THE WRATH OF HESIOD: ANGRY HOMERIC SPEECHES AND THE STRUCTURE OF HESIOD'S *WORKS AND DAYS*

ANDRÉ P. M. H. LARDINOIS

The structure of Hesiod's *Works and Days* has long puzzled classical scholars, in part because the poem is not held together by an overarching narrative, like the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey,* or the *Theogony*, but instead is composed of a single speech. As Martin West (1978.41) remarks: "To anyone who expects an orderly and systematic progression of ideas, it is liable to appear a bewildering text." Several explanations have been given for the structure of this poem. Some scholars have tried to find its unity in a central theme, but so far these efforts have remained largely unconvincing.[1] Others, like West, argue that Hesiod's poem is a collection of loose passages that could have ended anywhere after line 264, 316, 380, 617, or 764.[2] In this

1 Paul Mazon 1928.71, for example, has argued that the two dominant themes of *Works and Days* are justice and agriculture, to which van Groningen 1958.297 wants to add "le moment juste." Others, however, have pointed to the loose thematic structure of the poem: e.g., Verdenius 1962, esp. 111–14, Rowe 1983.134 n. 81, and Heath 1986.251–53. In Lardinois 1998, I argue that the many different themes of the poem are woven together in significant ways; cf. Hamilton 1989. I follow the text of West 1978, unless otherwise specified. Translations are based on his notes and on H. G. Evelyn-White's translation in the Loeb Classical Library (1936).

2 West 1978.45–46. The conception of the poem as a collection of largely unrelated passages goes back to the German analysts, on whom see West 1978.41. By convention, I will refer to the composer of *Works and Days* as "Hesiod," although I am persuaded by Gregory Nagy and others that Hesiod is probably a poetic persona who represents the internal narrator but not, necessarily, the actual poet-composer: see Nagy 1979.5–6 and [1982] 1990, Hunt 1981, Griffith 1983, Lamberton 1988.1–37, and Martin 1992.14–16.

Arethusa 36 (2003) 1–20

paper, I would like to suggest how a number of angry speeches in the Homeric epics may clarify the structure of the *Works and Days*. This comparison should help to explain both the organization of Hesiod's poem and the emotional framework in which it is set.

Sections of the *Works and Days* have already been compared to various Homeric speeches, most recently by Jens-Uwe Schmidt (1986). Following Heinz Munding (1959) and Hans Diller (1962), Schmidt compares the long passage on *dikê* in *Op.* 213–85 to Phoenix's speech to Achilles in Book 9 of the *Iliad*, and the Farmer's Almanac in *Op.* 286 and following to Nestor's instruction of his son Antilochus in *Iliad* Book 23. These comparisons, while useful in explaining certain details of composition, focus only on individual parts of the poem and thus implicitly reinforce the idea of a poem made up of unrelated units. I find an explanation for the structure of *Works and Days* in the arrangements of several angry speeches in the Homeric epics, in particular Menelaus's speech to Euphorbus (*Il.* 17.18–32), and I argue that this structure serves a particular rhetorical purpose, which is to persuade the external audience to side with Hesiod in his dispute with his brother and the kings of Ascra. Some scholars have commented already on the angry tone in Hesiod's voice: Gregory Nagy (1979.312–14), for example, referring to the prominent use of the word *neikos* in lines 29–35 and the insults Hesiod attaches to the title of the kings of Ascra in lines 39 and 264, recognizes Hesiod as a poet who is "engaged in making justified blame, expressed in language appropriate to blame-poetry," and Richard Hunt (1981.37) identifies "satiric elements" in the poem that are compatible with Hesiod's "role as a blame poet." Yet neither one of these scholars discusses the structure of the poem as a whole or analyzes the poem as an angry speech.

1. THE STRUCTURE OF HESIOD'S *WORKS AND DAYS*

In Figure 1, I have laid out the main elements of Hesiod's address in *Works and Days* to Perses and the kings.[3] These two addresses, which are intertwined, are remarkably similar: after an initial invocation of the gods, there is in each case an indirect address with gnomic and paradigmatic

3 For two recent discussions of these addresses, see Schmidt 1986.29–79 and Clay 1993. My analysis is largely compatible with their findings, but neither of them comments on the angry tone in Hesiod's voice.

Figure 1. Hesiod's Addresses to Perses and the Kings in *Works and Days*

1	Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν, ἀοιδῇσι κλείουσαι,	Invocation of the Muses
	δεῦτε, Δί' ἐννέπετε σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνείουσαι,	
	ὅν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε,	
	ῥητοί τ' ἄρρητοί τε Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἔκητι.	
5	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.	
	κλῦθι ἰδὼν ἀιών τε, δίκῃ δ' ἴθυνε θέμιστας	Invocation of Zeus
10	τύνη· ἐγὼ δέ κε Πέρσῃ ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην.	Indirect address to Perses
	Οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν	Indirectly delivered *gnômê*
	εἰσὶ δύω·	about Erides
	. . .	
27	ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα τεῷ ἐνικάτθεο θυμῷ,	Direct address to Perses
	. . .	
38	ἁρπάζων ἐφόρεις, μέγα κυδαίνων βασιλῆας	Indirect address to the kings
	δωροφάγους, οἳ τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλουσι δικάσσαι,	
40	νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν ὅσῳ πλέον ἥμισυ παντὸς,	Indirectly delivered *gnômai*
	οὐδ' ὅσον ἐν μαλάχῃ τε καὶ ἀσφοδέλῳ μέγ' ὄνειαρ.	
	lines 42–105: Story of Prometheus	Paradigmatic tales
	lines 106–201: Five Ages of Humankind	
202	νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσ' ἐρέω, φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς·	Indirect address to the kings
	[Fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale]	Paradigmatic tale
213	ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δ' ἄκουε Δίκης, μηδ' ὕβριν ὄφελλε·	Direct address to Perses
	. . .	
220	τῆς δὲ Δίκης ῥόθος ἑλκομένης ᾗ κ' ἄνδρες ἄγωσιν	Indirectly delivered *gnômai* about the kings
	δωροφάγοι, σκολιῇς δὲ δίκῃς κρίνωσι θέμιστας·	
	. . .	
248	ὦ βασιλῆς, ὑμεῖς δὲ καταφράζεσθε καὶ αὐτοί	Direct address to the kings
	τήνδε δίκην·	
	. . .	
263	ταῦτα φυλασσόμενοι βασιλῆς ἰθύνετε μύθους	Direct address to the kings + insult
	δωροφάγοι, σκολιῶν δὲ δικέων ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθεσθε.	
	. . .	
274	ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῇσιν,	Direct address to Perses
	καί νυ Δίκης ἐπάκουε, βίης δ' ἐπιλήθεο πάμπαν.	
	. . .	
286	σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ ἐσθλὰ νοέων ἐρέω, *μέγα νήπιε* Πέρση.	Direct address to Perses + insult
	τὴν μέν τοι κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἐστιν ἑλέσθαι	
	ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει·	Directly delivered *gnômai*
	. . .	
316	εἰς ἔργον τρέψας μελετᾷς βίου, *ὥς σε κελεύω.*	Declaration of command

The direct addresses to Perses with insults, directly delivered *gnômai*, and declarations of command are continued till the end of the poem: e.g., 397ff., 536, 603, 623, 633ff.

advice, followed by a direct address peppered with insults and, in the case of Perses, with several declarations of command. The poem opens with an invocation of Zeus and the Muses, capped in line 10 by a statement about Perses in the third person.[4] After this third-person reference to Perses, there follows an extended gnomic expression in lines 11–26 about the *genos* of Strife consisting of two Erides, a good and a bad one. This gnomic expression is, strictly speaking, still addressed to Zeus, and Perses is not directly spoken to until line 27, where Hesiod says: ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα τεῷ ἐνικάτθεο θυμῷ ("Perses, you now take these things to heart").

In lines 38–39, Hesiod speaks about "the gift-devouring kings" of Ascra in the third person, just as he did initially about Perses (*Op.* 10), and the two enigmatic *gnômai* that follow—about the half being more than the whole and about the great boon of mallow and asphodel (40–41)—can apply to these kings or to Perses.[5] The same holds true for the two paradigmatic stories about Prometheus and the Five Ages of Humankind: each story is applicable to Perses and to the gift-devouring kings of Ascra, which is probably why Hesiod does not specify to whom exactly these stories are addressed.[6]

In line 202, Hesiod promises to tell a new tale, an *ainos*, for the kings who have understanding (νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσ' ἐρέω, φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς). These "wise kings" are to be distinguished from the "foolish" kings of Ascra mentioned in lines 39–40 and function as a positive example for them (Nagy [1982] 1990.66, Griffith 1983.59), or else Hesiod decides to speak, temporarily, in more friendly terms about the kings of Ascra.[7] This indirect address to the kings in the third person closely resembles that to

---

4 There is some uncertainty about the grammatical case of Perses' name in line 10, but most modern editors agree that it should be dative, including Solmsen 1990 and West 1978.

5 West notes that the second saying, which, like the first one, may have been proverbial, "is not especially apt as a remark to βασιλῆες" (1978.153), but it is apt for someone whom Hesiod just encouraged to farm: if mallow and asphodel are advantageous, how much more so is Demeter's grain (Δημήτερος ἀκτήν, 32)? Other scholars who have wanted to apply these lines to Perses' situation include Evelyn-White 1920.128, Verdenius 1985.41, Clay 1993.27, and Hubbard 1995.166 n. 13.

6 The personal pronouns σε and σύ in lines 44 and 107 may constitute general second-person addresses and need not refer specifically to Perses (contra Clay 1993.27; cf. note 23 below), but even if they refer to Perses, the two myths pertain to the kings as well: see Hamilton 1989.55 (and note 14) and 62.

7 Compare Hesiod's friendly address of Perses as δῖον γένος in line 299, on which see Clay 1993.30. According to West (1978 ad loc.), Hesiod's description of the kings as having understanding "is not so much being polite as pressing the kings to agree."

Perses in line 10, and just as the extended *gnômê* about the two Erides applies to Perses, but is not directly spoken to him, so the fable of the hawk and the nightingale is intended for the kings of Ascra, but not directly addressed to them.

Immediately after the fable of the hawk and the nightingale, Perses is addressed directly (213), and he is encouraged to listen to *dikê* and to avoid hubris.[8] Soon thereafter, in lines 220–21, we hear about gift-devouring men who issue decrees with crooked justice. These men are, of course, none other than the kings of Ascra, whom Perses had bribed and whom Hesiod already had referred to as δωροφάγοι in line 39. Hesiod continues to talk about the kings in the third person until he formally addresses them in line 248 (Clay 1993.28). This direct address to the kings is repeated in lines 263–64, where the insulting adjective δωροφάγοι ("gift-devouring") is added to their title.

In line 274, Perses is addressed directly for the third time, and from this point onwards, he takes central stage. In line 286, he is addressed as "greatly foolish Perses" (μέγα νήπιε Πέρση), an insult that is added to his name twice more, in lines 397 and 633.[9] Hesiod seems to instruct Perses much more forcefully in the second half of the poem than in the first half: in lines 316, 536, and 623, Hesiod actually commands Perses to do as he says, using the phrase ὥς σε κελεύω ("as I order you").[10] He accompanies these orders with *gnômai* that are no longer delivered indirectly but spoken directly to Perses (e.g., *Op.* 317–19, 498–501, 644–45). As I argue elsewhere (Lardinois 1997.226–28), such "direct second-person" *gnômai*, which are applicable to the addressee, are typical of authoritative statements or angry speeches. In short, we find in the *Works and Days* two very similar addresses: one to Hesiod's brother Perses and another to the kings of Ascra. In each case, after the initial invocation of Zeus and the Muses, there follows an indirect address with gnomic and paradigmatic advice, succeeded by a direct address, insults, and, in the case of Perses, such declarations of command as ὥς σε κελεύω. The following sections of this paper will show

8 It is possible that the fable is intended for Perses as well, just as the two preceding mythological stories apply to both Perses and to the kings; see most recently Dalfen 1994, Hubbard 1995, and Nelson 1997.240–41. It is generally assumed that Hesiod addresses the moral of the fable to Perses in *Op.* 277–80 (Hamilton 1989.50, with earlier references in note 19, Clay 1993.29), but Hubbard 1995.162–63 and Nelson 1997.237 express skepticism.

9 See, on the significance of this term, Edmunds 1990, esp. 60–97, with Clay 1993.24 n. 4.

10 Cf. *Op.* 603: κέλομαι.

that all these elements are paralleled in angry speeches spoken by characters in the Homeric epics, in particular in Menelaus's speech to the Trojan warrior Euphorbus (*Il.* 17.18–32).

2. ANGRY SPEECHES IN HOMER

The structure of Hesiod's *Works and Days* shares many characteristics with angry speeches in Homer, which have the advantage for us over Hesiod's poem that they come with a narrative context that allows us to reconstruct, fairly precisely, their mood and intention. First there is the invocation of a god: at *Odyssey* 17.240–46, Eumaeus, the swineherd, rebukes (νείκεσ') the goatherd Melanthius by praying to the nymphs and asking them to send Odysseus home to punish the insolence of Melanthius:

τὸν δὲ συβώτης
νείκεσ' ἐσάντα ἰδών, μέγα δ' εὔξατο χεῖρας ἀνασχών·
"Νύμφαι κρηναῖαι, κοῦραι Διός, εἴ ποτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς
ὔμμ' ἐπὶ μηρία κῆε, καλύψας πίονι δημῷ,
ἀρνῶν ἠδ' ἐρίφων, τόδε μοι κρηήνατ' ἐέλδωρ,
ὡς ἔλθοι μὲν κεῖνος ἀνήρ, ἀγάγοι δέ ἑ δαίμων
τῷ κέ τοι ἀγλαΐας γε διασκεδάσειεν ἀπάσας,
τὰς νῦν ὑβρίζων φορέεις, ἀλαλήμενος αἰεὶ
ἄστυ κάτ'· αὐτὰρ μῆλα κακοὶ φθείρουσι νομῆες."

The swineherd stared and cursed him [= Melanthius]
and prayed aloud with his hands uplifted:
"Nymphs of the fountain, daughters of Zeus, if ever Odysseus
burned for you the thigh pieces of lambs or goats,
wrapping them in rich fat, fulfill for me this wish
that the man himself will come home, with a god guiding him;
then he would send flying all those proud airs
that you now put on in your insolence, forever loitering
here in the town, while bad herdsmen destroy the flock."[11]

11 Translations of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are based on Lattimore (1951 and 1965) with touches of Murray/Dimock and Murray/Wyatt (1995, 1999). I follow the Greek text of Allen and Monro 1912–20, unless noted otherwise.

Other invocations embedded in angry speeches are *Iliad* 13.631–35 (Menelaus to Zeus about his Trojan opponent Peisander) and 17.19 (Menelaus to Zeus about Euphorbus; see below). Walter Leaf, in his commentary on the *Iliad,* refers to such prayers as "a rhetorical artifice to express contempt" (1902.220), because the speaker ignores the presence of the addressee and pretends to address his remarks to a god. In this case, Eumaeus also uses his address to the nymphs to pray for the punishment of Melanthius through Odysseus's return. Immediately after praying to the nymphs, however, Eumaeus addresses the goatherd directly (φορέεις, 245), just as Hesiod switches to a direct address to Perses after his initial invocation of Zeus in the prooemium.

Invoking a god is one way to pretend to ignore an addressee; another way is to direct one's remarks to another human being. At *Iliad* 9.624–38, in a highly critical speech, Ajax first speaks to Odysseus about Achilles in the third person, before turning to Achilles himself:

τοῖσι δ' ἄρ' Αἴας
ἀντίθεος Τελαμωνιάδης μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπεν·
"διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ
ἴομεν· οὐ γάρ μοι δοκέει μύθοιο τελευτή
τῇδέ γ' ὁδῷ κρανέεσθαι· ἀπαγγεῖλαι δὲ τάχιστα
χρὴ μῦθον Δαναοῖσι καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθόν περ ἐόντα,
οἵ που νῦν ἕαται ποτιδέγμενοι. αὐτὰρ *Ἀχιλλεύς*
ἄγριον ἐν στήθεσσι θέτο μεγαλήτορα θυμόν,
σχέτλιος, οὐδὲ μετατρέπεται φιλότητος ἑταίρων
τῆς ᾗ μιν παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτίομεν ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
νηλής· καὶ μέν τίς τε κασιγνήτοιο φόνοιο
ποινὴν ἢ οὗ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο τεθνηῶτος,
καί ῥ' ὃ μὲν ἐν δήμῳ μένει αὐτοῦ πόλλ' ἀποτείσας,
τοῦ δέ τ' ἐρητύεται κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
ποινὴν δεξαμένῳ· *σοὶ* δ' ἄλληκτόν τε κακόν τε
θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι θεοὶ θέσαν εἵνεκα κούρης
οἴης· νῦν δέ τοι ἑπτὰ παρίσχομεν ἔξοχ' ἀρίστας,
ἄλλά τε πόλλ' ἐπὶ τῇσι· σὺ δ' ἵλαον ἔνθεο θυμόν,
αἴδεσσαι δὲ μέλαθρον· ὑπωρόφιοι δέ τοί εἰμεν
πληθύος ἐκ Δαναῶν, μέμαμεν δέ τοι ἔξοχον ἄλλων
κήδιστοί τ' ἔμεναι καὶ φίλτατοι ὅσσοι Ἀχαιοί."[12]

12 For this speech, I have adopted the new text of West 1998.

And among them Ajax
the godlike son of Telamon delivered a speech:
"Son of Laertes and seed of Zeus, resourceful Odysseus,
let us go. I think that nothing will be accomplished
by argument on this errand; we must go back quickly
and tell this story, though it is not good, to the Danaans
who sit there waiting for us. But *Achilles*
has made savage the proud-hearted spirit in his breast,
the cruel man, and he does not remember that friends' affection
wherein we honored him by the ships, far beyond all others,
the pitiless one. Yet a man takes from his brother's slayer
the blood price, or the price of a child who was killed,
and the guilty one stays in the country, having paid a great price,
and the kinsman's heart and proud spirit are curbed,
when he has taken the recompense; but in *your* breast the gods put
a spirit not to be placated, evil, for the sake of one single
girl. Yet now we offer you seven, the best there are,
and much beside these. Make gracious the spirit within you
and respect your hall; for under your roof have we come
from the mass of Danaans, and we are eager to be, by far,
the nearest and dearest to you, more than all other Achaeans."

In line 628, Ajax still speaks about Achilles in the third person, but, in line 636, he turns directly to him and addresses him with "you" (σοὶ). In this case, the switch from indirect to direct address is preceded by a gnomic statement (632–36), just as Hesiod's first direct address to Perses is preceded by the extended *gnômê* about the two Erides (*Op.* 11–26) and his direct address to the kings by a series of *gnômai* about hubris and *dikê* (225–47).[13]

13 Cf. *Il.* 2.284–332, where Odysseus delivers a highly critical speech before the army. After he first speaks to Agamemnon about the army in the third person and applies a series of *gnômai* to them (2.291–94, 297–98), he turns directly to the soldiers and tells them to stay

I submit that both Ajax and Hesiod speak these *gnômai* indirectly to their addressees in order to express their discontent.[14]

Besides these switches from indirect to direct address, there are other signs that Hesiod adopts an angry tone at the beginning of the *Works and Days*. Richard Martin, in a forthcoming publication, compares the opening line of Hesiod's *gnômai* about the two Erides to similar statements in the Homeric epics. He concludes that such statements, which combine the imperfect with the particle ἄρα, are used at tense moments when the speaker wants to vent his anger.[15] Achilles, for example, in his famous speech to the embassy in Book 9 of the *Iliad*, tells Odysseus that (*Il*. 9.315–17):

> οὔτ᾽ ἔμεγ᾽ Ἀτρεΐδην Ἀγαμέμνονα πεισέμεν οἴω
> οὔτ᾽ ἄλλους Δαναούς, ἐπεὶ *οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν*
> μάρνασθαι δηΐοισιν ἐπ᾽ ἀνδράσι νωλεμὲς αἰεί.
>
> not me, I think, will the son of Atreus, Agamemnon, persuade
> nor will the other Danaans, since *there is to be no gratitude*
> for fighting our foes mercilessly without end.[16]

Hesiod, at the beginning of the *Works and Days*, adopts the same tone of voice, and we should perhaps translate line 11 with something like: "And so, contrary to what you may think, there is no single *genos* of Erides, oh no!"

---

at Troy and to endure (2.299). On the angry tone of Ajax's speech at *Il.* 9.624–38, see Lohmann 1970.274 and Hainsworth 1993 ad 625–42, with reference to Higbie 1990.118–20.

14 One may compare the beginning of Creon's speech in Soph. *Ant.* 473–80, which he delivers to the chorus in front of Antigone. The use of indirect proverbial expressions to express anger or discontent has parallels not only in Homeric speeches but in other cultures as well: in Lardinois 1997.222, I quote as an example a conversation Basso 1976.106–07 reports in his study of "wise words" from the Western Apache in which a grandmother criticizes her granddaughter by delivering a proverbial expression applicable to the girl to her brother in her presence. For more examples, see Firth 1926.141, 142, and 144.

15 Martin, forthcoming. See also Minchin 2002, whose observations about Homeric rebukes find parallels in parts of Hesiod's poem as well. I would like to thank both authors for showing me their work prior to publication.

16 Denniston [1934] 1950.35–36 lists this use of ἄρα + imperfect under "ἄρα expressing the surprise attendant upon disillusionment" and notes that "the reality of a past event is presented as apprehended either during its occurrence, or at the moment of speaking, or at some intermediate moment."

In the second half of the poem, after line 274, Hesiod switches once and for all from an indirect address to Perses and the kings to a direct address to his brother, and from the indirect use of *gnômai* and paradigmatic tales to a direct citation of *gnômai* (e.g., 276–85, 317–34, 702–05). In Homeric speeches, it can be just as insulting to address gnomic expressions directly to someone as indirectly, because, as was noted above, the speakers in this way claim authority over their addressees. A good example is Athena's speech to Ares at *Iliad* 15.127–42. Ares wishes to rescue his son Ascalaphus, who is about to be killed on the battlefield, but Athena stops him and, according to the narrator, "grabs" Ares with words (ἡ δ' ἐπέεσσι καθάπτετο θοῦρον Ἄρηα, 15.127).[17] Athena ends her speech at line 140–41 with a *gnômê* spoken directly to Ares: "a difficult thing it is to save the lineage and offspring of all humans" (ἀργαλέον δὲ / πάντων ἀνθρώπων ῥῦσθαι γενεήν τε τόκον τε). She combines this direct address with insults (μαινόμενε, φρένας ἠλὲ, 128) and a declaration of command (κέλομαι, 138), just as Hesiod does in the second half of *Works and Days* while speaking to *his* brother.[18]

3. MENELAUS'S SPEECH TO EUPHORBUS (*ILIAD* 17.18–32)

So far we have identified various individual features of Hesiod's speech to Perses and the kings of Ascra, finding counterparts in different angry speeches in the Homeric epics. There is, however, one Homeric speech in which many of the same features work together, just as they do in *Works and Days*. This Homeric speech provides the best evidence that the structure of *Works and Days* has to be considered as a whole and takes the form of an angry speech. This structure, of course, does not preclude the possibility that individual passages are ironic, or even witty, but even such "satirical elements" can serve the critical posture of the narrator (Hunt 1981).

At *Iliad* 17.18–32, Menelaus delivers a short speech to the Trojan hero Euphorbus, said explicitly to be spoken in anger:

---

17 The verb καθάπτεσθαι, in the sense of "grabbing someone with words," is also used of an angry speech at *Il.* 16.421, but, at *Il.* 1.582, of a friendly address. The verb, as Kirk 1985.112 notes, "does not of itself imply hostility, but rather a direct effort to engage someone in speech for an important reason—more than simply to address them."

18 Cf. Hes. *Op.* 603, 316, 536, 623. In both cases, Athena and Hesiod, who are themselves renowned for their wisdom, accuse their brothers of lacking wit: μαινόμενε, φρένας ἠλὲ, *Il.* 15.128; μέγα νήπιε Πέρση, *Op.* 286, 397, 633; ἀεσίφρονα θυμόν, *Op.* 315, 335, and 646.

Τὸν δὲ μέγ᾽ ὀχθήσας προσέφη ξανθὸς Μενέλαος·
“Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐ μὲν καλὸν ὑπέρβιον εὐχετάασθαι.
οὔτ᾽ οὖν παρδάλιος τόσσον μένος οὔτε λέοντος
οὔτε συὸς κάπρου ὀλοόφρονος, οὗ τε μέγιστος
θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι περὶ σθένεϊ βλεμεαίνει,
ὅσσον Πάνθου υἷες ἐϋμμελίαι φρονέουσιν.
οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδὲ βίη Ὑπερήνορος ἱπποδάμοιο
ἧς ἥβης ἀπόνηθ᾽, ὅτε μ᾽ ὤνατο καί μ᾽ ὑπέμεινε
καί μ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἐν Δαναοῖσιν ἐλέγχιστον πολεμιστὴν
ἔμμεναι· οὐδέ ἑ φημι πόδεσσί γε οἷσι κιόντα
εὐφρῆναι ἄλοχόν τε φίλην κεδνούς τε τοκῆας.
ὥς θην καὶ σὸν ἐγὼ λύσω μένος, εἴ κέ μευ ἄντα
στήῃς· ἀλλά σ᾽ ἔγωγ᾽ ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω
ἐς πληθὺν ἰέναι, μηδ᾽ ἀντίος ἵστασ᾽ ἐμεῖο,
πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν· ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω.”

Deeply stirred, Menelaus of the fair hair answered him [= Euphorbus]:
“Father Zeus, it is not well for a proud man to boast.
Surely neither the fury of the leopard is so great, nor is the lion’s,
nor the fury of the devastating wild boar, within whose breast
the spirit is biggest and vaunts in the pride of his strength,
as is the pride in the sons of Panthous of the strong ash spear.
Yet, not even the strength of Hypenor, breaker of horses,
had profit of his youth when he stood against me and taunted me
and said that among all the Danaans I was the weakest
in battle. Not on his own feet, I say, did he go home
to make glad his dear wife and his honored parents.
So indeed I will break your strength as well, if you stand
against me; but I order you to get back
into the multitude, not to stand to face me, before you
suffer some harm. Once the deed is done, a fool understands.”

This speech of Menelaus begins, like Hesiod's *Works and Days*, with an invocation of Zeus, followed by a *gnômê* that is indirectly addressed to Euphorbus.[19] At lines 24–28, Menelaus adds a short paradigmatic tale, in which he implicitly compares Euphorbus to his brother Hypenor, whom Menelaus had killed in a previous encounter.[20] Following this indirectly delivered advice, Menelaus turns directly to Euphorbus in line 29 and, using one of the same declarations of command with which Hesiod addresses Perses (κελεύω), orders him to retreat.[21] Finally, Menelaus speaks a *gnômê* directly to Euphorbus in line 32, just as Hesiod delivers a string of *gnômai* directly to Perses in the second half of *Works and Days*.[22]

These parallels are enough to show that *Works and Days* is structured like an angry speech that includes a switch from indirect to direct addresses, insults, declarations of commands, and both directly and indirectly delivered *gnômai*. There are, however, some important differences between Hesiod's poem and the Homeric speeches I have cited. First of all, there are multiple recipients of Hesiod's speech in *Works and Days*: most of the poem is addressed to Perses, but parts are intended for the kings of Ascra, as we have seen, and still other parts are perhaps spoken to a general second person.[23] There are in the Homeric epics several instances of speeches with multiple recipients: Nestor's speech to Achilles and Agamemnon at *Iliad* 1.254–84, for example, is intended for both heroes and ends with a rapid change of address: from Achilles and Agamemnon together to Agamemnon alone to Achilles and back to Agamemnon.[24] This speech, like most

19 The structure of this speech is analyzed by Lohmann 1970.23–24, and Edwards 1991.64.

20 In this case, the paradigmatic tale is a personal tale about how Menelaus defeated mighty Hypenor in the past (on personal experiences as possible paradeigmata, see Austin 1966.300). As in the case of Hesiod's myths and fables, it is unclear to whom precisely this story is addressed: before the story, Menelaus speaks of Panthous's sons, including Euphorbus, in the third person (cf. Hesiod's mention of the kings in *Op.* 202), but immediately after the story he addresses Euphorbus by himself (σὸν, 29).

21 *Il.* 17.30, cf. Hes. *Op.* 316, 536, 623 (same emphatic position in the verse).

22 Menelaus's *gnômê* (ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω) has a close parallel in *Op.* 218. It is also used, with the same declaration of command, by Achilles in a speech to Aeneas (*Il.* 20.196–98), which Aeneas compares to the "strife and wrangling" of women fighting with words in the street (20.251–55). On the angry tone of this speech of Achilles and Aeneas's response, see Vodoklys 1992.62–75.

23 Verdenius 1962.158, West 1978.39, and Schmidt 1986.52–71 detect a "general second person" in the second half of the poem. Obbink 1993.71 is skeptical and maintains that all second-person exhortations in the poem are addressed to Perses.

24 This speech is analyzed by Lohmann 1970.224 n. 18; cf. Kirk 1985.81.

other Homeric speeches with multiple recipients, is delivered in public, before the assembled army, and suggests that the poet of the *Works and Days* perhaps wanted to portray his poem as a speech that Hesiod supposedly delivered in public as well. Such a public address, of course, would correspond nicely with the poet's own delivery of the poem, which presumably took place before a large audience.[25] The narrative situation inside the poem would thus be similar to the performance context outside: in both cases we are dealing with a public address.

Secondly, compared to Menelaus's angry speech to Euphorbus, Hesiod's speech to Perses and the kings of Ascra is greatly expanded with regard, for example, to the number of *gnômai* and paradigmatic tales included in the speech. As Menelaus's short speech to Euphorbus shows, it is not inappropriate for angry speeches to contain advice sections, but Hesiod's speech is clearly excessive in this regard. (No brother would stay and listen to such a long harangue.) The reason for this discrepancy is that, in the final analysis, the *Works and Days* is not a real speech but a poem. Literary compositions (and I am including oral poetry in my definition of literature) may be derived from ordinary speech genres, as Tzvetan Todorov famously argues, but they are transformations of them, not precise copies.[26] Just as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are no ordinary narratives, compared to, for example, the tales that Nestor and Menelaus tell Telemachus in Books 3 and 4 of the *Odyssey*, so the *Works and Days* is no ordinary speech: it is a literary composition greatly expanded by its inclusion of not one, but three paradigmatic tales and over one hundred *gnômai*.[27] While the Homeric epics take the form of a monumental narrative, the *Works and Days* is structured like a greatly expanded public speech, delivered in anger to Perses and the gift-devouring kings of Ascra.

---

25 See Thalmann 1984.117–23, among others, on the occasions for epic performances. Some commentators have suggested that the poem represents Hesiod's defense speech at the trial over the inheritance of his father, but this view is untenable: see Clay 1993.25 with earlier references (n. 7). Schmidt 1986.21–26 and Erren 1990.186–87 argue against this interpretation as well.

26 Todorov [1975] 1990, cf. van Dijk 1976 and Erren 1990.185.

27 Expansion in epic poetry has an aesthetic and rhetorical importance of its own, as Martin 1989.206–30 argues.

4. BAD STUDENTS ARE THE BEST

The *Works and Days* is not the only didactic poem that is composed like an angry speech: there are parallels both from the Near East, including ancient Egypt, and from Greece itself. A good example is *The Protests of the Eloquent Peasant*, a text from Egypt dated to the Middle Kingdom. In this text, a peasant delivers a series of angry speeches to the High Steward about the unjust treatment he has received from one of the steward's servants. In one of the speeches, we even find a switch from indirect to direct address, just as in Hesiod's poem, and possibly an accusation that the High Steward is taking bribes, just like Hesiod's "gift-devouring" kings:

> The son of Meru goes on erring. His face is blind to what he sees, deaf to what he hears, forgetful about what he should remember. Behold, you are a town without mayor, like a group without its ruler, like a ship without a captain, like a band without a leader. Behold, you are an officer who steals, a mayor who accepts (bribes) . . .[28]

These speeches of the eloquent peasant come with a narrative framework that tells us explicitly that the farmer delivers his protests in anger.

Closer to home, we find other parallels as well. For example, some of Solon's elegies addressed to the people and the elite of Athens appear to be structured like angry speeches. According to Aristotle, or whoever composed the *Athenaiôn Politeia*, Solon was "rebuking" both the people and their leaders in fragment 37, in which Solon himself uses the verb ὀνειδίζω to describe his stance toward the people: "If I must rebuke the people openly" (δήμωι μὲν εἰ χρὴ διαφάδην ὀνειδίσαι). In fragment 4a, Solon is said to "fight and dispute with each side on behalf of each side" (πρὸς ἑκατέρους ὑπὲρ ἑκατέρων μάχεται καὶ διαμφισβητεῖ), while, in fragment 4b, he "always attaches blame for the strife to the rich" (αἰεὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς στάσεως ἀνάπτει τοῖς πλουσίοις) by commenting on their arrogance and, perhaps, their love of money.[29] Demosthenes, who quotes fragment 4, says

---

28 Translated by N. Shupak in Hallo 1997.102. Cf. Pritchard 1950.409, who also supplies "bribes" in the last quoted line. For more examples of didactic texts from the Near East and Egypt similar to Hesiod's *Works and Days*, see West 1997.307.

29 Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 5.2–3, 12.5, quoted by West 1992 ad Solon frs. 37, 4a and b.

that Solon expressed "hate" (ἐμίσει) for the unrighteous citizens and leaders whom he criticizes in this poem, and, in fragment 4a, which, according to Aristotle, formed the opening of one of Solon's elegies, Solon says that he feels "pain" (ἄλγεα) over the state of "the eldest land of Ionia" (i.e., Athens).

The similarities between these elegies and Hesiod's *Works and Days* are striking: in both cases, the internal narrators address part of their comments to the common man—Perses or the Athenian populace—and part to their leaders. Solon's elegies, furthermore, seem to have contained a mixture of direct and indirect address similar to that in Hesiod's *Works and Days*: in fragments 4 and 37, for example, Solon speaks about the foolish citizens of Athens and their unjust leaders in the third person, while, in fragment 4c, Solon addresses the rich directly. In fragment 11, Solon speaks directly to the citizens, whom he accuses of aiding and abetting Pisistratus's tyranny. Even if these fragments do not come from the same poem, they show that Solon adopted both forms of address in his poetry. Like Hesiod's *Works and Days*, Solon's elegies were probably intended to imitate indignant speeches, in this case to the people of Athens and their leaders.

Other ancient didactic poems contain passages in which the speaker expresses his indignation or condescension toward an internal addressee, even if they are not structured overall as angry speeches: Theognis in the *Theognidea* criticizes his pupil Cyrnus, as Empedocles does Pausanias and Lucretius does Memmius.[30] Various contributors to a recent collection of essays on the addressee in didactic epic have argued that this criticism of the internal addressee by Theognis, Empedocles, and Lucretius is intended to create a rift between the internal and external audiences of the poems.[31] As such, it constitutes a rhetorical strategy to force the external audience to accept the poet's point of view; as Dirk Obbink remarks in the case of Empedocles and his pupil Pausanias: "Faced with the options of sharing Pausanias' state of uninstructedness, or accepting fully the teachings of the

30 Thgn. 253–54, 1259–62, 1263–66, 1271–74, 1283, 1311–18, 1377–80 (the anonymous *pais* addressed in lines 1259ff. is not necessarily one and the same as Cyrnus, but may be a separate addressee criticized in the *Theognidea*); on the addressees in Empedocles and Lucretius, see Obbink 1993 and Mitsis 1993.

31 See the contributions of Konstan, Mitsis, and Obbink to Schiesaro, Mitsis, and Clay 1993. Clay, in the same volume, argues for a similar distinction between "greatly foolish Perses" and Hesiod's ideal listener, but she explains its purpose differently. According to Clay 1993.32–33, Hesiod reserves a deeper and more troubling truth about the world for his ideal listener than for his idiot brother.

poet, the reader has little choice."[32] The same is true, I would argue, for the audience of *Works and Days*. Here the angry tone Hesiod adopts would make it even harder for the audience to side with Perses or the kings in the debate, for if they did, they would deserve the same blame that Hesiod heaps on his brother and the kings of Ascra. This anger also allows the poet of the *Works and Days* to state quite bluntly what he has to say. Greek poets usually had to be circumspect in instructing their audiences,[33] but by adopting the voice of Hesiod, who rebukes his brother and the kings of Ascra inside the poem, the poet can state very forcefully his opinions about justice and the need to work the land. Finally, the alleged stupidity of Hesiod's internal addressees provides a rationale for the poem itself: if Perses and the kings of Ascra were as smart as Hesiod, there wouldn't be any need to instruct them.[34]

CONCLUSION

We may therefore conclude that *Works and Days* is structured like an angry speech and that it shares many characteristics with angry speeches in Homer, especially Menelaus's speech to Euphorbus at *Iliad* 17.18–32. These characteristics include an opening invocation of a god, a switch from indirect to direct address, the use of the imperfect with the particle ἄρα, insults, declarations of command (κέλομαι, κελεύω), direct gnomic addresses, and paradigmatic tales. Other speech types may share some of these features, but their combination is unique to angry speeches in Homer and to Hesiod's *Works and Days*. Hesiod's poem differs from most angry Homeric speeches in that it purports to be a public speech with multiple recipients (Perses and the kings of Ascra) and is, ultimately, a piece of literature, which

32 Obbink 1993.88, cf. Konstan 1993.13–14, Mitsis 1993.123–26. In Solon frs. 4–4c and 37, the dynamic may be different, since the internal and external in this case may overlap, although it is not impossible that Solon, like Theognis or Alcaeus, in fact performed his poems at symposia before a small group of friends whom he wished to contrast both with the Athenian *hoi polloi* and the greedy *nouveaux riches*.

33 See Lardinois 1997.229–33 on some of the indirect strategies the poets of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* adopt to instruct their audiences.

34 Cf. Konstan 1993.21. There are also, however, didactic speeches and poems addressed to smart addressees. I already mentioned the example of the "wise kings" in Hesiod *Op.* 202. Other examples are Antilochus at *Il.* 23.308–09 and Achilles in the *Cheirônos Hypothêkai* (fr. 283 Merkelbach-West).

is expanded greatly by its inclusion of several paradigmatic tales and more than one hundred *gnômai*. The poem resembles, in this respect, the wisdom texts of ancient Egypt and the Near East, and it is not unlikely that these texts provided a model for the composer of the *Works and Days* or one of his predecessors (West 1997.306–07). Other ancient Greek and Latin didactic poems, like the elegies of Solon, are also structured like angry speeches or at least contain passages in which their internal addressees are castigated. This animosity creates a distance between the internal and external addressees and all but forces the latter to accept the narrator's point of view. The wrath of Hesiod is thus highly effective in persuading the audience that Hesiod's foolish brother and the gift-devouring kings of Ascra are wrong and the poet is right.

Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, T. W. and D. B. Monro (eds.) 1912–20. *Homeri Opera I–V*. Oxford.

Anhalt, E. K. 1993. *Solon the Singer: Politics and Poetics*. Lanham, Md.

Austin, N. 1966. "The Function of Digression in the *Iliad*," *GRBS* 7.295–312.

Basso, K. 1976. "'Wise Words' of the Western Apache: Metaphor and Semantic Theory," in *Meaning in Anthropology*, eds. K. Basso and H. Selby. Albuquerque. 93–121.

Clay, J. S. 1993. "The Education of Perses: From 'Mega Nepios' to 'Dion Genos' and Back," in Schiesaro, Mitsis, and Clay 1993.23–33.

Dalfen, J. 1994. "Die ὕβρις der Nachtigall: Zu der Fabel bei Hesiod (*Erga* 202–218) und zur griechischen Fabel in allgemeinen," *WS* 107.157–77.

Denniston, J. D. [1934] 1950. *The Greek Particles,* second ed., rev. K. J. Dover. Oxford.

Detienne, M. [1967] 1996. *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece* (trans. J. Lloyd). New York.

Diller, H. 1962. *Die dichterische Form von Hesiods Erga*. Mainz.

Edmunds, S. 1990. *Homeric Nêpios*. New York.

Edwards, M. W. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. V: Books 17–20*. Cambridge.

Effe, B. 1977. *Dichtung und Lehre: Untersuchungen zur Typologie des antiken Lehrgedichts*. Munich.

Erren, M. 1990. "Die Anredestruktur im archaischen Lehrgedicht," in *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, eds. W. Kullmann and M. Reichel. Tübingen. 185–97.

Evelyn-White, H. G. 1920. "Miscellanea Hesiodea," *CQ* 14.126–31.

———. 1936. *Hesiod, Homeric Hymns, Homerica*. Cambridge, Mass.

Firth, R. 1926. "Proverbs in Native Life, with Special Reference to the Maori," *Folk-lore* 1926.134–53 and 245–70.

Griffith, M. 1983. "Personality in Hesiod," *ClAnt* 2.37–65.

Hainsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. III: Books 9–12*. Cambridge.

Hallo, W. W. (ed.) 1997. *The Context of Scripture, Vol. 1: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World.* Leiden.

Hamilton, R. 1989. *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry*. Baltimore.

Heath, M. 1985. "Hesiod's Didactic Poetry," *CQ* 35.245–63.

Higbie, C. 1990. *Enjambment and Sentence Structure in the* Iliad. Oxford.

Hubbard, T. K. 1995. "Hesiod's Fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale Reconsidered," *GRBS* 36.161–71.

Hunt, R. 1981. "Satiric Elements in Hesiod's *Works and Days*," *Helios* 8.29–40.

Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. I: Books 1–4*. Cambridge.

Konstan, D. 1993. "Foreword: To the Reader," in Schiesaro, Mitsis, and Clay 1993.11–22.

Lamberton, R. 1988. *Hesiod*. New Haven.

Lardinois, A. 1997. "Modern Paroemiology and the Use of Gnomai in Homer's *Iliad*," *CP* 92.213–34.

———. 1998. "How the Days Fit the Works in Hesiod's *Works and Days*," *AJP* 119.319–36.

Lattimore, R. (trans.) 1951. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago.

———. (trans.) 1965. *The Odyssey of Homer*. Chicago.

Leaf, W. 1902. *The Iliad, Vol. II: Books XIII–XXIV*. London.

Lohmann, D. 1970. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin.

Martin, R. P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the* Iliad. Ithaca.

———. 1992. "Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics," *Ramus* 21.11–33.

———. forthcoming. "Hesiod and the Didactic Double" in *Rhapsodia*, unpublished typescript.

Mazon, P. 1928. *Hésiode: Théogonie, Les travaux et les jours, Le bouclier*. Paris.

Minchin, E. 2002. "Speech Acts in the Everyday World and in Homer: The Rebuke as a Case Study," in *Epea and Grammata: Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece,* eds. I. Worthington and J. M. Foley. Leiden. 71–97.

Mitsis, P. 1993. "Committing Philosophy on the Reader: Didactic Coercion and Reader Autonomy in *De Rerum Natura*," in Schiesaro, Mitsis, and Clay 1993.111–28.

Munding, H. 1959. *Hesiods Erga und ihrem Verhältnis zur Ilias*. Frankfurt.

Murray, A. T. 1995. *Homer: Odyssey*, second ed., rev. G. E. Dimock. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1999. *Homer: Iliad,* second ed., rev. W. F. Wyatt. Cambridge, Mass.

Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore.

———. [1982] 1990. "Hesiod and the Poetics of Pan-Hellenism," in *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca. 36–82. [First published as "Hesiod" in *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome, Vol. 1: Homer to Caesar*, ed. T. J. Luce. New York. 43–73.]

Nelson, S. 1997. "The Justice of Zeus in Hesiod's Fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale," *CJ* 92.235–47.

Obbink, D. 1993. "The Addressees of Empedocles," in Schiesaro, Mitsis, and Clay 1993.51–98.

Pritchard, J. B. 1950. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. Princeton.

Rowe, C. J. 1983. "Archaic Thought in Hesiod," *JHS* 103.124–35.

Schiesaro, A., P. Mitsis, and J. S. Clay (eds.) 1993. *Mega Nepios: Il destinario nell' epos didascalio* (Materiali e discussioni Vol. 31). Pisa.

Schmidt, J.-U. 1986. *Adressat und Paraineseform: Zur Intention von Hesiod's "Werken und Tagen"* (Hypomnemata 84). Göttingen.

Solmsen, F. 1990. *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum*, third ed. Oxford.

Thalmann, W. G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Poetry*. Baltimore.

Todorov, T. [1975] 1990. "The Origin of Genres," in *Genres of Discourse* (trans. C. Porter). Cambridge. 13–26.

van Dijk, T. A. 1976. "Pragmatics and Poetics," in *Pragmatics of Language and Literature*, ed. T. A. van Dijk. Amsterdam. 23–57.

van Groningen, B.A. 1958. *La composition litteraire archaïque grecque* (Verhandelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.R. 65.2). Amsterdam.

Verdenius, W. J. 1962. "Aufbau und Absicht der Erga," *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 7.111–70.

———. 1985. *A Commentary on Hesiod's* Works and Days *vv. 1–382*. Leiden.

Vodoklys, E. J. 1992. *Blame-Expression in the Epic Tradition*. New York.

West, M. L. (ed.) 1978. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford.

———. (ed.) 1992. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci, Vol. II,* second ed. Oxford.

———. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.* Oxford.

———. (ed.) 1998. *Homerus Ilias, Vol. I: Rhapsodiae I–XII*. Stuttgart.