrighetti 1998: 449–50 and 458–60, Cerutti 1998, Most 1998, and Clay 2005; cf. González 2010: 382–91. Even though it is not genealogical, the catalogue of Helen's suitors is consistent with core elements and themes of the *Catalogue* as is shown by, e.g., Heilinger 1983, West 1985a: 114–19 and, more recently, Cingano 2005. For a comparative study of the catalogue of ships in *Il.* 2 and the catalogue of