

Oxford Handbooks Online

Ovid's Hesiodic Voices

Ioannis Ziogas

The Oxford Handbook of Hesiod

Edited by Alexander C. Loney and Stephen Scully

Print Publication Date: Sep 2018 Subject: Classical Studies, Classical Poetry

Online Publication Date: Aug 2018 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190209032.013.48

Abstract and Keywords

Ovid's poetry opens a dialogue with the three major Hesiodic works: the Theogony, the Works and Days, and the Catalogue of Women. The ways in which these works complement or differ from each other are reflected in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, *Metamorphoses*, and *Fasti*. Hesiod's works are both diverse and integrated, a combination that appealed to Ovid's versatile genius. Stylistic and thematic aspects of Hesiodic poetry, such as puns and transformations, further resonate with Ovidian poetics. Ovid engages with Hesiod's text directly and indirectly through the tradition of Hesiodic reception, which includes philosophers such as Xenophanes and Philodemus, as well as Hellenistic poets such as Callimachus and Aratus.

Keywords: agriculture, Callimachus, certamen Homeri et Hesiodi, genealogy, metamorphosis, gender, philosophy, personification, time, syllepsis

Introduction

WHY does Hesiod appeal to Ovid? A common answer is that Ovid views the archaic poet through the lens of Hellenistic reception. A figure emblematic for Alexandrian poetics, Hesiod symbolizes the poet of peaceful pursuits and artistic refinement as opposed to the pompousness of martial epic. This approach can be useful, provided that we acknowledge that for Ovid the Hellenistic Hesiod functions as a “window”¹ on Hesiod’s poetry, which itself anticipates its own reception (cf. Haubold 2010; Hunter 2014; Canevaro 2015). The antagonism between Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, for instance, is already suggested in the *Works and Days* (hereafter *WD*) and is developed in the tradition of the competition (*certamen*) of Homer and Hesiod, which Ovid appropriates. Ovid is also aware of trends in Hesiodic reception other than Hellenistic poetry, such as the philosophy of Empedocles and Plato or the criticism of Xenophanes and Philodemus. Some of these philosophical analyses of Hesiodic poetry are related to main preoccupations of Ovidian poetics, such as the issue of gods’ morality, the controversy about truth and falsity in mythology, and the interplay between fabulous tales and their scientific interpretations.

The Hesiodic voice, which is variously pitched but invariably recognizable, fascinated Ovid. Distinctive traits of Hesiodic poetics must have attracted Ovid; personified abstractions, etymological wordplay, and sylleptic puns² feature prominently in Hesiod and Ovid. The thematic diversity of Hesiodic poetry was equally appealing to Ovid’s genius. Hesiod’s interests range from the creation of the world to mundane things of everyday life and combine a universal worldview with a deep concern about his times. As the ultimate authority on didactic poetry, poetic cosmogonies, and affairs between mortals and immortals, he provides a model for Ovid’s simultaneously diverse and unified works. The variety and unity of the Hesiodic corpus, an interpretative approach that Hesiodic poetry itself invites (Clay 2003; Haubold 2010; Canevaro 2015), appealed to (p. 378) Ovid. Hesiod and Ovid assume different voices and personas in different works, which are nonetheless self-consciously interconnected (cf. Van Noorden 2014: 204–60).

Homer and Hesiod

The first explicit reference to Hesiod in Ovid is in *Amores* (hereafter *Am.*) 1.15. The poet from Ascra appears right after Homer:

uiuēt Maeonides, Tenedos dum stabit et Ide,
dum rapidas Simois in mare uoluet aquas;
uiuēt et Ascraeus, dum mustis uua tumebit,
dum cadet incurua falce resecta Ceres.

(*Am.* 1.15.9–12)

Maeonian Homer will live, as long as Tenedos and Ida will stand, as long as Simois will roll his waters rushing into the sea, the Ascraean Hesiod will live too, as long as the grape will swell for must, as long as Ceres will fall beneath the stroke of the curving sickle.³

The mention of key geographical locations in the Trojan War (the island Tenedos, Mount Ida, and the river Simois) celebrates Homer as the poet of the *Iliad* before Ovid commemorates Hesiod as the poet of the *WD* by associating him with viticulture and agriculture. This juxtaposition alludes to the tradition of the *certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, which pits the warlike poetry of the *Iliad* against the peaceful agenda of the *WD*.⁴ The *Theogony* (hereafter *Th*) is not evoked, an indication that Hesiod was identified primarily, though certainly not exclusively, as the poet of the *WD*, and the *WD* as a poem about agriculture.

The reference to the rushing waters of Simois further evokes Callimachus's muddy river (*Hymn* 2.108–9), a symbol of epic poetry to be avoided. Ovid's response to Envy (*Liur*, see *Am.* 1.15.1–6) invites us to read *Am.* 1.15 against the background of Apollo's retort to Envy (Φθόνοϛ, Callimachus, *Hymn* 2.108–9).⁵ Apollo contrasts the dirty streams of epic with the pure water that the bees fetch for Demeter (*Hymn* 2.110–12). Ovid appropriates the Callimachean imagery by juxtaposing the rushing river of martial epic with Hesiod's Ceres. Thus, the Roman poet alludes to the tradition of the *certamen* and views it through the "window" of Alexandrian poetics. While both Homer and Hesiod are praised for their immortal poetry, Ovid implies the long-standing antagonism between Homeric/martial and Hesiodic/didactic poetry.

Ars Amatoria

Homer and Hesiod appear together in passages that evoke the tradition of the *certamen*. A case in point is the beginning of *Ars Amatoria* (hereafter *Ars*) 2:

(p. 379)

Laetus amans donat uiridi mea carmina palma,
praelata Ascraeo Maeonioque seni.
Talis ab armiferis Priameius hospes Amyclis
candida cum rapta coniuge uela dedit;
talis erat qui te curru uictore ferebat,
uecta peregrinis Hippodamia rotis.

(*Ars* 2.3–8)

The happy lover crowns my poem with green palm-leaves and prefers it to the Ascraean and Maeonian old men. Such was the guest, Priam's son, who spread his

gleaming sails from belligerent Amyclae in the company of his stolen bride; such was he who bore you in victorious chariot, Hippodamia, conveyed upon his foreign wheels.

In the *Certamen* (205–10), the Greeks support Homer, but King Panedes crowns Hesiod with the victory wreath because he prefers the poet of peace and agriculture to the poet of wars and slaughters. Ovid inserts himself into the tradition of the *certamen* and beats both Homer and Hesiod. In this revisionist version, the judge is not a king concerned with peace, but a lover who conquered the object of his desire thanks to Ovid's instructions. *Ars* 2.5–8 advertises the subordination of Greek epic to Ovid's didactic agenda. The abductions of Helen and Hippodamia suggest that Homeric and Hesiodic poetry alike are incorporated into Ovid's work. The lines that mention Helen and the epic compound *armiferis* anticipate the Trojan War; however, at the same time, Ovid repeats *talis* in a way that evokes Hesiod's formula of *ehoie* ("or such as") in the *Catalogue of Women* (aka *Ehoiai*). The examples of Helen and Hippodamia further resonate with the contents of the *Catalogue of Women* (hereafter *CW*), which included the stemma of the Pelopids (in Book 4) and concluded with the wooing of Helen (fr. 196–204 M–W).⁶ But the female-oriented tradition of the *Ehoiai* is focalized through the eyes of Ovid's male lovers. This is suggested by the gender shift from the feminine *ehoie* to the masculine *talis*.

The beginning of *Ars* 2 anticipates the importance of Hesiod in the shift to the female-oriented contents of *Ars* 3. Ovid gives his own twist to the playful Alexandrian versions of Hesiodic *Kataloggedicht*, but also evokes the motifs, formulae, and contents of the *Ehoiai* directly.⁷ As he moves from the first to the second book, he emphasizes that conquering a girl is not everything, but just the first step (Book 1). The second and equally important task is to learn how to keep the vanquished woman (Book 2). In this context, the evocation of the *CW* suggests its status as a sequel to the *Th*; the progression from *Ars* 1 to 2 parallels a transition in the Hesiodic corpus. Likewise, in the unexpected transition from *Ars* 2 to 3, Ovid evokes the shift from the end of the *Iliad* to the beginning of the *Aithiopsis*, but also from the end of the *Th* to the beginning of the *CW* (see Gibson 2003: 86). The mention of Penthesilea (*Ars* 3.1–2) replays the seamless transition from the last line of the *Iliad* (24.804, Ὡς οἱ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο, "thus they took care of the burial of Hector, tamer of horses") to the beginning of the *Aithiopsis* (fr. 1.1–3 Bernabé, Ὡς οἱ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος· ἦλθε δ' Ἀμαζών,/ ... ἐνδειδῆς Πενθεσίλ(ε)ια, "thus they took care of Hector's burial; and the Amazon came ... beautiful Penthesileia"). Moreover, the last couplet of *Ars* 2, in which (p. 380) Ovid announces his plan to move on to the subject of women, evokes the last two lines of the *Th*, which are also the first two lines of the *CW* and in which Hesiod invokes the Muses to sing of the tribe of women. Two catalogues of women at the beginning of *Ars* 3 (3.11–22, 33–42) further suggest the transition to the *Ehoiai*. The first contrasts vile with virtuous heroines, while the second focuses on heroines who were betrayed by men. Ovid praises women, touching upon the very program of Hesiod's *Ehoiai*. As he does not give just a list but an exemplary catalogue of virtuous heroines, his work is aligned with the program of the *Ehoiai*.

The *praeceptor* also imagines that he answers an objection that equipping his Amazons with the art of love is like entrusting a sheepfold to a hungry she-wolf (*Ars* 3.7–8). This recalls the misogynistic aspect of Hesiodic poetry, in particular the *WD*, in which we read that “whoever trusts a woman, trusts swindlers” (375). From that perspective, *Ars* 3 signals another transition within the Hesiodic corpus: from the male-oriented *WD*, whose didactic focus on work and profit often views women as rapacious and thus undermining men’s hard work, to the female-oriented *CW*, which revolves around the praise of famous heroines who are a great asset to their families. Hesiod, as the male-oriented instructor of the *WD* and the author of poetry in praise of female virtue, provides Ovid with the model for his transition to *Ars* 3. At the same time, the idea of teaching women is found in Hesiod, who instructs his addressee to marry a virgin, so that he can teach (διδάξῃς) her good habits (*WD* 699). Teaching one’s bride carries sexual connotations, as she is to be taught the works of Aphrodite (cf. Canevaro 2015: 120n119), the very aim of *Ars* 3. By teaching women love, Ovid both fulfills and subverts Hesiod’s advice. Far from teaching morality and marital sex to a virgin he married, Ovid instructs his female students to enjoy extramarital affairs.

Hesiod himself draws attention to the progression from the *Th* to the *WD*. The temporality of these works corresponds to Hesiod’s career. A poem on the creation of the universe (*Th*) is composed by a young shepherd, while the contemporary world of the *WD* is the work of a mature farmer. In the *WD* Hesiod’s autobiographical representation of his personal development appears in the form of a sequenced intertextuality (see Most 1993: 76–80), what Haubold (2010: 21) calls the biographical hermeneutics of the Hesiodic corpus. This provides a model for Ovid, who incorporates biographical information about his poetic career in the literary progression of his works.⁸ The expert teacher of the *Ars*, for instance, who learned from the mistakes of his youthful *Am.*, corresponds to the experienced narrator of the *WD*, who sets out to revise or complement his earlier *Th*.

At the beginning of the *Ars*, Ovid denies an encounter with the Muses and declares that his work is the product of experience rather than divine inspiration. This very disavowal aligns him with the narrator of the *WD*:

Nec mihi sunt uisae Clio Clisque sorores
seruanti pecudes uallibus, Ascra, tuis:
usus opus mouet hoc: uati parete perito;
uera canam ...

(*Ars* 1.27–30)

(p. 381) Neither did Clio and Clio’s sisters appear to me while I kept flocks in your vale, Ascra: experience sets this work in motion: obey an experienced bard; I shall sing of true things...

Ovid is referring to the famous initiation in *Th* 22–35 (cf. Callimachus, *Aetia* fr. 2.1–2 Pf.). While denying this divine epiphany, he echoes the program of the *WD* (cf. *WD* 10, ἐπήτυμα μθησαίμην, “I should tell the truth,” with *uera canam*), which is itself a revision of the

Th. Experience as the basis of his *opus/ἔργον* suggests the practical program of the *WD* (Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι), not the divinely inspired, and thus potentially false, poetry of the *Th* (see Rosati 2009: 349–51; Canevaro 2015: 42–43). Thus, Ovid's renunciation of the Muses' epiphany reproduces Hesiod's personal development and throws into sharper relief the tension between the *Th* and the *WD*.

Yet the dichotomy between the divinely inspired *Th* and the practical *WD* is not clear-cut (cf. Canevaro in this volume). The Muses in the *Th*, not unlike Hesiod in the *WD*, declare that they can sing the truth (28), and Hesiod's didactic persona proclaims that he can instruct Perses in seafaring, even though he has no expertise in the subject (*WD* 646–49). Hesiod gained knowledge without experience thanks to the Muses (*WD* 662, "For the Muses taught [ἐδίδαξαν] me to sing an inconceivable hymn," which clearly echoes *Th* 22, "they taught [ἐδίδαξαν] Hesiod a beautiful song"). Likewise, Ovid invokes the Muse Erato to favor his work (*Ars* 2.16), and his dismissal of Apollo is undercut by the god's epiphany (*Ars* 2.493–510). These inconsistencies reiterate the tension and continuity between the mythological *Th* and the didactic *WD*.

The *Ars* includes a scientific cosmogony that resonates with Hesiod's *Th* but downplays the mythological and anthropomorphic origins of Hesiod's cosmos (cf. *Met.* 1.5–7 with Ziogas 2013: 57–59). The beginning of Ovid's cosmogony opens a dialogue with Hesiod and the reception of his poetry:

*Prima fuit rerum confusa sine ordine moles,
unaque erat facies sidera, terra, fretum;
mox caelum impositum terris, humus aequore cincta est
inque suas partes cessit inane chaos ...*

(*Ars* 2.467–70)

First there was a confused mass of things without order, and stars and earth and sea had but one appearance; presently the sky was set over the earth, the land was ringed by the sea, and empty chaos retired to its own place.

To begin with Chaos is to begin with Hesiod's *Th*, and *prima* alludes to *πρώτιστα* Χάος γένετ' (116, "first Chaos came to being"). The image of the sky as set over the earth recalls Ouranos's oppressive union with Gaia (cf. *Th* 177–78, "and he [Ouranos] spread himself around her [Gaia]"), while the encircling of the land by sea refers to the river Oceanus. Ovid's cosmogony has its origins in the *Th* but follows a trend in Hesiodic reception that sees the archaic poet as a pioneer in philosophical and scientific thought, not as the author of false myths. Within the *Ars*, Ovid's cosmogonic digression aims to instruct his students that *eros* ("love") is the solution to *eris* ("strife"), thus giving a further twist to (p. 382) Empedocles's philosophy, which is in turn influenced by Hesiod.⁹ In the *Th*, *eros* leads to sexual violence and results in generational and gendered discord. For the *praeceptor*, love is the origin and dissolution of conflict, a subtle revision of the

Hesiodic worldview. Thus, Ovid incorporates a scientific lesson about the origins of the world in the didactic agenda of the *Ars*.

The dialectic between Ovid's *Ars* and Hesiod's *WD* revolves around the reprocessing of agricultural themes and language as amatory metaphors. Ovid calls Hesiod *praeceptor arandi* (*Fasti* 6.13, "teacher of plowing"), echoing *praeceptor amandi* (*Ars* 2.161, "teacher of lovemaking"). The parallel is not only intentionally antonymic (Rosati 2009: 359n48), but further draws attention to the similarities between plowing and lovemaking. Ovid's *opus*, for instance (e.g., at *Ars* 1.29), not only points to the *Ars* as an ἔργον of didactic poetry but also suggests sex as an agricultural metaphor.¹⁰ Ovid uses *opus* in the sense of "sexual intercourse" several times (see *Am.* 1.4.48, 2.10.36, 3.7.68, 3.14.28; *Ars* 2.480, 3.770), and this meaning is actually a metaphor from agriculture (see Adams 1982, 157; cf. Plautus, *Asinaria* 873–74). Ovid eroticizes Hesiodic poetry, but it should also be noted that the sexual connotations of ἔργον are already attested in Hesiod (see *WD* 521, οὐπω ἔργα ἰδυῖα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης, "still ignorant of the works of golden Aphrodite"). The seeds of the Ovidian interplay between the works of sex and agriculture were sown by Hesiod.¹¹

The *WD* contains other material that is relevant to the *praeceptor amoris*. Hesiod advises about the right age of marriage: late twenties to early thirties for a man and five years after she reaches puberty for a woman (*WD* 695–98). One should marry a virgin who lives nearby lest he be a laughingstock of the neighborhood (*WD* 699–701). While the recommendation about marrying a woman who lives nearby corresponds to Ovid's claim that men do not need to search beyond Rome to find attractive women (*Ars* 1.55–59), Hesiod's advice about marriage contrasts with Ovid's instructions about extramarital love. Ovid responds to the strict age limits for the appropriate woman with his more relaxed instructions; the right age depends entirely on his students' tastes (*Ars* 1.61–66).

Ovid introduces his reworking of Hesiod's "Days" (*Ars* 1.399–436 echoes *WD* 765–828; cf. Vergil, *Georgics* 1.268–96) by announcing that not only farmers and sailors but also lovers should be concerned with time and timing:

*Tempora qui solis operosa colentibus arua,
fallitur, et nautis aspicienda putat ...*

(*Ars* 1.399–400)

He errs who thinks that seasons are to be marked by sailors alone, and by those who till the toilsome fields ...

Tempora operosa glosses over Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι (cf. *Ars* 1.415, *die*). Ovid's statement is not necessarily a denial of Hesiod, but may remind us that even in Hesiod's "Days" we find advice that is directed neither to farmers nor to sailors. Hesiod marks the right day for getting married (*WD* 784, 800) and the appropriate days for the birth of male and female offspring (*WD* 783–800). Issues of marriage and procreation are grafted into the

right time for sowing and taming animals. Hesiod himself provides Ovid with the basis for combining the works of farming with the works of love.

(p. 383) The Hesiodic instructions about avoiding greedy women inform Ovid's "Days." The *praeceptor* marks the days on which the shops are closed and advises his students to avoid big festivals and to brand their beloved's birthday a "black day," since a gift to her cannot be avoided then (1.417-18). The literal reference to the rising of the Pleiades in Hesiod becomes a metaphor for financial loss in Ovid:

*Differ opus: tunc tristis hiems, tunc Pliades instant,
tunc tener aequorea mergitur Haedus aqua ...*

(*Ars* 1.409-10)

Put off work: the storm is lowering then, and the Pleiades loom over, the tender Kid is merged in the watery waves ...

By instructing his students to put off the task of courting when the days invite spending, Ovid appropriates Hesiod, who advises avoiding certain tasks on certain days (e.g., *WD* 780-81), but also brings up a tension between working hard and procrastinating. Hesiod warned against procrastination (*WD* 410-12, "Do not postpone [μηδ' ἀναβάλλεσθαι] until tomorrow and the next day: for the futilely working man does not fill his granary, nor does the procrastinator [ἀναβαλλόμενος]; industry fosters work [ἔργον]"), and Ovid's *differ opus* not only contrasts with Hesiod's "don't put off work" but also pits the serious agricultural pursuits of Hesiodic didactic against the playful task of courting. Yet it is not accurate to think of the *Ars* as simply undermining or mocking the *WD*. The playfulness of Ovid's work should not distract us from noticing the continuity between Ovidian and Hesiodic didactic. The *praeceptor* is a true heir of Hesiodic tradition. Hesiod's warning about avoiding parasitic women who charm men's minds while poking into their granary (*WD* 373-74) is in tune with the economy of wooing in the *Ars* (see 1.419-20). Resisting the mercenary habits of charming *puellae* is the *praeceptor's* markedly Hesiodic preoccupation.¹²

The winter rise of the Pleiades is associated with stormy weather at *WD* 619-22 (cf. Vergil, *Georgics* 4.232-35), in which Hesiod advises to put off sailing. Ovid may link the wintry rise of the Pleiades and the Kid (cf. Aratus, *Phaenomena* 158-59) with the Saturnalia (Hollis 1977 on 408), a big festival in December that involved gift exchanges, thus combining the dangers of winter storms for sailors with the financial hazards of the Saturnalia for lovers. The metaphor of a lover as a sailor buffeted in stormy weather (e.g. Horace, *Ode* 1.5; cf. Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 13-14) is in play here. But Ovid gives an unexpected twist to the metaphor of loving as sailing. The storms that threaten the lover do not arise from uncontrollable passion but from loss of income. The lover resembles a ship that may lose its cargo due to inclement weather, a distinctly Hesiodic concern. The *praeceptor* appropriates the traditional association of the Pleiades and the Kid with the

dangers of seafaring and transforms the themes and diction of traditional didactic into novel metaphors.

The deceitful and mercenary nature of the *puellae* calls for elaborate instructions about the reciprocity of gifts. Hesiod's straightforward advice, "give to one who gives and do not give to one who does not give: for one gives to a giver, but no one gives to (p. 384) a non-giver" (*WD* 354–55, καὶ δόμεν ὅς κεν δῶ καὶ μὴ δόμεν ὅς κεν μὴ δῶ·/δώτη μὲν τις ἔδωκεν, ἀδώτη δ' οὐ τις ἔδωκεν) is updated and applied to the exchange of gifts and favors in elegiac love. Ovid complicates Hesiod's instructions by warning that women like to receive without giving back (*Ars* 1.433, *Multa rogant utenda dari, data reddere nolunt*, "They ask to be given many things to borrow, but, once given, they do not want to give them back") and suggesting that his students should promise gifts without giving them. A man should always give the impression that he is about to give without actually giving (*Ars* 1.449, *At quod non dederis, semper uideare daturus*, "But what you have not given you may seem always on the point of giving"; cf. *Ars* 1.454). The polyptota (*dari, data; dederis, daturus*) evoke Hesiod (δόμην, δῶ, δώτη, ἔδωκεν, ἀδώτη, ἔδωκεν). Ovid casts the economy of reciprocity in gendered terms, adjusting Hesiod to the world of Latin love elegy. Elegiac women prefer snatching to giving, and Ovid's male students should match female wiles with equal cunning. Such a negative view of women is a characteristic of the *WD*. Ovid combines Hesiod's advice about gift exchange with his warnings about greedy females.

Women who appreciate expensive gifts more than good poetry give the *praeceptor* the opportunity to literalize and thus ironize the golden age:

*Aurea sunt uere nunc saecula: plurimus auro
uenit honos: auro conciliatur amor.*

(*Ars* 2.277–78)

Truly now our age is golden: the greatest honor comes with gold: love is gained with gold.

The Hesiodic myth of ages (*WD* 109–201) becomes *the* great Roman myth (see Feeney 2007: 112), thanks to Augustus, who claimed that he had restored the golden age in Rome.¹³ The imperial appropriation of the Hesiodic myth relies on Augustus's claims that he had established peace and justice and restored good old Roman morality. Wealth is the enemy of the Roman virtues of *paupertas* and *frugalitas*, and the "gold" of the golden age is metaphorical, not literal (cf. Plato, *Cratylus* 398a; *Am.* 3.8.35–36; *Metamorphoses* 1.89–112). But in the *Ars*, the voice of the elegiac lover who suffers from the greed of desirable women literalizes Hesiod's gold.¹⁴ It should be added, however, that the interplay between the figurative and literal meanings of the metallic races features already in Hesiod (see Van Noorden 2015: 33, 77–78). The bronze race, for instance, had bronze weapons, lived in bronze houses, and worked with bronze (*WD* 150–51).¹⁵ Thus, Ovid's

Ovid's Hesiodic Voices

literalization of the golden age can be interpreted as simultaneously undermining and Hesiodizing Hesiod.

While the condemnation of gold suits the imperial appropriation of Hesiodic morality, the power of gold in Augustan Rome lays bare the paradox of a wealthy society entertaining nostalgic dreams of returning to the simplicity of idealized ancestors. Ovid distances himself from this nostalgia in a way that complements and contrasts with Hesiod's voice. While Hesiod bemoans the fact that he was born in the iron age, Ovid fully enjoys Roman modernity:

(p. 385)

Prisca iuuent alios: ego me nunc denique natum
gratulator: haec aetas moribus apta meis.

(*Ars* 3.121–22)

Let ancient times delight others: I congratulate myself that I was not born till now;
this age fits my character well.

Ovid responds to Hesiod's wish that he had lived in an age different from his own (see La Penna 1979: 195; cf. *Fasti* 1.225–26); *alios* should include Hesiod, who would have been pleased had he lived in a previous or later era (*WD* 174–76). Ovid not only contradicts Hesiod's statement (La Penna 1979: 195; Barchiesi 1997: 235), but also fulfills his desire to have lived in a future era. As a *Hesiodus rediuiuus*, Ovid does not regret living in his times. Yet the golden age that suits his character (*moribus*) is at odds with Hesiod's ideal age of morality. Ovid enjoys the sophistication and refinement of the city, not the strict morality and hard work of the countryside. The Hesiodic background to the *Ars* highlights the contrast between the country as the setting of Hesiod's *WD* and the city as the playground for Ovid's games of love.

Metamorphoses

The continuity of Hesiod's works features prominently in the *Metamorphoses* (hereafter *Met.*). After a short proem, Ovid begins with Chaos (*Met.* 1.7), a poetic and cosmic opening of Hesiodic origins. The myth of the four ages (Ovid omits the heroic age) follows Ovid's scientific cosmogony and the creation of man (1.89–150).¹⁶ From the *Th* we move to the *WD*; Ovid's *ultima* (1.127), which introduces the iron age, teases us to think that we have already reached Ovid's times (see Van Noorden 2014: 219–20). Yet after the myth of the races we are back to the theogonic material of Gigantomachies (1.151–62). The shift from the anthropocentric perspective of the *WD* to the *Th*'s battles of gods and Giants is indicative of the complex temporal progression of the *Met.*, which is more intricate than the linear move from the beginning of the world to Ovid's times that is promised in the proem (*Met.* 1.3–4). The world is on the verge of returning to Chaos several times in the

Met.; after the flood, for instance, or during Phaethon's doomed ride. Phaethon's demise resonates with Zeus's battle with Typhoeus and the god's decision to put an end to the age of heroes in the *CW* (see Ziogas 2013: 69–73). The heroic race may not feature in Ovid's version of human races, but the poet compensates for this omission by dealing with heroes in the greatest part of his work. In Hesiodic terms, the *Met.* covers the age of gods (*Th*), heroes (*CW*), and mortals (*WD*), and repeatedly combines and shifts between these works. The narrative and temporal progression of the *Met.* within the Hesiodic corpus is both linear and circular.

The transition from the *Th* to the *CW* is replayed several times. The *CW* is a sequel to the *Th*, since the last two lines of the *Th* overlap with the first two of the *CW* (*Th* 1021–22 = *CW* fr. 1.1–2 M–W). We move from the affairs of goddesses with men, the (p. 386) last section of the *Th* (963–1020), to heroines who slept with gods, the *leitmotif* of the *CW*. Narrative sequences in the *Met.* reproduce the continuity of these two Hesiodic works. The entrance of Apollo (*Met.* 1.437–52) replicates this transition, since the god is transformed from an Olympian who fights with a primordial monster (Python) into an immortal who falls in love with a beautiful nymph (Daphne). In this programmatic episode, Amor's victory over Apollo recalls the powers of Hesiod's primordial Eros, who conquers all gods and mortals (*Th* 120–22; see Scully 2015: 147). The narrative continuity from the *Th* to the *CW* is reiterated in the shift from Phaethon's cosmic conflagration to Jupiter's passion for Callisto (*Met.* 1.401–10), as well as in the internal narratives of the Muses (*Met.* 5) and Orpheus (*Met.* 10; see Ziogas 2013: 66–68, 73–75, 86–94, 149–50).

The *WD* is woven into Ovid's Hesiodic trajectory from the *Th* to the *CW*. The victorious song of the Muse, for instance, in the competition with the Emathides, praises Ceres and agriculture, thus evoking Hesiod's victory in the *certamen* due to the peaceful agenda of the *WD* (see Bilinski 1959). At the same time, the Muse reiterates a transition from the Typhonomachy to the loves of the gods (*Met.* 5.356–84). In this episode, Venus's address to Amor clearly refers to Hesiod's Eros.¹⁷ While the *CW* comes to an end after the wooing of Helen, Ovid continues until he reaches his own times, thus including the contemporary perspective of the *WD*. As a whole, the *Met.* moves from Chaos to divine loves and from the race of heroes to the age of mortals, covering the entire spectrum of the Hesiodic worldview.

Stephen Scully (2015: 146) brilliantly observes that the end of the *Met.* signals the establishment of Augustus's peace in Hesiodic terms. The emperor resolves the primordial strife that opened the poem. Yet the sphragis (*Met.* 15.871–79) upsets the omnipotence of a Jovian regime by declaring Jupiter's/Augustus's fires incapable of silencing Ovid. Zeus's lightning bolt puts an end to the discordant rebellion of Typhoeus at the end of the *Th*, while the *Met.* ends with the failure of Jupiter's weapons to erase Ovid's defiant voice from memory. Unlike Hesiod, Ovid is not the mouthpiece of the Muses that celebrate a Jovian cosmos, but echoes the rebellious voices of Jupiter's last enemy.¹⁸ The *Met.* ends with a hint that the universe can revert to chaos, back to the

beginning of Ovid's work. The poet, not the prince, has the power to shift from chaos to cosmos and vice versa.

The *Met.* has structural, thematic, verbal, and stylistic similarities with Hesiod. Etymological wordplay and personifications of abstract ideas are distinctive aspects of Hesiod (e.g., Ζῆλος, Φήμη, Λιμός) and Ovid (e.g., *Invidia, Fama, Fames*). Metamorphosis is a recurring motif in the *CW* (see Hirschberger 2008). Transformation was associated with the Hesiodic character in ancient criticism and was related to implausible and thus false myths. The problematic truth of the poets, the lies of mythological tales, and the simultaneous appeals to readers' disbelief and gullibility are central to the magical realism of the *Met.* (cf. Feeney 1991: 229–35; Wheeler 1999: 162–93). This crucial aspect of Ovid's poetry originates in the initiation scene of the *Th.*, in which the Muses enigmatically proclaim that they can either speak the truth or tell lies similar to the truth. Metamorphosis is also reflected in poetic language. An interplay between (p. 387) the figurative and literal meaning, recognized as key to Ovidian poetics (see Tissol 1997), also features prominently in Hesiod (Ziogas 2013: 16–17, 105–6, 142–43, 174–78). Formulas of Homeric epic appear transformed in amatory contexts. The eroticization of epic diction and the juxtaposition of martial and marital narratives feature prominently in Hesiod and Ovid.¹⁹

Ovid evokes Hesiod not only to signal his adherence to the themes and poetics of the archaic Greek bard, but also to stress his departure from Hesiod's world. As Conte (1986: 81) notes, “[r]eference to the norm obviously does not mean submission to the norm; rather it delimits the common space within which the new poetry can both emulate tradition and speak with a fresh voice.” Ovid's scientific cosmogony contrasts with Hesiod's anthropomorphic *Th.* While the *Ehoiai* praises the sexual affairs of gods with mortal women and focuses on their offspring, Ovid problematizes the violence of divine rapes and plays down the *CW*'s genealogies.

Transformations may be a recurring motif in Hesiod, but in Ovid they often replace the genealogical contents of the *CW*. A telling case is Pyrrha and Deucalion's puzzlement about how they should repopulate the earth after the annihilation of mankind in the flood. Curiously, sex as a means of procreation does not occur to the married couple (cf. Ahl 1985: 107), and they resort to metamorphosis from stones. In the *CW*, Pyrrha and Deucalion have biological children *and* create men and women out of stones. Deucalion's daughters have children with Zeus, and the genealogy of his son Hellen defines Hellenism. But Ovid distances himself from the *CW*'s genealogical progression and edits out the very origins of the Greek race. That is not to say that genealogy is not important in the *Met.* Genealogical links and associations may ostensibly be suppressed, but they are still crucial (see Cole 2004; 2008; Ziogas 2013: 75–81, 133–35).

Ovid's revival of Hesiodic poetry does not occur in an intellectual or literary vacuum. The tales of Coronis and Mestra, for instance, open a dialogue with Callimachus's reception of Hesiod, while Ovid restores these myths to the narrative structure of the *Ehoiai* (Ziogas 2013: 112–47). In Book 10, the tales of Orpheus begin with allusions to Phanocles's

Erotes (Segal 1972: 477; Gärtner 2008: 31–32), an elegiac catalogue of homoerotic affairs, and move on to heterosexual affairs with clear references to the *Ehoiai* (Ziogas 2013: 151–64). Ovid is fully aware of the philosophical arguments that revolve around Hesiodic poetry. The song of Calliope (*Met.* 5) engages with Empedocles's philosophy (Trencsényi-Waldapfel 1969). Arachne, who gives an obscene version of the *CW* as she depicts the deceptive transformations and sexual violence of the Olympians, is from Colophon (*Met.* 6.8), the fatherland of Xenophanes, who criticized Hesiod for attributing all sorts of blameworthy deeds to the gods, such as deception and adultery (fr. 21 B 11 D–K; cf. Rosati 2009: 364–65). Achelous evokes the structural and thematic dynamics of a *Mestra-ehoiē*, while answering Pirithous's objection about the power of gods to change shapes. The episode is set against the background of Philodemus's critique of Hesiodic theology (Ziogas 2013: 144–45; cf. Obbink 2004). A study of Ovid's Hesiod requires knowledge of Hesiodic reception in antiquity, not only in Hellenistic poetry but also in ancient philosophy.

(p. 388) *Fasti*

Ovid casts the transition from the *Met.* to the *Fasti* as a progression within the Hesiodic corpus. The proem invokes the gods to inspire the poet to spin a song from the beginning of the world to his own times (*Met.* 1.3–4, *ab origine mundi / ad mea ... tempora*). Beginning with Chaos (*Met.* 1.7) refers to the beginning of the *Th*, while ending with *mea tempora* suggests the *WD*, which deals with Hesiod's times and the right time for different tasks. *Tempora* is the first word of the *Fasti*, and thus the proem to the *Met.* already anticipates the *Fasti* as the sequel to Ovid's epic (Barchiesi 1991: 6–7). The unified reading of the Hesiodic corpus provides Ovid with the model for transitioning from the *Met.* to the *Fasti*. The first word (*tempora*) and thus the alternative title of the *Fasti* casts Ovid's work as a version and elaboration of Hesiod's "Days"; the *Fasti* follows the Roman calendar, which prescribes which days are suitable for work and which for festivals. To some extent the *Fasti*, with its emphasis on holidays, contrasts with Hesiod's focus on work.

Just as the *Met.* includes the entire spectrum of the Hesiodic worldview and is chronologically arranged, thus reproducing the move from the creation of gods (*Th*) to the birth of the demigods (*CW*) and from the demise of the heroes to Hesiod's times (*WD*), the *Fasti* replays the continuity and progression within the main three Hesiodic works. The god Janus is emblematic of the simultaneously unified and multifaceted nature of Hesiod's works. Janus's epiphany echoes the programmatic appearance of Apollo in Callimachus's *Aetia* (cf. *Fasti* 1.93–94 with *Aetia* fr. 1.21–22 Pf.), which is in turn a reworking of Hesiod's encounter with the Muses in the *Th*. In his address to Ovid, the god reveals his original identity as Chaos, the primordial beginning of the *Th*, while associating the poet of the *Fasti* with Hesiodic didacticism:

"disce metu posito, uates operose dierum,
quod petis, et uoces percipe mente meas.
me *Chaos antiqui* (nam sum res prisca) uocabant:
aspice quam longi temporis acta canam."

(*Fasti* 1.101–4)

"Set aside fear and learn, laborious bard of the days, what you seek, and bear my words in mind. The ancients used to call me Chaos (for I am old matter): notice the deeds of very old times of which I am singing."

Janus's imperative *disce* is a marker of didactic poetry (cf. *Fasti* 2.584, 4.140, 145, 6.639; cf. *WD* 213, ἄκουε, 275 ἐπάκουε) that echoes the Muses' instructions to Hesiod (*Th* 22, Ἥσιοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδὴν, "they taught Hesiod a beautiful song"; cf. *WD* 662); *operose dierum* paraphrases *Opera et Dies*.²⁰ Janus exemplifies the combination of the lessons of the *WD* with the cosmogony of the *Th*. In this context, the mention of the *antiqui* can be read as a reference to the ancient authority of Hesiod.

(p. 389) In his reminiscence of Saturn's arrival in Latium, Janus briefly mentions the succession myth of the *Th*; Saturn found refuge in Latium after Jupiter drove him away from the kingdom of the sky (1.235–36). Janus was ruling over the Ianiculum in an era of agricultural simplicity, when gods and humans were mingling on earth:

tunc ego regnabam, *patiens* cum terra deorum
esset, et *humanis numina mixta locis*.
nondum *Iustitiam facinus mortale fugarat*
(ultima de superis illa reliquit humum),
proque metu populum sine ui *pudor* ipse regebat;
nullus erat iustis reddere iura labor.
nil mihi cum bello: *pacem* postesque tuebar.

(*Fasti* 1.247–53)

I was ruling then, when earth was enduring gods and deities mingled in human places. Mortal crime had not yet put Justice to flight (she was the last of the gods above to leave the ground) and instead of fear and without violence shame itself guided the people; it was no toil to give back justice to the just. I had nothing to do with war: I was the guardian of peace and doorposts.

The society of gods and humans recalls the joint feast at Mekone (*Th* 535) and the beginning of the *CW* (fr. 1.5–7 M–W); *mixta*, in particular, implies the affairs of gods with mortal women (see fr. 1.5 M–W, μισγόμεναι θεοῖσ[ιν], "mingling with gods"; cf. fr. 5.4, 253.3 M–W, μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότῃτι, "having mingled in love"). The offspring of these liaisons are the race of heroes, who eventually become a burden on the earth. The *CW* opens with the common feasts of gods and men and ends with Zeus's plan to decimate mankind by causing the Trojan War, which relieves Earth of the human burden and finalizes the gap between mortals and immortals (see Clay 2005). Ovid's *patiens ... terra* suggests the anthropomorphic suffering of Hesiod's Gaia (cf. *Th* 159, 843, 848), implying

that Earth is oppressed by the presence of the gods and their mingling with mortals. The proclaimed flight of Justice combines the departure of Αἰδώς, “Reverence” (cf. *pudor*), and Νέμεσις, “Retribution,” from the earth (*WD* 197–200) with the maltreatment of Δίκη, “Justice” (*WD* 220–27), at the hands of greedy mortals, who drag and drive her away (*WD* 224, οἱ τέ μιν ἐξελάσωσι; cf. *Iustitiam facinus mortale fugarat*). The transition from Justice to peace reproduces the sequence in the *WD* (Δίκη, 219–27; εἰρήνη, 228–37), adding a Greek layer to the association of Janus with the closing of the gates of War. The interplay between abstract nouns and their personifications is characteristically Hesiodic. Besides *Iustitia*, it is tempting to capitalize *patiens* ... *Terra*, *Pudor*, and *Pacem*. The use of an abstract noun as subject of *regere* is peculiar (see Green 2004: 119), inviting us to take *Pudor* as the personified Shame, while the syllepsis *pacem postesque tuebar* suggests that Janus was the physical guardian of Peace in his temple (contra Green 2004: 119–20). Her escape would result in a disaster tantamount to the opening of Pandora’s jar.²¹

(p. 390) In *Fasti* 1, Janus shows that the *Th* and the *WD* are the two faces of the same coin. But the god makes another, rather surprising, appearance in *Fasti* 6.100–30. Janus returns and rapes the nymph Cranae. This peculiar story evokes a tale from the Hesiodic *Ehoiai*. The beginning of Ovid’s etiology with the introduction of Cranae recalls the typical opening of an *ehoie* with the presentation of the heroine. Cranae is wooed by many suitors, a salient motif of the *CW* (see fr. 22.5–6, 75, 196–204 M–W; cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 11.288), but refuses to marry (108). While she can deceive men by escaping as they are leading the way, she cannot deceive two-faced Janus. The god rapes her and then announces that she will control the hinges of the doors as a recompense for her lost virginity (127–28). The narrative sequence and direct speech recall the speech of Poseidon to Tyro, whom the god seduced and then comforted by promising the birth of glorious children (see *CW* fr. 31 M–W; cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 11.248–52). The *CW*’s promise of heroic offspring is replaced with the *Fasti*’s etiological conclusion, a common Ovidian twist. Thus the presence of Janus in the *Fasti* marks a progression within the Hesiodic corpus: from the *Th* and the *WD* to the *CW*.

Concluding Remarks

Helen van Noorden (2014: 216) notes that while we might think of the *Met.* and the *Fasti* as a pair to rival the *Th* and the *WD*, a more accurate view is that both recall both. To some extent the Hesiodic corpus already suggests this interplay between progression and inclusion. The *Th* and the *WD* present a trajectory from mythological to didactic epic, two different worldviews, each of which contains aspects from the other. There are didactic elements in the *Th* and theogonic elements in the *WD*. Reading the *Th* and the *WD* as two poems that complement and at times contradict each other has been the focus of modern scholarship (see Clay 2003). The *CW*, a sequel to the *Th* in ancient manuscripts, has recently attracted more attention as a work offering a heroic and thus intermediate perspective between the divine (*Th*) and the human (*WD*), both chronologically and

Ovid's Hesiodic Voices

conceptually (see Clay 2005). This approach has at times been criticized as a modern interpretation of Hesiod through the lens of a preconceived master narrative (Kerr Prince 2005). Yet this master narrative is not a modern invention, but is suggested in the Hesiodic corpus. The polyphony and coherence of Hesiod's many voices features prominently in the poet's Hellenistic reception (see Canevaro in this volume). In his holistic view of the Hesiodic corpus, Ovid follows in the footsteps of Hesiod's Hellenistic reception. He seems to have been very much interested in perceiving Hesiod's cosmos through the lens of a comprehensive narrative as he repeatedly points to the harmony and conflict between and within Hesiod's works. Ovid is himself obsessed with the continuities and disruptions, the unities and contradictions, the evolution and circularity of his career. In Hesiod, he found an archetype for reflecting on his poetic and personal development.

References

- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore, MD.
- Ahl, F. 1985. *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca, NY.
- Barchiesi, A. 1991. "Discordant Muses." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 37: 1-21.
- Barchiesi, A. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince*. Berkeley, CA.
- Barker, D. 1996. "'The Golden Age Is Proclaimed': The *Carmen Saeculare* and the Renaissance of the Golden Race." *Classical Quarterly* 46: 434-46.
- Bilinski, B. 1959. "Elementi Esiodei nelle 'Metamorfosi' di Ovidio." In *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano, II*, 101-23. Rome.
- Canevaro, L. G. 2015. *Hesiod's Works and Days: How to Teach Self-Sufficiency*. Oxford.
- Clay, J. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.
- Clay, J. 2005. "The Beginning and End of the *Catalogue of Women* and Its Relation to Hesiod." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by R. Hunter, 25-34. Cambridge.
- Cole, T. 2004. "Ovid, Varro, and Castor of Rhodes." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 102: 355-422.
- Cole, T. 2008. *Ovidius Mythistoricus: Legendary Time in the Metamorphoses*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca, NY.

Ovid's Hesiodic Voices

- Farrell, J. 2004. "Ovid's Virgilian Career." *Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 52: 41-55.
- Feeney, D. C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford.
- Feeney, D. C. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley, CA.
- Fletcher, R. 2005. "Or Such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*... ." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by R. Hunter, 299-319. Cambridge.
- Frazer J. G., ed. and trans. 1931. *Ovid: Fasti*, revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA.
- Gärtner, T. 2008. "Die hellenistische Katalogdichtung des Phanokles über homosexuelle Liebesbeziehungen: Untersuchungen zur tendenziellen Gestaltung und zum literarischen Nachleben." *Mnemosyne* 61: 18-44.
- Gibson, R., ed. and comm. 2003. *Ovid, Ars Amatoria*. Book 3. Cambridge.
- Goslin, O. 2010. "Hesiod's Typhonomachy and the Ordering of Sound." *TAPA* 140: 351-73.
- Green, S. J., ed. and comm. 2004. *Ovid, Fasti I: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Hardie, P. 2005. "The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and Latin Poetry." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by R. Hunter, 287-98. Cambridge.
- Haubold, J. H. 2010. "Shepherd, Farmer, Poet, Sophist: Hesiod on His Own Reception." In *Plato and Hesiod*, edited by G. R. Boys-Stones and J. H. Haubold, 11-30. Oxford.
- Hirschberger, M. 2008. "Il tema della metamorfosi nel *Catalogo* esiodeo delle donne." In *Esiodo: Cent'anni di papiri: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 7-8 Giugno 2007*, edited by G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, 113-27. Florence.
- Hollis, A. 1977. *Ovid: Ars Amatoria*. Book 1. Oxford.
- Hunter, R. 2005. "The Hesiodic *Catalogue* and Hellenistic Poetry." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by R. Hunter, 239-65. Cambridge.
- (p. 393) Hunter, R. 2014. *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days*. Cambridge.
- Kerr Prince, C. 2005. "Review of Clay (2003)." *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 4: 23.
- Koning, H. H. 2010. *Hesiod: The Other Poet; Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon*. *Mnemosyne Supplement* 325. Leiden..

Ovid's Hesiodic Voices

- La Penna, A. 1979. "L' *usus* contro Apollo e le Muse." *Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa* 9: 985–97.
- Labate, M., 2005. "Tempo delle origini e tempo della storia in Ovidio." In *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne—Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung*, edited by J. P. Schwindt, 177–201. Heidelberg.
- Most, G. 1993. "Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality." In *La componente autobiografica nella poesia Greca e Latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*, edited by G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari, 73–92. Pisa.
- Most, G., ed. and trans. 2006. *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*. Cambridge, MA.
- Most, G., ed. and trans. 2007. *Hesiod: The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*. Cambridge, MA.
- Obbink, D. 2004. "Vergil's *De pietate*: From *Ehoiae* to Allegory in Vergil, Philodemus and Ovid." In *Vergil, Philodemus and the Augustans*, edited by D. Armstrong, J. Fish, P. Johnston, and M. Skinner, 175–209. Austin, TX.
- Ormand, K. 2014. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women and Archaic Greece*. Cambridge.
- Rosati, G. 2009. "The Latin Reception of Hesiod." In *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, edited by F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, C. Tsagalis, 343–74. Leiden.
- Scully, S. 2015. *Hesiod's Theogony: From Near Eastern Creation Myths to Paradise Lost*. Oxford.
- Segal, C. 1972. "Ovid's Orpheus and Augustan Ideology." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 103: 473–94.
- Showerman, G., ed. and trans. 1914. *Ovid: Heroides, Amores*. Revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA.
- Thomas, R. F. 1986. "Vergil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90: 171–98.
- Tissol, G. 1997. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"*. Princeton, NJ.
- Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. 1969. "Eine Invektive gegen Hesiod bei Ovid." *Collection Latomus* 101: 728–50.
- Van Noorden, H. 2014. *Playing Hesiod: The "Myth of Races" in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge.

Ovid's Hesiodic Voices

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982. "The Golden Age and Sin in Augustan Ideology." *Past and Present* 95: 19–36.

West, M. L. 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*. Oxford.

Wheeler, S. 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"*. Philadelphia, PA.

Ziogas, I. 2013. *Ovid and Hesiod. The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge. (p. 394)

Notes:

- (1.) On "window reference," defined as the adaptation of a model, noticeably interrupted in order to allow reference back to the source of that model, see Thomas (1986: 188–89, 197).
- (2.) "Syllepsis" is the simultaneous employment of the literal and metaphorical meaning of words, which results in a combination of physical and linguistic transformations.
- (3.) All translations are adapted from the Loeb editions (Showerman 1914; Frazer 1931; Most 2006, 2007).
- (4.) On the tradition of the *certamen*, see Koning (2010: 239–68); and Hunter (2014: 302–15). On Hesiod's reception as inextricably linked with that of Homer, see Koning (2010); and Canevaro in this volume.
- (5.) On the Hellenistic reception of Hesiod, see Canevaro in this volume.
- (6.) On Ovid and the Hesiodic *CW*, see Fletcher (2005); Hardie (2005); and Ziogas (2013). On the structure of the *CW*, see West (1985).
- (7.) Like Ovid's *talis*, Sosicrates or Sostratos's Ἡοῖοι suggests a similarly peculiar masculine version of the Hesiodic formula. But a gendered play with the *ehoie* formula may be as old as Homer; see *Iliad* 1.262–64 with Ziogas (2013: 190–92). On the *CW* and Hellenistic poetry, see Hunter (2005).
- (8.) See Farrell (2004) on Ovid modeling his career on Vergil. Yet Hesiod is the archetype for both Vergil and Ovid. Vergil connects and contrasts the *Eclogues* with the *Georgics* in a way that evokes Hesiod's cross references between *Th* and *WD*. The autobiographical aspects of Vergil's *Georgics* follow in the footsteps of Hesiod's *Th* and *WD*; see Nelson in this volume.
- (9.) In *Th* 224–25, Φιλότης ("Sexual Intercourse") is the sister of Ἔρις. Cf. the contrast between *lites* and *amor* at *Ars* 2.151–52. See also Scully (2015: 145).

Ovid's Hesiodic Voices

- (10.) On ἔργα meaning “fields” in Hesiod, see Nelson pp. 365–68 in this volume.
- (11.) Cf. Canevaro (2015: 122–23) on procreation in the *WD*, which is seen in terms of productivity, analogous to planting or rearing animals.
- (12.) Alexander Loney points out to me that at *Th* 594–612, work, sex, offspring, production, consumption, and greedy women are all tied together.
- (13.) The return to the golden age is predicted by Anchises in Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.792–94. Cf. *Eclogue* 4, which predicts the return of a second heroic age and another golden era. On the golden age and Augustan ideology, see Wallace-Hadrill (1982).
- (14.) Cf. Feeney (2007: 134–36). See Barker (1996) for the inherent ambiguity of the golden race as morally superior due to its lack of greed and as corrupt due to its literal goldenness.
- (15.) The interplay between metals and metallic ages is in play in Janus’s speech (*Fasti* 1.192–226). The copper coins of olden days have been replaced with gold. See below on Ovid’s Janus and Hesiod.
- (16.) On Ovid and the Hesiodic myth of races, see Van Noorden (2014: 204–60).
- (17.) Cf. *Met.* 5.366, *superas omnes*; 369–70, *superos... domas* with *Th* 121–22, πάντων τε θεῶν ... δάμναται ... νόον.
- (18.) On Typhoeus as a foil for the Muses, see Goslin (2010).
- (19.) See, e.g., Atalanta in the *CW* and *Met.* 10 with Ziogas (2013: 164–74); Ormand (2014: 119–51).
- (20.) Barchiesi (1997: 223); Green (2004: 74–75). On Janus and Hesiod, see Barchiesi (1997: 230–36).
- (21.) Labate (2005: 190–91) argues that Janus’s opening and closing of the gates of war recalls the opening of Pandora’s jar (*WD* 20–105).

Ioannis Ziogas

Ioannis Ziogas is assistant professor at Durham University. He is the author of *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women* (Cambridge University Press, 2013). He coedited (with M. Skempis) *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic* (DeGruyter, 2014) and (with P. Mitsis) *Wordplay and Powerplay in Latin Poetry* (DeGruyter, 2016). He is currently working on a monograph on law and love in Ovid.

