Introduction

The *Catalogue of Women* ascribed to Hesiod is one of those (many) ancient poems where enough survives to intrigue and to allow the formulation of very interesting questions, but not enough to answer any more than a few of them. The essays in this book reveal the pleasure and the frustration in almost equal measure. Unanimity is not to be expected.

The *Catalogue* was a poem of ambitious scope and length (Hellenistic scholars divided it into five books) which constructed a map of the Hellenic world in genealogical terms; the organising principle within the great families was the offspring of mortal women and gods, and some of these women were introduced by the ἠ᾽ οἵη 'or such as' formula which gave the poem its other title, Ἠοῖαι. The *Catalogue* was clearly thought of as a continuation of the *Theogony* (the final part of which has suffered in transmission and contains some relatively late material), and appears to have been transmitted as part of this latter poem until they were separated, perhaps through a mixture of scholarly acumen and the demands of the book trade; the identification of the *Catalogue* as a separate poem seems to have occurred at least by the high period of Alexandrian scholarship, although *Theogony* and *Catalogue* may have continued to be treated as parts of a single work in some texts.[1] That the *Catalogue* never (as far as we know) possessed or acquired an elaborate hymnic and 'personal' proem in the manner of the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* is a further sign of its secondary status, though the parallels between the account of the past in the opening invocation and the extraordinary sequel to the wooing of Helen towards the end (fr. 204.95ff.) provide a framing coherence.[2] Behind our *Catalogue*, and perhaps partly incorporated into it, is generally assumed to be 'genuine' Hesiodic poetry, which did indeed move on from the origin of the gods in the *Theogony* to the origin of the heroes, and of which traces remain in the final sections of the *Theogony*.

[1] Cf. Meliadò 2003.   [2] Cf. e.g. Clay (this volume).

The very broad structure of the *Catalogue* has now been clarified on the basis of the papyrus finds of the last century and their analysis in Martin West's landmark book on the poem, which is the single most important modern contribution to its elucidation.[3] Book 1 and some of Book 2 were taken up with the descendants of Deucalion, which included the crucial families of Hellen and Aeolus; the descendants of Inachus occupied the rest of Book 2 and probably part of Book 3, which also dealt with the families of Pelasgos and Arkas; Book 4 seems to have been more varied – the daughters of Asopus, figures from the history of Attica, and the descendants of Pelops (including Alcmene and her son, Heracles);[4] Book 5 contained the relatively well preserved episode of the wooing of Helen, followed by the Trojan War and the end of the age of heroes. Within this overarching structure, particular interest has naturally focused upon the ἠ᾽ οἵη 'or such as' formula, for – despite the notoriety it later acquired – it is certainly not used for each new and fertile female who appears. One might have expected such a formula to introduce *exempla* (e.g. of women who slept with gods) or stories to illustrate general truths, but this is clearly inappropriate for the systematic genealogy of the *Catalogue*, in which the meaning of the formula is in fact very hard to fix. It may perhaps have been used to mark a move to a woman who did not follow directly (in genealogical terms) from her predecessor in the poem (and as such would come to be seen as marking 'major' transitions),[5] but an increasing number of scholars have seen in it a practice of or survival from a different (and less complex) type of catalogue-poetry, inherited by the *Catalogue*-poet and incorporated into his new conception.[6]

The origins and date of the final version of the *Catalogue* (i.e. the poem from which our fragments are taken) remain the subject of very great dispute, as the essays in this book attest. Although Richard Janko has argued on linguistic grounds that the date cannot be much later than that of Hesiod himself,[7] most students of the poem would (for a mixture of different reasons) now date its most complete form to the sixth century.[8] West himself favoured a date late in the century and an Attic identity for the poet,[9] though others have looked further north – to Thessaly and central

---

[3] West 1985a. For a recent survey, cf. Hirschberger 2004: 32–41; this commentary on the extant fragments appeared too late for contributors to this volume to take proper account of it.

[4] Cf. Haubold (this volume).   [5] Cf. e.g. West 1985a: 46–50; Rutherford 2000: 83–5.

[6] Cf. e.g. West 1985a: 167; Rutherford 2000.   [7] Cf. Janko 1982: 86–7, 198.

[8] The sixth-century date (and West's arguments) are, however, rejected by Dräger 1997. For a survey and bibliography of the relevant arguments cf. Hirschberger 2004: 42–51.

[9] West 1985a: 168–71.

Greece – and been inclined to a rather earlier date.[10] What is becoming increasingly clear, however, is that the *Catalogue*, at each stage of its development, had specific social and political contexts; this poem is one more illustration of the banal truth that social groups explain the present through stories about the past. In this case, the key fact about the present is identity: 'ethnic genealogies were the instrument by which whole social collectives could situate themselves in space and time, reaffirming their identity by appeals to eponymous ancestors such as Doros, Ion or Dryops, who were at the same time the retrojected constructions of such identity'.[11] The map which genealogy offers[12] is thus to be set alongside the other kinds of map to be found in early epic. As the *Odyssey* lays out a hierarchy of cultures and modes of behaviour and the *Iliad* preserves a memory of the heroic past, which can serve political and moral claims in the present, so the huge sweep of the *Catalogue* establishes a constantly repeated pattern of marriage and reproduction in the past with crucial consequences in the present: we the audience thus become part of an imagined élite community; the passing of the 'Age of Heroes' and the separation of gods from men in Book 5[13] may reveal the full implications of the τότε 'at that time' of the proem (fr. 1.6), but genealogy offers in fact a more hopeful contact with the past than does the 'Myth of the Races' in the *Works and Days*. Whether or not we wish to see that myth as 'cyclical' (cf. esp. vv. 174–5, 'Would that I did not live among men of the fifth generation, but had either died beforehand or lived after'), each race passes for ever from the earth, and in the current circumstances our best hope of approaching the happiness of the past comes through the practice of justice. Genealogy, however, continues: the audience for the *Catalogue* claimed familial and ethnic descent from the characters of the *Catalogue*. There is thus a creative tension within such poetry between, on the one hand, the teleological push – made explicit in the dramatic events of Book 5 – which drives us and the poem towards the present day, and the systematic manner in which families are played out to the end,[14] and, on the other, the vast (apparently boundless) sea of story in which the poet can splash around and play and linger (or not) as he chooses.[15]

---

[10] Fowler 1998 argues for an association of the *Catalogue* with the Thessalian Amphictyony in the period after its success in the First Sacred War (cf. 580).

[11] Hall 1997: 41.   [12] Cf. Fowler 1998: 1.   [13] Cf. Cingano, Clay (this volume).

[14] Cf. West 1985a: 38–9. West notes that 'there is no sign of capricious transitions from one story to another', but this leaves a great deal of room for the exercise of poetic design or the deliberate appearance of lack of design.

[15] Cf. Rutherford 2000: 93.

The traditional nature of the verse form means, of course, that different contexts from different periods are at every stage incorporated, reused, and reshaped, but that does not mean that 'early' passages and genealogies are simply 'historical relics' to which newer, more 'political' passages are added. If group identity is truly discursive,[16] then our analysis of genealogical myth into chronological layers will have historical and archaeological interest, but will be of only limited value in explaining what the genealogies meant to those who told and heard them at any particular time. There will, of course, always be room for argument about just *how* specific the context(s) for our *Catalogue* were – the essays of (e.g.) Irwin, Osborne, and Rutherford in this volume show three of the routes which could be taken – and it would be naive to imagine that there was not also a large measure of non-specifically functional pleasure to be had from listening to stories and lists of names. Both archaic (e.g. *Iliad* 7.127–8) and Hellenistic (e.g. Apollonius, *Arg.* 2.762–72) epic indeed dramatise this pleasure.

---

[16] Cf. Hall 1997: 41–2.

CHAPTER I

Ordering women in Hesiod's Catalogue

Robin Osborne

All that we possess of Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* is shreds and tatters. The vast majority of what survives does so on papyri where there are barely two consecutive lines which can be read without resorting to some sort of restoration. The small proportion of surviving fragments which derive from ancient quotation give, at best, just half a dozen consecutive lines. Only the fifty-six lines of fr. 195 which are identical with the opening of the *Shield of Heracles* provide a substantial and entirely secure consecutive section. Not surprisingly, working out the order in which the preserved fragments appeared in the original poem, assuming indeed that there was 'an original poem', has been neither easy nor uncontentious. The order championed by Merkelbach and West has become orthodox, and will be assumed here. It makes good sense of the surviving evidence, although it leaves some forty fragments unaccounted for, and seems unlikely to be seriously wrong in its basic structure, even if new discoveries have caused some revisions of details and more such revisions are highly likely.[1]

In the light of all of that, it might seem that the best that we can do is to examine particular episodes, as do some other contributors to this volume. In this paper, however, I shall make an attempt at understanding the poem as a whole. I shall first argue that the manner in which the fragments have come down to us gives grounds for reasonable confidence that what survives is typical of what is lost. I shall then try to show that what survives is sufficiently distinct from other comparable early catalogue-poetry to suggest that Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* had a distinct 'plot'. In concluding, I will suggest that the 'plot' of the *Catalogue* is confirmed by the parodic reading of the poem afforded by our longest surviving early non-hexameter poem. In reading the *Catalogue*, I pay particular attention to order, perversely, as it might be thought, given the poem's surviving

---

[1] Cf. West 1985a: Chapter 2 for a history of the study of the poem; esp. 35 for the basis of the current arrangement.

condition. I shall argue that Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* raises a range of issues to do with women and order. Consideration of the order in which the women appear, and its consequences, leads to issues about their relationship to order, and in their relationship to orders. The ambiguity of English 'order' is paralleled, though not reproduced, by the Greek *taxis* and its cognates, and I take this as some justification for approaching in this way a poem to whose very conception taxonomy is basic.

IS THERE A POEM TO READ?

Although what we have of the *Catalogue of Women* is shreds and tatters, the total number of lines and parts of lines that is preserved is large, some 1,300. The quantity is large both because of the number of surviving fragments (fifty separate significant papyrus fragments, besides quotations and other references) and because of the size of some of the papyrus fragments, which include large chunks of papyrus on which parts of anything up to one hundred or so consecutive lines are found (frr. 10a, 204). The *Suda s.v.* Ἡσίοδος records that the *Catalogue of Women* consisted of five books. West has speculated that Book 1 was closer to 900 than to 800 lines in length, while entertaining the possibility that it might be longer still. All books are unlikely to have been of the same length, but the total length of the work is unlikely to have been substantially less than, or substantially more than, 4,000 lines. What survives is therefore likely to amount to between a third and a quarter of the original poem.

The surviving lines are quite well distributed over the poem as a whole. Indications of book of origin that are likely to be accurate attach to seven fragments and refer to Books 1, 3 and 4. Fragments 196–204 certainly derive from the beginning of Book 5, and other fragments can very plausibly be ascribed to Book 2. There is little doubt, therefore, that all five books are represented in what survives, and although the distribution of papyrus fragments across the books is by no means even, there is no reason to believe that only parts of the poem were copied and read in antiquity, or that any part of the poem is in principle less likely to be represented than any other.

Against this, some thirty-four of the papyrus fragments derive from just eight papyri, each of which yields more than one fragment. West has noted that the general tendency of fragments of the same papyrus to come from parts of a poem that were closely proximate in the original is borne out by these papyri, which mainly yield fragments belonging to a

single genealogy.[2] The consequence of this is that the papyrus fragments cluster. This significantly increases the chance that some parts of the poem represented by no fragment were quite long, but it does mean that patterns of expansion within sections of genealogy can be quite closely observed.

To these purely statistical reasons for believing that what is preserved is effectively a random sample of the original poem can be added considerations based on content. At various points in the surviving fragments, one particular figure is singled out for more expansive treatment. With the exception of the special case of Heracles, discussed in this volume by Haubold, where the complicated question of the relationship between this poem and the *Shield of Heracles* comes into play, these more expansive sections do not seem to have been those that get picked up in the literary tradition. Indeed, it is a remarkable fact that the section on the suitors of Helen (cf. Cingano, this volume) survives entirely on papyrus and is never cited by any ancient author. The question therefore arises as to whether other expansive sections have not been lost completely, sections which might significantly affect the way in which the poem as a whole is read. But although this possibility cannot be excluded, it is not easy to find an appropriate candidate for such a treatment. Heracles and Helen are both figures of major mythological moment: there simply was no other son to match Heracles and no wife to match Helen. Of the daughters, mothers and sons who attracted the notice of Athenian tragedians, Jocasta and Oedipus are treated rather cursorily in fr. 193, Clytemnestra with similar laconic understatement in fr. 23. The same is true of Danae and Perseus in fr. 129. Theseus and Medea make no appearance in the surviving *Catalogue*, but extended treatment of either in a poem not usually regarded as later than the middle of the sixth century would be surprising. Of those who do receive somewhat expansive treatment, both Phineus and Mestra (fr. 43)[3] also attracted Hellenistic authors, while Telephus attracted classical sculptors as well as Euripides. Atalanta's race does not come in for such extensive literary coverage in surviving literature, but Atalanta and Melanion appear together on vases from the early sixth century. The absence of obvious candidates for lengthy treatment, the fact that all the more extensive treatments are of figures who are in one way or another flagged up in other archaic or later literary or artistic productions, and the observation made by West that expansive passages tend to occur at the end of lineages (so Phineus, Atalanta, Telephus, Helen and quite probably Mestra) all make it rather

[2] West 1985a: 36, 41.   [3] Cf. Rutherford (this volume).

unlikely that there were major developments within the poem which have left no trace in the material which we now have.

If it is reasonable to have some confidence that we know the basic structure of the poem, and that enough survives to make it unlikely that what was said in the lost part of the poem was significantly different from what is said in the extant portion, then it must be reasonable to look at the poem as a whole and at the themes which emerge from a sequential reading. Such a reading certainly cannot be definitive, but its foundations, although capable of being rocked, are neither insignificant nor fragile.

THE PRIMACY OF PANDORA

West has shown how the poet of the *Catalogue* was steeped in Hesiod's poetry.[4] Quite apart from the link between the end of *Theogony* and the opening of the *Catalogue* in terms of overlapping verses, the opening phrase of the *Catalogue*, with its 'tribe of women', links in with the often bracketed line 591 of *Theogony*. This phrase also makes starting with Pandora inevitable: 'from her is the cruel race and tribes of women'. When the *Catalogue* opening goes on (fr. 1.6) to talk of the 'common feasts' that gods and men used to enjoy together, we are transported, though without verbal reminiscence, to pre-Mekone times when gods and men were not yet divided (*Theogony* 536), to the world before Prometheus (compare *Works and Days* 108, bracketed by Solmsen but not by West), and hence to a world 'waiting for Pandora' (the scholia on 108 refer to Prometheus, Pandora and Epimetheus). When Pandora is mentioned in fr. 2, readers of the *Theogony* will therefore expect that this is the figure with whom that poem has made them familiar.

The tradition about what exactly the *Catalogue* said about Deucalion and Pandora is confused, but it is safe to assume that a Pandora at least appeared as Deucalion's daughter, had intercourse with Zeus and became mother of Graikos (fr. 5). Almost certainly she was the first of the 'best women' who mixed with the gods. For West, this Pandora must be Pandora II, since tradition elsewhere makes Deucalion's wife Pyrrha daughter of Epimetheus and Pandora. We can see how the phrase in fr. 5, 'Pandora, a *kore* in the halls of glorious Deucalion' (κούρη δ' ἐν μεγάροισιν

---

[4] West 1985a: 125–30. Whether this is quite the right way to put it depends upon one's view of the relative dates of the *Catalogue, Theogony*, and *Works and Days*. For the possibility that the *Catalogue* is the oldest of the three, see Janko 1982: 85–7, discussed further in the final section of this paper. If we were to take seriously the possible priority of the *Catalogue*, then the *Theogony* might seem to be playing with an innocent Pandora, rather than the other way round.

ἀγαυοῦ Δευκαλίωνος|Πανδώρη), might distinguish a 'maid Pandora' from a 'matriarch Pandora', but I am not sure that I share West's confidence that the term κούρη necessarily rules out Casanova's view that there was only one Pandora, and that the Pandora from whom Zeus begets Graikos is the (ex-)wife of Epimetheus, lodging with her son-in-law Deucalion.[5] But even if we allow two Pandoras, it is hard to imagine the repetition of the name within the family to be innocent. The *Catalogue* is otherwise fecund in names.

So, what are the implications for making the first mortal woman with whom Zeus lies the woman, or the homonymous granddaughter of the woman, whom he made to fool men? Epimetheus' story emphasises how men are deceived by the external appearance of woman, but is the same to be said of the gods? The double bind stressed in the *Theogony*, though in a passage bracketed by Solmsen (603ff.), that men either marry and put up with the consequences in terms of troublesome children, if not a troublesome wife, or do not marry and so have no posterity to look after them when old, clearly does not apply to the gods – as the prologue's 'not indeed having an equal span of life' (οὐδ' ἄρα ἰσαίωνες, fr. 1.8) stresses. For the gods, the evils consequent upon woman's arrival in the world are not relevant: there can be no deceit as far as they are concerned because the consequences of their sexual relations with mortals are, for them, although productive, completely anodyne. For them, the world of beautiful women has no links with the world of work.

Putting Pandora first has consequences for our whole attitude to the *Catalogue*. It serves to highlight the contrast between the world visited here every time a god beds a mortal woman, and the world of men: the *Catalogue* may be a step down from the *Theogony*, where gods bed goddesses, but it is a step that leaves the gods less, not more, responsible. Bedding a goddess can have disastrous consequences for a god – some sons of goddesses are destined to be greater than their fathers, and mothers may encourage sons to be rebellious – but bedding a mortal woman, as related here, will have none. Both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* explore problematic relationships between equals, but when a god beds a mortal woman the relations are unequal, and the inequalities of status and gender map onto one another.

Before moving on, it is worth just pausing to note that it is Zeus that beds Pandora – and who goes on to bed two of her sisters, Thyia (fr. 7), and Protogeneia.[6] The prologue has catalogued the gods whose seeding of kings

---

[5] West 1985a: 52 n. 38.   [6] West 1985a: 52.

it will record, and has begun that catalogue with Zeus. So Zeus' unchal-
lenged role as seducer of the daughters of Deucalion follows the order that
the prologue gives. Poseidon, the next to be listed in the prologue, appears
with the great-granddaughters of Deucalion, the daughters of Aeolus, bed-
ding both Canace and her granddaughter Iphimedeia. The declared hier-
archy of the prologue is not challenged by the order of exposition in the
Catalogue, at least as far as our evidence goes. By contrast to the *Theogony*,
and indeed to the *Works and Days*, this is not a poem in which authority
is challenged. But we should also note that in the *Theogony* Hephaestus, in
obedience to Zeus' orders, makes Pandora χαριζόμενος Διὶ πατρί 'giving
pleasure to father Zeus' (580): in the *Catalogue* we find Zeus not just taking
pleasure in the existence of the woman who will trick Epimetheus, but
taking pleasure in the woman herself, himself succumbing to the beauty he
has had created.

ORDERLY WOMEN

Pandora appears simply as 'a maid in the halls of glorious Deucalion' (fr. 5):
her appearance is not described – the reader of the *Theogony* knows more
than enough about it already. From Creousa onwards, however, in the
extant fragments, it becomes regular for the women when mentioned
also to be described. Creousa herself is a 'fair-cheeked maiden with lovely
form' (Κ[ρείουσαν ἐπή]ρατον εἶδος ἔχ[ουσαν] | [κούρ]ην καλλ[ιπάρηον,
fr. 10a.20–1). Perimede in the next generation is 'of fair appearance'
(ε]ὐ̣ειδέ[α] Π̣ε̣ρ̣ιμήδην fr. 10a.34).

   As we go through the poem, it is repeatedly for their fair or lovely appear-
ance, and especially their hair and ankles, that the successive generations
of women who attract the sexual attentions of gods or men are praised –
so with the wife of Hippodamas 'having a very lovely appearance' (ὅ γ᾽
Ἱπ̣[ποδάμας πολυή]ρ̣[α]τ̣ον εἶδος ἔχουσαν | ἠγάγετ̣ . . . , fr. 10a.45),
with Calyce ('he made Calyce of fair appearance his fertile wife', ε̣[ὐειδέα
Καλύκην θα]λερὴν ποιήσατ᾽ ἄκοιτιν, fr. 10a.59), with Polycaste 'of the
fair tresses' (εὐ̣]π̣λόκαμο̣ς Πολυκά̣στη, fr. 10a.66), with the women whose
names do not survive in fr. 17a.3, who are 'fair-cheeked' (κ̣αλλιπά[ρ̣]ηον)
and possessed of 'very lovely appearance' (πολυήρατον εἶδος ἔχουσ[αν]),
the much-wooed Demodike ('Demodike, whom most men on earth wooed,
and strong kings promised many famous gifts, for the sake of her appear-
ance that was beyond description', [Δημοδίκη,] τὴν πλεῖστοι ἐπιχθονίων
ἀνθρώπων | μνήστευον, καὶ πολλὰ [περ]ικλυτὰ δῶρ᾽ ὀνόμηναν | ἴφθιμοι
βασιλῆες, ἀπειρέσιον [μ]ετὰ εἶδος, fr. 22.5–7), the goddess-like Leda,