

# ΜΗΤΙΣ

Revue d'anthropologie du monde grec ancien

PHILOGIE · HISTOIRE · ARCHÉOLOGIE



## HESIOD'S TREATMENT OF WEALTH \*

The purpose of this paper is to present Hesiod's relationship and attitude to wealth and his thoughts about it. It is commonly assumed that he wrote the *Works and Days* to teach his contemporaries how to be good farmers or even sailors, and that in the *Theogony* he offered them a systematic theology.

Such a view is misleading and does not do justice to Hesiod in certain respects. First of all, Hesiod's claims to be regarded as a great poet is rejected by the majority of scholars, and secondly, whatever interest he arouses is occasional and indirect, e.g. to the extent that his works throw light on problems relating to Homer. During more recent years, since Homeric studies have concentrated on the techniques of oral composition, some philologists have turned to Hesiod to study 'Homeric' composition. So we learn that Hesiod too composed – some say wrote down – his poems using formulae and drawing from a traditional stock, like Homer. But some go even further and argue that Hesiod was so bound to his material that he could not control it, so that there are many deficiencies and gaps in his work, mainly in joining the separate parts. The lack of unity, especially in the *Works and Days*, is almost assumed by the majority of these scholars who have dealt with the question<sup>1</sup>. But I think the greater reason is on the side of the few exceptions.

---

\* This paper, though modified, in substance remains as it was delivered before the Cambridge Hellenic Society on December 11th, 1982, being a simplified form of the much larger chapter on Hesiod in my London doctoral thesis *Wealth and Society in Early Greek Literature* (1982).

I acknowledge with gratitude the encouragement of Dr. A.J. Gossage in preparing this paper and his suggestions for its improvement; he of course carries no responsibility for whatever blemishes remain.

1. E. Havelock, «Thoughtful Hesiod» (*YCS*, 20 *Homeric studies*, 1966, 59-72) p. 66 ;

Of Hesiod's works the most relevant to this matter is the *Works and Days*. Nevertheless the *Theogony* systematizes and names the cosmic powers of the universe and also some 'powers' of society. Therefore this poem is relevant, too, because wealth here is legislated for and established as a social power. Among the genealogies of the gods, indeed, in lines 969-74, Hesiod says that Demeter gave birth to Wealth after she had joined in love with Iasion

Δημήτηρ μὲν Πλοῦτον ἐγένετο διὰ θεᾶων,  
 Ἴασιῶ ἥρωι μιγεῖσ' ἐρατῇ φιλότῃ  
 νειῶ ἐνὶ τριπόλῳ, Κρήτης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ,  
 ἐσθλόν, ὃς εἶσ' ἐπὶ γῆν τε καὶ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης  
 πᾶσαν· τῷ δὲ τυχόντι καὶ οὐ κ' ἐς χεῖρας ἵκηται,  
 τὸν δ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε, πολὺν δὲ οἱ ὤπασεν ὄλβον  
 (cf. *h. Dem.* 486-9).

This is important because it is stated that Wealth is a god or a daemon (cf. *Op.* 121-6) and that he was born of the goddess of agriculture, i.e. that the first kind of wealth comes from cereal crops and that this is the kind of wealth that Hesiod stresses<sup>2</sup>. Historically the age of agricultural wealth follows that of animal farming, but in Greek theoretical thought wealth starts from agriculture. Besides, the word πλοῦτος itself is probably derived from the root of πλέω in its early meaning, 'flood' or 'abound'<sup>3</sup>. Hesychius

F. Will, «Observations on the Conflict of Art and Didacticism in Hesiod», (*SO* 37, 1961, 5-14); K. Kumaniecki, «The Structure of Hesiod's *Works and Days*», (*BICS* 10, 1963, 79-96), p. 94; P. Walcot, «The Composition of the *Works and Days*», (*REG* 74, 1961, pp. 1-19); etc.

2. Cf. G. Dindorfii, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, tom. I, p. 257 and L. Di Gregorio, *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam* (Milano, 1975), p. 119. See also M.L. West, *Hesiod Theogony*, (Oxford, 1966) *ad loc.* and N.J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, (Oxford 1974), on vv. 486-89.

3. See *LSJ*; J.B. Hoffmann, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen*, (München, 1950); H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, (Heidelberg, 1960-72) s.v.; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque* III, (Paris, 1968) p. 918. See also Hesychius s.v. πλούσιος, πλοῦτος and εὐπλοῦτον καινοῦν. The meaning of 'flood' is more explicit in the Homeric expression ῥυδὸν ἀφνειοῖο (*Od.* 15. 426) where the adverb (from ῥέω) is close to the original literal meaning of πλοῦτος. Cf. also *Il.* 2. 670: πλοῦτον κατέχευε; *Pi.Ol.* 7. 34, 49-50.

mentions that originally the word meant a surplus of cereals:

«πλοῦτον γὰρ ἔλεγον τὴν ἐκ τῶν κριθῶν καὶ τῶν πυρῶν περιουσίαν».

But this does not mean that somebody could not become rich with animal-breeding. On the contrary, when Homer calls Odysseus rich and enumerates his riches, the animal possessions are greater (*Od.* 14.99 ff). This may come from current tales about Odysseus, but in any case Hesiod himself has something to say about animal-farming.

Furthermore, to come back to the *Theogony*, the fact that Wealth was born in Crete is no doubt not only a confirmation of the fertility of Crete but also mainly a reminiscence of its development in the Minoan age and its contribution to the creation of Greek mythology. Besides, Hesiod's relationship with Crete is certain and manifold: First, through the Delphic oracle, which according to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* was established by Cretan sailors in accordance with the god's own will. Also, when they objected, because there were no fertile fields there, like those in Cnossos, the god had to bring forward an equivalent wealth but from another source. Secondly, it has been shown that many elements of Hesiodic mythology go back to the Minoan and Mycenaean period, while others were introduced into Greece during that period and were used by Hesiod<sup>4</sup>. Zeus himself was born in Crete.

Furthermore, in the same passage above, it is said that after his birth Wealth travels over land and sea and makes rich those whom he touches. From this begins, so far as we know, the popular motif of the blind Wealth<sup>5</sup>, who makes rich whom he visits; this constitutes the theme not only of the homonymous comedy of Aristophanes but also before him of some small poems of Hipponax and Timocreon. It seems that it was a traditional element, which has remained to Byzantine and modern times. But the fact itself, that Wealth travels over land and sea and makes wealthy whom he touches, must obviously suggest that besides the land even the

4. Cf. J.E. Harrison, *Prolegomena*<sup>2</sup>, (Cambridge, 1908) (repr.), pp. 565ff; G. Thomson, *The First Philosophers*, (London, 1977), pp. 137ff; L.R. Palmer, *Mycenaeans and Minoans*, (London, 1961), pp. 109, 225; W.K.C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, (London, 1968), p. 282; M. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion*, (Oxford, 1949), p. 24.

5. Cf. Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.* 2. 146); Timocreon 731 P.; Hipponax 36 W.; Ar. *Pl.* 90; Tzetzes' sch. p. 30 b 1, (Positano); R.F. Willets, *Blind Wealth and Aristophanes*, (Inaug. Lect., Birmingham, 1970).

sea may produce wealth. And this is another reminiscence of Crete, because wealth from the sea is exactly the chief characteristic of Cretan-Mycenaean civilization. It is well known that the Mycenaean empire declined when it lost the commercial control over East Mediterranean, on which the wealth of «much-golden Mycenae» was mainly based. On the other hand we must consider that Hesiod keeps in mind his own historical time. It is exactly the period in which Hellenism was emerging from the so-called Dark Age and started trade and the second wave of colonization, the two new means of making wealth. Hesiod's father himself left Cyme of Aeolis in Asia Minor because of poverty (*Op.* 638) and settled himself at Ascra in Boeotia, near Thespieae, when the rest of his compatriots sailed to the West. We can say, therefore, that when Hesiod makes Wealth travel over the sea he recognizes the importance of the sea and trade for achieving wealth, although he confesses that they are a necessity because the people of a prosperous land do not sail to win a livelihood (*Op.* 236-7).

All this constitutes in a sense the sociological and conceptual background of the *Works and Days*. How much the two poems are connected is clear not only from external criteria, such as meaning, but also from the form of the poem. After a short but very important proem, the *Works and Days* introduces the theme, and explains the motive of the poem (vv. 11-39): «There is not only one kind of Eris as now I realize but two». This shows the poem's relationship with the *Theogony*, in which the poet, among the other children of Night, such as *Fraud* and *Old Age*, includes also the hard-hearted *Strife*. So in the *Works and Days* the poet corrects and develops the other poem<sup>6</sup>. He says that one *Strife* is bad and the other good, that the former causes wars and that people honour her because of necessity: that is, hating one another or quarreling with one another is an aspect of life that has been imposed upon mankind by the gods. Homer also had personified *Strife* (i.e. the bad one) and had connected her with war or the powers she stands for (*Phobos*, *Kydoimos*). But Hesiod's source is not only literature. He is also inspired from life, in which his brother *Perses* is a follower of this *Strife*, because his dispute with his brother over their patrimony gave him the motive for the poem. Hesiod informs us that they had divided their patrimony but it seems that *Perses* laid

---

6. It is generally accepted that *Theogony* is earlier. Besides M.L. West, *Hesiod Theogony*, pp. 45ff, argues that «the *Theogony* may well be the oldest poem we have» and H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1973), p. 173. note 44, seems to accept West's arguments. But the view of these scholars contrasts with the generally accepted one.

claim to his brother's share and Hesiod tries to save it<sup>7</sup>. But the poem does not have such a narrow perspective. As happens with good poetry the poet goes from the particular to the general, with such artistry that many times one is lost sight of inside the other, which, in my opinion, explains the lack of unity which the critics often discover. Hesiod is protesting not only that their paternal lot has been divided, but also that Perses bribes the 'kings' who are going to judge the case. It must be stated that of the privileges of the patriarchal kingship the 'king' in Hesiod keeps the judicial right. This concerns the nobles. Aristocracy appears already in the *Odyssey*, especially, in the case of Ithaca with the suitors, and it characterizes no doubt Hesiod's age. But while the bad Strife's job is to make people aim at what belongs to others and to cause civil wars because of accumulated injustice, there is on the other hand the alternative way of the good Strife, on which the message of the *Works and Days* is built up. The two Erides represent the good and bad aspects of competitiveness, the bad being represented by Perses and the good by the poet. Good Strife moves both the poor to work and every one in his particular trade to compete with others whom he sees to be rich and successful. So she helps man οἰκόν τ' εὖ θέσθαι – a concept which includes the seeds of economy in its modern sense (cf. Xen. *Oec.* 1.2f5).

After introducing his theme, or rather simultaneously with it, Hesiod goes on to the general theme in which the social, political and philosophical value of the poem lies. The 'kings' who are going to judge the case are called δωροφάγοι – Homer speaks of δημοβόροι – and it means those who receive gifts i.e. bribes («bribe-devouring or swallowing kings» ; cf. fr. 361). This shows how the system of administering justice had been undermined. The aristocratic judges judged according to their own or their own class's interests and in accordance with their favour and so they oppressed the people<sup>8</sup>. Justice was based on a system of principles called δίκαι, that is a kind of unwritten corpus going back to the clans and families and transferred from king to king. That the *Works and Days* is a speech in court is a

7. Cf. M.S. Jensen, «Tradition and Individuality in Hesiod's *Works and Days*» (*Cl. Med.* 27, 1966, pp. 1-27) pp. 6, 8, 9 ; P.B.R. Forbes, «Hesiod versus Perses», (*CIR* 64, 1950, pp. 82-7) p. 83. Contra J.F. Latimer, «Perses versus Hesiod», (*TAPA* 61, 1930, pp. 70-9), p. 77 ; P. Walcot, «Hesiod and the Law», (*SO* 38, 1963, pp. 5-21), pp. 10, 20-1.

8. Cf. A.R. Burn, *The World of Hesiod, A Study of the Middle Ages 900-700 B.C.*, (London, 1936), p. 109 ; H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, (trans. by M. Hadas-J. Willis, Oxford, 1975), pp. 113-4 ; A.A. Trever, «The Age of Hesiod: A Study in Economic History», (*CPh* 19, 1924, pp. 157-68) ; etc.

misunderstanding due, in my opinion, to the double, or multiple, meaning of the word δίκη, which sometimes is quite difficult to distinguish completely. The transition to the general occurs with a couplet which causes *much trouble: immediately after the characterization δωροφάγοι Hesiod says that the kings are fools, «because they do not know how much more the half is than the whole, nor what great advantage there is in mallow and asphodel» (Op. 40-41).*

These phrases are proverbial. The first reminds us of the English «a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush» or the modern Greek «five in hand is better than ten that you wait for», while mallow and asphodel are examples of the cheapest and most frugal food. The general meaning is that something little or poor is more and better than the whole and the best which are unattainable. The problem is, which is the half-something which is not stated? The answer depends on the interpretation one offers of the *Works and Days*. But the problem becomes even more difficult from what follows: that the gods have hidden βίος, i.e. livelihood, from the people so that while previously one day's work was sufficient for one to live a whole year, without being obliged to plough or to sail, now men are obliged to toil because Zeus hid their livelihood when he became angry against Prometheus because the latter deceived him and so he decided to send men toils and sorrows. The deceit Prometheus made (though in the *Theogony* for purposes serving that poem the explanation was different) was that he stole fire and gave it to men. And the evil for the good (κακὸν ἀντὶ καλοῦ) Zeus decided to send to man was Pandore<sup>9</sup>, (The All-endowed), so called because all the gods contributed to her qualities: Aphrodite offered charm, Hermes a crafty and deceitful mind and Athene skill in weaving. The ambiguous sense of Pandora's name may suggest that she not only received gifts but she also bestowed some kind of a 'gift' on mankind (cf. πολύδωρος, *Od.* 24. 294, *Il.* 22. 83, 6. 394 and scholia *ad loc.*; Sappho fr. 44. 8 ff Lobel-Page). Before Pandore came there was a paradisaical life without toils and diseases, but the evil she caused directly was that she opened the jar which contained the evils and these spread over the earth. But she put the cover on in time and so Hope remained in. Does this mean that Hope is evil? She is both good and evil, like Strife. And this is important for Hesiod's thought. She is bad when hope is empty and aims at big things

9. See J.-P. Vernant, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, (transl. J. Lloyd, N. Jersey, 1980), pp. 168ff; *Id. Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs* (Paris; Greek translation by S. Georgoudi, Athens, 1975), pp. 43ff, 64ff; P. Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*, (Baltimore and London, 1977), pp. 97-8.

without proper preparation, so that she has an eye on what belongs to others, and she is good when hope constitutes the motive of men's right activities. An ancient proverb says that «the farmer always is rich next year» (Zenobius 2. 43). If we consider that Hesiod addressed farmers of some substance or even rich ones (something like the ζευγῖται in Attica<sup>10</sup>) and that generally every action from its own nature refers to the future like hope, then we understand his social and political purpose. His audience and all mankind in general must be motivated by the good Hope in order to obtain wealth and to avoid the nobles' oppression. Otherwise, Hesiod says, without work and accompanied by the evil Hope (and Strife) they will meet poverty (*Op.* 498 ff).

The purpose of the story of Prometheus and Pandora is to found socially, philosophically and politically the necessity of work. Once upon a time mankind lived with least work. Later on Zeus made the means of life scarce and brought to mankind as punishment toils and work. But at least fire, and whatever it may produce, and Hope, which if used properly with work and the good strife may reduce by a half the loss of the previous paradisiacal life, stayed with mankind. So as explaining a pre-existing condition, the myth of Pandora and Prometheus is aetiological. But also the hiding of the means of life absolves the divine from responsibility for the difficulties of life and makes man 'violate' nature with work and the technological means available in order to discover and win his livelihood. God as sovereign of nature and life becomes the cashier of man's efforts; men will uncover the hidden livelihood – another picture taken from agriculture. Work must redeem its value and 'liberate' production (i.e. make it generally possible), circulate wealth and keep a balance between labour and reward<sup>11</sup>. But in the Prometheus myth, the evils which have been spread over the earth, the fall of the paradisiacal state, and the hiding of life are clear attitudes of a guilt-culture.

The next section (vv. 106-201) is the tale of the five ages which begins disjunctively: «or, if you will, I will develop for you with clarity, well and skillfully another speech, and you keep it in your mind, how the gods and mortal men sprang from the same source». I do not propose here, as with

10. Cf. *Op.* 436-7, 405, 607; Ch. G. Starr, *The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800-500 B.C.* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1977), p. 126; J. Hemelrijk, *Πενία εν Πλοῦτος*, Utrecht, 1925, (repr.), p. 53; G.E.M. de Sainte-Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, (London, 1981), p. 278.

11. Cf. *Τῶν πόνων πολοῦσιν ἡμῖν πάντα τὰγάθ'* οἱ θεοί, Epicharmus B. 36 D-K; Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.28.

the previous tale, to deal with the mythological and social problems related to this tale<sup>12</sup>. The ages are named from the metals and their significance corresponds to the metals' values. Iron gives its name to the fifth generation, but this does not mean that iron as a metal, especially in agriculture, is not valuable, but refers mainly to the ambiguity of iron as such: it gives not only agricultural equipments but also weapons. And the ambiguity of the fifth generation, Hesiod's own time, is given. The unjust πόλις of the real life of the fifth generation is the same condition as the 'literary' fifth generation. The just and prosperous πόλις resembles the golden paradisiacal state. The golden race enjoyed the goods that the earth produced, and when they went away they became δαίμονες πλουτοδότηι, who supervise the goods that the land produces for mankind. For the golden race earth unforced bore fruit abundantly and without stint (ἄφθονον). "Ἀφθονος occurs for the first time here<sup>13</sup>. That means that once upon a time the gods used to give to mankind all good things without envy, but later on they became envious of abundance. This brings us back again to an attitude of guilt-culture and to the hiding of the means of life: there was a time when the gods did not feel envy, and therefore goods were plentiful (paradisiacal state); but the gods hid the livelihood because of their envy and now men have to work. The golden race became daimons (122ff), but we must keep in mind that Wealth himself is a daimon. They shared this duty of giving wealth with Demeter and (Plouton) Zeus Chthonios.

Furthermore, the silver γένος represents those men who, from shunning work, come to hunger and depend for their subsistence on others. The bronze γένος represents those violent men who seize others' goods. The

12. See e.g. G. L. Snider, *The Myth of Pandora in Hesiod*, (Diss., summary in *HSPH* 75, 1971, pp. 221-2) ; F. C. Phillips, «Narrative Compression and the Myths of Prometheus in Hesiod», (*CJ* 68, 1973, pp. 289-305) ; K. von Fritz, «Pandora, Prometheus and the Myth of the Ages», (*Rev. of Rel.* 11, 1946-7, pp. 227-60) ; J.-P. Vernant, *Mythe et pensée*, pp. 29ff, 57ff ; P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East*, (Cardiff 1966) *passim* ; M. L. West, *Hesiod, Works and Days*, (Oxford 1980), pp. 174ff ; and also the H. C. Baldry and T. J. Griffiths's controversy over the invention of five races ; P. M. Smith, «History and the Individual in Hesiod's Myth of Five Races», (*CW*, 74, 1980, pp. 145-63) ; T. G. Rosenmeyer, «Hesiod and Historiography», (*Hermes* 85, 1957, pp. 257-85) ; D. J. Stewart, «Hesiod and History» (*BR* 18, 1970, pp. 37-52), etc. and J. Fontenrose's important paper «Work, Justice and Hesiod's Five Ages», (*CPh* 69, 1974, pp. 1-16).

13. Cf. *H. Hom.* 30, vv. 8, 16 ; *Od.* 18. 16. On φθόνος see P. Walcot, *Envy and the Greeks*, (Warminster, 1978) ; E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1971), pp. 30ff ; H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus*, pp. 56ff ; J. L. Myres (*CIR* 51, 1937, pp. 163-4).

first and second generations are semi-divine, while with the third human history begins. The two first generations do not work, the third one, at least, should do (v. 146). As for the heroic generation, there are many allusions to their relationship with the earth and work (*Op.* 172ff, 160, 157; 158ff). For the happy heroes the grain-giving earth bears honey-sweet fruit flourishing three times a year. The third generation has ὕβρις in common with the fifth one (*Op.* 146; 190ff). The third, fourth and fifth generations have war in common (152, 161ff, 189 unbracketed).

So from a natural golden age man gradually declines to lesser ages, whereas according to Protagoras' optimistic myth (Plato, *Prot.* 320 c ff) man starts with a primitive nature and progresses towards better stages of civilization. Nevertheless the deterioration expressed in the first myth is not perpetual. The decision must be taken by the present iron age, which is worse than the first, but also can be better through the abilities that men possess. Hesiod accepts reality as it is, worse than the common origin of men and gods (v. 108, unbracketed) would suggest, but perhaps better than the bronze and certainly similar to the golden and heroic generations, given certain presuppositions. Hesiod's interpretation is half-way between optimistic and pessimistic acceptance of human civilization, that «between two evils one must choose the lesser». Gold is more valuable than iron but iron itself is precious. The phrase «would that I were not among the men of the fifth generation» (174-5) corresponds to the state of affairs described in 182ff, 238ff, 270ff; the phrase «but either had died before» (175) to the good past (golden, silver, heroes); the phrase «or been born afterwards» (*ib.*), to the vision of a prosperous πόλις which is going to materialize with the presupposition of justice. The fusion of myth into reality is noticeable: when one has felt the desperate condition of the iron generation – «and there will be no help against evil» (201) – at the point midway between the tale of the hawk and nightingale and the section on Dike – the fictitious human life enters into actual life and reality, with the certain conviction that δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει (217). Therefore the tale of the five ages goes from the paradisaical life without evils and toils (the 'pre-Pandora' condition and the golden age) to the age of labour, strife, good or bad, and Hope, good or bad, and kneads together, or rather fuses one into another, the previous into the next.

The following section is on δίκη and injustice and their results. It is about the tale of the hawk and the nightingale and the vision of the just and unjust πόλις (202ff, 213ff, 225ff, 238ff, and 248-85). Addressing the kings – «now I will tell a fable for kings» – Hesiod relates what a hawk said to a nightingale when he carried her high up among the clouds, gripped in his

talons. The hawk says that «he is a fool who tries to withstand the stronger, for he does not get the mastery and suffers pain besides his shame» (trans. Evelyn-White). Who is which occupies scholars in this parable<sup>14</sup>. I follow the more recent and less common interpretation, which sees in this tale the «might is right» theory (generally accepted), πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε, but suggests that the hawk is not the kings, but Zeus, and the nightingale is not Hesiod (as commonly accepted) but the kings. The difficulty arises from the generalization of the particular. In Hesiod's real judicial position it seems that he is in the talons of the «bribe-devouring kings» (hawk), but granted that Hesiod no doubt generalizes his personal social oppression, he seems to say that finally the kings are gripped inevitably in the hawk-Zeus' talons.

Another difficulty is connected with the meaning of δίκη. Whatever its original meaning may be<sup>15</sup>, it came to mean a *corpus* of oral, legal rules which the judges, the kings, used in trials. These rules were learned by successive generations orally. Memory was an essential faculty for an early judge. Mnemosyne (:Memory) is the mother of the Muses in Hesiod and he describes the benefits which the Muses confer on kings. In Gortys, indeed, the κῶσμοι, helped by the μνήμονες, judge cases of common law. In the trial scene of the Homeric shield (*Il.* 18.497ff) the judge is called ἴστωρ. A king as well as a poet might invoke Mnemosyne to aid his memory. This is why the Muses are important to Hesiod's judge-kings.

Another reason which has made scholars identify Hesiod with the nightingale is that she is called ἄοιδός. But in fact we can reverse the argument if we consider the above relationship between Muses and kings. A poet is related to the Muses (ἄοιδός) but also a king has to have a good memory

14. On the tale of the hawk and nightingale and *dike* see: M. Gagarin, «Dike in the *Works and Days*», (*CPh* 68, 1973, pp. 81-94) ; *Id.*, «Dike in Archaic Greek Thought», (*CPh* 69, 1974, pp. 186-97) ; C.B. Welles, «Hesiod's Attitude toward Labor», (*GRBS* 8, 1967, pp. 5-23) ; V. A. Rodgers, «Some Thoughts on *Dike*», (*CQ* 21, 1971, pp. 289-301) ; C.R. Roth, «The Kings and the Muses in Hesiod's *Theogony*», (*TAPA* 106, 1973, pp. 331-38) ; M.W. Dickie, «Δίκη as a moral term in Homer and Hesiod», (*CPh* 73, 1978, pp. 91-101) ; D.B. Claus, «Defining moral terms in *Works and Days*», (*TAPA* 107, 1977, pp. 73-84) ; G. B. Ford, Jr., «An Interpretation of the fable of the hawk and nightingale in Hesiod's *Works and Days*», (*Orpheus* 12, 1965, pp. 3-9) ; H.T. Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History*, (Oxford 1958), p. 12 ; H. Frisch, *Might and Right in Antiquity*, (transl. C.C. Martindale, Copenhagen, 1949), p. 11 ; M.S. Jensen, *art. cit.*, pp. 20-22 ; etc.

15. See esp. L. Palmer, «The Indo-European Origins of Greek Justice» (*Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1950, pp. 149-68) ; Pucci, *op.cit.*, pp. 46, 50ff ; Gagarin, *op.cit.*, P. Chantraine, *Dict. Étym. Langue Grecque* I, (Paris, 1968), s.v.

(:Mnemosyne). And besides, we must add that the hawk is the symbol of Zeus – and there is no way to escape the will of Zeus (*Op.* 105), just as the nightingale cannot escape the hawk's talons (see also below).

The parable refers not only to the kings; it is also applied to Perses, and straight after apostrophizing him Hesiod says: «But you, Perses, listen to δίκη and do not foster ὕβρις; for ὕβρις is bad for a poor man and not even a rich man can easily bear its burden, because he is weighed down, by reason of ὕβρις, when he has fallen into ἄτη. But there is a better way to go towards the δίκη; because finally δίκη prevails over ὕβρις; and when one has suffered he learns» (*Op.* 213-8). Here δίκη mainly is justice, but by reason of its ambiguity it also denotes: 'trial', 'what was due to' Perses (his share of the patrimony) and 'verdict'. Accordingly, ὕβρις is injustice and all the means Perses is prone to use in order to win the trial (e.g. bribe). Ὑβρις is bad for a poor man because it makes him spend his goods and so empty his store-room (cf. ἐφόρεις, v. 38 and vv. 31-4 and the empty hope). Tragedy later will show explicitly how an ἐσθλός, noble, is weighed down when he lights upon ἄτη, ἄτη, being both the fawning infatuation and the ruin resulting from it, just as the well-known tripartite doctrine κόρος-ὕβρις-ἄτη in Aeschylus (esp. *Pers.* 820-22) must be modified κόρος-ἄτη-ὕβρις-ἄτη. The δειλός βροτός is equivalent to *Op.* 31 and the opposite must be equivalent to ἐσθλός. A δειλός man's ὕβρις (e.g. in the tale of the Erides) is disputes and strifes (v. 33) or fraud, robbery, deception (321 ff).

Nevertheless, both a man of inferior and one of superior status, kings and common people, belong to the iron age, which is the claws of inevitable forces, so that, even though the former are stronger, they have to take care not to fall into ὕβρις. The rich men are inclined to ὕβρις by their arrogance and brazenness. Injustice is a sort of luxury that only those who have a more stable means of livelihood can afford; but not even (οὐδέ, 214) the kings can escape the consequences of their unjust actions. Certainly the poor cannot. But not even the kings are without obligations. As δίκη δμῶων (*Od.* 14.59) and δίκη μνηστήρων (*Od.* 18.275) mean 'proper behaviour', so Hesiod implies\* δίκη βασιλῆων in the tale of the hawk and nightingale with the same meaning: 'proper behaviour', and then 'due right' – not what is due to them but what they owe to the people before Zeus.

This may be more explicit. The fable is addressed to the princes (202); and when Δίκη is violated by the bribe-devouring princes, she brings mischief to men (220-4); also, the princes are again warned to «mark well this δίκη» (248-9; cf. also 39, 269). But since, in my opinion, this δίκη goes back to the fable, it means 'the kings' job', δίκη βασιλῆων, and therefore

what the kings owe to the people.

Certainly the poor will be punished for their ὕβρις, e.g. by the nobles. The kings will be punished by the Zeus-hawk. A continued injustice causes disasters – this is what experience suggests (cf. *Il.* 16.384 ff; *Od.* 19,107ff, or Agamemnon's case in the first book of the *Iliad*), Hesiod seems to say. The prosperous just πόλις or the unjust disastrous πόλις continues this opinion. In the unjust πόλις the earth, since wealth has been put under the gods' approval, becomes sterile and hunger kills men. The kings' responsibility for men's prosperity is very great. Therefore, through the tale of the hawk and the nightingale, the 'half', that which is little and inferior in comparison with the perfect, and which is better than the whole or the perfect, namely than the paradisaical way of life which has been lost inevitably, is to practise δίκη and judge in accordance with it. Since man's participation in the divine prosperity has been lost, Perses must be satisfied with what the iron age can supply to him.

The δίκη-section constitutes one of the most important parts for the philosophical foundation of the *Works and Days*, so that many scholars are misled and take it as the main topic of the poem, while in fact it is a means to Hesiod's purpose. Such critics disconnect the section from what precedes and follows, probably because of the inflexibility of the language inherent in the formulaic material. Nevertheless, Hesiod dwells on δίκη or Δίκη. Regarding the alternative interpretations of the last words, that is whether δίκη is a process or a principle, though a disputed matter, I think those who have seen Hesiod to have transformed justice from a concrete descriptive term into an abstract universal concept and principle of justice or right, or into a match between the forces of heaven and earth, are right, because the *Works and Days* must be conceived in connection with the *Theogony*. And, as in Anaximander «the τίσις of one thing constituted the ἀδικία of another... this, too, is exemplified in the *Theogony* where the offspring becomes guilty as he inflicts deserved punishment upon his father»<sup>16</sup>. If Hesiod rationalizes the natural powers, he does not close his eyes to social conditions. As in the *Theogony* the victory of Zeus over Kronos terminates the cycle of ἀδικία, so in the *Works and Days* Zeus is the protector of justice. In his presence τίσις is determined; here lies the 'solution' of the disturbed order (cf. all the proem and Zeus' omnipotence in the poem).

16. P. Seligman, *The 'apeiron' of Anaximander : a Study in the origin and function of metaphysical ideas* (Westport, 1974), p. 104.

At any rate δίκη is the means of achieving what Hesiod has in mind. Straight after the δίκη-section, once more apostrophizing his brother Hesiod says: «Having ἐσθλά in mind I will speak to you, foolish Perses» (236). And it is said that the *Works and Days* gather together different topics! The poet is willing to teach. He said it in v. 10: «I will tell of true things»; v. 27 «lay up these things in your heart»; v. 106; v. 202; vv. 274-5; v.286; vv. 293 ff and esp. 298; v. 648; etc. Hesiod wants to teach; but what? Verse 286 is, I think, the turning point of the poem. And though from the beginning he wants to teach, initially Hesiod builds up the presuppositions of his message. With v. 286 he turns to the general purpose and from v. 383 he goes on to the particular, practical advice for the farmer and the sailor, and the day's jobs that must be done. In fact all the *Works and Days* may be seen as a development of strife, evil and good. The former part (vv. 27-285) emphasizes rather the negative results, i.e. the evil strife, and the latter rather the positive aspects, i.e. the good strife. But in both parts polarity is a mode of Hesiod's thought, since he speaks of both the prosperous and the unprosperous πόλις, of the way towards δίκαια, and of oppression, and in the second part, of labour and idleness, of hunger and full store-rooms, of blessings and disasters, if one acts in this or that way.

In a strict sequence, therefore, if we follow rightly Hesiod's thread of thought, before passing on the practical advice, how one can obtain prosperity, he says programmatically what prosperity itself is. The ἐσθλά of v. 286 is the ἐτήτυμα of v. 10: «κακότης can be got easily and in abundance, because the road to it is smooth and it lives very near us; but the immortal gods have placed sweat before ἀρετή; and the path to it is long and steep and rough at first; but once a man has reached the top, then it becomes easy, though before it was hard» (287-92). Accustomed to the later myth of Arete and Vice (Xen. *Memor.* B.I. 21ff) and the later meaning of the words, most scholars see here a moral sense. Simonides modifies the words according to his own mind (fr. 519). Once the particularization of ἀρετή started, already in Homer (cf. ἀγαθός at shouting) – and it was continued with the lyric age – Hesiod too, takes from what ἀρετή meant in Homer what accords with his own mind and message. Ἀρετή mainly denotes material success. It is what enables a man to be a successful farmer, to avoid famine, to stand superior in society and to have material prosperity. The sweat before ἀρετή is the sweat of labour for wealth. The previous ἀγαθός, at least in the *Iliad*, was rich and brave. The suitors were rich but not brave in the *Odyssey*. In the *Works and Days* the ἀγαθός is only rich, or rather one who must be rich. Here the ἀγαθός is 'virtually', in Homer he had been 'completed', i.e. he was 'in actuality'. The contrast with κακότης

makes it, I think, quite clear, since in Homer though *κακός* means also ugly, it mainly denotes poor or low-born and is clearly a class-term (cf. *Od.* 2. 10ff, 4. 63-4, 18.125-8, 217-8 etc; Arist. *Pol.* 1294a21f). Therefore, poverty is easy to obtain, the road to it is smooth, as idleness and the evil strife and the empty hope's way of life is. Poverty is next door neighbour, because this is the normal position of the free farmers until the age Hesiod is speaking about. But it is clear from many passages of Hesiod that during the eighth and seventh century a mobilization of society occurs and the free farmers start becoming more independent.

But Hesiod dwells on preliminary terms, which constitute the consciousness of the new social and political possibilities. If one has realized all things, i.e. first of all the lesson on *ἀρετή* and *κακότης*, and generally has grasped the new conditions, he is *πανάριστος*. *Ἄριστος* of course is the extreme quality of *ἀγαθός*, but Hesiod now coins the new superlative *πανάριστος*, obviously for the sake of his surrounding possibilities and realities. Also he who listens to a good adviser is an *ἔσθλός*. The relationship between Perses and Hesiod is obvious. But he who neither thinks for himself nor keeps in mind what another advises him, is an *ἀχρεῖος* man. *Πανάριστος* and *ἔσθλός* are moral terms just to the extent that they express a code. Actually, they are used in the traditional Homeric sense, that is, they are social terms. *Ἀχρεῖος* makes it explicit in another way, since it is a completely material term expressing the very real activities of an existing reality (293-7). It is the man who does not labour and has not realized or does not understand what is taking place on the scene of history.

Therefore Hesiod's role, but also every poet's (for poetry's mission was always social and political, i.e. in the service of society) is to enlighten his audience. And Hesiod is fully aware of this social mission. He says in the *Theogony* that when he was shepherding his lambs the Muses said to him «we know how to speak many false things as though they were true; but we know, when we will, to utter true things» (27-8; Evelyn-White) and that they gave him a sceptre. This is the first passage in European literature in which a poet directly is mentioned. To say that the Muses inspire a poet is a metaphor for us, but for ancient peoples it was a proper expression. Homer also means it thus when he is addressing the Muses<sup>17</sup>. But in Hesiod this saying becomes a descriptive and dramatic expression: we see Hesiod

17. Cf. E. Havelock, *Preface to Plato* (: A History of Greek Mind, I) (Oxford, 1963), pp. 97-114; F.M. Cornford, *Principium Sapientiae* (Cambridge 1952), pp. 104-5; cf. W. Minton, «Invocation and Catalogue in Hesiod and Homer», (*TAPA*, 93, 1962, pp. 188-212); P. Murray, «Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece», (*JHS* 101, 1981, pp. 87-100).

receiving a sceptre from the Muses – and he had some reasons: a sceptre is the symbol of royal authority and legality and it was held by the speakers in the councils of the Homeric epics. Thersites in the *Iliad* was maltreated by Odysseus because he spoke without having the sceptre. Therefore, in saying that the Muses handed him the sceptre, Hesiod means that he has the legal authority to say what he is going to, with the same authority as that with which the kings holding their sceptres spoke their decisions and verdicts. The Muses, daughters of Mnemosyne (Memory) help both the kings to remember the δίκαι and poets to organise their material<sup>18</sup>. Of all the Muses Calliope stands more obviously than any of the others for the two-fold gift, that of poetry and the dispensation of justice (cf. *Th.* 79 ff). The word Hesiodos itself means «he who emits the voice». And the Muses' saying that they say false things but know, if they will, how to utter true things constitutes not only a criticism of previous poets, including Homer, who sang of the heroes and the nobles, but also a declaration that this poet does not belong to the same class as such poets and that he will speak of truth. So Hesiod founds mythologically and philosophically, though with traditional material, his mission as a poet. In the proem of the *Works and Days* Hesiod says that with the Muses' inspiration and under Zeus' omnipotence he will say the truth to Perses. Zeus' authority plays an important role in the new society Hesiod wishes to establish. Heaven's peace and good-order, with Zeus' predominance, must prevail over the earth, too. Furthermore, Hesiod's claim about his inspiration (*Th.* 31-2, cf. 38) on the one hand foreshadows the context of the *Theogony* (πρό τ' ἔδοντα) and on the other hand foretells the content of the *Works and Days* (ἔσσομενα), at least in so far as the poet maintains his essential identity over a period of time. We can now say that the ἐτήτυμα (*Op.* 10), the true things (*Th.* 28), and ἐσθλά (*Op.* 286) are the same thing and that this something is the justified occupation of the πανάριστος (*Op.* 293) or that of the ἐσθλός (*Op.* 295), that is the ἐφετηῆ which follows (*Op.* 298). The «true things» is the meaning or the message itself of the *Works and Days*, i.e. that Perses and every body else must follow the good Strife (competition), to act in accordance with δίκη and to labour so as to become rich and be liberated from the aristocracy's oppression. Throughout the *Works and Days* the matter at issue is how the farmer can become rich with the further point of being freed economically and politically from the nobles.

And this message is presented in a skillful way: by means of on the one

---

18. Cf. C.R. Roth, *op.cit.*, p. 337 and *passim*.

hand the poet's, and on the other hand the kings' relationship to the Muses, Hesiod substitutes himself for the kings, dresses his 'truth' with their prestige and legality, and puts it under the same authority, from which they were drawing their own authority, i.e. Zeus.

Therefore, after establishing his theme philosophically and ethically with the tale of the five ages and the δίκη-section and completing his apostrophe (286ff) or his new proem (293ff), in a strict continuity not only from the preceding verses but also with the whole poem, Hesiod goes on to the particular:

ἀλλ᾽ σὺ γ' ἡμετέρης μεμνημένος αἰὲν ἐφετμῆς  
ἐργάζεο, Πέρση, δῖον γένος

(*Op.* 298-9)

Ἐφετμή must be connected with the 'true things' and to what Hesiod was initially planning to say (*Op.* 10), and δῖον γένος must be understood literally, that is, coming from Zeus, just as gods and mortals sprang from the one source (*Op.* 108). Hesiod keeps in mind the tale of the five races; Perses and everybody else belongs to the race coming from Zeus but also to the vivid reality of the fifth race and so he has to work. So in starting the particular advice on work Hesiod reminds us of the fifth race and its inevitable necessity for work.

In the following lines (299-327) Hesiod argues with regard to labour and the wealth coming from it in a sort of general prologue to the particular advice given at each stage of agricultural or seafaring wealth. In fact they develop vv. 27ff, as vv. 392ff do. These arguments are expressed epigrammatically: «Work, Perses, that Hunger may love you and fill your store-room with food. Hunger is a good comrade for the idle. Besides, both gods and men are angry with a man who lives idly, like the drones who waste the labour of the bees, eating without working. But you must order your work properly, that your barns may be full of goods in the right season. Men become rich through work. The man who works is loved by the gods. Work is not a disgrace, it is idleness which is a disgrace. If you work, the idle will compete with you, as you grow rich, because fame and ἄρετή follow wealth whatever your lot is; work is best for you, if you take away your mind from other men's property. An evil shame is the needy man's companion; shame harms or prospers a man; shame is connected with property, confidence with wealth...» (Evelyn-White's translation with some alterations).

Here again the themes of the proem (in a wider sense, 1-41) are re-

peated: hunger and Demeter, idleness, competition, injustice (320ff), the relationship with the gods and the gods' omnipotence (303, 309, 325-6). The comparison with the drones has been used in the *Theogony*, too (594ff). But there women are compared with the drones, because they eat men's labour<sup>19</sup>. Here it is Perses and everybody else, like the nobles who exploit other men's work. In both cases the idea of productivity and economic activities forms the background to the thought. And though the above ideas appear to us almost obvious, some of them are revolutionary for the poet's epoch. Earning a livelihood by work is an almost obvious necessity, since mankind has been established in a permanent place, but when the poet claims, regarding one's own work,

ἐξ ἔργων δ' ἄνδρες πολύμηλοι τ' ἀφνειοί τε

(*Op.* 308)

this is surely a revolutionary declaration, because kingship or aristocracy still existed and some would have worked and others would have enjoyed the fruits of their labour, unless there was a social mobility, which might allow small landowners and free farmers to obtain wealth, and Hesiod had his sure purposes. Besides, though at no time in Greek history has manual work as such been regarded as degrading, but only that kind of work which the non-moneyed class has to perform in order to earn its livelihood and which therefore leads to all sorts of social dependence or intellectual limitedness<sup>20</sup>, and though the *Works and Days* is not a eulogy of labour as such, Hesiod has to deliver it from disgrace (*Op.* 311). The paradisaical time without work has been inevitably lost, but at least let freedom not be lost. Labour is a means of wealth and freedom of the class that Hesiod is addressing. Furthermore, to say that

19. See also Xen. *Oec.* 7.10ff, 22 ; 8 *passim*. L.S. Sussman, «Workers and drones. Labor, idleness and gentler definition in Hesiod's beehive», (*Arethusa* 11, 1978, pp. 27-41) ; G. Nussbaum, «Labour and status in the *Works and Days*», (*CQ* n.s. 10, 1960, pp. 213-20).

20. See also Arist. *Rhet.* 1367a 32 ; Xen. *Mem.* 2.8.1-5 ; J. Hemelrijk, *Περί εν Πλοῦτος*, pp. 66, 13ff ; C. Mossé, *The Ancient World at Work*, (London, 1969), pp. 27-8 ; M. Finley, *The Ancient Economy*, (London, 1975), p. 41 ; *Id.* *The World of Odysseus*, (London, 1977<sup>2</sup>), p. 71 ; G.E.M. de Ste Croix, *Class Struggle*, pp. 116-7 ; M.M. Austin & P. Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece*, (London, 1977), pp. 14ff ; H. Bolkestein, *Economic Life in Greece's Golden Age*, (Leiden, 1958), p. 72.

πλούτῳ δ' ἀρετὴ καὶ κύρος ὀπηδεῖ

(*Op.* 313)

is rather a reverse of conditions existing in the Homeric epics, which I think leaves no room to those who deny Hesiod's social purposes, since the poet claims that he who will gain wealth by his labour gains the prestige and the glory (ἀρετὴ) of those who have wealth hereditarily as nobles. So he suggests what in fact took place about a century later and regarding which Theognis protested so strongly. That is, Hesiod counsels his audience to obtain wealth so as to obtain what those who were rich enjoyed, a social and political standing. Later on, people who used to be κακοί, poor, became ἀγαθοί, rich, and those who were ἀγαθοί, became κακοί, as Theognis laments. Furthermore, repudiating pre-existing notions and so adapting them to his own purposes, Hesiod emphasizes the ambivalent αἰδῶς (317-9)<sup>21</sup> that it may harm or prosper a man. The shame which people think of as virtue (v. 317) is in fact with poverty (v. 319) and so it harms men (v. 318). Confidence is virtue because it goes with wealth (v. 319) and prospers men (v. 318). The bad αἰδῶς is the inferiority complex which robs peasants of all activities, which are an aspect of confidence, and makes pawns of them in the hands of the lawless.

But apart from the general demand for work, how could one become rich if not hereditarily? Though Hesiod mentions some practical general advice in the next part of the poem (327-382) and some particular advice in the following section (383-617), we may distinguish in general four ways. First, one may extend one's estate by buying another man's lot (*Op.* 341). Though this passage is connected with piety (and also it is controversial) it is very important<sup>22</sup>. It appears that in a wider climate of social rearrange-

21. Cf. K. J. McKay, «Ambivalent αἰδῶς in Hesiod», (*AJPh* 84, 1963, pp. 17-27). Cf. A. Hoestra, «Hésiode, Les Travaux et les Jours» (*Mnem.* 4<sup>th</sup> ser. 3, 1950, pp. 89-114) pp. 99-106 ; Pucci, *Hesiod.* pp. 14-5.

22. Cf. Ed. Will, «Aux origines du régime foncier grec: Homère, Hésiode et l'arrière-plan mycénien», (*REA* 59, 1957, pp. 5-50) pp. 12-24. Contra Ern. Will, «Hésiode: Crise agraire? ou recul de l'aristocratie?», (*REG* 78, 1965, pp. 542-56) and M. Detienne, *Crise agraire et attitude religieuse chez Hésiode*, (Collection *Latomus* 68, Brussels, 1963). Cf. also A. Trever, «The Age of Hesiod». On the alienability of land see M. Finley, «The Alienability of Land in ancient Greece», (in *The Use and Abuse of History*, pp. 153-60) ; «Marriage, sale and gift in the Homeric world», (*Seminar XII*, 1954, pp. 7-33. (= *Rev. Inter. des Droits de l'Antiquité* III vol., 2, 1955, pp. 167-94) ; *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece (USA, 1983)*, pp. 233 ff.) ; N. Hammond, *Studies in Greek History*.

ments during the archaic age, or even because of special conditions in Hesiod's area one's lot could change hands and land had become alienable. Such a background of social changes favours the interpretation I follow that Hesiod is conscious of his position and his message is deliberate; i.e. Hesiod has realized the new possibilities and taught his audience to exploit them in order to be freed from social and political exploitation. The fact that Hesiod builds up his theory on agriculture and advises Perses to be in a position to buy another man's lot, agrees with and foreshadows the attitude of the *nouveaux-riches* who wanted to possess land in order to appropriate the nobles' prestige of being ἀγαθοί.

Another way of making wealth is hoarding (*Op.* 361-3): «Many a mickle makes a muckle», which is both 'an attitude of royal status, when the store-rooms are full with goods and treasures, and of the instinctive human fear for the morrow, and of one's dependence on one's own produce. But a better way is the increase of productivity by intensive labour. Closing his general advice on work Hesiod claims by way of 'categorical imperative', for the second time

σοὶ δ' εἰ πλούτου θυμὸς ἐέλδεται ἐν φρεσὶ σῆσιν,  
ὦδ' ἔρδειν, καὶ ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι  
(*Op.* 381-2; cf. 288-9, 397-8)

This principle is applied to all kinds of jobs: Perses and everybody else must do job after job and must do each stage of a job upon the previous one. Once more wealth (in its abstract sense now) is connected with labour. The free farmers who possessed land must have been more numerous than in the past and while the nobles still enjoyed the fruits of work, the people must have become to a greater extent than before masters of their labour. The word πλούσιος itself occurs for the first time in Hesiod.

Finally, passing to the particular advice on each stage of agricultural work, which includes all the farmers' calendar, and stressing once more the necessity for work (*Op.* 397-8), Hesiod expresses some other particular ways of making wealth: to avoid procrastination and to do each job in a proper fashion and time and to practise tidiness (*Op.* 410-13, 473)<sup>23</sup>.

---

(Oxford, 1973), pp. 104-44 ; Starr, *Social Growth*, pp. 150ff, 182ff ; A. Andrews, *The Greeks* (1967), pp. 97ff ; etc.

23. A man ἀφνειός in mind (455) resembles a man prone to empty hope, if he thinks it is possible to build up a waggon requiring a hundred timbers, without proper preparation beforehand. Ἀφνειός is used for the first time metaphorically here in an 'out of gram-

Proper time (καῖρός) has already been mentioned in the general advice (306-7) as a presupposition of abundance and will be referred to again in the seafaring section. The *Works and Days* as a whole presupposes that work is shaped and controlled according to its proper *metra* when it is fitted into the orderly course of the seasons.

Therefore, after having spoken first of labour in general, and next of agriculture as the basic form of work, Hesiod comes to speak of navigation and trade. Animal-farming is not mentioned in the *Works and Days* but is legislated for in the *Theogony*. Its protectors are Hermes and Hecate, who enjoys a special favour from the poet (416ff, 444ff); and many of the more 'Homeric' of Hesiod's fragments say that somebody was rich in oxen or sheep. Once in the *Works and Days* the man who is rich is called 'rich in flocks' (308; cf. 120). Hesiod himself was a shepherd.

Eventhough Hesiod does not in particular favour sailing it is the second kind of work about which he has to say a great deal (618-94). In Homer trade appears to be operated by the Phoenicians. So since Hesiod includes it in his lessons for making wealth it probably denotes that it had begun to be carried out by the Greeks. The word ἐμπορίη itself for the first time in Hesiod bears its commercial meaning, while in Homer ἔμπορος means «passenger» (in another man's ship). Colonization was the solution for the overpopulation of the towns and the discovery of new lands was a motive for these enterprises. The people who participated in colonization were mainly of middle or poor status with nobles as leaders. Hesiod's father himself came from Cyme in Asia Minor to Boeotia driven by poverty as the poet informs us (*Op.* 638). Trade was both a cause and a result of colonization. Regarding the actual type of traders these were not professional trading men, but farmers or sailors with their own ships (*Op.* 622ff.) who carry their surplus to exchange it abroad. There is no money, and it is doubtful whether coins were minted because of this trade. Hesiod, as with labour and agriculture, gives advice in detail on sailing; when one must sail and what to ship. Καῖρός and μέτρα are particularly emphasized. The reason for all this is to make as much profit as possible. The most important point is that Hesiod stresses the meaning of κέρδος, profit, in its commercial sense, for the first time in the usage of the word. In Homer in general it denotes cunning, benefit, advantage, interest. In the world of heroes there is no room for this word in any other sense, since everything has been shared and established from generation to generation in accordance with δίκη,

---

mar' interaction which emphasizes the poet's purposes and intentions (see also other figurative uses, *Op.* 719-20, fr. 286 etc.).

what is due to them. So there is nothing new to be shared. But when trade and sailing were developed, a new area of ownership was opened and κέρδος was the channel through which this new ownership or substance was conveyed to new possessors. In Homer only once κέρδος appears to have its commercial meaning (*Op.* 8.159 ff) and it is exactly that 'advanced' passage with Euryalos which speaks of trade and the profit coming from it. Though the role of the aristocrats in trade has been disputed<sup>24</sup>, we cannot exclude the possibility that they participated in commercial activities, firstly because there are examples such as Charaxos, Sappho's brother, and others, secondly because in the period of change almost all the population, both aristocrats and commoners, were in a social melting-pot, thirdly because peasants were not more *homines economici* than aristocrats, nor were the latter disinterested in wealth or economic gain, fourthly because trade is connected with colonization where very often aristocrats were leaders, and finally because to begin such enterprises as trade some 'capital' i.e. surplus merchandise, of whatever kind is necessary, which the nobles may have possessed. On the other hand, it seems that the commoners of some standing first began to sail in the time between the decline of kingship and the rise of aristocracy, either because the kings were not interested in business or trade, or because some pioneer commoners felt oppressed by the kings. And judging by the later evidence it is beyond any doubt that some men previously poor became rich. So κέρδος is always connected with trade, being in fact the new type of 'raid' for which it has become a substitute.

The next small section, containing some social and religious commandments, suggest how one can prosper in other ways besides through labour (695-764). And the last means of becoming prosperous is the 'days', namely the time at which one must perform certain actions. This part of the poem accounts for the poem the second part of the title (765-828). The last three verses of this section might constitute the epilogue of the whole poem: if one fulfils all the previous requirements, one may become ὄλβιος and εὐδαίμων without offending the deathless gods.

---

24. See J. Hasebroek, *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece*, (London 1933) and the reply by A.W. Gomme, *Essays in Greek History and Literature*, (Oxford, 1937), pp. 42-66; Traders and Manufacturers in Greece; M. Finley (ed), *Trade and Politics in the Ancient World*, (Second International Conference of Economic History, Aix-en-Provence 1962, repr. 1979); F.M. Heichelheim, *An Ancient Economic History* (vol. I Leiden 1958), *passim*; Starr, *Social Growth*, ch. 3-4; G.M. de Ste Croix, *Social Struggle*, pp. 120-33; etc.

And to be ὄλβιος is to possess wealth, the visible manifestation of being εὐδαίμων, that is of having the good-will of one's daimon. To be then εὐδαίμων and ὄλβιος is to be ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, that is to be absolved from the 'original sin', the κρύψις βίου, which is a feature of a guilt-culture<sup>25</sup>.

Therefore the main theme running through the *Works and Days* is prosperity, how to obtain it and remain in it, and why to gain it. Seen under this angle the *Works and Days* not only does not lack unity but also it is very tight. Every section follows the previous one in such a way as if it were to be necessarily so<sup>26</sup>.

The period from the eighth to the sixth century is characterized by the rise and ascendancy of local aristocracies. But on the other hand there was opposition from the side of the lower classes against the arbitrariness of the nobility. Certain evidence is found in Homer, in particular the second half of the *Odyssey*. But it appears to me that Hesiod made it the main theme in the *Works and Days*. Initially he founds in a social and political sense the everlasting problem of *earning* a livelihood. The man of 'today' has lost his paradise. But at least he has won civilization, not only the technical one symbolized by Prometheus' fire, but also the philosophical mind allowing him to live recognizing his rights, in contrast to the animals (*Op.* 276ff). Hesiod advises people of his class to *earn* wealth. To that end justice, which protects man from unjust wealth and civil wars, and labour, and especially the increase of agricultural production with well-ordered and proper work – improvement of technological equipment is not understood – also animal farming, sailing and trade and the observation of certain commandments, are the means of making wealth. So one may obtain all these marks of social and political prestige by which the ἀγαθός, i.e. the rich and prosperous man, is characterized. And this is the 'half' which is better and more than the irrevocably lost whole.

Kleomenes, the king of Sparta, called Homer the poet of the Lacedaimonians and Hesiod the poet of the helots, because the former teaches how one must fight and the latter how one must cultivate the land (*Plut. Apoph. Lac.* 223 a). Homer, of course, does not say only this, but the general observation, that he addressed the nobles, and Hesiod the

25. See C. de Heer, *Μάκαρ-Εὐδαίμων-Ὀλβιος-Εὐτυχής* (Amsterdam 1969) p. 25 and Dodds, *Irrational*, pp. 42, 58 (note 78); cf. *Op.* 314 and Heracl. B. 119 D-K.

26. For this reason the best way from a methodological point of view to deal with Hesiod's treatment of wealth in the *Works and Days* is to do it through a section by section analysis of the work.

people who toil in the fields, is right. When also Heracleitus called Hesiod teacher of many people (57D-K; cf. 40), probably he had in mind the free small land-owning farmers. And history was on Hesiod's side. We may believe that the *Works and Days* influenced movements during the political struggles in the lyric age of Greece, and that it was widely known and taught in various parts of Greece, as so many imitations suggest, and thus exerted an influence on the moral and legal ideas of later generations<sup>27</sup>.

In the next century the condition of the oppressed farmer in Attica reached such a point that during the local upheavals Solon legislated what for Hesiod was only a vision. The tempest from the accumulation of injustice burst out indeed (*Op.* 238ff; *Il.* 16. 384 ff; Solon fr. 13. 17ff) and Solon, without being a revolutionist smoothed the way for the Athenian democracy of Kleisthenes and his successors. So Hesiod becomes not only the first individual author, before Archilochus, but also the first political thinker in ancient Greek literature, and with his cosmic, social and political system becomes the first 'presocratic philosopher'.

(Université de Jannina)

Ioannis PERYSINAKIS

---

27. Cf. M.C. West, «Echoes and imitations of the Hesiod poems (*Philologus* 113, 1969, pp. 1-9) ; also Rzach's list of *loci similes* (ed. major 1902) and T.A. Sinclair, *Hesiod, Works and Days* (London 1923), intr. pp. XXXI ff.

Also, when Kostas Palamas, the modern Greek poet, needed a symbol to use in addressing the Greeks after the defeat of 1897 by the Turks and before the victorious Balkan war of 1912-14, he wrote the *Ascraios* (1903-4). The poem becomes a vision of practical activity and of a new social reality. See *Hapanta*, vol. 3 (Bires, ed. Athens, s.d. pp. 202 ff).