The "Days" of the *Works and Days*

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

About the authorship and the composition of the "Days," which have been transmitted as a sequel to Hesiod's "Works," no consensus has been reached; but as far as it is possible to discern a trend in recent scholarship, it seems to be in favor of accepting the "Days" as authentic and finding some kind of Hesiodic coherence in them. Fifty years ago the situation must have been different. When Nilsson in one of his famous studies on the early Greek calendar[1] found not only the time scheme underlying the "Days" but also their spirit and outlook quite alien to those of the "Works," he did not regard his conclusions as at variance with the *opinio recepta*. By a brief statement he aligned his own views with this *opinio*: "Das Anhängsel wird daher allgemein dem Hesiod aberkannt."[2]

"Daher" seems to imply that some of his observations were familiar but "allgemein" must have been an overstatement even in 1911.[3] Moreover it was just in those years that the understanding of the entire poem entered a new phase. Abandoning the habit of cutting the "Works" into pieces of supposedly disparate and unrelated origin, scholars learned to appreciate both the truly Hesiodic character and the unity of this poem. Unity, as the concept is used in literary research, suffers from a certain vagueness; it may be of an intrinsic or of an extrinsic type. Even to-day while every interpreter of the *Erga* recognizes some kind of unity in them, there still is considerable divergence of opinion as to the degree of unification or organization achieved.

[1] "Die älteste griechische Zeitrechnung. Apollo und der Orient," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 14 (1911) 423 ff., reprinted in *Opuscula selecta* 1 (Lund 1951) 36 ff., to which I shall refer (the sections which concern us include no changes or additions).

[2] *Opusc.* 59. See also Nilsson's *Die Entstehung und religiöse Bedeutung des griech. Kalenders*[2] ([separately published] Lund 1962) 31.

[3] The "Days" had been treated as genuine by Alois Rzach in his *editio maior* (Leipzig 1902), and by Pierre Waltz in *Hésiode et son poème moral* (Bordeaux 1906). Rzach's article in *RE* 8 (1912), s.v. "Hesiodos," informs about the views current at the time.

For our purpose it is not necessary to review the history of these studies. Progress has undoubtedly been made, but there may be reason to wonder whether the understanding of the "Days" has kept pace with that of the "Works" and whether the "Days" have not been somewhat rashly "integrated." If your net is large and loose, you may catch more than one fish at a time; but through its wide meshes a part of the catch will escape again.

Some of Nilsson's arguments are as valid to-day as they were in 1911. They have sometimes been disregarded but never refuted. Wilamowitz, to be sure, took his stand on Nilsson's side; when producing his edition and commentary of the "Works,"[4] he excluded the "Days," considering them a different poetic unit on which Nilsson had said all that was essential. More recently Hermann Fränkel and Albin Lesky have denied Hesiod's authorship,[5] but most scholars seem to be found in the opposite camp. The authors of the current English, French, and Italian editions of the "Works" accept the "Days" as their authentic sequel;[6] references to the "Days" as a poem of Hesiod are a matter of common occurrence in philological and historical studies; and within the last ten years B. A. van Groningen and W. J. Verdenius[7] have come forward with thoughtful analyses of the *Works and Days* which for the "Days" result in a vindication of the traditional attribution. As both scholars have brought novel methods to bear on the question,[8] it becomes imperative to con-

[4] *Hesiodos Erga* (Berlin 1928) 8. Wilamowitz had also prior to the publication of Nilsson's article indicated that he did not regard the "Days" as genuine (*Hermes* 40 [1906] 124).

[5] Hermann Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (New York 1951) 178; Albin Lesky, *Geschichte der griech. Literatur* (Bern 1957–58) 97.

[6] T. A. Sinclair, Hesiod, *Works and Days* (London 1932); Paul Mazon, *Hésiode* (Paris 1928, 1951); Aristide Colonna, *Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Varese–Milano 1959). Sinclair (LVII ff.) seems to have felt some uneasiness. Mazon had previously (*Hésiode. Les Travaux et les Jours* [Paris 1914]) treated considerable portions of the "Days" as of later origin.

[7] B. A. van Groningen, *La Composition littéraire archaïque grècque* (*Verhandelingen d. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie*, n.r. 65.2 [Amsterdam 1958]) 291 ff.; W. J. Verdenius, "Aufbau und Absicht der Erga" in *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, tome 7: *Hésiode et son influence* 109 ff., esp. 154 f.

[8] Van Groningen's analysis forms part of a very fruitful new approach to archaic poetry in general. My own belief that archaic compositions are open to accretions has been greatly strengthened by his investigations; on the following pages I have readily availed myself of his insights. As applied to the "Days" his method shows that they have typical characteristics of archaic poetry rather than that they must be considered a work of Hesiod.

sider whether methods old and new have now succeeded in establishing Hesiod as author of the "Days" or whether there still is room for doubt and denial.

We may begin by recalling Nilsson's arguments. In summarizing these I ought perhaps to give first place of importance to the difference in the time schemes used by the two poems. Unfortunately this is the argument on whose value I find it most difficult to form an opinion. It is perfectly true that the "Works" pay no attention to days and their place in a month, but on Nilsson's own showing references to specific days could have done no good as long as there was no fixed and workable lunisolar year. It is true too that the "Works" define the proper time for the farmer's successive tasks not by references to months but to the movements of the constellations and to other events in nature that are of sufficiently regular recurrence ("when the Pleiades, daughters of Atlas, are rising . . .," "when you hear the voice of the crane" etc.).[9] Here again the same counter-argument applies. Moreover the "Works" do include a reference to, and even the name of, a month (μῆνα δὲ Ληναιῶνα, 504). Nilsson damaged rather than improved his case when he suggested that this passage should be considered an addition by another hand.[10] The editors have rightly refused to follow him in this point.[11] In fact the passage, unique as it is, may suggest that more than one "time scheme" was familiar in Hesiod's environment. The "Works" are a selective poem; we have no right to look to them

[9] *Op.* 383, 448; see also 564, 571 f., 582 ff., etc. Cf. Nilsson, *Opusc.* 40 f., and also his discussion in *Primitive Time Reckoning* (Lund 1920) 46 f.

[10] See esp. *Die Entstehung* (above, note 2) 45, note 3, "der böotische Dichter kann nicht einen jonischen Monatsnamen angeführt haben." Nilsson is less definite in *Opusc.* 43.

[11] Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* (above, note 4) 101 f., expresses his astonishment but says, "wir müssen uns damit abfinden" and shows how impossible it is to think of interpolation. Of his specific argument the strongest is perhaps that 557, μεὶς γὰρ χαλεπώτατος οὗτος, refers back to 504 and thus protects it. The *Lenaion* as Hesiod describes it has its own characteristic features by which it makes itself known when it comes. Moreover, Hesiod does not tell his farmers here, as he does in many other sections, that they must do this-and-this work at this-and-this specific point in time but warns them to be on their guard against a whole extended period of the year. These and other reasons may account for the singularity. It may however be mentioned that Nilsson in his review of Wilamowitz's edition (*Gnomon* 4 [1928] 617) persisted in his doubts. Whether Mycenaean months and month names are relevant to the question is still *sub judice* (cf. Michael Ventris and John Chadwick, *Documents of Mycenaean Greek* [Cambridge 1956] 303 ff.; Nilsson, *Entstehung* 30).

for a full account of all that was known (or observed) by Hesiod and the people among whom he lived.

The true force of Nilsson's arguments lies elsewhere. The "Days," he pointed out,[12] are conceived in a spirit of anxious and superstitious bigotry; whereas the "Works," to use his own words, "die Forderungen des praktischen Lebens . . . nüchtern und sachlich darlegen." We shall find much to substantiate this contrast, and there is no way of minimizing it.[13] Moreover it does not take much imagination to realize that the rationally practical, in no way bigoted counsels of the "Works" and the superstitions of the "Days" would sometimes—and in vital matters—come into conflict with one another. The "Works" bid the farmer to cut the wood he needs for his plough and wagon when the worst heat of the summer is over and the trees are least worm-eaten.[14] This surely is reasonable and practical advice; the work itself is called *ὥριον*. Yet according to the "Days" woodcutting is best done on a seventeenth of a month.[15] This idea is not rational—nor is it advanced on the strength of a reason or an argument; it simply is a *religio*. Similarly, if the farmer follows the advice of the "Works," he will thresh his grain as soon as he sees Orion rising; but if he also listens to the "Days," he will again have to wait for the next seventeenth[16]—which may mean twenty-eight or twenty-nine days, if he is out of luck. The period which Hesiod thinks safe for autumn navigation is not very long; he has hardly allowed his brother or whatever would-be sailors he has in mind to depart when he adds the warning: *σπεύδειν δ' ὅττι τάχιστα πάλιν οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι*[17] (an admonition prompted by fear of the late autumn with its storms and rain). The man in the audience eager to try his fortune in overseas trade may still see his chance; he will be disillusioned when later—in the "Days"

[12] *Opusc.* 51; cf. *Entstehung* 39 f.

[13] Except perhaps by insisting that the taboos (724–59) which precede the "Days" resemble them in their bigoted, superstitious spirit. We shall return to this point below, page 316.

[14] *Op.* 414–22 (see esp. 420 f.).

[15] *Op.* 805, 807.

[16] *Op.* 597 ff., 805 ff. Hesiod, incidentally, is not in the habit of repeating himself as closely as the author of the later passage repeats the language of the former. This author evidently expects his hearers to remember 597 ff. (*ὀπιπεύοντα*, 806, is said with reference to the *δμῶες* of 597).

[17] *Op.* 673.

—he learns that he had better wait for a "twenty-ninth" before hauling his boat into the sea.[18]

With the last examples we have gone slightly beyond Nilsson. Their point is not so much to indicate conflicts of conscience—conflicts between reason and faith—which may have materialized in the soul of the Boeotian or other motherland peasants but to illustrate, if perhaps somewhat drastically, the fundamental difference of outlook and attitude which separates the two poems. It is of course possible to speculate that Hesiod's audience may have listened to his advice with minds sufficiently independent to pick and choose—some men inclining to the rational counsel, others to the *superstitiones*—or that Hesiod himself composed the "Days" not so much from conviction as from a desire to oblige people anyhow addicted to such beliefs. There is little to be gained from weighing the probability of such hypotheses. It seems better at this point to shift our inquiry for a while from the subject of the authorship to the composition and intrinsic organization of the "Days." For as long as we do not know what kind of poem it is, we lack firm ground for making progress with the question as to its author. In fact this question may lose much of its meaning as soon as the "Days" are analyzed. For the analysis, too, Nilsson has furnished help by pointing out some inconsistencies in the body of the poem; in particular he has noticed that the normal sequence of the days in the month, while observed in 770–84, is abandoned in 785–804, to be taken up again in 805–18 (except for 809, which he would remove). We shall return to this anomaly in due course but prefer to begin our analytical observations at another point.[19]

It has not escaped the critics that 822 f. of the concluding section,

> αἵδε μὲν ἡμέραι εἰσὶν ἐπιχθονίοις μέγ' ὄνειαρ,
> αἱ δ' ἄλλαι μετάδουποι, ἀκήριοι, οὔ τι φέρουσαι,

are not in complete harmony with the actual content of the poem, which informs us not only about good but also about bad days.[20]

[18] *Op.* 817 f.

[19] *Opusc.* 51, note 22. In Nilsson's opinion (*ibid.*), "die Annahme einer gewollten Regelmässigkeit in der Tagefolge ist das einzige Hilfsmittel der Analyse." With this I should not easily agree.

[20] See esp. van Groningen *op. cit.* (above, note 7) 299 ff., whose explanation is tentative and to my mind unconvincing. Inconsistencies between the adjectives of 823 are not of a serious kind.

The "fifths" for instance are bad without qualification.[21] The thirteenth day is not good for the sowing of the grain, even though it is good for planting. For planting the sixteenth in turn must be considered unfavorable,[22] and in the balance the bad outweighs the good for this day. There is something definitely inauspicious also about the "fourth of the waxing and of the waning month" (a closer analysis of the passage[23] will not alter this impression but will leave the middle fourth too in the "mixed" class). This discrepancy between 822 f. and the body of the "Days" is aggravated by the fact that the author of these lines does not even seem to know the opposition between good and bad days; the only distinction that he makes is between good and indifferent days. Quite conceivably the original intention of the "Days" was to enumerate only the good days. For 769 does announce the ἤματα that are Διὸς πάρα μητιόεντος as the topic to be treated,[24] and this announcement is followed in 770–79 by a list of days that are auspicious, particularly auspicious and in relation to one another more or less auspicious. We are certainly willing to believe that these days are Διὸς πάρα μητιόεντος. It is only in 780 that we—rather suddenly—read of a day to be avoided. For the moment we need not proceed farther with this phase of our analysis. It suffices if it suggests the idea of an original stock (769–79) to which material was added. At the conclusion of this study we shall be prepared to admit additions after 779 as well as after 823.

But there seems to be an addition also before 769. The relation between 765–68, which begin ἤματα ἐκ Διόθεν πεφυλαγμένος, and 769, αἵδε γὰρ ἡμέραι εἰσὶ Διὸς πάρα μητιόεντος, poses a difficult problem. The text as it stands presents the curious and anomalous situation that 765 ff. begin the list of propitious days with the thirtieth; whereas 769 ff., after once more announcing the subject (*sc.* the ἡμέραι Διὸς πάρα), begin their enumeration with the first, going on from it in what we may consider the natural sequence to the fourth, the seventh, etc. To be sure there may have been obstacles and objections to having the "thirtieth" day of the month generally recognized; habits

[21] 802–4; see below, page 308.

[22] 780–81; 782–84.

[23] 798; see below, page 300.

[24] 765–68 too suggest that ἤματα ἐκ Διόθεν are auspicious days. The reasons why I think it better to infer this from 769 will presently become clear.

varied, and the unsettled state of affairs is likely to be reflected in our text.[25] Even so it remains difficult to believe that a rhapsode wishing to enumerate the favorable days should begin with what would generally be regarded the last day of the month—and what he himself, if he uses the word τριηκάς, must so regard. Speculations that the thirtieth may after all have been the "beginning" of the month cannot help us, since 769 ff. quite obviously begin the month with the "first."[26] Moreover the purpose for which the thirtieth is recommended is unique: it is said to be "the best" ἔργα τ' ἐποπτεύειν ἠδ' ἁρμαλίην δατέασθαι. To inspect the work (done by the δμῶες, etc.) and to distribute the rations on the last day of the month would seem to be good and rational management; any owner of a large or small farm might think it wise to adopt this policy.[27] Yet it is precisely the reasonable quality of this advice—its obvious concern with good οἰκονομία —which contrasts with everything that we read in 769–821. Nothing that we find in the main body of the "Days" can by any stretch of the imagination be called rational—and nothing that we read in 765–68 can be called superstitious. Someone must

[25] On this uncertainty cf. Nilsson, *Entstehung* 16, where he shows that τριηκάς + νουμηνία is an alternative to ἕνη καὶ νέα. 768 acquires its point from these conflicts or more simply from the fact that in "hollow" months there would be no "thirtieth"—unless there were regulations to this effect. Sinclair's explanation of 768 is on the right lines. I understand ἄγωσιν = τὰς ἡμέρας ἄγωσιν, ἀληθείην being the object of κρίνοντες.

[26] ἕνη in 770 is as far as I can see generally understood in this sense. Whether to justify this meaning we must assume that the author substitutes this short expression for ἕνη καὶ νέα (as Nilsson appears to think, *Entstehung* 16) may be another question. We cannot be sure that this phrase existed at the time. If ἕνη was the day on the evening of which the new moon appeared, it may well in the popular mind have become associated with εἷς and its oblique cases (a different breathing does not prevent Hesiod from connecting the *Horai* "etymologically" with ὠρεύειν, *Theog.* 901–3).

[27] 765–68 suggest a good-sized farm where the rations are distributed once a month. Is the owner an absentee landlord who appears also only once? It is probably not necessary (though at first one is inclined to understand) that the δμῶες do the ἐποπτεύειν and δατέασθαι, in which case they would be "intendants," (van Groningen, *op. cit.* [above, note 7] 291, note 2). The passage has escaped the attention of economic historians, although what Chester G. Starr (*The Origins of Greek Civilization* [New York 1961] 365) has to say about increase in agricultural production may help. Cf. also Gustave Glotz, *Greece at Work* (London 1926) 39, and perhaps 73 f. Conceivably the rations to be distributed may have varied according to the quality of the ἔργα performed by the slaves. In "Arist." *Oec.* 1.5.1344B, 7 f. this is considered good policy, and advice to this effect is prefaced by the words διόπερ δεῖ ποιεῖσθαι σκέψιν, which correspond to ἐποπτεύειν in our passage. With ἁρμαλίη compare ἅρματα in the sense discussed by me in *Glotta* 37 (1958) 127 ff.

have felt prompted to include this intelligent and practical piece of advice in the authoritative poem about the choice of days. To give it the desirable prominence, he placed it at the beginning without noticing, or caring to notice, that he thereby stultified the point of 769, making the poem begin with the last day instead of with the first.[28]

Another passage which must be clarified before we can proceed farther with our analysis is 794–99. In 794–97 the fourteenth day (the *τετρὰς μέσση*) is recommended for a variety of good purposes, including the taming of dogs, mules, and other animals. In 797 the text as printed in recent editions continues

> *πεφύλαξο δὲ θυμῷ*
> *τετράδ' ἀλεύασθαι φθίνοντός θ' ἱσταμένου τε*
> *ἄλγεα θυμοβορεῖν· μάλα γὰρ (γὰρ* ℘[5]*: τοι* MSS.)
> *τετελεσμένον ἦμαρ.*

The abrupt shift from a time scheme which recognizes three "fourths" to another that divides the month into two parts is disturbing; however tolerant we may wish to be, it must be said that nothing of the kind ever happens in the other sections. Moreover, read as a coherent sentence, the exhortation is most awkwardly phrased; for Hesiod it would be unparalleled and hardly good enough. "Watch out in your heart to avoid" . . . would be acceptable. Bearing 780 f. in mind,[29] we would also tolerate a construction of *ἀλεύασθαι* with another infinitive ("avoid this-and-this day to do this-and-this"). But the accumulation of verbs *πεφύλαξο—ἀλεύασθαι—θυμοβορεῖν* is bewildering and produces obscurity, which is aggravated by the fact that the subject of the third verb *θυμοβορεῖν* is no longer the persons addressed (*sc.* of the audience) but the word *ἄλγεα*. Critics who felt that the sentence is out of joint have suggested a change of *θυμοβορεῖν* to *θυμοβορῇ* or *θυμοβορᾷ*; Rzach even proposed *ἄλγε' ἃ θυμοβορεῖ*.[30] Each of these suggestions would

[28] I hope I have shown that we have no right or reason to make changes in the order of 767–69; nor is anything gained by athetizing some of these lines. For suggestions of the kind see Rzach's *apparatus*. What Karl Lehrs, *Quaestiones epicae* (Königsberg 1831) 251, says about 765 f. is thoroughly sound and acute; inevitably, however, similar observations suggest today somewhat different conclusions.

[29] *τρισκαιδεκάτην ἀλέασθαι σπέρματος ἄρξασθαι* (In 802 the construction is simpler; cf. also Hesiod's own verses, 504 f.).

[30] See the apparatus in Rzach's *editio maior* (cf. note 3). In ℘[5] this part of 799 is not extant.

leave two jarring accusative objects of ἀλεύασθαι. It seems preferable to regard 798 as intrusive. When it is removed, we read πεφύλαξο δὲ θυμῷ ἄλγεα and are free to put a colon after ἄλγεα and to connect θυμοβορεῖν with what follows: θυμοβορεῖν μάλα τοι (so MSS; papyri do not invariably have the better reading) τετελεσμένον ἦμαρ. In this way thought and sentence structure become satisfactory. Whether it was a rhapsode or an "editor" who fitted—or rather, forced—798 into its present place, I should not pretend to know.[31] The day on which one has to beware of grief would, on our reading of the passage, originally have been the fourteenth. The intrusion of 798 has the result of making the fourth day of the waxing and of the waning moon the fatal ones. We may suppose that few (παῦροι; cf. 824) or none quite knew and the person responsible for the present place of the verse perhaps least of all. The elimination of 798 from the context of 792–99 has the additional advantage that there is no longer within this section a shifting from the τετρὰς μέσση to the alternative system of counting by the increasing and decreasing moon (I should not however consider a change of this kind as impossible and would in any case put the stylistic reasons for the removal of 798 first).

Having found a line which warns us of two "fourths," we may stick with the fourth for a while and examine other passages that refer to it. No day of the month worries our poet(s) more. In 770 the fourth is, like the first and the seventh, declared to be a ἱερὸν ἦμαρ. 794 ff. describe the middle fourth as propitious for the birth of daughters and for other purposes but caution us against heartaches on this day because it is μάλα τετελεσμένον. 798, as we understand it, denounces categorically the fourth of the waxing and of the waning moon. 800 urges marriage on the fourth (i.e. probably on the first fourth of the month). 809 singles out the τετράς as a good day for shipbuilding. Finally

[31] 798 was athetized by G. F. Schoemann. If it is eliminated, the sequence θυμῷ—θυμοβορεῖν acquires greater force. While it is possible that a rhapsode added 798 after 797, regardless of what became of 799—or that 798 and 799 remained for a time alternative sequels to 797—we are also free to consider 798 as a maxim (ὑποθήκη) which had been independently current. Since it lacked a δέ, it could not when it was incorporated be made a separate unit. For the relatively late place of τοι in the original sentence as reconstructed, compare *Il.* 2.297 f. I do not of course rule out the possibility that the text of 799 has undergone more changes than we are able to realize.

819–21, as far as we can make out, take up all three fourths of the month, specifying the first as good for the opening of a barrel,[32] calling the middle fourth "sacred above all others," and suggesting for the last a differentiation (about which we shall presently say more) between the morning and the afternoon. Although the afternoon of the last is called *χερείων*, there is nothing here like the categorical deprecation of the *τετρὰς φθίνοντος* in 798.

Theoretically it may be possible that one and the same poet, being profoundly convinced of the powers of the fourth day should come back to it again and again (although at 770 the fourth does not seem so particularly *τετελεσμένον*); but on closer examination of the lines in question a different method of explanation appears preferable. In 800 f. we read

ἐν δὲ τετάρτῃ μηνὸς ἄγεσθ' εἰς οἶκον ἄκοιτιν
οἰωνοὺς κρίνας οἳ ἐπ' ἔργματι τούτῳ ἄριστοι.

These are the only lines (prior to 828) that include a reference to an alternative superstition. Evidently the criteria of *ὀρνιθομαντεία* are to be combined with those for the right selection of the day (the birds may have to be consulted about the choice of the wife; once they approve, the fourth day would be well chosen for the marriage). If Hesiod is to be the author of the "Days," it should certainly be noted that he nowhere else shows an interest in bird *omina*. Are we to suppose that, when he wrote the "Works" (and the *Theogony*), his mind was filled with the trust in Zeus and in Justice, Zeus' daughter, but that in the measure in which old age closed in on him he became increasingly addicted to superstitions, first to those concerning the wise choice of the right days and in the end even to bird *omina*? I think another approach has more to commend itself. As we know, an epic

[32] M. L. West, *CQ* 55 (1961) 140, reads 819 f. as follows: *τετράδι δ' οἶγε πίθον—περὶ πάντων ἱερὸν ἦμαρ—μέσσῃ*. I incline to favor the traditional punctuation and interpretation *περὶ πάντων ἱερὸν ἦμκρ μέσσῃ*, because if *τετράδι μέσσῃ* were meant to be a syntactic unit, their separation by four intervening words and especially by a parenthetic interposition would be out of keeping with the style of the "Days." The tendency is clearly to keep *μέσσῃ* as close as possible to the numerical designation which it modifies. However, as we are on very uncertain ground, I should even think it possible that the original counsel was simply *τετράδι δ' οἶγε πίθον· περὶ πάντων ἱερὸν ἦμαρ* and that when it was expanded the last four words acquired a new meaning and grammatical connection.

poem called *Ornithomanteia* was attached to the *Works and Days*, the last line of our present text,

ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων,

serving as "link."[33] Like other didactic epics this poem too became in due course attributed to Hesiod. If we do not accept his authorship for it, we may as well clear his name of any connection with 800 f.[34] 800–1, if not actually by the author of the *Ornithomanteia*, should be assigned to a rhapsode who presented this poem as sequel of the *Works and Days*.

Even the defenders of Hesiod's authorship make allowance for interpolations, and it must be admitted that the presence of "interpolations" does not *per se* weaken the case for the unity of the poem or for Hesiod as its author. Still, it is natural to ask whether observations like those applying to 800 f. may not be extended to other parts of the poem and whether some of its units may not have been added or inserted by rhapsodes who had their convictions about one day or another. Our examination of the "fourths" may furnish additional light. As we know, 819–22 deal with all three "fourths." There can be little doubt that the sentence of 820 f.,

παῦροι δ' αὖτε μετ' εἰκάδα μηνὸς ἀρίστην
ἠοῦς γιγνομένης,

needs for its completion not only the concept of τετράς introduced in the preceding line (so that μετ' εἰκάδα = the 24th) but also the verb ἴσασιν of 814, six lines back,[35] where we read παῦροι

[33] The scholion on 828 (last edited by Augustinus Pertusi, *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et dies* [Milano 1959] 259) states: τούτοις ἐπάγουσί τινες τὴν Ὀρνιθομαντείαν . . . This confirms what the line itself suggests. Van Groningen (*op. cit.* [above, note 7] 301) takes what seems to me excessive trouble to account for 826 ff. It suffices that they are a "cheville" and as such comparable to *Theog.* 1019 ff. (van Groningen 300, note 4). See also below, page 307.

[34] In referring to the "author" of the *Ornithomanteia*, I do not at all wish to preclude the possibility that this poem too "grew"; its subject is one that would invite accretions. Strictly speaking, a connection with the *Ornithomanteia* is indicated only for 801; 800 may have stood by itself originally.

[35] δ' αὖτε in 820 now rests on the authority of 𝔓[5] (Papyrus Rainer L.P. 21–29, 4th cent. A.D.). Of the manuscripts on which we rely for the text C has δέ, D δέ τε (Colonna's family Φ agrees with C). Before the discovery of the papyrus δ' αὖτε owed its presence in the text to the "Byzantini," or "recentiores," more precisely to I (Laur. 32.16, called D in the *Theogony*). An examination of all readings that first appear in I has increased my respect for the philological *ingenium* of its "scribe" but has not convinced me that he drew on a textual tradition not available to us. (Cf.

δ' αὖτε ἴσασιν τρισεινάδα μηνὸς ἀρίστην . . . To be sure, this is not Hesiod's way of writing verse—we gladly leave it to others to uphold his stylistic reputation in the face of such slipshod practice. The sentence of 814 too begins with παῦροι δ' αὖτε, and in 818 we read παῦροι δέ τ' ἀληθέα κικλήσκουσιν. Still another παῦροι used with similar intent occurs in 824: ἄλλος ἀλλοίην(*sc.* ἡμέραν) αἰνεῖ, παῦροι δὲ ἴσασιν. It seems natural to give all four παῦροι to the same author, and this inclination is strengthened when we notice that all four are inspired by the same animus of protest against the prevailing errors or the prevailing ignorance about "best" days.[36] Is this the same man who so quietly and without the least polemical ardor began at 770:

πρῶτον ἔνη τετράς τε καὶ ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ?

It is rather late in the day to learn about the ἀρίστη. Our "minority poet" is quite right: the twenty-ninth and the twenty-fourth for which he stands up have not found proper recognition in the early sections of the "Days" (where the "systematic" enumeration of good days came to an early end at 779).[37] He is right again, and his words are very much to the point when he says: ἄλλος ἀλλοίην αἰνεῖ. The words are a welcome confirmation of our approach. Different poets had praised different days before he had his chance of asserting the "truth."

Matters may be even worse than we have so far suspected. The section 814–21, which includes three of the four sentences or clauses beginning with παῦροι, can hardly be a unit (in the genetic sense of the word). There is no δέ or other particle of similar function in 817 to connect the hauling of a boat into

Felix Jacoby in the *praefatio* of his edition *Hesiodi carmina, Pars I, Theogonia*, [Berlin 1930] 66.) δ'αὖτε is a typical *felix conjectura* of this Byzantine scholar to which he was probably inspired by 814. Since the other MSS. which have this reading are later, we need not hesitate to assume that they took it from I.

[36] Note that this poet twice (814 and 820) calls a day ἀρίστην and that on both occasions he speaks up for a "third" (the latter observation, incidentally, militates against interpreting τρισεινάδα [814] as "twenty-seventh" or finding in μετ' εἰκάδα [820] a reference to any day other than the twenty-fourth). ἀρίστην at the end of the verse and the ἀληθείη motif recur in the section 765–68 whose author is similarly interested in the end of the month. Are we therefore to consider the authors as identical? The evidence falls short of being conclusive. If we were surer as to the point of ἀληθέα κικλήσκουσιν (818) and could assume this poet too to be preoccupied with the right names (or correct observance) of the last days of the month, the case for identity would be stronger.

[37] See, however, below, page 308, on 805–8(9).

the "wine-colored sea" with the yoking of oxen and other animals. *Minima non curat praetor*, but the classicist cannot take this high-minded attitude. Conceivably a connective might be introduced by way of conjecture (*sc.* by writing νέα τε πολυκλήιδα instead of νῆα πολυκλήιδα).[38] This would be justified if there were no other way of understanding the condition of our text. Most of the recent editors, as a matter of fact, have not resorted to conjecture but preferred to put 815 f. within brackets. From our point of view there is nothing peculiar about these lines; we merely have to admit that 814 had two alternative sequels, one dealing with domestic and agricultural matters, i.e. the opening of the barrel and the yoking of oxen, etc., the other dealing with boats. One of them, to be sure, must have originated later than the other and may therefore be considered an "accretion." Here again I believe the editors to have made the right decision (my only objection to them is that they appear to treat this accretion as though it were something unique in the "Days"); to consider 817 f. rather than 815 f. as the original sequel of 814 has the advantage of leaving the two παῦροι to the same poet, a person of character and marked individuality as we have come to realize. Moreover, if we have a choice, it is better not to have one and the same poet in 814 f. recommend the twenty-ninth as the day for starting the barrel and in 819 say τετράδι δ' οἶγε πίθον. Or should there be a subtle difference between "opening" the barrel and "starting" it? On our view the poet who favors starting the barrel on the twenty-ninth may have been provoked by the other who recommended the fourth, and he may have wished to correct that statement. (Moreover if he did not believe in the τριηκάς, the twenty-ninth would for him be the day of the new moon and for this reason the best for starting a new barrel.)

It remains true that particularly many superstitions clustered around the "fourth." Yet the superstitions—what would be more natural?—varied and fluctuated. One man knows this day to be ἱερόν, another knows that it is good for taking a wife, provided the birds are properly consulted; still another thinks it especially important to open the barrel on this day, while a fourth is sure that the τετράς of the waxing and of the waning

[38] Rzach's *apparatus* records this as a conjecture of Schaefer (whose first name I have not been able to identify).

moon must be "avoided."[39] There remains the author of 809, who recommends this day for building a boat. All that we can say with confidence is that he cannot be identical with the last of our four men. As for the other three, he may be any one of them—but would not almost any rhapsode of the seventh or sixth century be able to produce the line:

τετράδι δ' ἄρχεσθαι νῆας πήγνυσθαι ἀραιάς?

Before we continue our analysis of the teachings embodied in the "Days," we may look once more at the concluding section, 822–28. In some way the condition of this section seems to reflect the history of the "Days"; and since our analysis has netted several observations regarding the section, we wish to consider how these observations combine and whether they may be expanded. We have seen that the first two lines (822 f., quoted above, page 297) correspond in intent to the original beginning of the "Days," i.e. to 769–79.[40] The next line (824, ἄλλος ἀλλοίην αἰνεῖ κτλ.) was added by the "minority poet" who here registered his final protest against the prevailing errors and fluctuations of opinion;[41] he may have considered himself obliged to recite the "Days" in the form in which they had been passed on to him but would not deny himself the satisfaction of uttering his words of warning and disapproval. A similar attitude of dissent may have inspired 825:

ἄλλοτε μητρυιὴ πέλει ἡμέρη, ἄλλοτε μήτηρ.

Van Groningen[42] rightly wonders: "n'est ce pas précisement le contraire de la tendance qui est à la base des jours"? I agree that the principle of the "Days" is here called into question. Does this line too owe its place here to a rhapsode who could not help reciting the poem (in whatever form he knew it) but, not having his heart in it, at the end voiced his disbelief? While this is possible, it is not the only possibility of accounting for the line, which may well originally have existed by itself as a "proverb."

[39] Posterity, as far as it cared for "day lore," seems to have sided with this poet; cf. Nilsson, *Entstehung* 43. On day lore in general see Sinclair (above, note 6) LVII ff.; see *ibid.* LVIII about the tradition (Herod. 2.82) regarding its Egyptian origin.

[40] See above, page 298.

[41] See above, page 304.

[42] *Op. cit.* (above, note 7) 300.

Its incorporation may be due to accident or to plan, to thought or to thoughtlessness. There remain the last three lines of the work:

> τάων εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὄλβιος ὃς τάδε πάντα
> εἰδὼς ἐργάζηται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν,
> ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων.

Granted that the genitive at the beginning is not quite easy to construe, the meaning seems to be that someone who knows "all this" about the days has a good chance of incurring no guilt in the eyes of the gods. There may be room for doubt as to whether freedom from guilt is the automatic result of the special knowledge which he has been privileged enough to receive, or whether in addition to knowing "all this" a man must also keep free of guilt if he is to attain wealth (and happiness).[43] Still whichever interpretation we choose, it is difficult to refer τάδε πάντα to the ten lines 770–79 which content themselves with enumerating seven auspicious days of the first half of the month. A larger amount of knowledge involving specific information about days good and days bad or indeed even about days good for one purpose but bad for another seems to be required to give the words τάδε πάντα substance. 770–99 or, alternatively, 770–79 plus 800–21 would answer this requirement; and if we have confidence in the sequence of our verses 822–28,[44] we should believe that the contributions of the "minority poet" (who speaks to us in 824) had been incorporated prior to the addition of 826–28. Regarding 828 we have observed its affinities with 801; both verses reflect the stage at which the "Days," being more or less

[43] Most commentators and translators refer τάων (822) to the ἡμέραι (A. W. Mair's "therein" and Evelyn-White's "in them" do not strike me as felicitous renderings; we may as well admit that the genitive depends on τάδε πάντα although we need not admire this). ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν (827) must be close in meaning to ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων (828). It is pertinent to remember Chapter II of E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley 1950). For the guilt motif in the *Shield of Heracles* cf. my remarks, *Glotta* 37 [1958] 130, note 1. ἐργάζεσθαι (827) is the theme of the "Works," yet the author(s) of 826–28, far from endorsing the outlook of that poem, would wish to see "work" done in the spirit of 724–59, of the "Days," and of the *Ornithomanteia*. In the final synthesis the "Works" count least.

[44] Unlimited confidence in the sequence of the verses would not be justified. 824 and 825 may conceivably have been thrust into their present place at a time when 826–28 were generally accepted as the end of the poem. In this case details of the theory here presented would have to be modified. But the principle would not be affected. What I wish to show is that the sequence should be understood "genetically" and as closely connected with the genesis of the "Days."

completed, received the *Ornithomanteia* with its different but comparable material of superstitious beliefs as their sequel. Thus our concluding section correlates at the lowest with three different stages in the growth of the "Days." At the highest (if 825 was added deliberately by a skeptic and if 828 is later than 826 f.) it correlates with five. The accretions that we trace in the conclusion mirror the process by which the bulk of the poem grew.

Returning now to the main body of the "Days" and bearing in mind the accretions so far discovered, we shall feel justified in suspecting different poetic individualities even in instances where the criteria for identifying each of them are less good than we would wish. 802–4 instruct us that the fifths must at all costs be avoided; for this is the day on which the Erinyes put themselves at the service of Horkos. Are we to assign these lines to the author of 770–79? Hardly, for days that are χαλεπαί τε καὶ αἰναί[45] were not what he proposed to set forth; they are not Διὸς πάρα. Have we reasons for attributing them to the minority poet? The answer is again negative. In the present arrangement of our poem 802–4 follow immediately upon the line referring to the *omina* of birds; and as we regard 800–1 as a later addition, we may reasonably take the same view of 802–4.

805–9 are different in outlook. Dealing with the seventeenth day, they find no fault in it but specify a good number of activities as suitable. The environment suggested by these lines is clearly agricultural so that it would not be absurd to consider them a part of the same poem to which 770–79 originally belonged.[46] However, I should not regard this as more than a moderately attractive hypothesis. The course of caution is to refrain from advancing a hypothesis. We may, however, before we leave the lines to their fate, observe that the section may easily once have come to an end with 807, before boats and the building of boats

[45] The reason is that the "fifth" is considered the birthday of Ὅρκος; yet the statement of this reason is introduced by a φασίν (803), which is not Hesiod's way. *Theog.* 306, the only other line that includes a φασίν, is under serious suspicion, and not only on account of this word. Hesiod, although recognizing *Phêmê* as a deity (*Op.* 760 ff.), derives his authority not from what "they say" but from the Muses (who in the "Days" are conspicuous by their absence). The author of 803 f. evidently knows Hesiod's version of the birth of Horkos (*Theog.* 231); what he presents is a conflation of this version with a current belief.

[46] Cf. Nilsson, *Opusc.* 51, note 22.

enter the picture. There are three possibilities, each of them deserving serious consideration—and each of them incapable of being either proved or disproved. 808–9 may have been added as a unit by a rhapsode who had his mind on boats. 808 may have been added at one time and 809 at another (presumably by different men). Finally, 808 may from the beginning have been a part of this section, in which case only 809 (which introduces a different day) would be of later origin. Still by presenting each of these three possibilities for consideration, I do not wish to exclude a fourth, *sc.* that both lines from the beginning belonged to this section.

810–13 treat of the first and middle "ninth." The middle is said to be "a better day in the afternoon." Here for the first time in the "Days" not an entire day but a part of it is described as auspicious. The only other instance of the kind occurs—later—in the lines that we have given to the minority poet.[47] It is possible, but no more than possible, that the present section too is by him. In any case differentiation between parts of a day—*sc.* the morning inauspicious, the afternoon auspicious—represents a "developed" form of the superstition embodied in the "Days." Moreover, I should hesitate to believe that the same poet who in 772 f. praised the ninth day as ἔξοχον ἦμαρ of the waxing moon should here once more assure us that this day is παναπήμων and οὔποτε πάγκακον and that he should look at it on one occasion as a part of the "waxing moon" and on the other as one of the "ninths." One would at least wish to know what motive he had for returning to the first ninth. May he, since in the meantime days had been scrutinized with special reference to the birth of children, have wished to look also at the ninth from this point of view? This would mean that, if the entire section largely preoccupied with the subject of procreation (782–99) is by *one* poet and by the same poet who wrote 770–79, our section too has a chance of being his composition. After all that has so far been said, we begin to feel that the *onus probandi* is on the side of the "unitarians" and in this particular instance the *onus* would, like Hesiod's *Phêmê*, be ἀργαλέον δὲ φέρειν, χαλεπὸν δ' ἀποθέσθαι.

However, we too must avoid taking on too big a task. It is time to decide what we can and what we cannot prove. We

[47] 820 f. Cf. above, page 304.

have, I believe, found strong evidence for the view that the "Days" grew by accretion, 770–79 being the original stock, and we have also with reasonable certainty identified the contributions of some of the rhapsodes responsible for this kind of growth. But we should overestimate our chances if we tried to carry such identifications much farther, attempting to determine for every unit of the section 780–99 whether it belongs to the same poet as the preceding (or following) unit and whether this particular poet is also to be found elsewhere in the "Days." For such an attempt neither the linguistic criteria nor those of content suffice. All we can do with reference to that section is to ask a few searching questions.

As we pass from 769–79 to 780–99, we notice two changes of orientation. The author of the later section is (if I may repeat this point) no longer concerned with *ἡμέραι Διὸς πάρα μητιόεντος* or *ἱερὰ ἤματα* but rather with what we may call mixed days; and while in the former section the days were referred to in their natural order, this principle is now abandoned and we have instead the sequence 13, 16, 6, 8, 12, 20, 10, 14.[48] What accounts for this sequence is obviously associations attaching themselves to specific activities. The thirteenth is good for planting but the sixteenth is bad. The twentieth is a good *ἀνδρογόνος*; so is the tenth.[49] Not surprisingly, Hesiod's authorship of this section is championed by scholars who believe that in the "Works" too association often explains the transition from one topic to another. With regard to the "Works" this opinion may well contain a grain of truth; yet like any principle of the kind it lends itself to misuse and should be applied with caution.

However high we may rate the power which association had over Hesiod's mind, he has certainly never in the "Works" (nor, for that matter in the *Theogony*) succumbed to it as completely as he would have done here; nor has he ever produced anything as chaotic as 780–99. In the "Works" there are many instances where association can hardly account for the succession of thoughts,[50] and even where it might operate, Hesiod's procedure

[48] See 780, 782, 785, 790, 791, 792, 794 f. I am here taking up Nilsson's observation (*Opusc.* 51, note 22; cf. page 297).

[49] 781 ff., 792, 794.

[50] 286, 327, 336, 342, 373 (as following in the genuine text upon 369) are of this kind. In connection with the first of these passages Verdenius writes (above, note 7, 139): "Es erhebt sich daher von selbst die Frage ob die Gerechtigkeit genügt," and

may just as well or better be explained on more "rational" lines. When Hesiod, offering a string of good counsels, puts item after item without indicating a connection, it is gratuitous to look for "associations"; for all items refer to one and the same τέλος, *sc.* the securing of wealth (ὄλβος) through thrift and hard work. This, whether it is made explicit or not, suffices as a unifying principle.[51] Other sections are unified by the central idea which inspires them. When Hesiod describes the beneficial effect of work or warns his fellow citizens against a violation of Justice, Zeus' maiden daughter, the sequence of thoughts reflects his own passionate belief, which is not satisfied with one expression but moves from the vision of 30,000 watchers of Zeus to the picture of Justice herself complaining to Father Zeus and, in the end, asserts itself once more by assuring us that Zeus' own eye sees everything and notices everything.[52] What prompts this succession of vivid images is intense conviction and indignation; they do not arise in response to associations materializing in the process of formulation. To sum up, associative connections are in some instances unnecessary to explain a sequence, in others insufficient.

"Hesiod hat die Mahnung nicht an ihrem logisch richtigen, sondern an ihrem psychologisch effectiven Ort eingefügt." The question is hardly of the kind to arise by itself (and the answer, I may add, even less). With his second comment Verdenius in effect admits a kind of planning that goes beyond the "continuity of associations" (154). It is impossible here to go deeper into this subject nor should I like to polemize at length against Verdenius' opinions which in my own mind are irresistibly associated with the happy memories of the Vandoeuvre conference where he presented them so impressively. In 327–35 the "unwritten laws" are incorporated at the tail-end of a section in which Hesiod has developed his own views about justice (cf. my *Hesiod and Aeschylus* [Ithaca 1949] 75, note 265). Appropriate as this place is, it would be well to recognize 327–35 as a new development in Hesiod's argument and to make of them a separate paragraph (van Groningen [above, note 7] 286 seems disinclined to do so).

[51] See especially 342–80; 381 actually states the common τέλος of these rules of conduct. In 695–723, a section which in its "loose" structure is comparable to 342–80, the orientation toward a common τέλος is perhaps less obvious. 706 (probably spurious, see below note 69) separates two sets of counsels, the former dealing with marriage, the latter with conduct toward friends. Both subjects would come up naturally, and I do not see why associations induced by the concept of μέτρα (694; "richtiges Maas," Verdenius 151 f.) should be necessary to make Hesiod take up the topic of relations with friends.

[52] 252–55; 256–62; 267–69. For 249–69 Verdenius rightly refrains from using association as the principle of composition. For 287–92 (the "two ways") see note 50. That the way to success is steep and that it is barred to anyone unwilling to exert himself in constant ἔργον has been evident since the beginning of the poem (see esp. 42 ff.). It is one of the major themes to which Hesiod would return as being essential to his purpose.

Returning from these generalities to a closer look at 780–99, we may record a variety of observations without immediately committing ourselves as to their possible significance. 780 is the point where we get away from the days that are properly speaking ἐκ Διόθεν. At 785 the natural order of the days in the month is abandoned, mention of the sixth succeeding that of the sixteenth, just as slightly later (794) the tenth is discussed after the twentieth. Another observation is that the sixth and the tenth day of the month which in 769–79 had been passed over in silence are now found to have their uses. In 783 a new subject, auspicious birthdays, moves into the center and continues for a while to be the dominating concern (other subjects of interest to the author or authors are the gelding and taming of the domestic animals). Generally speaking, 780–99 leave us with the impression that the business of choosing the right day, which in the preceding section seemed so straightforward, turns out to be considerably more complex; hardly any day can be recommended without qualification, and the farther we read the more "casuistic" the scheme becomes. At the same time a new method of designating the days makes its appearance. We now read of the "middle sixth," of the "first sixth," and of the "middle fourth," [53] whereas the original method had been simply to refer to a day as say the fourth or the seventh of the month (or of the waxing moon).[54]

These, I think, are the observations that should be pondered. It is easy to minimize them—and perhaps also easy to consider them as decisive in favor of a plurality of authors. Conceivably Hesiod when composing 780–99 was more than normally carried hither and thither by associations. The bewildering variety of

[53] 782, 785, 794.

[54] 772 f. I should not deny that several methods may have been in use at the same time (and in the same region). And in the case of some days, most notably (805) the seventeenth, metrical difficulties may have militated against the use of the straightforward ordinal number. No superstitions relating to the last third of the month are set forth before we come to 814. It is possible that *religiones* began to crystallize around the early days of the month (or moon) and then gradually spread to the other parts of it. Alternatively 769–79 may originally have had a sequel dealing with the days of the μὴν φθίνων, and this sequel may have been discarded when its contents were no longer judged satisfactory, the miscellany of 780–821 taking by and by its place. It is certainly best to consider everything in a condition of flux, the beliefs themselves as well as their expression in verse and finally, as a result of it, the text of the "Days."

beliefs may have proved too much for his power of control. For doubtless, even if understood as a result of associations, this section is unique in his work.

For the opposite view this may be said: if there is evidence for a plurality of authors in the "Days" (and I think we have found such evidence), it is natural to explain the condition of 780–99 and their relation to what precedes them on this basis. And if ἄλλος ἀλλοίην αἰνεῖ gives us a clue, the clue may as well be applied here. One poet may know the sixteenth, another the sixth, still another the twentieth, a fourth the tenth, and (if it is permissible to include 810–13 in our present scrutiny) a fifth the nineteenth as an excellent "bearer of male children."[55] We had better not ask how many bright children born on one of these days they needed to know before they felt entitled to make their statement. Nothing prevents us from reading the verses in question as expressing different and competing preferences, except the fact (which should not impress us unduly) that in our tradition all these admonitions have come down in an epic going under the name of Hesiod.[56] In this section it is an exception if five lines (794–97, 799) are so compact and syntactically so closely interconnected that it would be difficult to insert additional material. Yet even in this exceptional case and under the most difficult conditions it did happen, with the result that the intrusive line betrays itself by the disruption which it causes. Normally a statement is set forth in one line or in two. Such statements could easily be added or receive additions in turn.

That Hesiod's verse and thought were known in the environment in which the "Days" took shape is not astonishing. Evidently the rhapsodes could for the purpose of their own versification—no nobler word need be used—fall back on half-lines or other parts of lines that they remembered from his poems[57] (as they could, of course, also draw on Homer's and other epics). In my opinion the "Days" are best thought of as a wild growth, proliferating without control and direction and reflecting

[55] 783, 788, 792, 794, 812.

[56] There is room for the impression that the preoccupation of the author(s) of 780–99 is with pastoral rather than with agricultural matters. Of the "Works" the opposite would be true.

[57] See esp. 789, 796, 806 (cf. 78, 604, 599). Because of their peculiar and (at least for us) unique content, the "Days" are not an ideal subject for the study of oral technique.

the equally uncontrolled wildfire-like spread of the superstition. Not every regional or other variety of such beliefs needs to have found its expression in the medium of the hexameter, and not every hexameter of the kind needs to have found its way into the poem or once admitted to it kept its place there. Considering how easily a new piece of wisdom could be added,[58] I should think it likely that in the sixth century the text varied considerably from region to region, not to say from rhapsode to rhapsode. Some attempts at consolidation may well have been made; some "redaction" may have enjoyed more prestige than others. After the superstition had run its course and things had quieted down—shall we say that by the end of the sixth century this was the case?—it may have been possible to get the material into "shape." The idea of a Pisistratid redaction having this consolidating result is attractive; after R. Merkelbach[59] in particular has presented an impressive case for the reality and the influence of this redaction, I should reckon with this possibility. Yet we are inevitably on uncertain ground, and while there can be no doubt that Heraclitus[60] knew the "Days" as a poem of Hesiod—which probably means that he knew them as part of the *Works and Days*—we cannot be sure how far the material and its arrangement in Heraclitus' text was identical with that in the late, post-Alexandrian editions to which our manuscripts (and papyri) go back. There being no pre-Alexandrian quotations and no scholia relating to the textual work of the Alexandrian critics, we may as well confess our ignorance about important phases of the text history. We cannot say how much divergence there was in the material on which the Alexandrians went to work and how many lines Aristarchus or (what is perhaps more to the point) his predecessors rejected, obelized, or provided with notes indicating

[58] We have observed this repeatedly, and I am reluctant to mention further instances. For it is difficult to say how far the experiment of treating individual lines as accretions should be carried (note, e.g., how easily 796 may have been added or how easily 794 may at one time have been complete in itself before it was expanded by the addition of 795 ff.; 787 is not particularly "organic" in its place, and I am tempted to say that with a *τέ* or *δέ* it would fit as many days as *ληκύθιον ἀπώλεσε* fits prologues). It must have been easy too to substitute the name of one day for that of another. Pollux' *πέμπτη* in 782 where the MSS. have *ἕκτη* may or may not be an old variant. And who could be sure whether the day here discussed was *μάλα σύμφορος* or *μάλ' ἀσύμφορος* for planting?

[59] "Die pisistratische Redaktion," *RhM* 95 (1952) 23 ff. (on Hesiod, *ibid.*, 40 f.).

[60] Plut. *Cam.* 19 (cf. Heraclitus B 57 and 106 Diels–Kranz).

dubious provenience or authenticity.[61] As far as we can tell, Plutarch in his commentary had no trouble with alternative versions or passages of uncertain standing.[62] Around 100 A.D. the text would have become uniform and may well have been so for some time previously.

It is no accident that the "Days" became attached to Hesiod's "Works." For of all epic poems that gave the Greeks of the archaic period practical ὑποθῆκαι for their daily life, the "Works" were certainly the most authoritative and for all that we know also the most popular. Moreover, Hesiod himself had not confined his instructions to his special message about the necessity of work and justice but had incorporated a certain amount of advice that from a thematic point of view barely relates to these topics.[63] Still everything that he included shares with these topics the quality of useful wisdom. From the "Works" an audience would expect to learn how to make one's way to prosperity or how to avoid the wrath of the gods. How to act

ὄφρ' ἄλλων ὠνῇ κλῆρον, μὴ τὸν τεὸν ἄλλος

(341) was certainly worth knowing. If other rules of conduct that would lead to the same result were familiar to the rhapsodes or their audience, is it astonishing that they became eventually incorporated in this repository of practical σοφίη? To go through life unharmed and remain ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν[64] it might be well to refrain from unjust acquisitions and to respect other men's rights—but there were also more primitive ways of remaining ἀναίτιος and avoiding trouble. You had to be careful not to beget a child when returning from a burial, not to cross a brook with hands unwashed and not to cut your fingernails

[61] It would be an error to think that lines (or readings) rejected by the great critics were forever banished from the text. They reappear in the editions of the imperial period on which our tradition depends (cf. Günther Jachmann, in *NGG* 1949, 167 ff.).

[62] What scholion 248.7 Pertusi reports about lines passed over and perhaps not read by Plutarch is irrelevant for our purposes. After a good deal of discussion it now seems clear that the omission in Plutarch's text was due to the homoeoteleuta in 791 and 796; cf. Pertusi, *Aevum* 26 (1952) 214 and his edition (Note 33) 246 and "Testimonia et adnotatio critica" 216; Hartmut Erbse, *BZ* 50 (1957) 137 f.

[63] This is true especially of 695–723 (advice concerning marriage, etc.) and some of the verses in the section 342–82 ("invite your friend to a meal, but leave your enemy alone" etc.).

[64] 827; see above, page 307.

while at a banquet at which the gods received a libation.[65] Once such wisdom was included in the poem, it would also seem desirable to incorporate instructions about the right and the wrong days. For to observe these instructions was another way of keeping out of trouble.

Everything that we read in the "Days" and in the section 724–759 is rules of conduct and in this respect comparable to the maxims put forward in the original Hesiodic "Works." In all instances transgression calls forth *ποινή*, *ἄτη*, or the wrath of the gods, whereas compliance opens or leaves open the way to success and prosperity. The modern reader may be very sensitive to the differences in tone and level between the content of the "Days" (or of the section immediately preceding them, 724–59) and Hesiod's own pronouncements about the road on which man walks toward *ὄλβος*;[66] in fact these differences are one of the reasons why we are unwilling to credit Hesiod with anything in the last 105 lines of the poem, except the five verses dealing with *Phêmê*.[67] In the genuine sections there are admonitions like

καὶ δόμεν ὅς κεν δῷ καὶ μὴ δόμεν ὅς κεν μὴ δῷ,

and we are told that if a friend hurts us it is best to retaliate *δὶς τόσσα*.[68] While the ethical outlook of these passages is by no means idealistic, it still is far removed from the *δεισιδαιμονία* of the final sections. But the *populus* for whom this *δεισιδαιμονία* was the daily fare would not necessarily be aware of, or offended by, such differences of ethical level. In a sense we may look upon the incorporation of these sections as evidence that Hesiod's poem, although it doubtless made a deep impression on the Greeks of the motherland, had failed to raise them to his own more

[65] 735 f., 737 ff., 742 f. It could be argued that the "Works" and the "Days" also have in common the idea of *ὥρια ἔργα* and that this motif (although differently understood in the two poems) facilitated the addition of the "Days." I mention this argument because *ὥρα* is certainly an important concept; yet I should not wish to attach much weight to it.

[66] The author of the concluding verses (826) actually uses in this connection the words *εὐδαίμων* and *ὄλβιος*. However, the end which 724–59 have in view seems more modest; it is the avoidance of harm caused by the wrath of the gods.

[67] I believe Wilamowitz (above, note 4, 129 f.) was right—and at his most brilliant—when he declared 760–64 to be the end of the genuine poem, suggesting that they originally followed 723.

[68] 354, 709–11.

advanced conception of the gods. The φρόνησις which he inculcated was a kind of intelligent self-reliance, a τραχεῖα ὁδός. Many for whom the road was too hard and steep would prefer, if not the lazy, shiftless κακότης which he contrasts with his ἀρετή, yet another, more mechanical way of insuring their "luck." Human nature being what it is, there is nothing to astonish us in Hesiod's partial failure.

Much that may be said about the outlook of the "Days" and about their "irrational" character applies also to 724–59. It therefore seemed natural to include them in some of our last observations.[69] To defend Hesiod's authorship of this section one would have to argue that Hesiod, while in some respects ahead of his time, was in others a child of it, having not outgrown the belief in taboos that prevailed in his day and his environment. This argument would be more persuasive, if evidence to support it could be found also in other parts of his poems; as long as it rests exclusively on 724–59, it remains unsatisfactory. In spirit the taboos of 724–59 are so close to the "Days" that it seems reasonable to consider them too as an accretion. That the authentic "Works" should come to an end in a section so at variance with their view of life is not easy to believe, and as we have found an alternative explanation for the presence of this section, we may as well accept this explanation with a sense of relief. There is nothing in 724–59 of the pithy wit, wisdom or irony which from time to time flash forth in the preceding parts of the poem, nothing even that could be compared with a thought like

ἐκ κοινοῦ πλείστη τε χάρις δαπάνη τ' ὀλιγίστη

in 723, the last genuine line before the section now under discussion. The maxims of conduct embodied in 695–723 are not lacking in shrewd understanding for human conditions and

[69] The similarity in outlook between the section dealing with taboos and the "Days" has often been noted. See e.g. Nilsson, *Geschichte d. griech. Religion* 1[2] (Munich 1955) 623 f.; Hermann Fränkel (above, note 5) 178. Since we cannot analyze 724–59 by the same methods that have served us for the "Days," the question whether one or several poets have here been at work must be left on one side. 706, a line singularly unmotivated in the context and therefore treated as interpolation by more than one modern editor, was probably inserted at the time when the "taboos" were added to the "Works." Either the author of the taboos or a man of similar mentality would introduce the ὅπις ἀθανάτων into a section which for his taste was too "secular" in outlook.

affairs; arguments given in support of these maxims are wise and indicative of reflection brought to bear on experience. By contrast the taboos of 723 ff. are supported by an appeal to fear, by references to a divine *νέμεσις*, to a *ποινή* or *ὀλοὴ μοῖρα*.[70]

Hesiod may or may not have been the first to use the hexameter for non-epic or non-heroic subjects. In doing so he elevated the subjects without—I venture to say, although this is only roughly true—lowering the dignity of the hexameter. Once a poet had begun to employ the "epic form" for matters "nearer home," there was no limit to the possibilities of so using it. Hexametric poetry, having become the vehicle of advice for the average man's daily life, could be applied to the humblest needs of this life, to washing, to elimination, and to the cutting of one's finger-nails. It is true that the Homeric epic, too, embraces human activities, great and small, in its scope, considering hardly anything irrelevant and dwelling with loving care on the details of the preparation of a meal, the eating of a meal, the tending of a flock, etc. Yet it stops short of referring to the most primitive physical functions and does not admit words denoting them to its vocabulary. In 724–59 no holds are barred. Does it make sense to speak in connection with

μηδ' ἐπὶ κρηνάων οὐρεῖν, μάλα δ' ἐξαλέασθαι[71]

of "epic" and "epic style"? *πλὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποι συνάπτοντες τῷ*

[70] See esp. 741, 745, 749, 754 f., 756. Cf. Fränkel (above, note 5) 178. Considering the typical fashion in which statements like *οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον* (750) or *ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἔπι ποινή* (749) conclude an admonition and take their place at the end of a verse, I am reluctant to read in 759 f. *τὸ γὰρ οὔ τοι λώιόν ἐστιν ὧδ' ἔρδειν* (as van Groningen suggests [above, note 7] 290). *ὧδ' ἔρδειν* is better—with the editors—made a separate clause.

[71] 758 (=736a). For 727–32 Wilamowitz (above, note 4, *ad loc.* and 130) shows (1) that they include phrases and constructions with which one would not readily credit Hesiod (*ὅ γε θεῖος ἀνήρ*, 731 used of a man who complies with the rules of decency is ludicrous), (2) that 728 and 730 are accretions, and (3) that the author of 728 in all probability misunderstood the meaning of 727. Evidently there were different opinions as to when *οὐρεῖν* was inoffensive (just as we have found different opinions about the "fourth," above page 301). Needless to remark, *οὐρεῖν* is one of the words not admitted to the Homeric vocabulary. Cf. Jacob Wackernagel's (*Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* [Göttingen 1916] 224) comments on "das Anstandsgefühl der epischen Dichter" as responsible for "Lücken des homerischen Wortschatzes." When Wackernagel (*ibid.*) contrasts Hesiod in this respect with Homer, he relies too much on our section where *ἐκλογὴ ὀνομάτων* sinks below the level of genuine Hesiodic diction.

μέτρῳ τὸ ποιεῖν . . . ἐποποιοὺς ὀνομάζουσιν.[72] Epic forms and epic phrases were ready at hand; the technique of versification was mastered by many—not always to perfection, as we can see in the case of

ὃς ποταμὸν διαβῇ κακότητ' ἰδὲ χεῖρας ἄνιπτος.[73]

ἀενάων ποταμῶν καλλίρροον ὕδωρ may sound like an authentic epic phrase, even if it is followed by the rather prosaic ποσσὶ περᾶν.[74] But surely no great poetic skill was required to produce the verse

τετράδ' ἀλεύασθαι φθίνοντος θ' ἱσταμένου τε

or to put together the words

οὐδὲ μὲν ἡ πρώτη ἕκτη κούρῃ γε γενέσθαι (ἄρμενος).[75]

Every piece of wisdom, every floating belief could be put in the form of an hexameter. Thus it would acquire authority and would be easier to remember. In days that had no books, no pamphlets, and no newspapers, hexametric "poetry" was a means of communication and instruction. A person who had heard that "the fifths were to be avoided" may well have been inclined to act on this notion; when the rhapsode told him that Erinyes and Horkos are about on this day,[76] any lingering doubts

[72] Aristot. *Poet.* 1.1447B, 13 f.

[73] 740.

[74] 737. πολυηράτῳ ὕδατι λευκῷ (739) is another attempt to keep the treatment of lowly matters on a poetic level. These are not the only instances of "solemn" language. For taboos, cryptic phrases (742 f., 750) may be in order; by resorting to them the poet(s) could achieve something like the obligatory stylistic elevation.

[75] 798, 785. I would not wish to make too much of the non-epic βροτήσια in 773 or of the ἀερσιπότητος ἀράχνης in 777 (in the *Lexikon des frühgriech. Epos* the adjective is, s.v., explained as "normalisiert aus der Augenblicksbildung ἀερσιπότης," which "Augenblicksbildung" is however cited only from "Hes." *Scutum* 316); yet I doubt whether Hesiod's linguistic feeling would have allowed him to use ἐνθρέψασθαι as we find it employed in 781, where ἐν = ἐν τῇδε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. A stylistic feature common to the "Works" and the first section of the "Days" is the use of γρῖφοι (ἶδρις for the ant, 778; cf. φερέοικος for the snail, 571, ἀνόστεος for the cuttlefish or the polypus, 524). Here may be found an argument for Hesiod's authorship, if not of the entire "Days," at least of 769–79. But the argument, while not negligible, is far from cogent; an alternative explanation would be that the popular language knew γρῖφοι (cf. Wilamowitz, [above, note 4] 151; Nilsson, *Gnomon* 4 [1928] 613 "wie Bauern") and that Hesiod's precedent encouraged the author of this passage.

[76] In 803 f. this is the reason why the "fifths" are to be shunned. Reasons are given also in 771 (the seventh is Apollo's birthday) and in 777–79, which I understand thus: when the spider weaves, a woman should weave; when the ant ἀμᾶται you

would vanish—and it was certainly desirable that others too should be informed of this important fact. Conversely, a person convinced that the fourth was a good day for taking a wife—or why not say, a person who on the strength of this belief had actually taken his wife home on a fourth?—would be grievously disappointed if the rhapsode, while recommending the fourth as auspicious for various other purposes, failed to mention how suitable it was for this particular one.

should ἀμᾶσθαι your grain (775; it is immaterial that for us ἀμᾶσθαι is not the same verb in 775 and 778). In the "Works," too, animal behavior is to be watched (cf. 448 ff.; 571 f., 582 ff.) but for how different a purpose! The voice of the crane brings a σῆμα ἀρότοιο and indicates χείματος ὥρην (450). The difference in the attitude to nature is characteristic.

I am grateful to Emmett L. Bennett and Martin L. West for reading this paper and giving me the benefit of their critical comments.