

M. HIRSCHBERGER, *Gynaikon Katalogos und Megalai Ehoiai. Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Band 198, München-Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2004, 511 pp., ISBN 3-598-77810-4.

This very thoroughly researched book, developed from a dissertation written at the University of Düsseldorf, represents a continuation of the excellent tradition of German scholarship on early Greek epic, since it takes almost complete account of the earlier literature. As such, it will be a valuable work of reference. Although recent decades have given us back yet more of text of the *Catalogue* (*Cat.*) since the edition of R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (M.-W.)¹, interest in it inevitably declined once West pronounced it to be spurious and an Attic composition of sixth-century date². Fortunately enthusiasm for both sets of *Ehoiai* has revived of late. The edited volume of essays edited by R. L. Hunter³ is of very uneven value, but includes a fine piece by G. B. D'Alessio on the *Megalai Ehoiai* (*ME*)⁴. In addition, a number of scholars such as P. Dräger⁵, G. Arrighetti⁶, and J. S. Clay⁷ have recently argued for the authenticity of *Cat.*, in which I have long believed⁸.

¹ *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, Oxford 1967.

² *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: its Nature, Structure and Origins*, Oxford 1986, 130-6, 168-71.

³ *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge 2005.

⁴ "The *Megalai Ehoiai*: a survey of the fragments", in Hunter, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, 176-216.

⁵ *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods*, Stuttgart 1997, 1-26.

⁶ *Esiodo: Opere*, Turin 1998, 445-7.

⁷ "The beginning and the end of the *Catalogue of Women* and its relation to Hesiod", in Hunter, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, 25-34.

⁸ *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*, Cambridge 1982. Some contributors to Hunter, *The Hesiodic*

The volume consists of a bibliography (9-20), introduction (21-86), edition of the fragments, including at the end those that could be from either work (89-161), and a lengthy commentary (163-494), followed by indices of names and motifs and a concordance.

In the general Part I of her introduction, Hirschberger (H.) explains that she decided to include both poems because of their interrelationship. Her text, modestly intended to be not a full re-edition but merely as a guide to reading the commentary (21), comprises only fragments that are directly transmitted, unlike that of Merkelbach and West (M.-W.). The testimonia and paraphrases are included in small print with the fragments to which they refer. The numeration of M.-W. is replaced by a new one, which H. tries to justify on the grounds of new discoveries⁹. Her reason for doing so is that this enables her to print continuously papyrus fragments that are divided up artificially in M.-W., which is of course a gain. Her system has the disadvantage that the testimonia are relegated to the commentary. It would have been better to print a text with a register of testimonia as well as a textual apparatus at the foot of each page; perhaps clarificatory headings in Latin could have kept the reader oriented (one misses the explanatory Latin notes of M.-W.). Fortunately H. always gives the old numerals as well as the new. (In this review I shall continue to cite the numbers of M.-W.) H. omits to number the testimonia; largely for this reason, she prints only 142 fragments of *Cat.* versus 245 in M.-W.

Catalogue of Women, conclude from my proof that the language of *Cat.* is very slightly more archaic than that of Hesiod's *Theogony* that I think the poem antedates Hesiod. They have not understood what degree of precision can be expected from linguistic tools. The evidence shows that the language of *Cat.* is very close indeed to that of the *Theogony*, of which it was formally and in the ancient manuscripts the continuation. Consequently it may well be by the same poet.

⁹ Yet another numeration is being introduced by G. W. Most, *Hesiod: The Shield, Catalogue of Women and Other Fragments*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge MA 2007. See my review in *BMCR* 2007.3.

H.'s sequence of fragments follows in essence that of M.-W., despite some variation, since she too accepts that the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus echoes the order of *Cat.* Her numerous innovations, many of them based on attributions either made since M.-W. or ignored by them, are carefully set out (22-6). Some are owed to a different assessment of whether a woman came to be mentioned as a wife or as a daughter (sometimes these changes are partly taken over from West's later monograph¹⁰, e.g. the order of the children of Aeolus), others to an assignation to a different poem. Thus H. rightly follows F. Casanova rather than M.-W. in restoring Iardanos rather than Dardanos as the hero in fr. 180, and in accepting *P.Oxy.* 2509 on Actaeon (her fr. 103) as part of *Cat.* Reconstructing a poem of this kind is very difficult, and disputes about how to do so will continue until new excavations at Herculaneum or elsewhere yield up a complete text. H. also surveys views about the titles of the poems, rightly accepting that the *ME* was a different work from the *Ehoiai* or *Catalogue*. Further progress on this issue has since been made by G. B. D'Alessio, who has pointed out that the scholia to Pindar cite only this work, which enables us to discount the notion that the foundation of Cyrene in Libya appeared in *Cat.*¹¹

Part II discusses the content and structure of *Cat.*, with a useful schematic overview (38-41). The evidence for the division of the material into books is summarized (41); there is suspiciously little left of Book 2. Her account of the authorship and date of the work is scrupulously full (42-51). H. lists both the ancient and recent scholars who assign the poem to Hesiod, and those who think the work contains later elaborations or indeed is a later composition in its entirety. H. records my statistical demonstration that the language of *Cat.* is roughly contemporary with that of the *Theogony*¹², but does not seem to grasp its implications. In

¹⁰ *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*.

¹¹ "The *Megalai Ehoiai*".

¹² *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, 85-7, 221-5.

seeking to verify the date, she is correct that everything hinges on the fragments about Cyrene. Reflecting the general consensus, she accepts that they prove that the poem postdates c. 631 B.C., but unfortunately the argument is unfounded, as several scholars have shown¹³. Nor is her *terminus ante quem* of c. 590, which is more reasonable than West's, likely to be correct, since *Cat.* antedates the *Shield of Heracles*, because the latter incorporates part of *Cat.*, while the *Shield* antedates the *Hymn to Pythian Apollo*, which refers to events of c. 590-580, namely the First Sacred War¹⁴. H. also surveys the unusual linguistic forms in the poem, following West and missing my lengthy discussion which comes to different conclusions¹⁵. H. usefully shows, however, that *Cat.* privileges Aeolus and Dorus over Ion and Achaeus (50-1), which may well reflect Hesiod's perception of his own ethnic background. However, although she notes the numerous West Greek forms in the poetic diction, e.g. Ἑρμιάων or *iv*, she does not draw the necessary conclusion, viz. that this poem is unlikely to be of Attic origin. Next H. considers the relations between *Cat.* and other early Greek epic, and rightly deduces that the Ionian tradition of poetry about Troy was already important when the poem was composed (52-63). The role of genealogy both in Greece and in traditional societies in general is discussed (63-70). Here H. ought to have taken account of the brilliant work by M. Finkelberg on royal succession in heroic myth¹⁶.

¹³ D. Marcotte, "Héros divinisés et simulacres dans le Catalogue hésiodique des femmes", *AC* 57, 1988, 249-57, at 251-5; A. Köhnken "Meilichos orga": Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der Neunten Pythischen Ode Pindars", in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare (Entretiens pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique)*, Geneva 1985, 71-111, at 101, 103; C. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*, New York-Oxford 1993, 147; P. Dräger, *Argo pasimelousa*, Stuttgart 1993, 221-8; G. B. D'Alessio, "The *Megalai Ehoiai*", 206-7.

¹⁴ R. Janko, "The *Shield of Heracles* and the legend of Cycnus", *CQ* 36, 1986, 38-59.

¹⁵ *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, 221-6 (Appendix D).

¹⁶ "Royal Succession in Heroic Greece", *CQ* 41, 1991, 303-16, now in her *Greeks and Pre-Greeks: Aegean Prehistory and Greek Heroic Tradition*, Cambridge 2005, 65-89.

Lastly, H. identifies a variety of narrative motifs, e.g. the age when heroes mingled with gods. As throughout, the wealth of pertinent comparative material, both ancient near-eastern and modern, is impressive.

Part III of the introduction, on the *ME*, follows the same pattern (81-6). H. rightly regards the *ME* as spurious and the foundation of Cyrene and First Sacred War as its *termini post quem* (84).

To turn to the text (89-161), a good editor of a fragmentary work needs to strike the right balance between caution and courage. Here, although the contexts of quotations are given much more fully than in M.-W., nothing that could remotely be doubtful is printed, because of what I judge to be excessive timidity. Punctuation is pared down almost to none, in the style of Edgar Lobel, even in cases where it is blindingly obvious that it is needed, e.g. at the end of the line in fr. 25.23. Supplements that are not adopted, including many that are highly likely to be correct (e.g. Merkelbach's in fr. 23(a).²⁰ and innumerable ones by West), are not given in the *apparatus*, which, presumably for reasons of cost, is placed at the end of each fragment rather than at the foot of each page. Supplements that are printed are not always the best (e.g. at fr. 22.8 West's version is smoother than H.'s, and H.'s supplements at fr. 43a.77-80 are implausible). H. makes some good suggestions of her own (e.g. in fr. 1.15, 16.12, 43a.24), and derives others from March, e.g. at fr. 16.7, but generally the text is little improved except where new or previously unrecognized papyri have accrued, as in the 'Wedding of Peleus and Thetis' and the account of Actaeon (131-4). Further improvements can still be made¹⁷: In many places a continuous text is replaced by a sadly lacunose one, in which the widths of wider lacunae are not marked. With due diligence a reader could reconstruct a readable text from the commentary, but that is what an editor is for. At fr. 10a.58 Ἀεθλίoo is not an acceptable restoration, while at fr. 26.8 H. has not understood that the scribe put a dot over the prior omicron in the unmetrical Παρθά[ο]νος in order to correct

¹⁷ See e.g. I. J. Hadjicosti, "Hesiod fr. 212b (MW): death at the Skaian Gates", *Mnemosyne* 58, 2005, 547-54.

it to Παρθένος. At fr. 150.25 H. omits Merkelbach's supplement Φλεγραῖον τ' (*ZPE* 2, 1968, 6). The overlap between P.Berol. 10650.1-15 (fr. 204) and P.Berol. 9739 col. iv (fr. 199), recognized by West in his later monograph¹⁸, shows that the top of P.Berol. 9739 col. i (fr. 196) is the start of Book V, the line-numbers of which can now be supplied by mathematical calculation; but this is not done.

A lack of detailed running-heads makes the commentary somewhat hard to follow, since one is constantly losing one's place. This is partly because it is so exhaustive, which is in many ways a virtue. For each fragment, a complete bibliography of discussions that mention it precedes an introduction, which is only then followed by the line-by-line notes. A single compendious bibliography at the back of the volume would have saved much space. Formulaic parallels are cited in full, with complete lists even of common phrases, and even fairly basic features of the epic language are explained. Such is the mania for comprehensiveness that some supplements conclusively disproved by finds of overlapping papyri are still mentioned in the commentary (e.g. on fr. 16.25); perhaps this is done to show that supplements can be wrong, but we all know this, and on the same rationale supplements that have been confirmed by new finds ought to have been mentioned too. I was pleased to see that Linear B is consistently taken into account. I noted few minor errors and omissions and no misprints¹⁹.

RICHARD JANKO

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
rjanko@umich.edu

¹⁸ *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, 115-16.

¹⁹ Danaus and Aegyptus each had 50 offspring, not 40 (36). *P.Oxy.* 2513 is now known to come from the early *Argonautica* contained in as *P.Oxy.* 3698 (210), as M. W. Haslam observed in the *editio princeps* of the latter. Heracles' exploits on Cos in fr. 43a.60-5 are part of a larger Gigantomachy or Heracleia: see my n. on *Il.* 14.250-61 (279-81).