
Of the genealogical epics current in Classical Greece, the ‘Ehoiai’ or ‘Catalogue of Women’ attributed to Hesiod was and is by far the most important: the most often drawn upon by later poets and quoted by prose writers; the most widely read, as evidenced by the numerous papyri; and in consequence of this diffusion the one about which we are best informed. The surviving fragments amount to some hundreds of lines, and we are able to form an idea of the structure and arrangement of the whole work, which was in five books. Beside it there was a separate ‘Hesiodic’ work, presumably even longer, known as the ‘Megalai Ehoiai’, but this is less often cited, and its scope, structure, and relationship to the ‘Catalogue’ remain unclear.

This is an inviting body of material for a commentary, and H. has produced one on a substantial scale. In a 66-page introduction she explains the plan and aims of the work and discusses in order the titles of the poems, the function of the recurrent ἴ ὀ ὑ formula that underlies the titles, the content and structure of the ‘Catalogue’, the division into books, the authorship and date of composition, the poem’s relationship to other epic tradition, the status and significance of genealogy, and a series of narrative motifs (the Heroic Age; love, marriage, and jealousy; apotheosis and metamorphosis; divine punishment and protection); in the last few pages similar questions are raised concerning the ‘Megalai Ehoiai’.

Following the introduction come the texts: 142 fragments attributed to the ‘Catalogue’, 16 attributed to the ‘Megalai Ehoiai’, and 39 more presumed to be from one or the other (εἷ ὦ δῆλον ἔπων). Then comes the commentary, which occupies 332 pages. Finally there is a list of sources for the texts (ancient authors with the editions used; publications of papyri), indexes of Greek names, themes and motifs, and Greek words discussed, and concordances.

H.’s views on the nature and structure of the ‘Catalogue’ are essentially sound, though different scholars will naturally disagree over details. She has good points to make on the nature of the genealogical tradition in anthropological perspective and on the typological affinities of the Greek tradition (65–8). The evidence for the ascription of fragments to particular books of the ‘Catalogue’ (41) can now be augmented by an inconvenient new datum: C. Meliadò (ZPE 141, 2004, 1–5) has recognized Ἡ Ἰ αίδου ἐ ν τ οι ὑ in connection with Hippomenes in a papyrus scholion to Theoc. 3, 40 (P. Oxy. 3548). Citations in this form must be understood as referring to the ‘Catalogue’, so three fragments quoted by Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian which H. puts in her εἷ ὦ δῆλον ἔπων section (F *)33–*35) should have been included with the ‘Catalogue’ on this ground.

She rightly considers the ‘Catalogue’ the work of a single author, not a conglomerate (47). In a rather brief discussion of its date (48 f) she takes the defining arguments to be the posteriority of the Kyrene-ehoie to the foundation of Cyrene (c. 631), the testimony that Stesichorus criticized Hesiod’s version of the Helen story, and the attachment of the ‘Aspis’ to the Alkmene-ehoie from the ‘Catalogue’. «All dies zusammen scheint für den Katalogos eine Datierung etwa zwischen 630 und 590 nahezulegen, doch läßt sich keine letzte Sicherheit gewinnen». But as I explained in my book ‘The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women’
M. L. West: Hirschberger, Gynaikon Katalogos und Megalai Ἐβοιαι

(Oxford 1985; cited hereafter as HCW), 130–7, her second and third arguments are unreliable, and there are a number of others, with which she does not engage, that point to a dating between 580 and 520.

Against my arguments for attributing the work to an Attic poet (HCW 168–71) she raises objections that have little force. (1) For a form such as ὀισσεταῖα, she writes, «finden sich jedoch reichlich Belege in Epos und Elegie». This formulation glosses over the detail of the very limited distribution of such forms, which I set out at HCW 170 n. 95. (2) The (Attic) hyperpericemium γαῖας ἀδικεῖν, she claims, might not go back to the original text. (3) The Attic genealogies are thin and undeveloped. (4) «Die Apotheose des Herakles – nach West eine attische Erfindung – kommt bekanntlich schon in Odyssee und Theogonie vor». No, it comes in what nearly everyone recognizes to be late additions to those poems. H. is being either disingenuous or naively uncritical. (5) In an Attic genealogy one would expect Erechtheus to stand in the main line as father of Kreiousa and grandfather of Ion and Achaios, whereas in F 11a, 20–1 M.–W. he appears only incidentally as Xouthos’ father-in-law. But that is not part of the poem dealing with Attica, it is the stemma of Hellen near the beginning; the significant thing is that Ion and Achaios are made the sons of a daughter of Erechtheus. (6) No Athenian interests are to be discerned in the catalogue of Helen’s suitors. Well, Menestheus is there as a suitor: what more could an Attic poet have done? H. prefers the hypothesis of an Aeolian author, probably in Asia Minor. She appeals to «die Prominenz der Aiolier durch das ausführliche und weitverzweigte Aiolidenstemma» (50). But the Aeolid stemma was not the creation of this poet: it must have established itself a century or more before his time as the major construction of genealogical epic. The ‘Catalogue’ poet was essentially a synthesizer of existing traditions from all over Greece, not a weaver of new fabric.

As regards the ‘Megalai Ἐβοιαι’, H. suggests (81) that it differed from the ‘Catalogue’ in not being based on major stemmas. That may be so, if the ‘Catalogue’ poet was exceptional in his bent for grand systematization and in his use of the ἱ ὁ ἄρθρον formula as a special device for returning to an uncompleted branch of a family. But there is too little evidence for certainty.

The text section contains only verbatim fragments from papyri or quotations. Most of the non-verbatim fragments are worked into the commentary. H. explains that the Textteil «versteht sich nicht als Textausgabe, sondern als Lesetext, der den Kommentar begleitet und seine Benutzung erleichtern soll» (21). Restorations are adopted sparingly, and the critical apparatus is generally confined to transmitted variants; discussion of conjectures and supplements is reserved for the commentary. The fragments have been rearranged and numbered, though wherever H. cites her own numeration she always adds that of Merkelbach–West in brackets. As a guide to the probable original order of the fragments, the M.–W. numeration certainly requires some revision today. But even where this is apparent, the disadvantages of renumbering outweigh any practical gain. As H.’s work is not a complete edition of the Hesiodic fragments, there is little prospect of her numbers (which run in three separate series) coming into general use, and she would have done better to keep to the standard sequence and numeration, explaining where appropriate the reasons for relocation.

The commentary does not, after all, form a continuous, developing argument that needs to follow the order of the poem closely. Each fragment is taken on its own. This is emphasized by the formatting. Under each fragment number there is a bibliography in smaller type, then usually an introductory discussion followed by notes on individual verses. The layout is artfully designed (even breaking...
of words between lines is avoided) and pleasing to the eye. But this neat appearance is bought at a price. No paragraphing is allowed, so that the discussion runs on for a page or more in an unbroken block, regardless of changes of topic. And there are no footnotes, so that subsidiary material has to be accommodated in parentheses which distend sentences and make them more difficult to read. On p. 328, for example, an indefinite article is separated by five lines from the noun one thought was never coming.

The commentary concerns itself principally with the mythology, with problems of interpretation where the text is defective, and with phraseological parallels from Homer and other early hexameter poetry. Like the work as a whole, it is businesslike in manner and free from waffle, though without detectable concern for economy of paper. Texts are quoted at generous length, and there are some unnecessary repetitions and accumulations of material. H. sometimes spells out the obvious: «Nur wenig ist von den Versen erhalten» (269); «Die Versreste sind zu gering, um eine Deutung zu erlauben» (436; they consist of the letters [i] in one line and [ou] in the next); «Der Ätna ist ein Vulkan an der Ostküste Siziliens» (326). Occasionally something that calls for comment is passed over in silence, for example the forms 'Αεθελίοοο (Cat. F 5, 58 (restored)) and Άνθέμια (F 29, 1), or the meaning of F 63, 14 τῶν μὲν τε νόσεις [γε] καθενε; there is nothing on lines 7–10 of Inc. F 5 [75 M.–W.], which are of some literary interest.

Quite a full account is given of earlier scholarship, though more than once details are misreported, or information given in the apparatus of Merkelbach–West becomes muddled. Sometimes we are given more than we need; there was no point in recording on pp. 222 (twice) and 321 a series of supplements that are now recognized to be impossible. Often the reporting settles down into a mechanical listing of alternatives. Thus in the space of little over a page (173 f) we read «Zwei Möglichkeiten der Ergänzung und Interpretation wurden in der Forschung vorgeschlagen: (1) ... (2) ...»; «Zwei Interpretationsmöglichkeiten des Verses wurden vorgeschlagen: (1) ... (2) ...»; «Für die Interpretation der vorliegenden Verse ergeben sich vier Möglichkeiten .... (1) ... (2) ... (3) ... (4) ...»; «Es bestehen zwei Möglichkeiten der Ergänzung .... (1) ... (2) ...». In none of these cases is there any discussion of the relative merits of the proposals. Yet more irksome is the incessant recurrence of «der vorliegende Vers», «im vorliegenden Fragment», and similar expressions, often three or four times on the same page. Writing in a scholarly manner does not require the suppression of one’s own personality and the adoption of a formulaic, I-speak-your-weight style.

H. is a conservative critic, willing to accept from quoting authors forms such as εἴπον and εὑράμενος on the ground that they are sometimes found (387, 430); so they are, but they are late forms. On a number of occasions she ignores or rejects important conjectures. Sometimes her failure to appreciate their merits results from a defective feeling for style. There are occasional errors of Greek, and confusion of linguistic terms: ἱδρύμης / -έπειτα is not «heteroklitisch» (165), nor is χοῦ «Korreption» (267), nor Ἡλετρύφως «Vokalassimilation» (365).

More disturbing is her incompetence as a metrician. In three places (her Cat. F 5 [10a], 93, 17 [43a], 43, 93 [229], 1) she proposes supplements that create lines without caesura. In 48 [315] she supposes that the transmitted text οὐκετέ ἡ
βαίνοντι λάμοις ποσίν can be preserved by marking line-end after βαίνοντι and writing ποσίν. She prints 54 [137] as transmitted, with a cetic in the third foot, rejecting Casaubon’s obvious τόν for τήν. She thinks that ἀγχυλετῶν scans like ἀγχυλετόν (244); declares that λόγον καλλιθέουσα scans – – [ - - - - – (288); considers a line-ending βίος Πηλιάκης (278); wrongly attributes unmetrical supplements to Merkelbach (222) and Jenny March (386); imagines that ἤμηρος has a short iota (425), and that ἱπτότα Τιθένες is a permissible supplement for the beginning of a line (425 f).

Someone working critically with this material needs to be, if not a trained papyrologist, at least aware of the physical realities of the papyri he or she is dealing with and familiar with ancient writing conventions. In considering supplements H. does not pay enough regard to the measurement of the space. At her Cat. F 17 [26], 8, where the papyrus has παρθένος, the dot over the first omicron is a standard mark of cancellation, not (as she suggests, 221) of synizesis. She begins the notes on her inc. *3 [76] with the statement «Das Fragment ist wie F *3 [75] eine Kolumne von P.S.I. 130 (Vitelli 1913, 44) und muß auf dieses gefolgt sein». A glance at a photograph (plate VI in Merkelbach’s ‘Die Hesiodfragmente auf Papyrus’) would have shown her the two successive columns on the same piece of papyrus: *4 visibly does follow *3, it is not altogether up to date with editions of papyri and authors. At Cat. F *32 should now be given as Lesbona x περιγράμμων 2 (p. 178 Blank). Outmoded editions are used for certain authors: Schmidt for Hesychius 60-60 (passim), Walz for Menander Rhetor (165), Dindorf for Haplography (121), Abel for Orphica (419), Cramer for the Homeric ‘Epimerismoi’ (495), Flach for the scholia to Hesiod’s ‘Theogony’ (497). It is not noted that Wilamowitz’s ‘Panionium’ and ‘Die griechische Heldensage’ are reprinted in his ‘Kleine Schriften’, 2(1) and 2(2) respectively (18, 179, 217).

Here is a selection of more detailed notes, 14 n. 89 Deukalion and Pyrrha do not presuppose the Flood myth; see HCW 55, 53 On the ‘Korinthiaka’ of ‘Emelios’ see JHS 112, 2002, 109-13. 166 (Cat. F 1 [11, 4 f) The present participle μεγύμνασιν implies that μύτης ἀλλόστροφος refers to sexual intercourse, not to parturition. 168 (F 1 [11, 15] ἐν is indefensible;obelos’s δή (ΔΗ: AN) must be accepted. 193 (F 5 [103, 94] Hipponax’s κατήσσωs is a priest, not a bird. 208 On the problem of Helen’s parentage my conjecture in F 24 M.-W. should be discussed; cf. HCW 123, 215 (F 15 [213], 35) On golden gods and gods’ accoutrements see G. Costa, Archivio Glottologica Italiana 69, 1984, 26-32. 223 f It should have been noted that only three lines are lost between F 16 [25] and 17 [26]. In 17, 1 δάμη can only refer to death; e.g. δάμη βῆλε Άσπαλλωνος. In line 3 perhaps ἐν ψέσασθαι. 227 (F 17 [26], 19) ‘Zwei Flüsse wurden für die vorliegende Stelle vorgeschlagen’: Casanova’s proposal of Ἀσπαλλῶνος (RivFil 97, 1969, 456) has been overlooked. At line 26 Herodotus 7, 198 may be cited for the rivers Dyras and Melas. The genitive of the latter was Μίλανος, not Μέλλαντος, cf. Livy 36, 22, 8. K. Stieue, GGA 216, 1964, 112, proposed τὸ τῆς νῆμης τῆς ὁδος νῆμης, cf. my ‘The East Face of Helicon’ 207, 265 (F 31 [70], 38 f) Why should Kometes not be Jope’s father? 274 (F 37 [434], 10) It is clear from 19 ff that Mestra was ‘sold’ as a bride, not as an animal. The combination of 22 ff with F 44 M.-W. creates a problem in 22, and the assumption that a whole column is lost between 23 and 27 makes the Sisyphos story more extended than is likely. At line 35, H. seems to misconstrue ἔδωκα δ’ ᾑδε: in my supplement as ‘both of them wanted’. Her parallels are irrelevant and her reference to a plural verb incomprehensible. At 68, before ἐνε, supple-
ment not αὐτήρ but αὐτῆς or αὐτίς. In 89 probably αἰδοῖον βεσοῦτος, δὲ ἐν Αἰτνήα
ἐγέρει. 287 (F 41b [49]) Σήμος is not «die ionisch-epische Namensform des Eponyμm der
Insel Samos»! 293 On the myth of the Danaids one should cite A. F. Garvie, Aeschylus' Supplies. Play and Trilogy (Cambridge 1969). 302 (F 49 [133]) Lentz's pretended
edition of Herodian claims another innocent victim. There is no 'text transmitted in Herod-
ian'; the only transmitted reading is Eustathius' κατάγουσι. 304 (F 52 [134]) In line 1
perhaps ἄριστον (317 [F 60 (143 A)]) Androgeos and Euryyyes seem to have been distinct
persons in the Catalogue, cf. HCW 84, 322 (F 63 [150], 15–19) There cannot have been a
distinction here between East and West Aithiope. In 16 the supplement Υπάρχουμεν must
be abandoned, as it is too long (Luppe, CronErC 14, 1984, 116 f). But it is impossible to see
how Herakles could be accommodated here. Nor is there room for grappling in 21 ff. On
μεταξυγίουσι (34) see my note on Hes. Th. 269. 329 «Es gibt zwei Inselgruppen, die diesen
Namens [Στρατοπέδα] tragen: presumably rival claimants for the mythical name. 332 (F 67
[83], 17 f) H. takes these fragmentary verses to refer to the Centaurs' killing of Kaineus,
plausibly supplementing θάνατος Φαρσάλου and τὴν θανάτουν. 333 (442) There are two
'Hesiodic' versions of the birth of Asklepios, making him the son either of Koronis,
daughter of Phlegyas, or of Arsinnoe, a daughter of Leukippos. H. follows P. Dräger in
attributing the first to the 'Catalogue' and the second to the 'Megalai Ehoiai'. But this entails
(a) the assumption that P. Oxy. 2495 contained parts of both poems, and (b) placing the
whole series of fragments 50–58 M.–W. in the 'Megalai Ehoiai'; they would take with them
the Δεσμακτίαν κατάλογος cited by Crates (52) and the story of Krisos and Panopeus,
who were grandsons of Deion (58). This implies a systematic Aeolid stemma such as is
well established for the 'Catalogue', and it seems rash to detach this group of fragments
from that work. It remains unclear where the Koronis story appeared; cf. HCW 69–72.
343 (F 75 [171], 3) Merkelbach and I did not propose εἰπερίχθωνοι, as H. states. 356 (F 90
[193]) The bibliography omits R. Führer, ZPE 73 (1988) 4. 364 The statement of schol. II.
9. 4. 246 that Hesiod 'knew the Peloponnese as a whole' (F 189 M.–W.) may mean that he
used the phrase Πέλαγος νόρμος. 374 (F 93 [229]) The supplements for 14–17 attributed
to March are in fact mine (HCW 112). 390 «Etymologie und Herkunft des Namens Kyre-
ne scheinen unklar»: it should be noted that the quantity of the first syllable is variable.
405 (F 107 [201]) The fragment consists of line-beginnings: ...κοιμοί τῇ θνή τῇ Αἰσχίνην,
οἶουντο ... [413 (F 110 [204]) For the suitors' oath cf. also Stesichorus PMGF
190. 418 (on line 101) For 'sons of gods' meaning 'gods' cf. also Job 1, 6. Lines 112 ff may refer
to Apollo, e.g. 112 πειράζοντα ... 114 ἄλλα τα γ' οὔκ εἶναι οὗτος, ἐδέα ἔμεθεν οὗτος τοῖς;
[F 112 (235)] The 'Urea Neptuni filia' who appears in Hyg. Fab. 161 as mother of Ilius (Ileos Ro-
se) is not likely to represent Hyria, but rather ἕρμη (ὑμή), though it is surprising that a
nymph should be a daughter of Poseidon. 432 (F 115 [240]) «Das Fragment könnte aus
demselben Kontext wie F 114 [319] stammen»: if so, the two cannot have stood in this or-
der Δαιμόνην in the first and Δαιμόνης της in the second. H.'s attempt to defend
νέον δ' in 7/8 without the assumption of a lacuna, and her construal of 11 as the apod-
osis to 10, are nonsensical. 449–51 (Meg. Eh. F 12–13 [251a–2]) Add to the bibliographies
N. Robertson, ClPh 75, 1982, 4–10 and Hermes 108, 1980, 284 ff. His supplement in 12, 2,
Βούτερδα [ἐμένου γνώμην ἀφίξατο καὶ Βούτερδα δεύτερα] γνώμην μετατητὶς ἀφίξατο, avoids
the oddity of Boutes' sons' residing with Keyx. 457 (Inc. F ι· [71 A]) Line 10 might be re-
stored as Υλλάδης, Εὐλαίας καὶ Αριστάμην ροδοδίνας. On the problem of the ap-
parent reclamans (12) and book-division see HCW 67; but the question is complicated by
the new testimonium (see above) citing Hesiod ἐν τῷ τῇ in connection with Hippome-
nes, 476 (F 8* [176]) «Die Verse gehören wohl nicht zum Gynakēn Katalogos, da Peis-
andra dort den Namen Timandra trägt (F 15 [23a], 31). But in the present fragment we have
tης ἄνδρι τις a variant for πεισόκεντος, and Geel's emendation to Τιμάνθιη is easy. It is
no argument against that Peisandra is «ein durchaus passender Name für eine untertreue
Verführerin» (471). 472 (F 9· [175]) The first line may be no more than an inaccurate recall
of F 110 [204], 94 (HCW 119). 473 (F 10 [221], 3) Note Hellanicus fr. 156 Fowler, where
Persepolis appears as 'Telmachos' son by Nausikaa. 476 (F *14) This verse inclusion (like
several other items in this section) should not have been included. As Immerwahr rightly
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says, ΗΟΙΗΜΕΡΑΚΛΕΙ = ήοι ηή Ηγοιάλεον, ης οήγη Trojan War... 425 (F. 27 [316]) I referred to Ant. Lib. 18 because of the closing phrase there, τιν ε δε μετετα τέτευθα.

In 27 n. 35 'Hdt. I 144, f. 3' should be Hdn. I 145, f. 18. In Cat. F 15 (p. 96) lines 23–33 and Inc. F 25 are printed with no punctuation. Wrong accents are not infrequent; nor are omitted or transposed letters. This has an amusing outcome on p. 319: «Jacque némens Ποδερτη». 

Despite its flaws, this is a diligent piece of work that makes a useful addition to the literature on the genealogical poetry ascribed to Hesiod.

Oxford Martin L. West


Entscheidet stellt sich der Verf. gegen die Rekonstruktion von ‘Orphik’ als eines religionsgeschichtlich faßbaren, einheitlichen Phänomens (13ff; 37–46; vgl. 227ff), was freilich seit den bestimmenden Seiten von E. R. Dodds, The Greeks
