conundrum over the centuries, as when St Jerome's sexual obsessions pilloried Theophrastus' satirically detailed observations on marriage. Then Chaucer took the story up in 'The Wife of Bath'. Our first scientists lived perilous lives in a troubled world.

Theophrastus was not merely a name given to his many books, most of which were lost, but his infectious influence survived them. His was 'an appetite for life as it is experienced, rather than just for its laws or mechanisms; an eye for the oddness, the variety and whimsicality of forms, or processes, that is irresistible' (p. 168). Beatty continues: 'If all of this is correct, it makes our mania for recording, for books and libraries, appear backward looking and even dead – as if they were just different types of cupboard' (p. 186). Materialising the past made Orpheus tragically look back.

Beatty spins her myth of the life of Theophrastus with an eloquence and literary allusiveness unique to her considerable talent. It proves easy to fall in love with her sentences, her way of painting a prose picture, reminiscent of the late W.G. Sebald who, like Beatty, used old photographs to give his stories a local habitation and a focus.

What then are the patterns of human social conduct, in particular traits of bad character that continue to speak to us from the very creation of communities and of time itself – 'something halfway between science and story' (p. 204)? Theophrastus captured what is common to us all. He achieved this, by the same sort of close observations he practised first on Lesbos. It was not Aristotle's ethics he was dutifully subscribing to in writing his *Characters*, but facts and facets of daily life, our human failings of breaking faith with our neighbours.

University of California, Riverside

DAVID GLIDDEN glidden@ucr.edu

HELLENISTIC ELEGY

GALLÉ CEJUDO (R.J.) (ed., trans.) *Elegíacos helenísticos. Introducción, edición y traducción.* Pp. xc+838. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2021. Cased, €35.58. ISBN: 978-84-00-10890-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X22001962

The collection contains editions with introduction, critical text, translation and explanatory notes of all Hellenistic elegists except Callimachus. It is divided into three parts. The first contains *testimonia* and fragments of those judged to be, with reason, the five most important Hellenistic elegists, namely Philitas, Hermesianax, Alexander of Aetolia, Phanocles and Parthenius. The second includes *testimonia* and fragments of seventeen further authors, including poets known to have written in a variety of genres such as Eratosthenes, Posidippus and Simias. The third is devoted to elegiac *adespota* of varying size and interest, some known for some time to Classicists, such as the so-called Tattoo elegy (Hermesianax fr. 13 Lightfoot) and the Pride of Halicarnassus (*SGO* 01/12/02), others likely to be familiar only to the smaller community of papyrologists.

G.C. acknowledges in the introduction that the collection does not include astronomical poems or works of scientific character. But philosophy is also tacitly excluded; consequently, Crates of Thebes, who employed elegiacs for hymns (*SH* 359–61) shortly before

The Classical Review (2023) 73.1 94–96 \odot The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Callimachus (and possibly Philitas), is, justifiably, albeit regrettably, left out. The same goes for Timon of Philus' *Indalmoi* (*SH* 841–4), a philosophical poem on illusions by a poet whose major work, the *Silloi*, exercised a significant influence on the early Hellenistic triad.

Readers of Spanish scholarship will be familiar with J.A. Martín García's excellent selection of *Poesía helenística menor*, translated with short notes in the 'Biblioteca Clásica Gredos' series (1994). G.C.'s work, although confined to the boundaries of a single genre, is an incomparably more ambitious enterprise. We have here not only the first ever translation into any modern language of Hellenistic elegiac *adespota*, but also the first ever collection of *testimonia* of 'minor' elegiac poets such as Phanocles, Moero and Nicaenetus. The use of such an extensive corpus has allowed G.C. to offer a fresh assessment of a genre that has pivoted for so long around Callimachus and his *Aetia* alone.

In the introduction, after a brief account of relevant scholarship from the past two centuries, G.C. offers interesting methodological considerations on the difficulties posed by texts of limited size in determining the content of fragments, even when the authors and titles of poems are known. The introduction also contains a helpful discussion of the origin of the genre, with special attention given to the establishment of the catalogic framework in the archaic age and its employment in later erotic poetry. G.C. skilfully traces the gradual development across the centuries of narrative or digressive elements within the genre (which he calls *microgéneros*), from foundation episodes to bucolic themes. There are also chapters dedicated to the paradigmatic value of myth in elegy; the emergence of aetiology as a trademark of Hellenistic sensitivity; the politics of systematic divergence from Homer (branded *«periferia» homérica*) pursued by elegists in the treatment of myth in general and love in particular.

Every poet or work in the collection is introduced by an informative state-of-the-art discussion of key aspects of content and textual transmission. The introduction to Philitas is particularly rich in detail, with ample discussion of notoriously thorny issues, from the genre of his *Demeter* (including the possible relation of some of the *dubia* with the goddess' cult at Cos) to the content of more elusive compositions attributed to the Coan, such as the elegies for Bittis and the *paignia*. The longest fragments in the first part of the collection, Hermesianax fr. 3, from the *Leontion*, and Alexander of Aeolia fr. 3, from the *Apollo*, are given further consideration in separate critical appendices, where the editor's approach to the text is explained in more detail, though not always persuasively. Indeed, editorial choices appear to me to be often marred by an excess of conservatism, which becomes particularly evident in the text of Hermesianax' *Leontion*, where G.C. reproduces many of the unfortunate textual choices made by P. Kobiliri in her much-criticised edition of the poet. (Here, G.C.'s text differs from Lightfoot's in as many as 55 of the 98 complete verses.)

Some detailed comments on individual poets:

Philitas: in fr. 6.4 $\check{e}\mu\pi\epsilon\delta\alpha$ και τοισιν the *brevis* at the end of the hemistich is hard to justify.

Hermesianax: in place of the ametrical περì πικρά in l. 81, admitted by G.C., but generally emended by editors, one could suggest περì νύκτα in relation to Philitas' proverbial nocturnal elucubrations, cf. σκοτίην in 80 and Spanoudakis, *Philitas of Cos*, 69 on T 21.

Alexander of Aetolia: in T 6 Ritschl's συνήκμασε ... Νικάνδρω is unlikely to be correct: see E. Magnelli, in: M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker, *Beyond the Canon* (2006), pp. 201–2 for the chronology of the latter. Fr. 3.9 θελήσει at the beginning of a verse is hardly defensible. For καὶ ἄμα, proposed by G.C. in lieu of the transmitted $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\alpha$ at 3.15, read instead ἅμα καί?

Phanocles: at fr. 1.11 the transmitted $\alpha \dot{\nu} \tau i \kappa \alpha \delta' \dot{\nu} \pi \eta \nu$, which scans as an unlikely *meiouros*, is probably corrupted (*pace* Alexander), given the absence of a connective particle at 12. Note that the scholar emending $\tau i \varepsilon$ to η in fr. 5 is not Giacomo Leopardi, but Paul Leopardus.

Simias: the poet did not lead a campaign for the colonisation of Amorgos from Samos and did not participate in the foundation of any cities; the Suda entry for T 1 contains information on Semonides of Amorgos wrongly attributed to Simias: see Adler $ad \sigma 431$.

Simylus: at fr. 1.5 read αp for αp'.

Sostratus/Sosicrates: in T 1, for Ἡρόδοτος πρώτη 'por primera vez', read πρώτω (scil. βυβλίω), i.e. at 1.148.1: see Billerbeck *ad* St.Byz. μ 229.

Adespota papyracea: in SH 964, whilst the content of 'poem 2' remains wholly obscure, I wonder, after a glance at the online picture of the papyrus, whether its title could not have been $\delta \delta \alpha \omega \omega$ (rather than $\delta \delta \omega \omega$), given that $\delta \alpha \omega \omega \omega$, occurs later in 1. 41 with reference to either Heracles or 'the demon of Mt. Oeta' and that *daimones* like the Trophoniades appear elsewhere in the papyrus. At SH 966.7 έν τεμέ[νει hardly works at the end of a hexameter: write έν τεμέ[νεσσι?

I noticed some typos, mostly clustered in the bibliography and generally unobtrusive, with the exception of 3.7.9-10, where a verse was erroneously printed twice. Minor shortcomings and disagreements are inevitable in a work of such remarkable scope and erudition. There are in fact many instances, in which G.C. suggests sensible improvements to the given text, for example in Parthen. fr. 2 ii 19, where ἐρυσάρματοι is put forward in lieu of χρυσάρματοι as metaplasm of ἐρυσάρματες.

This book has many virtues. The explanatory notes are clear, detailed and to the point. The apparatus criticus is extremely generous, and there is ample evidence of laborious philological work conducted on the original manuscripts. Translations have the merit of clarity and elegance. The bibliography is extensive and up to date. The volume, beautifully produced and inexpensively priced for a book of over 800 pages, is certainly destined to become a major reference work in the field of Hellenistic poetry.

University of Liverpool

MARCO PERALE perale@liverpool.ac.uk

A COMMENTARY ON CALLIMACHUS' HYMN TO ARTEMIS

ADORJÁNI (Z.) (ed., trans.) *Der Artemis-Hymnos des Kallimachos. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. (Texte und Kommentare 66.) Pp. xii+436. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2021. Cased, £100, €109.95, US\$126.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-069842-8. doi:10.1017/S0009840X22002840

An up-to-date, comprehensive commentary on Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* is long past due. Many years have passed since the publication of the last commentary dedicated exclusively to this hymn (F. Bornmann's 1968 commentary – now out of print and difficult to find), making A.'s recent commentary a most welcome addition to Callimachean studies. The recent past has seen a surge of interest in Callimachus' hymns, but the

The Classical Review (2023) 73.1 96–98 \odot The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association