

Citation style

Bauer-Zetzmann, Martin: Rezension über: Zsolt Adorjáni (ed.), *Der Artemis-Hymnos des Kallimachos. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2021, in: *Exemplaria Classica*, 26 (2022), S. 278-281, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33776/ec.v26.7422>, heruntergeladen über Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

ZSOLT ADORJÁNI, *Der Artemis-Hymnos des Kallimachos*. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar, Texte und Kommentare 66, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2021, xi+436 pp., 89,95 €, ISBN 978-3-11-069842-8.

More than fifty years have passed since the last stand-alone philological commentary on Callimachus' *Hymn to Diana* has been published.¹ Zsolt Adorjáni's new take on the poem is therefore a highly welcome addition to scholarship on Hellenistic poetry and an impressively erudite foundation for further studies. The text is Pfeiffer's with very few changes, the most important being the return to transmitted (and certainly correct) ὄλβος in v. 131. All of them are listed on p. 122 and discussed in the commentary. Regarding the *crux* in v. 213, Adorjáni favours the conjecture ἀσύλλωποι made by a *manus recentior* in the Matritensis Gr. 4562 in both apparatus and commentary (at p. 305f), but cautiously refrains from putting it into the text. Even though the adjective *ἀσύλλωπος ('not covered by a cloak') is not attested otherwise, it fits the context smoothly, can be easily explained paleographically, and certainly is the most plausible solution found so far. Maybe a future papyrus find can confirm at least the very existence of the adjective.²

The text is accompanied by an abridged *apparatus criticus* (based on Pfeiffer with the addition of three recent papyri), a newly constituted *apparatus fontium* (instead of Pfeiffer's *testimonia*), and a German translation. Adorjáni acquits himself well of the difficult task of rendering Callimachus' intricate language into a modern language, and overall captures the spirit of Callimachus' both charming and learned poetry quite convincingly. At times he could have taken more liberties to accommodate a modern non-specialist reader, especially regarding the syntax, but this is entirely a matter of taste (and target audience).

In the introduction (1-94), Adorjáni gives an overview of existing scholarship on the text and re-evaluates traditional questions of research. One of the most significant insights is his new suggestion for the dating of the hymn, expanding on an earlier article.³ In his 'Ptolemaic interpretation', Adorjáni argues that the goddess Artemis as recipient of the hymn should be understood as a veiled allusion to Queen Arsinoe II – just as in the second hymn, Ptolemy II Philadelphos is honoured in the guise of Apollo.⁴ Therefore, Artemis is invoked

¹ Fritz Bornmann, *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam. Introduzione, testo critico e commento*, Firenze 1968. The *Hymn to Diana* is also covered, albeit with a much more succinct commentary, in Susan A. Stephens, *Callimachus: The Hymns*, Oxford-New York 2015. In recent decades, translation and notes to the hymn have also been provided by Markus Asper, *Kallimachos. Werke*, Darmstadt 2004, and Giovan Battista D'Alessio, *Callimaco. 1. Inni, Epigrammi, Ecclae. 2. Aitia, Giambi e altri frammenti*, Milano 1996.

² Just as e.g. P.Oxy. 2819 did with Wackernagel's conjecture λευκαθέοντων at [Hes.] Sc. 146.

³ Zsolt Adorjáni, "Artemis und Arsinoe. Zeitlosigkeit und Zeitbezug im Artemis-Hymnos des Kallimachos", *Hermes* 145, 2017, 61-78.

⁴ This is far from being a novel thought in Callimachean scholarship, as Adorjáni himself acknowledges, but had never been examined in detail. Further allusions to Ptolemaic imperial

as Callimachus' Muse and benefactor in vv. 136-9, a role evidently assumed by Arsinoe at court, and the goddess defends her Ephesian temple against attacking Cimmerians as a parallel to Ptolemy's and Arsinoe's victory against invading Galatians in 275/274. As Callimachus most likely wanted the queen to hear these encomiastic allusions in person, the hymn therefore must have been written in the second half of the 270s, between the assault of the Galatians and Arsinoe's death in 270.

Moreover, by examining the hymn's structure anew, Adorjáni makes a strong case for the much-challenged compositional unity of the text (14-33). Admittedly, the elaborate internal invocation vv. 136-41 with its presentation of the poet's *persona* is almost certainly modelled on the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and indicates the beginning of a new section of the narrative. But Callimachus tries to avoid the impression of a bipartite hymn by using multiple internal invocations throughout the work (cf. e.g. v. 110, 204, 225, 228, 240, 259) and links different sections by a dense network of recurring motifs, as Adorjáni clearly shows (cf. also the commentary at p. 239f.). Structurally, the *Hymn to Diana* therefore can be understood as a deliberate improvement on its Homeric model.

Another important feature of the introduction is the detailed metrical analysis of the hymn (76-94), which is a significant advance in the study of Callimachean verse and prepares the ground for a re-examination of Hellenistic versification technique in the future.

In many cases, Adorjáni adopts a rather cautious and conservative approach, which is entirely appropriate for a commentary designed to aid research for several decades to come. His main principle is to recognise Callimachus' hymns as highly allusive poetry and to read them strictly against the backdrop of Greek literary tradition. Consequently, possible influences of contemporary religious practice, performance situation, and Hellenistic-Egyptian culture are repeatedly called into question.⁵ Adorjáni is certainly right in observing that Callimachus often tends to avoid direct references to his own time and rather constructs parallel worlds converging on reality by exploiting and innovating myths and literary models (p. 59). On the surface, therefore, his poetry is ostensibly and intentionally Greek and deeply rooted in tradition.

However, sometimes one cannot but feel that religious discourses and cultic concepts play a bigger role in Callimachus' *Hymns* than Adorjáni wants to allow for. For example, his own arguments regarding the equation of Artemis and Queen Arsinoe could have been further strengthened by considering the cultural context of Hellenistic Egypt: On the one hand, undeniably the depiction of

representation can be identified in Callimachus' first and fourth hymn, cf. Susan A. Stephens, *Seeing Double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2003, 74-121.

⁵ Adorjáni himself acknowledges his opposition to such approaches, as exemplified by Ivana Petrović, *Von den Toren des Hades zu den Hallen des Olymp. Artemiskult bei Theokrit und Kallimachos*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 281, Leiden-Boston 2007.

Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, brother and sister, within the mythical framework of divine siblings Apollo and Artemis make for a meaningful allegory, but on the other hand we have evidence that the historical Arsinoe was commonly associated with (and venerated as) Aphrodite Zephyritis, not Artemis.⁶ This poses a challenge for Adorjáni's interpretation, which he defends by invoking Callimachus' supposed fondness of unorthodox and surprising ideas. But seeing through an Egyptian lens, the Egyptian goddess Arsinoe was equated with was, of course, Isis.⁷ Both Aphrodite Zephyritis and Callimachus' Artemis *polyonymos* may be seen as Greek approximations of different aspects of Isis *polyonymos*. This could also explain some unusual features in the *Hymn to Diana*: Artemis' connection with cities, highways and harbours may be further aspects of a syncretistic Hellenistic Isis hiding behind the carefully constructed traditional Greek façade.

In consistence with the principles outlined in the introduction, the extensive commentary (123-354) is mainly focused on philological and literary aspects – especially on Callimachus' '*arte allusiva*' –, though many *realia* are covered as well. Adorjáni has assembled an impressive wealth of linguistic observations, literary parallels (ranging from Homer and Hesiod to the last poets of late antiquity), and scholarly opinions from more than 200 years of Callimachean studies. In direct comparison to his predecessor Bornmann, Adorjáni provides a larger selection of both lemmas and ancient parallels, and altogether more (and, naturally, more recent) information. Wordplays, etymological riddles, and playful engagement with Homeric philology are frequently highlighted in the commentary, in some cases with intriguing results. A good example is the elaborate discussion of the difficult Φρυγίη περ ὑπὸ δρυὶ (v. 159, at pp. 260-4), where Adorjáni adduces *Hymn to Apollo* 23 to show that Callimachus uses similar imagery for Niobe and Heracles and their respective 'metamorphoses'.

However, in the light of the author's profound knowledge of both ancient sources and scholarly debates it is to be regretted that the commentary genre results in the discussion of important issues being scattered over numerous different lemmas – e.g. the influence of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, the poem's place in hymnic tradition, or the interrelationship between Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes. Although a sound treatment of these topics would admittedly need to consider the whole Callimachean corpus and thus go far beyond the scope of Adorjáni's book, a synthesis centred on the *Hymn to Diana* would have been a welcome addition.

⁶ The epithet 'Zephyritis' derives from Cape Zephyrion near Alexandria, where a temple to Arsinoe-Aphrodite had been dedicated.

⁷ See e.g. Stefan Schorn, "Eine Prozession zu Ehren Arsinoes II. (P. Oxy. XXVII 2465, fr. 2: Satyros, Über die Demen von Alexandria)", in Klaus Geus, Klaus Zimmermann, eds., *Punica – Libyca – Ptolemaica. Festschrift für Werner Huß*, *Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta* 104, *Studia Phoenicia* XVI, Leuven-Paris-Sterling, VA 2001, 199-220.

The book concludes with a full bibliography, which again shows the wide range of Adorján's reading, and four indices. In summary, this is an extremely rich and immensely useful commentary which provides ample material for future studies of the *Hymn to Diana*. No scholar of Hellenistic poetry can go past it.

MARTIN M. BAUER
 Universität Innsbruck
 Martin.Bauer@uibk.ac.at

RAFAEL J. GALLÉ CEJUDO, MANUEL SÁNCHEZ ORTIZ DE LANDALUCE, eds., *De Calímaco a Nono de Panópolis: estudios de crítica textual y exégesis literaria*, Studia Hellenistica Gaditana 2, Lecce: Pensa Multimedia, 2021, 388 pp., 38,00 €. ISBN 978-88-6760-807-2.

El volumen se abre con la presentación de Rafael J. Gallé Cejudo (5-13), director del proyecto de investigación FFI2017-85015-P bajo cuyos auspicios se publican estos once capítulos, que versan sobre la literatura helenística y el influjo de esta en épocas posteriores.

El primero, obra del propio Rafael J. Gallé Cejudo, se titula “Notas de crítica textual sobre la elegía helenística. Hermesianacte y Fanocles” (15-65). En la introducción (§ 1, 15-16), el autor, cuya edición revisada de los elegíacos helenísticos ha aparecido en 2021 en la colección “Alma Mater” (Madrid, CSIC), da muestras de una gran honestidad al defender sus elecciones textuales. A su juicio, toda edición crítica es hija de su época y de los métodos dominantes en ella, de modo que el establecimiento de un nuevo texto debe partir siempre de un cuestionamiento concienzudo de todas las ediciones anteriores (texto, aparato crítico, testimonios), así como de las traducciones existentes. Respecto de estas últimas, Gallé examina (§ 2, 16-21) varios casos de traducciones mejorables. Uno de ellos es un pasaje de Alejandro de Etolia (frg. 3.23-4 Gallé = 7.23-4 Powell): $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omega / \rho\eta\iota\delta\iota\eta\nu \omicron\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\delta' \xi\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota \sigma\tau\omicron\mu\iota\omicron\upsilon$, donde es preferible hacer depender el dativo $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ de $\rho\eta\iota\delta\iota\eta\nu$ (“tengo oído que *para todos es fácil* bajar por esta entrada”, Gallé) a conectarlo con $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omega$ (“*a todos oigo* que fácil es la senda de este agujero”, Martín García), ya que el verbo suele construirse con genitivo partitivo, mientras que el dativo suele tener el matiz semántico de ‘atender’, no de ‘oír’. La siguiente sección (§ 3, 21-3) está dedicada a la selección de los testimonios y a la acotación de la porción de texto de estos que debe incluirse para no dejar fuera informaciones relevantes. Sirva de ejemplo el frg. 3.69-74 Gallé (= 7.69-74 Powell) de Hermesianacte, que los editores modernos no han incluido como testimonio, y ello pese a que, a propósito de la caída en desgracia de Filóxeno de Citera, menciona el paso del poeta ditirámico “por esta ciudad” ($\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma \dots \delta\iota\grave{\alpha} \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$), es decir, por la ciudad desde la que escribe Hermesianacte, sea ésta