BOOK REVIEW


Hesiod seems to change his mind at the start of Works and Days; it’s a famous moment. In the Theogony, he speaks of one Strife but in WD, as Most translates it in the volume under review, he decides that “so there was not just one birth of Strifes after all, but upon the earth there are two Strifes” (11-12). The discrepancy has also split scholarly opinion. Does Hesiod respond to traditional genealogies, an oral “Hesiodic” poem, or to his own previously written text? Is the WD response or revision?

In an act of both response and revision, Glenn Most has now updated his Loeb edition of the Hesiodic corpus. Several fragments, testimonia and a library shelf of bibliography on Hesiod have appeared in the decade since its initial publication. The revision includes these and corrects infelicities. As before, the texts are sound, the translations lucid and the fragments and testimonia made accessible to students and scholars at all levels. The volumes are indispensable, and the benefits of the revision should persuade even those who already own the first edition to consider revising their collection and purchasing anew.

The new testimonia offer insight into several areas of Hesiodic Studies. In an argument over the historical chronology of Hesiod and Moses, Origen (T158) contends that not only are Hesiod and other cosmographers younger than Moses, who was “much older than the time of the Trojan War” (πολλοί τὸν Ἰλίκον πρεσβύτερον), but their “unqualified” accounts exculpate Jewish sources from being the “most implausible and uncultured stories” (ἀπίθανωτα καὶ ἀνουσωτάτα). Nine inscribed epigrams by Honestus from Mt. Helicon (T159 a) = Inscriptiones Graecae VII 1796-1805), which once adorned statue-bases of the Muses, blend Hesiodic
etymologies with other gods, for example Thaleia with Peace (c) and Terpsichore with Bromios (d), and practices, such as Ourania with "celestial investigations" (asterais érēseis [h]). In a recently published funerary inscription (SEG 61.1058), T.160 commemorates Kyrión, a Bithynian poet whose sons praise him as an "imitator of Hesiod and rival of Archilochus" (Hesiodou zëlota ke Archilochou orekta, 2). Likewise, T.161 (SEG 58.1810), a 4th century BCE dipinto on an Egyptian schoolhouse, records the prayers of a teacher that his students "all learn the sweet works of the Muses" (pantas mou saōn erga melichra mathein, 5).

The fragments, though meagre, are likewise welcome additions. They begin with a recently assembled papyrus (Fr. 307, cf. D. Danbeck, ZPE 187 [2013]) from book one of the Catalogue, heavily reconstructed on the basis of Iliad 20.220-22, on "the wealthiest of mortal humans" (aphneiotatos ... thnētōn anthropōn, 7) with "three thousand horses" (trischei sati hippo). In Fr. 308 features Plutarch's claims that Hesiod and other poets knew Heracles as both Boeotian and Argive, not Egyptian or Phoenician. Other fragments include Pollux (Fr. 309) on nomenclature for sea channels, a scholiast to the Iliad (Fr. 310) on the relative date of Hesiod's based on his knowledge of the Lydians and the Etymologicum Gnomicum (Fr. 311) on derivations of "to fly" (petēn).

The bibliography successfully updates most strands of Hesiodic scholarship. This is especially true for Hesiod's "Influence and Reception," which has boomed in the past decade and grown from seven to sixteen items. The only Hesiodic text that does not receive additional bibliography is the Shield (lxxii). Although Most almost exclusively cites monographs, readers could benefit from citation of helpful articles on the Shield, for example by Z. Stamatopoulou (CP 108.4 [2013] 273-84) and R. Martin (in The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions, ed. R. Hunter (Cambridge 2005) 153-75), or the commentary on lines 139-237 by H. C. Mason (DPhil Thesis, Merton College, Oxford [2015]).

The merits of Most's translation shine through both in the clarity of its rendition of the Greek and occasional lyricism in particular passages. Take for example Catalogue Fr. 145, where the alliteration of /p/ in the final phrase (ptera pontoporpoio) becomes the interlaced repetition of /f/ and /s/ across two lines with the metaphor postponed to a concrete, monosyllabic end: "these were the first to fasten together swaying ships, / and the first to set up sails, the sea-crossing boat's wings" (hoi de toi prótoi zeuxan neas amphielissas / prótoi d' histi' ethen néos ptera pontoporpoio, 6-7). Most also translates the vocabulary of identity and violence with accuracy, avoiding euphemism and the missteps of other translations that have recently come into criticism. For example, forms of damazō in sexual contexts are
consistently translated as “overpower” (e.g. Theog. 327, 374, 453, 857, 962, 1000), a word choice that conveys the imbalance in power and likelihood of sexual violence. Only the translation of enslavement is less consistent: δυσάδες “slave” at WD 470, though it is rendered “servant” in the metaphorical context of craftwork at WD 430 (“servant of Athena”); conversely, νικεως is translated as “house servant” at Fr. 27.20, though it more likely refers to an enslaved domestic worker.

I encountered only three typos: at Shield 459, the Greek text contains the Roman letter ‘ś’ inserted within αὐθές (austēς [sic], or “battle cry,” an error not in the first edition); at Theog. 723a, ἵσων is spelled with a lunate instead of lowercase sigma; at the note to WD 464 (124), “testt.” should likely be “testt.” (cf. n. WD 211, p. 105). Otherwise, the revised edition is clear, reliable and a necessary member of any Classics library.
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