

THE HESIODIC CATALOGUE OF WOMEN AND THE MEGALAI EHOIAI

IVAN M. COHEN

IN THEIR EDITION of the Hesiodic fragments Merkelbach and West assign seventeen fragments to a poem entitled *Megalai Ehoiai*.¹ Indeed the ancient sources already attribute all seventeen to this particular poem by name.² Merkelbach and West give the bulk of their collection—245 fragments—to a different poem, the *Catalogue of Women* (or *Ehoiai*), though not all their ascriptions are equally well-documented. Many fragments, to be sure, come explicitly from this poem, or even from a specific one of its five attested books. Others however are attributed only to the author “Hesiod,” and many more are judged to be Hesiodic and assigned to the *Catalogue* only because they exhibit points of style or content that are related or similar to that of the well-known fragments. For example, a “Hesiodic” line introduced by ἦ ὦν, or a fragment that seems to be genealogical, is assigned to the *Catalogue of Women* because we know that it had lines beginning with that phrase and that it dealt with genealogy. Similarly, papyrus-fragments that duplicate or resemble authentic Hesiodic fragments are ascribed to Hesiod. One may well wonder, however, why such fragments should be assigned to the *Catalogue of Women*, rather than to the *Megalai Ehoiai*. This paper will examine the fundamental similarities between the fragments explicitly attributed to the *Catalogue* and the *Megalai Ehoiai*, and explore the possibility that the two titles in fact refer to what is essentially a single poem.

If we begin with the assumption that there are two poems, we note at once that their style and structure (so far as it may be recovered) appear very similar. The introductory expression ἦ ὦν is found in fragments under both titles (fr. 195 and 253 M-W);³ and fragments from each poem suggest a narrative structure based on genealogy.

This similarity suggests it should be difficult to assign the *Catalogue*-style fragments to a particular poem. Moreover, this difficulty is not resolved by

¹R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967), henceforward referred to as M-W. New fragments derived from more recent discoveries can be found in an appendix to the second edition of the Hesiodic poems in the Oxford Classical Texts series (Oxford 1983, referred to below as OCT) 227–232: Fr. 10 a–d, 71A, 145A, 188A, 217A. F. Leo, “Hesiodica,” *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*² (Rome 1960) 343–354 (originally published in 1894), J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodica* (Leyden 1960), and M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985) are cited below by author’s name.

²The editors also ascribe two papyrus-fragments to the poem, both of them closely connected with citations from other sources: fr. 251a and 259b M-W.

³Fr. 215 M-W, which is also introduced by this expression, appears to be from the *Ehoiai*, a title to be discussed below.

reference to the subject-matter. Many stories from the *Megalai Ehoiai* (frr. 246–262 M-W) are also found in the *Catalogue*:

(1) Fragments 246 and 247 M-W concern the families of Inachus and Argos. Merkelbach and West assign frr. 122–159 to the stories of the Inachids, but only two of them (frr. 133, 137) are expressly from Hesiod's *Catalogue*.

(2) Fragments 248 and 249 M-W are quoted as the words of Alcmene to Heracles. Fr. 195, ascribed to book four of the *Catalogue*, deals with the myth of Alcmene and the birth of Heracles.

(3) Fragment 250 M-W relates an incident in the life of Telamon, involving Heracles and providing an *aition* for the name "Aias." This might be brought into connection with the myths of the family of Aeacus (father of Telamon) in frr. 205 and 206, which are attributed only to "Hesiod," but ascribed by the editors to the *Catalogue*.⁴

(4) Fragment 254 M-W concerns the blinding of Phineus. Fr. 138, from the same source (sch. Ap. Rhod. 2.178), deals with Phineus' father Phoenix, though the scholiast does not name the poem. Phineus may also have figured in the flight of the Harpies, which appears at fr. 156, ascribed to the *Catalogue* by the editors, but attributed to no specific poem by the source.⁵

(5) Fragments 255 and 256 M-W deal with the children of Phrixus, an Athamantid. This family provides the subject matter for frr. 68–76, which are not specifically ascribed to the *Catalogue*, but are assigned to it by the editors because the content appears to suit the proposed structure of the poem.⁶

(6) Fragment 259 M-W provides a list of the victims of Oenomaus, including Porthaon, son of Alcathous. Porthaon and his offspring are the subjects of frr. 11, 12, and 14, where the poem is not named. A recently-published papyrus,⁷ however, shows that frr. 11 and 14 followed closely after fr. 10, which is attributed to "Hesiod." Porthaon's daughters are the subject of fr. 26.5, which is from the *Ehoiai* (see below, 132).

⁴Tzetzes attributes these lines to Hesiod ἐν τῇ ἡρωικῇ γενεαλογίᾳ, a description every bit as appropriate to the type of narrative found in the *Megalai Ehoiai* as to that in the *Catalogue*.

⁵The blinding of Phineus is also dealt with in fr. 157 M-W, from the third book of the *Catalogue*. An apparent contradiction between the contents of frr. 157 and 254 will be discussed below.

⁶Merkelbach and West have arranged the fragments according to the great families of Greek myth and have determined that a good many are concerned with the family of Aeolus (frr. 10–76). Because frr. 68–76 deal with the the offspring of Athamas, an Aeolid, they are included in this group. For a detailed discussion on the structure of the *Catalogue* see West 31–124.

⁷P. J. Parsons and J. R. Rea, eds., *Papyri Greek and Egyptian edited by various hands in honour of Eric Gardner Turner* . . . (London 1981, EES Graeco-Roman Memoirs 68) 1–20, henceforward referred to as *PTurner*. Lines 25–27 = fr. 10 M-W; lines 49–65 = frr. 11, 14 M-W. These lines are fr. 10a–d in the OCT Hesiod.

(7) Fragment 260 M-W has to do with Endymion. His story also appears to have been told in an early section of the *Catalogue* (fr. 10a OCT) and possibly in book five (fr. 245 M-W). Other fragments (frr. 22–29 M-W) concerning the descendants of his mother, the Aeolid Calyce, are explicitly attributed to the *Catalogue* and the *Ehoiai* (see below, 135–136 and 136–138).

(8) Fragment 261 M-W concerns Melampus. A papyrus-fragment, *PSI* 1301, contains lines from an unnamed poem which also refer to his exploits. These have been included in the Aeolid section of the *Catalogue* (fr. 37) since *PSI* 1301 is from the same manuscript as *POxy* 2481, whose several fragments all contain lines that refer to descendants of Aeolus (West 39). Further exploits of Melampus, in connection with the madness of the Proetides, may be alluded to at frr. 131 and 132, in lines ascribed to Hesiod, but not to a particular poem.

Evidently the contents of eleven of the seventeen fragments attributed to the so-called *Megalai Ehoiai* can be connected or even integrated with the contents of various fragments assigned by the editors to the *Catalogue*. As for the remaining six, which were not discussed in detail above, none gives any indication that the general type of information (genealogical narrative with mythical digressions) contained in the *Megalai Ehoiai* was any different from that in the *Catalogue*. Nevertheless, Merkelbach and West have chosen to assign all such fragments to the *Catalogue* unless they are specifically attributed to the *Megalai Ehoiai*. This in spite of the fact that, where the contents overlap, only five fragments are specifically attributed to the *Catalogue* or to the *Ehoiai* (cf. nos. 1, 2, 6, 7 above). All other overlapping fragments could equally well have been integrated with those attributed to the *Megalai Ehoiai*.

It is not hard to see why the editors assigned the fragments in this way. Twenty citations, from fifteen ancient sources, cite the *Catalogue* or the *Ehoiai* by name; all acknowledge Hesiod as the poet;⁸ six citations refer to a specific book.⁹ In contrast to this, only five ancient sources cite the *Megalai Ehoiai*. Three of them name Hesiod as well. Clearly, if the origin of a fragment is in doubt, it is safest to assign it to the most widely-cited work.

⁸Sources citing Hesiod's *Catalogue* or *Ehoiai*: Sch. Ap. Rhod. (frr. 2, 33b, 157 M-W); Ioannes Lydus (fr. 5); Pausanias (frr. 23b, 25, 204.87–92); Sch. Bern. in Verg. *Georg.* (fr. 32); Steph. Byz. (fr. 34); Sch. Hes. *Theog.* (fr. 52); Arg. A. in *Scutum* (fr. 195); Eustathius (fr. 223); Herodianus (fr. 133); Strabo (fr. 137); Harpocration (frr. 150, 153); Apollonius Rhodius (fr. 230); Athenaeus (fr. 239); Sch. Soph. *Trach.* (fr. 240); Sch. Pind. *Pyth.* (fr. 215).

⁹These are: Book 1: fr. 2, 34 M-W; Book 3: frr. 150, 153, 157; Book 4: fr. 195. In addition, fr. 121 refers to book two; frr. 158 and 159 to book three; and fr. 245 to book five; all are attributed to Hesiod, but none names the poem. These have been understood to be from the *Catalogue*, no doubt because the other such references are. Moreover, one of the sources, Herodianus (frr. 121, 158), does seem to refer to the *Catalogue* by name elsewhere: fr. 133.3–5 are ἐκ τοῦ παρὰ Ἡσιόδου καταλόγου περὶ τῶν Προϊτίδων.

It is curious that the *Megalai Ehoiai* is not referred to more often and more specifically by the ancient commentators. The adjective μεγάλοι in its title suggests that it was longer than another poem of a similar name.¹⁰ If so, it might have been composed of more than five books and, presumably, might have had wider scope than the *Catalogue/Ehoiai*. Yet no source indicates a book number, and it appears to have been comparatively little read. In the circumstances, and given the close similarity of style and content, it is tempting to consider the likelihood that the two titles, *Catalogue* and *Megalai Ehoiai*, have been used by different sources to designate one and the same poem. It is true that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are not always distinguishable on the basis of style, but the similarity in the Hesiodic work may be taken with other factors to allow at least the possibility of a single poem.

There are three lists, all late, of the poems attributed to Hesiod, and each of them mentions works not listed by the others.

<i>Suda</i> η 583	Paus. 9.31.4–5	“Proclus” <i>proleg. in</i> Hes. Op. p. 8 Gaisford
Θεογονία	ἐς γυναικάς τε ἄδόμενα καὶ ἅς μεγάλας ἐπονομάζουσιν Ἡοίας	Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι
Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι	Θεογονία	Ἀσπίς
Ἀσπίς	ἐς τὸν μάντιν Μελάμποδα	Θεογονία Ἡρωογονία
Γυναικῶν ἥρωινῶν κατὰ- λογος ἐν βιβλίοις ἑ	ὡς Θησεὺς ἐς τὸν Ἄϊδην καταβαίη	Γυναικῶν κατάλογος
Ἐπικῆδειον εἰς βάτραχον	παραινέσεις Χείρωνος	τὰ λοιπὰ
Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι		

Presumably the Γυναικῶν ἥρωινῶν Κατάλογος in five books (*Suda*) is the same as the Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος (“Proclus”), and it is tempting to recognize it in Pausanias’ ἐς γυναικάς τε ἄδόμενα. The other *testimonia* supplied by Merkelbach and West refer to the same work under various appellations:

- (1) (a) οἱ Κατάλογοι *Proleg. in Hes. Op.* p. 3.9 Pertusi.
(b) ὁ Κατάλογος [Luc.] *Amores* 3.

¹⁰West 1 and 3. In his commentary on Hesiod’s *Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 22, n. 4, West discusses the use of μέγας and μικρός in titles in connection with the *Megala Erga*. He cites the Μικρὰ Ἰλιάς (also Ἰλιάδα τὴν ἐλάσσω in contrast with τὴν Ἰλιάδα τὴν Μεγάλην), Democritus’ Μέγας and Μικρὸς Διάκοσμος, Plato’s Ἰππίας Μείζων and Ἐλάττων and Aristotle’s Μεγάλα Ἠθικά, “which must originally have been bigger than the *Nichomachean Ethics*, which was called Νικομάχεια Μικρά (David, *Proleg. ad Categ.* 25a40).”

- (2) (a) ὁ Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος Eustath. in Hom. p. 1680.29;
Diomedes *Gramm. Lat.* 1.482 f. Keil;
Dio Prus. 2.13 f.; (Max. Tyr. 26.4
p. 312 Hobein).
(b) οἱ Κατάλογοι τῶν Γυναικῶν Menander περὶ ἐπιδεικτ. 628 (*Rhet.*
Gr. 9.268.15 Walz, 3.402 Sp).
- (3) περὶ Γυναικῶν Serv. in *Aen.* 7.268; Luc. *Diss. c.*
Hesiodo 1; Max. Tyr. 18.9 p. 230
Hobein.
- (4) γένος ἀρχαίων ἡ(μ)ιθέων [Asclepiades sive] Archias, *Anth. Pal.*
9. 64.
- (5) Ἡοίη Hermesianax fr. 7.21–26 Powell.
- (6) Ἡοῖαι Eunap. *Vit. soph.* 6.6.6–10.
- (7) Ἡοῖαι· ὁ Κατάλογος Ἡσιόδου Hesych. η 650.

It seems quite clear that there was a poem usually called ὁ Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος (the *Catalogue of Women*); there may have been another called the Ἡοῖαι, though the testimony of Hesychius implies that this is merely another name for the *Catalogue*. Neither *Suda* nor “Proclus” includes a separate poem entitled *Ehoiai* (though they could have considered it under “the others”). Pausanias’ list, however, poses a problem, for in his apparent reference to two poems, ἐς γυναῖκας τε ἀδόμενα καὶ ὡς μεγάλας ἐπονομάζουσιν Ἡοίας, he introduces what appears to be a third title, the *Megalai Ehoiai*. Indeed, in specific references to a genealogical or mythological poem, the various sources for our non-papyrus fragments (again, of late date) use one of three titles:

15 fragments are said to come from the *Catalogue*;¹¹

5 fragments are said to be from the *Ehoiai*;¹²

17 are specifically attributed to the *Megalai Ehoiai* (Frr. 246–262 M-W)

In our discussion thus far we have accepted without question the identification of the *Catalogue* with the *Ehoiai*. This has been the rule since Leo’s study in 1894 proposing that the three titles refer to two poems, a *Catalogue* (*Ehoiai*) and a *Megalai Ehoiai*.¹³ His conclusions are reflected in

¹¹Frr. 2, 5, 23b, 32, 33b, 34, 52, 133, 150, 153, 157, 195, 204.87–92, 223, 230 M-W.

¹²Frr. 25.12–13, 215, 235, 240 (cf. fr. 43c), 346 M-W. Although the editors have placed fr. 346 among the *fragmenta dubia*, A. Henrichs, in a re-examination of the extant papyrus fragment (“Toward a New Edition of Philodemus’ Treatise on Piety,” *GRBS* 13 [1972] 67, n. 2) finds what is “obviously an express reference to the Hesiodic [poem]” at line 3:]ηοια[ις].

¹³Schwartz examines the attempts by scholars to reconcile the evidence of the testimony for fragments with the known lists of Hesiodic works at 17–22, with a list of solutions on 21.

the subsequent major editions of the Hesiodic fragments. A. Rzach separated the *Catalogue/Ehoiai*-fragments from those of the *Megalai Ehoiai*. All fragments attributed to the latter are excluded from A. Traversa's edition of the *Catalogue*. H. G. Evelyn-White took a slightly different approach in his edition for the Loeb Classical Library; he believed that there were originally three poems, which became two when the *Catalogue* and the *Ehoiai* were joined.¹⁴ The most recent editors have, as we have seen, distinguished two poems, with a reference to Leo's study.

Leo argued that the *Catalogue* and the *Ehoiai* were the same poem on the basis of elements of style and the testimonia of Hesychius and Eunapius (350). The argument is greatly strengthened, if not confirmed, by the contents of *POxy* 2481 fr. 5. This papyrus-fragment joins several others edited by Lobel,¹⁵ as well as the previously unpublished *PMich* 6234 fr. 2, edited by Merkelbach and West; the sequence appears in their edition as fragments 23a, 25, and 26. Fragment 23b (= Paus. 1.43.1) says: οἶδα δὲ Ἡσίοδον ποιήσαντα ἐν Κατάλογῳ Γυναικῶν Ἰφιγένειαν οὐκ ἀποθανεῖν This seems to refer to fr. 23a.21–26, which occur in a section of the poem that deals with the daughters of Thestius, and which begins with ἡ οἶαι (line 3);¹⁶ here, as in fr. 195 Sc.¹ M-W, the *Catalogue* contains "*ehoiai*." Elsewhere, however, Pausanias (10.31.3) cites the *Ehoiai* and writes that Ἀπόλλωνα . . . ἀμῦνα κουρήσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς καὶ ἀποθανεῖν Μελέαγρον ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος. Significantly, this detail is found at fragment 25.12–13, a part of the same papyrus and still part of the ἡ οἶαι of the daughters of Thestius. Pausanias clearly uses the titles Κατάλογος Γυναικῶν and Ἠοῖαι to refer to the same poem.

Leo continued to distinguish the *Megalai Ehoiai* from the *Catalogue of Women/Ehoiai* because, although the last two names are never cited together in reference to two poems whose contents are contrasted, one or the other is opposed to the *Megalai Ehoiai*:

fr. 251b (= Paus. 4.2.1): *Ehoiai* contrasted with *Megalai Ehoiai*;

fr. 254 (Sch. Ap. Rhod. 2.178): *Catalogue* Book 3 contrasted with *Megalai Ehoiai*;

¹⁴A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina* (Leipzig 1913); A. Traversa, *Catalogi sive Ehoearum Fragmenta* (Naples 1951, Coll. di studi greci 21); H. G. Evelyn-White, *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and Homerica* (London 1915) xxi–xxv; titles appear on pages 154 and 256. Cf. Schwartz 20, 21.

¹⁵E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 28 (London 1962) 1–31.

¹⁶Although Pausanias uses the usual name Iphigeneia, the Hesiodic fragment calls Clytemnestra's daughter Iphimede. Lobel (*op. cit.* 10) notes that there is no other authority for the assignment of this name to the daughter of Clytemnestra; Iphimede had hitherto occurred in Greek legend only as the wife of Aloeus, mother of Otus and Ephialtes.

Similarly, the Hesiodic poet uses the name Artemis Einodia where Pausanias used Hecate (fr. 23b M-W).

fr. 260 (Sch. Ap. Rhod. 4.58): "Hesiod" (a line attributed by another source to *Catalogue* Book 5 in fr. 245) contrasted with *Megalai Ehoiai*.¹⁷

There can be little question that the names *Catalogue of Women* and *Ehoiai* refer to one and the same poem.¹⁸ But we must now re-examine the evidence and consider whether there is truly a distinction in the sources between the *Catalogue/Ehoiai* and the *Megalai Ehoiai*.¹⁹ Can it be shown that the ancient sources for the *Megalai Ehoiai* never referred to a *Catalogue* or an *Ehoiai*; but that the poem they call the *Megalai Ehoiai* is the same poem that others called the *Catalogue* or *Ehoiai*? The five sources in question are Antoninus Liberalis, a commentator on Aristotle *Eth. Nicom.* 3.7, the scholia on Pindar, the scholia on Apollonius Rhodius, and Pausanias. As we shall see, only the last two present any real problem.

1. Antoninus Liberalis

The only Hesiodic fragment (256 M-W) provided by Antoninus Liberalis is attributed to the *Megalai Ehoiai* (cf. above, 128, number 5). It treats of Magnes, son of Argos (the son of Phrixus) and Perimele (daughter of Admetus). This is compatible with several fragments from other sources that have been assigned by the editors to the *Catalogue*. "Hesiod" mentioned Admetus in the story of Asclepius (fr. 54c); Phrixus was dealt with in a fragment that has been associated with the stemma of the Aeolid Athamas (fr. 68). Although the scholiast on Apollonius says that Phrixus and his offspring were treated in the *Megalai Ehoiai* (fr. 255), and elsewhere puts them in a *Catalogue* (cf. fr. 157 and 254), there is no evidence that Antoninus Liberalis himself knew of two poems.

2. Anonymous Commentator on Aristotle's *Eth. Nicom.* 3.7

Similarly, the only fragments provided by this commentator (248, 249

¹⁷Leo continued his argument by indicating other discrepancies (351): (a) "Hesiod" called the mother of Asclepius Arsinoe (fr. 50 M-W); Marckscheffel allowed a variant Hesiodic version in which Coronis was mother of Asclepius (*app. crit. ad fr.* 50) and Wilamowitz reconstructed the Coronis-episode to make her the mother of the god of healing (fr. 60). Leo suggested that the Coronis-story belonged in the *Megalai Ehoiai*. Despite the contradiction, Merkelbach and West place the Coronis-fragments among those attributed to the *Catalogue*. (b) there is a discrepancy in the number of Niobids that Hesiod was supposed to have mentioned (fr. 183). Apollodorus says that Hesiod counted 10 sons and 10 daughters; Aelian says that Hesiod counted 9 sons and 10 daughters. Again, Leo suggests that this is because the story was told differently in the *Catalogue* and the *Megalai Ehoiai*; again, despite the discrepancy, Merkelbach and West have attributed both to the *Catalogue*; (c) Leo also noted a discrepancy in the name that Hesiod was supposed to have attributed to the wife of Sthenelus: Nicippe or Antibia (fr. 191). The offending passage has since been emended by Jacoby, and the discrepancy removed.

¹⁸As Schwartz writes (23, n. 4), "Dans la fausse opposition entre κατάλογος γυναικῶν et . . . Ἠοῖαι, le dernier terme concerne la forme extérieure, le premier le contenu du poème."

¹⁹Schwartz has questioned the justification for a distinction (22).

M-W) are attributed to the *Megalai Ehoiai* (cf. above, 128, number 2). The subject matter—Alcmene and Heracles—is compatible with that of fr. 195, which is part of the *Catalogue*. This does not, of course, prove that the two poems were one; but neither is it evidence for two poems dealing with the same myths. There is no indication that the anonymous commentator knew a second poem.

3. *Scholia on Pindar*

Twenty-one Hesiodic fragments come from this source. Two are expressly from non-genealogical works (frr. 283, 357 M-W), and are excluded from further discussion here. Two (250, 253) are said specifically to be from the *Megalai Ehoiai* (cf. above, 128, number 3). The origin of the others is given in various phrases, for the most part consisting of the poet's name only:

(a) "Hesiod," frr. 10, 12 (with 11, 13, 14), fr. 23a.31, 24, 40, 42, 49, 71, 205, 209, 232, 259a;

(b) ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰς Ἡσίοδον ἀναφερομένοις ἔπεσι, frr. 60, 61;

(c) ἀπὸ δὲ Ἠοίας Ἡσιόδου, fr. 215;

(d) frr. 169 and 170 are attributed by the scholiast to no particular author or work.

All these fragments, except fr. 259a, are assigned to the *Catalogue* by Merkelbach and West. Yet none is linked unquestionably to lines that are known to be from that poem; even those that may be so associated could also come from a *Megalai Ehoiai*. We have seen that at least some legends are ascribed to both poems.

The question to be considered is whether or not the Pindaric scholia refer by name to an Hesiodic poem other than the *Megalai Ehoiai*. At first glance this appears to be so in fr. 215 M-W, which is understood to be attributed to the *Ehoiai*. We note however that the scholiast's phrase is ἀπὸ δὲ Ἠοίας, singular, and not the plural, ἐν ταῖς Ἠοίαις, which is more usually employed when the poem is referred to by that title.²⁰ He seems to be saying that "Pindar took the story [of Cyrene] from an *ehoia* of Hesiod, . . ." that is, from a *section* of a longer poem. The lines that follow show no obvious connection with any fragment attributed by other sources to the *Catalogue/Ehoiai*. They do, however, share the introductory formula ἢ' οἷν with a fragment derived by the Pindaric scholia from the *Megalai Ehoiai* (fr. 253 M-W). Since sections of that poem could reasonably be referred to as *ehoiai*, it is possible that the references in the Pindaric scholia to Hesiod and Hesiodic poetry, including the *Megalai Ehoiai*, allude to one poem.

²⁰E.g., frr. 239 and 240 M-W ἐν ταῖς Ἠοίαις and ἐν Ἠοίαις, respectively; and fr. 346.3]ηοα[ι]ς.

4. Scholia on Apollonius Rhodius

Twenty-five fragments originate in the scholia on Apollonius Rhodius. Seven are expressly from non-genealogical works (fr. 263, 299, 300, 315, 320, 390, 391 M-W). Five (fr. 254, 255, 260, 261, 262) are attributed to the *Megalai Ehoiai* (cf. above, 128–129, numbers 4–8). Eleven fragments are credited only to “Hesiod.” Most of these have been assigned arbitrarily by Merkelbach and West to the *Catalogue*.²¹ In the case of fragments 33b and 245 there is good reason. The former concerns the death of Periclymenus, and appears to relate a detail that sch. ad Hom. *Il.* 2.333–335 claims to be “in the *Catalogues*.” In addition, the episode appears in a fragment of *POxy* 2481 (fr. 2 = fr. 33a M-W). The same papyrus provides another fragment (3 = fr. 35 M-W) that continues the story. The evidence of Steph. Byz. (= fr. 34 M-W) indicates that lines 6–8 of *POxy* 2481 fr. 3 (= fr. 35 M-W) occurred “in the first [book] of the *Catalogues*.” Similarly, the information about Endymion that is cited in fr. 245 M-W by sch. Ap. Rhod. 4.58 was claimed to have been found by a commentator on Antimachus of Colophon ἐν τῷ εἰ. It is generally accepted (cf. above, note 9) that this means ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ Καταλόγῳ (cf. fr. 195 M-W) or ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ Καταλόγων (cf. fr. 34 and 150 M-W). Because we do not have his name for the work, however, the evidence of 33b and 245 M-W does not prove that the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius knew a poem called the *Catalogue* in addition to the one he named *Megalai Ehoiai*. The scholia do state specifically that fr. 2 M-W was “in the first [book] of the *Catalogues*.” To be sure, this alone does not prove that the scholiast had first-hand knowledge of two poems; he may have known two names for the same poem.

This does not seem to be so for fr. 254 and 157 M-W, where there appear to be contradictory versions of the same story in the *Megalai Ehoiai* and in book three of the *Catalogue*: πεπηρώσθαι δὲ Φινέα φησὶν Ἡσίοδος ἐν Μεγάλαις Ἠοίαις, ὅτι Φρίξω τὴν ὁδὸν ἐμήνυσεν, ἐν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ Καταλόγῳ, ἐπειδὴ τὸν μακρὸν χρόνον τῆς ὄψεως προέκρινεν. According to the *Megalai Ehoiai* Phineus was blinded because he gave directions to Phrixus; the *Catalogue* says that it was because he chose long life over sight.

Furthermore, conflicting details about the life of Endymion are given in fr. 245 and 260 M-W. Although the scholiast does not use two titles, he does refer separately to “Hesiod” and to the *Megalai Ehoiai*: τὸν δὲ Ἐνδυμῶνα Ἡσίοδος μὲν Ἀεθλίου τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Καλύκης, παρὰ Διὸς εἰληφότα τὸ δῶρον ἦν αὐτῷ ταμίαν εἶναι θανάτου, ὅτε θέλοι ὀλέσθαι . . . (fr. 245); ἐν δὲ ταῖς μεγάλαις Ἠοίαις λέγεται τὸν Ἐνδυμῶνα ἀνενεχθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς εἰς

²¹Two examples of this arbitrary allocation are fr. 231 and 241 M-W. The editors suggest that the first could also be placed after fr. 251. The second concerns the return of the Argo; there may have been some details of the *Argonautica* in the *Megalai Ehoiai* (e.g., Phineus, fr. 254). Cf. above, n. 17.

οὐρανόν, ἐρασθέντα δὲ Ἥρας εἰδῶλῳ παραλογισθῆναι νεφέλης, καὶ διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα ἐκβληθέντα κατελθεῖν εἰς Ἄιδου (fr. 260 M-W).

In order to resolve the difficulty, we must ask ourselves (a) whether it is possible that there was contradictory material within the Hesiodic poem, and (b) whether the scholiast could be referring to part of the same poem by a separate title.

(a) In the case of frr. 254 and 157 M-W, we note that neither reason for Phineus' blindness coincides with any of the possible versions offered by Apollodorus at *Bibl.* 1.9.21. There we are told that Phineus was alleged to have been blinded by the gods for foretelling the future to men; or by Boreas and the Argonauts because he blinded his own sons at the instigation of their stepmother; or by Poseidon because he told the children of Phrixus how they could sail from Colchis to Greece. Confusion in the tradition about Phineus is also noted by the scholiast on Ap. Rhod. 2.178b: Πηρωθῆναι δὲ λέγουσι τὸν Φινέα ὑπὸ Ἥλιου, ὅτι πολυχρόνιος εἶλετο μᾶλλον εἶναι ἢ βλέπειν. ἔνιοι μὲν τοσσαύτας ἐξηκέναι γεγενῆσ ἀπίθανον εἶναί φασι, πλείους δὲ αὐτοὺς γεγενῆσ, καὶ ἕτερον τὸν Φινέα ἑβδομον ἀπόγονον εἶναι τοῦ Φοίνικος πρὸς ὃν ἀπήνητησαν (οἱ) ἥρωες. Πηρωθῆναι δὲ αὐτὸν ὅτι ἐπεβούλευσε Περσεῖ.

It is possible that two parts of the Hesiodic poem reflected varying traditions. There is reason to believe that certain mythical characters occurred in several places throughout the poem;²² and this seems especially likely for one who has chosen τὸν μακρὸν χρόνον. A poem constructed with loosely-connected genealogies and mythical digressions would allow the re-introduction of characters, with details differing according to the context. Phineus may have been considered in connection with Helios, then again in an *Argonautica*. Even if the original poet did not himself discuss Phineus in two places, a second reference, inconsistent with the first, could have been added at a later date.

(b) A fragmentary commentary on Antimachus indicates that the phrase "ἐν δ' αὐτῷ θανάτου[ο],” which is almost identical to that used by the scholiast in reference to “Hesiod’s” version of Endymion’s story, is found in book five. Yet the most recent papyrus of the *Catalogue* has proved that the line “ἐν δ' αὐτῷ ταμίης θανάτου” actually stood in book one (*PTurner*, line 62 = fr. 10A.62 OCT: a second hand has put the variant θανάτου ταμίης in the margin). Thus Endymion, son of Aeolus’ daughter Calyce, appears to have been dealt with among the other Aeolidae, in a book of the *Catalogue* that was certainly known to the scholiast (cf. fr. 2 M-W). Are we to believe, therefore, that Endymion was treated in books one and five of the *Catalogue*, as well as in the *Megalai Ehoiai*? It has been suggested that Endymion only appears twice in the Hesiodic poetry, and that the reference by the commentary on Antimachus must be incorrect, since Endymion more prop-

²²E.g., Heracles: frr. 26, 43a, 195; Helen: frr. 24, 197–204 M-W.

erly belongs with the other Aeolids.²³ While this may be true, it hardly provides adequate reason to dismiss the commentator's testimony altogether. Perhaps we ought to consider the possibility that the reference to book five is in fact to a part of the poem that has been called *Megalai Ehoiai* by other sources.

It is not unusual that a poem such as the *Catalogue* should come to be known by several names, especially when we consider the nature of book-titles in antiquity. Books were normally identified by labels, ἐπιγράμματα, that provided a brief description of the contents.²⁴ These labels, however, were not necessarily attached to a work by its author, and a poem might be recognized by several such descriptions. Our earliest source for the name "Iliad" is Herodotus (2.116 f.). The title may be older of course, and it has been suggested that it was first applied when Homer's poem was considered in connection with the *Little Iliad*, which promises to sing the fate of Troy and for which the name is thus more appropriate.²⁵ Although both epics together present the story of Troy's fall, a more fitting title for the Homeric poem would be the "Wrath of Achilles." Similarly, the "*Theogony*" as a formal title is not attested earlier than Chrysippus (*Stoic.* 2.256) in the third century B.C. Nevertheless, the term may have been used as a description before that time, though even many later writers employed periphrases such as θεῶν γένεσις.²⁶ Such periphrastic descriptions were commonly applied to the major epic poems. In an epigram celebrating Hesiod and his various works Archias (Asclepiades?) writes:

οὐδ' οὐ κορεσσάμενος μακάρων γένος ἔργα τε μολπαῖς
καὶ γένος ἀρχαίων ἔγραφες ἡμιθέων (Anth. Pal. 9.64.7-9)

And as early as the fifth and fourth centuries individual episodes of the *Iliad* were cited with special titles: Διομήδους ἀριστεία (Herodotus 2.116); σκήπτρου παράδοσις (Thucydides 1.9.4); νεῶν κατάλογος (Thucydides 1.10.4); τειχομαχία (Plato *Ion* 539b); Ἀλκίονος ἀπόλογοι (Plato *Resp.* 10.614a and Aristotle *Rh.* 1417a13, *Pol.* 1455a2). The same phenomenon is to be

²³PTurner 2, n. 1 and West 34, 35. Indeed, Endymion does appear among the Aeolidae in Apollodorus *Bibl.* 1.7.6, though Apollodorus is not necessarily to be taken as an accurate guide for the arrangement of the Hesiodic fragments.

²⁴By way of example, a fragment of Attic comedy (from the *Linus* of Alexis) presents Heracles, a pupil of Linus, who is asked to choose from a number of books in front of him. Linus says:

. . . πανύ γε διασκοπῶν
ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων, ἀτρέμα τε καὶ σχολῇ
Ὅρφευς ἔνεστιν, Ἡσίοδος, τραγωδίαί . . .

(Alexis, fr. 135 [Meineke 3, p. 444; Kock 2, p. 345; Edmonds 2, p. 436 = Ath. 4.164c]).

²⁵W. Schmid and O. Stählin, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* 1.1 (Munich 1959) 93.5.

²⁶M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford 1978) 150.

observed in references to the Hesiodic poem concerning women, which is variously known as Γυναικῶν ἥρωινῶν κατάλογος, Ἡοῖαι, περὶ Γυναικῶν, διηγούμενος . . . ἔτι δὲ γυναικῶν ἀρετάς, ἐς γυναῖκας ἀδόμενα. Other testimonia appear to have applied particular names to specific episodes: περίοδος γῆς (fr. 151 M-W); κατάλογος τῶν Λευκιππίδων (fr. 52); ὁ κατάλογος περὶ τῶν Προυτίδων (fr. 133). In light of these examples it is not unreasonable to suggest that *Megalai Ehoiai* was merely another term used to describe a part of the *Catalogue* poem. It is significant that our testimony for a *Catalogue* in five books (*Suda* η 583) does not list a *Megalai Ehoiai* among the works of Hesiod, nor does any reference to a book-number use the name *Ehoiai*. We return to the possibility that Endymion, like Phineus, was dealt with in two places in a single poem, either because of early interpolation or because there were several traditions about his exploits. It is possible that, by the time that the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius came to read the *Catalogue*, book five had come to be referred to as the *Megalai Ehoiai*, perhaps because it contained fuller or conflicting accounts of characters found elsewhere in the *Catalogue*. Alternatively, A. Casanova has expressed the belief that a version of the *Catalogue* published at Pergamum contained sections that were considered spurious by the "stricter" scholars of Alexandria; thus it was longer and came to be known as the *Megalai Ehoiai*.²⁷ If the scholiast did not have his own copies of the two editions, his secondary sources might lead him to conclude that there were two poems because they commented separately on those passages and alluded to the poem by different names.²⁸

In any event, the scholia refer most often to the *Megalai Ehoiai* (five times) and only twice to the *Catalogue* as though it were a separate poem. Even if we are to believe in two poems, this frequency-pattern, similar to that noted above in the scholia on Pindar, suggests that Merkelbach and West ought to have assigned to the *Megalai Ehoiai* the eleven fragments attributed only to "Hesiod."

5. *Pausanias*

Thirteen fragments originate in the work of Pausanias. One (fr. 375 M-W) has been considered spurious by Merkelbach and West. Seven are attributed by Pausanias to the *Megalai Ehoiai* (frs. 246, 247 [cf. above, 128, number 1], 251b, 252, 257, 258, 259a [cf. above, 128, number 6]). The source of the others is given in various phrases:

- (a) Κατάλογος Γυναικῶν frs. 23b and on fr. 204.87-92
- (b) Ἡοῖαι fr. 25.12-13

²⁷A. Casanova, "Catalogo, Eèe e Grandi Eèe nella tradizione ellenistica," *Prometheus* 5 (1979) 225-228, 236-240.

²⁸Schwartz makes this suggestion (23). It is accepted by F. Vian, in "Poèmes hésiodiques et pseudo-hésiodiques," *REG* 74 (1961) 270, and to some degree by Casanova, *op. cit.* 225-226.

- (c) Ἡσίοδος ἢ τῶν τις ἐμπεποιηκότων ἐς τὰ Ἡσιόδου τὰ ἔπη συνθέντα fr. 50
 (d) Ἡσίοδος fr. 224.

The last two, although assigned by the editors to the *Catalogue*, could equally belong to a poem known by the other title.²⁹ It has been shown (above, 132) that Pausanias' references to the *Catalogue* and the *Ehoiai* are, in fact, to the same poem. That he knew one poem by these titles does not, in itself, imply that he was aware of another poem. Such an awareness does seem to be shown, however, in fr. 251b M-W:

πυθέσθαι δὲ σπουδῇ πάνν ἐθελήσας οὔτινες παῖδες Πολυκάου ἐγένοντο ἐκ Μεσσήνης, ἐπελεξάμην τὰς τε Ἠοίας καλουμένας καὶ τὰ ἔπη τὰ Ναυπάκτια, πρὸς δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅποσα Κιναιῖθων καὶ Ἄσιος ἐγενεαλόγησαν. οὐ μὴν ἔς γε ταῦτα ἦν σφισιν οὐδὲν πεποιημένον, ἀλλὰ Ὑλλου μὲν τοῦ Ἡρακλέους θυγατρὶ Εὐαίχμῃ συνοικῆσαι Πολυκάονα υἱὸν Βούτου λεγούσας τὰς μεγάλας οἶδα Ἠοίας· τὰ δὲ ἐς τὸν Μεσσήνης ἄνδρα καὶ τὰ ἐς αὐτὴν Μεσσήνην παρεῖται σφισι.

Pausanias claims to have read, among other things, the poem called *Ehoiai* in order to discover the names of the children of Polycaon and Messene. That effort was in vain, but he does know that the *Megalai Ehoiai* told that Polycaon married Euaichme. As it happens, we have a papyrus-fragment whose contents relate the marriages of Polycaon and Euaichme (fr. 251a M-W). If that fragment is properly ascribed to the *Megalai Ehoiai*, Pausanias must be referring to the information contained therein. In that case, however, he has made a mistake, for there we read that Euaichme married Polycreon (lines 8–9); it was her sister Aristaichme who married Po[u]lycaon (lines 1–4). Is Pausanias himself guilty of carelessness? Or may we conclude that he did not have his own copy of the *Megalai Ehoiai* and relied upon someone else's account of it? If he knew of the *Megalai Ehoiai* from secondary sources only (cf. Casanova, above, note 27, 229), then he may not be in a position to know that the title had been applied to a part of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (e.g., book five) or to a second version of the whole.

Another more recently-published papyrus, POxy 42.2999 (fr. 71A OCT), has been identified as a piece of the *Catalogue*, with the suggestion that its subject-matter parallels that of fr. 251 M-W: sons of Butes marry daughters of Hyllus in the house of Ceyx. But fr. 71A.12 OCT has been identified with fr. 73.1 M-W, which appears to begin the episode about Atalante (already assigned to the *Catalogue*). If the latter identification is valid, three possible conclusions may be drawn: (1) the marriage of the sons of Butes did

²⁹We infer from sch. Hes. *Theog.* 142 (= fr. 52 M-W) that the birth and death of Asclepius were found in a *section* referred to as the "catalogue of the Leucippidae" (the episode of Apollo and the Cyclopes is usually considered a part of Asclepius' story). This does not exclude the possibility that the poem as a whole was known as the *Megalai Ehoiai*.

appear in the *Catalogue/Ehoiai*, in spite of Pausanias' evidence to the contrary; (2) the story of Atalante also appeared in the *Megalai Ehoiai*, another instance of overlapping content, or (3) the episode concerning the sons of Butes belongs, with the story of Atalante, to an edition of the *Catalogue/Ehoiai* that was not available to Pausanias, but was referred to, in whole or in part, as the *Megalai Ehoiai*. Inasmuch as Pausanias claims to have read the *Ehoiai*, the first possibility is least likely. The notion of overlap, expressed in (2), considered in conjunction with the many other such similarities, serves to reinforce the likelihood of (3), and the belief that there was essentially one collection of *Catalogue*-poetry available in two versions.

Whether or not he had first-hand knowledge of that version, Pausanias does appear to treat it separately from the *Ehoiai*. In his list of Hesiod's works at 9.31.4–5 he includes ἐς γυναϊκάς τε ἄδόμενα, καὶ ᾗς μεγάλας ἐπονομάζουσιν Ἡοίας. A number of attempts have been made to show that these words refer to one and the same poem;³⁰ one of the most notable is that of J. Schwartz (24). He has suggested that Pausanias' apparent allusion to two poems is the result of a misunderstanding, which stems, in part, from the nature of titles in antiquity (see above, 137 ff.). Schwartz begins by looking at Proclus' list of the Hesiodic poetry and notes the presence of a *Heroögonny* and a *Catalogue of Women*. The *proleg. in Hes. Op.* p. 3.9 (Pertusi) appears to refer to the *Heroögonny* as ἡ ἥρωικὴ γενεαλογία. Tzetzes, however, uses the latter term when he cites lines that are more likely to be from the *Catalogue* (frs. 205, 9, 10, 235 M-W). The order *Theogony*, *Heroögonny*, *Catalogue* corresponds to a situation that is perceptible in our editions of the *Theogony*. At line 962 the descendants of the divine parents stop; there is a new formula of invocation at line 965, which is followed by another at line 1021 that has been identified as the beginning of the *Catalogue*. Between these two invocations are told the loves of divine mothers and mortal fathers (lines 969–1018), sometimes with a brief statement about their offspring. These descendants could be called ἡμίθεοι (sch. Hes. *Op.* 159–160 p. 63 Pertusi) or "heroes," and the designation *Heroögonny* is quite appropriate. This "title" could be extended to include the *Catalogue*, as Tzetzes seems to have done. On the other hand, the term "Catalogue" could be extended to include the part sometimes designated "Heroögonny" (as may be the case in the *Suda*'s list [above, 130]). Indeed, Pausanias (1.3.1) does allude to *Theogony* 986 (= fr. 375 M-W) as ἐν ἔπεισι τοῖς ἐς τὰς γυναϊκάς.³¹

³⁰M. Cardini, in "I Cataloghi Esiodei," *Athenaeum* 9 (1921) 91, cites Bekker and Schleiermacher who eliminated καὶ; and Lehman who read ᾗς καὶ. These editors identified the *Megalai Ehoiai* with the *Catalogue*. Although the repositioning of καὶ and ᾗς would allow the desired meaning for ἐπονομάζουσιν, Marckscheffel rejected this solution on the grounds that the phrase ἐς γυναϊκάς τε ἄδόμενα ᾗς καὶ μεγάλας ἐπονομάζουσιν Ἡοίας, καὶ Θεογονίαν τε καὶ . . . was not proper Greek. Cardini himself prefers to distinguish the two poems, taking the adjective as predicative: "the *Catalogue/Ehoiai* and the *Ehoiai* which they call *megalai*."

³¹But see M. L. West (above, n. 26, 426–427): "It is . . . quite unsafe to assume that Pausanias read this passage [*Theog.* 986–991] in the *Catalogue*."

Schwartz proposes that ἔπη ἐς τὰς γυναῖκας and "Heroögony" are two names that refer to the same part of the Hesiodic corpus, a segment that is usually printed with the *Theogony*. Thus "Proclus," who lists *Theogony*, *Heroögony*, *Catalogue*, makes the same error as Pausanias, who lists ἐς γυναῖκας τε ἀδόμενα, *Megalai Ehoiai*, and *Theogony*, "une sorte de reduplication du titre." If with the first term Pausanias is actually referring to the last lines of the *Theogony*, then the only other poem to which he is referring is the *Megalai Ehoiai*, which he cites elsewhere seven times by that title, twice as *Catalogue*, and once as *Ehoiai*.

The possibility remains, however, that Pausanias did believe the *Megalai Ehoiai* to be an independent poem on the basis of information derived from secondary sources. We note that, although he evidently is familiar with the titles, he does not use *Catalogue* or *Ehoiai* in his list of Hesiod's works. Yet his entry for *Megalai Ehoiai* is entirely consistent with five of the seven references made by him to that poem elsewhere:

fr. 246 M-W: τὰ ἔπη . . . ἃ δὴ Ἕλληνες καλοῦσι Ἡοίας Μεγάλας

fr. 257 M-W: ὁ τὰ ἔπη συνθείς ἄς μεγάλας Ἡοίας καλοῦσιν Ἕλληνες

fr. 252 M-W: ὁ τὰ ἔπη τὰς Μεγάλας Ἡοίας ποιήσας

fr. 259 M-W: κατὰ τὰ ἔπη τὰς Μεγάλας Ἡοίας

fr. 258 M-W: πεποιήται ἐν Ἡοίαις Μεγάλαις.

That is, he usually alludes to a poem "that the Greeks call . . ." or to the unspecified poet of that work. We might compare Pausanias' references to the *Naupactia*, which at 10.38.11 he calls τὰ δὲ ἔπη τὰ Ναυπάκτια ὀνομαζόμενα ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων and expresses doubts about its authorship. While professing there to follow Charon of Lampsacus in accepting as author Carcinus of Naupactus, elsewhere he does not mention Carcinus, and simply says ἔπη δὲ ἔστιν ἐν Ἑλληνσι Ναυπάκτια ὀνομαζόμενα (2.3.9) or τὰ ἔπη τὰ Ναυπάκτια (4.2.1). Similarly, then, although Pausanias may know the *Megalai Ehoiai* as a distinct work, he appears to be in some doubt about its Hesiodic authorship.

An important factor, therefore, in the decision not to distinguish two poems is our understanding of how the early epics were given their titles in the first place. The fact is that we do not know what the Hesiodic poet called his body of catalogue-poetry. Furthermore, the evidence for any title is very late; certainly none of the *testimonia* pre-dates the Hellenistic period, and thus all are well beyond the date in the seventh century that one might expect for poetry attributed to Hesiod.³² Our many sources do show us, however, that an extensive and diverse collection of this catalogue-poetry devoted to women, gods, and heroes descended to the Hellenistic age, by

³²For a fuller discussion on dating Hesiod to the late eighth and early seventh centuries see, for example, H. T. Wade-Gery, "Hesiod," *Phoenix* 3 (1949) 83; G. P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford 1971) 7; and M. L. West (above, n. 26) 44-46.

which time it was known as a whole and in its parts by several names. Principally, it is called a *Catalogue of Women*, a term that describes its contents. This *Catalogue* is also referred to as the *Ehoiai* presumably because many of its constituent episodes are introduced by that phrase. The name *Megalai Ehoiai* in all probability describes all or part of what is generally the same collection of episodes. The epithet *megalai* may refer to the fact that individual *ehoiai* were available in a fuller form, or that more such episodes had been added or retained. If two versions existed, they were probably due to the work of Alexandrian scholars on the traditional corpus. The existence of two somewhat different editions of essentially the same poem, known to later commentators by name only, may have led to confusion and the belief that there were actually two poems.

In the most recent edition the great majority of the Hesiodic fragments that might belong to a genealogical poem, and which are attributed only to "Hesiod," have been assigned to the *Catalogue/Ehoiai*. Indeed, there are no details in their contents that are directly contradictory to details in the fragments specifically attributed to the *Megalai Ehoiai*; and nothing would exclude them from a poem of that title. Thus, so long as there is no comment on the relation in length or content of the *Catalogue* to the *Megalai Ehoiai*, the present arrangement appears arbitrary. I believe that we could justifiably integrate the seventeen fragments of the so-called *Megalai Ehoiai* with all of those now assigned to the *Catalogue*, and at the same time concede the likelihood that such an integrated text had a separate distribution in antiquity.³³

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS,
MOUNT ALLISON UNIVERSITY,
SACKVILLE, N.B. E0A 3C0.

³³An earlier version of this article formed part of my doctoral dissertation on the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (Toronto 1983). I am grateful to the anonymous referees of *Phoenix* for their helpful comments.