Artemis' fourth throw (Call. *Dian.* 121f.)

By Giulio Massimilla, Potenza

In vv. 119–123 of the Hymn to Artemis, Callimachus asks the goddess how many times she tested her silver bow. In answering his own question, Callimachus mentions the four throws whereby Artemis made trial of her weapon. Here is the text, as in Pfeiffer's edition:

ποσσάκι δ' ἀργυρέοιο, θεή, πειρήσαο τόξου;
πρῶτον ἐπὶ πτελέην, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἦκας ἐπὶ δρῦν,
τὸ τρίτον αὖτ' ἐπὶ θῆρα. τὸ τέτρατον οὐκέτ' †ἐπὶ δρῦν†,
ἀλλά †μιν εἰς ἀδίκων ἔβαλες πόλιν, οἵ τε περὶ σφέας
οἵ τε περὶ ξείνους ἀλιτήμονα πολλὰ τέλεσκον.

Callimachus says that Artemis shot firstly at an elm, secondly at an oak, thirdly at a wild beast and fourthly at the city of unjust and evil men. The transition from the third to the fourth target is emphasized by the poet: while with her first three throws Artemis was just practising, with the fourth one she took on her religious role of avenging goddess. Regrettably this transition, which occupies the second hemistich of v. 121 and the beginning of v. 122, suffers from corruption in our manuscripts: Pfeiffer obelizes both ἐπὶ δρῦν at the end of v. 121 and μιν in v. 122.

And indeed the transmitted text, although metrically correct, raises problems regarding its sense:

1) τὸ τέτρατον οὐκέτ' †ἐπὶ δρῦν†. After mentioning the elm, the oak and the wild beast, why should Callimachus single out the second target and write: "The fourth time (you) no longer (shot) at an oak"? ἐπὶ δρῦν at the end of v. 121 can easily be explained as an erroneous repetition of the *explicit* of v. 120.

2) ἀλλά †μιν εἰς ἀδίκων ἔβαλες πόλιν. The pronoun μιν should refer to τόξου in v. 119: but there – as Pfeiffer points out in his apparatus – the word means "bow", whereas here the meaning required is "arrow"[1].

1 Some scholars try to defend the *textus receptus*: A. Ronconi in: F. Bornmann, *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam. Introduzione, testo critico e commento* (Firenze 1968) 134 proposes keeping ἐπὶ δρῦν; A. Meineke, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu Kallimachos", *JCPh* 6 (81) (1860) 44 and *Callimachi Cyrenensis Hymni et Epigrammata* (Berolini 1861) 163f., and Q. Cataudella, "Hellenistica (Filita, Menandro, Callimaco, Teocrito, Eroda)", *Helikon* 7 (1967) 408f. = *Intorno ai lirici greci. Contributi alla critica del testo e all'interpretazione* (Roma 1972) 200f. are in favour of μιν; K. J. McKay, "Mischief in Kallimachos' *Hymn to Artemis*", *Mnemosyne*, s. IV 16 (1963) 249–254 and G. Giangrande, "Artemis and the Oak-trees in Callimachus", *CL* 3 (1983) 69–71 think that both verses are sound.

The conjectural emendations of the text so far proposed (some of which do not tackle the problem of μιν) follow four different routes:

1) Some scholars assume that a verse was lost after v. 121, where the elm and the wild beast appeared again: in this way all the first three targets (not only the oak) would be mentioned twice. According to Schneider[2], such a verse might be something like οὐδ' ἔτ' ἐπὶ πτελέην, οὐδ' ἀγροτέρους ἐπὶ θῆρας[3]. Haupt[4] contrives, e.g., the hexameter οὐκ ἔτ' ἐπὶ πτελέην ἦκας βέλος, οὐκ ἐπὶ θῆρα. Wilamowitz[5] too supposes that a verse is missing after v. 121, but does not volunteer any supplement.

I find such an approach unappealing, as the whole passage would become highly redundant and incompatible with Callimachean concision.

2) Others put a different complement at the end of v. 121, instead of ἐπὶ δρῦν. Meineke[6] thinks that it would have been more natural for the poet to mention the third target (the wild beast) again, rather than the second (the oak), before going on to the fourth one: therefore he changes οὐκέτ' ἐπὶ δρῦν into οὐκ ἔτι θῆρα or οὐκ ἐπὶ θῆρα. This conjecture seems to me implausible because the verse form (its two hemistichs beginning with a numeral adverb and ending with the same word) would be clumsy[7].

Sitzler[8] and Cataudella[9] try to convert ἐπὶ δρῦν into a complement which summarizes the three targets previously named: they propose substituting οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖα or οὐκ ἐπὶ ταῦτα for οὐκέτ' ἐπὶ δρῦν. In this way the *clausula* of the verse would be smooth, but rather flat.

3) Mair[10] replaces ἐπὶ δρῦν in v. 121 with an adverbial phrase. He writes οὐκέτ' ἐπὶ δήν instead of οὐκέτ' ἐπὶ δρῦν and translates: "But the fourth time – not long was it ere thou didst shoot at the city of unjust men." This conjecture has the advantage of providing an easy palaeographical explanation for the erroneous ἐπὶ δρῦν, but is utterly implausible with respect to prosody and sense. First of all, Callimachus would not be expected to lengthen the *iota* of ἐπί before δήν, because he does not take into account the original *digamma* of this adverb

2 O. Schneider, "De locis quibusdam Callimachi lacunosis", *Philologus* 6 (1851) 554f. and *Callimachea* I (Lipsiae 1870) 226.

3 As often in Schneider's conjectural versification, this hexameter infringes a Callimachean metrical rule (a masculine caesura should be followed by either a hephthemimeres caesura or a bucolic diaeresis or both): see G. Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia, libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996) 41f.

4 M. Haupt in: Meineke, *Hymni et Epigrammata* (n. 1).

5 U. von Wilamowitz–Moellendorff, *Callimachi Hymni et Epigrammata* (Berolini ⁴1925) 21.

6 *Opp. citt.* (n. 1).

7 The problem is perceived by T. Gomperz, "Zu Kallimachos", *WS* 32 (1910) 2 = *Hellenika. Eine Auswahl philologischer und philosophiegeschichtlicher Kleiner Schriften* II (Leipzig 1912) 309, whose attempt to improve Meineke's emendation is nevertheless far-fetched: τὸ τρίτον αὖτ' ἐπὶ σῦν, τὸ δὲ τέτρατον οὐκ ἔτι θῆρα.

8 J. Sitzler, *PhW* 43 (1923) 267.

9 *Op. cit.* (n. 1).

10 A. W. Mair, *Callimachus. Hymns and Epigrams* (London/Cambridge, Mass. 1955) 70f.

(*δϝήν) in *Hec. fr.* 49.3 H. μετὰ δήν (short *alpha*)[11]. Then, Mair's translation shows that the meaning of the passage would be very contorted.

4) Others put a verb at the end of v. 121, instead of ἐπὶ δρῦν. Gallavotti[12] suggests οὐκέτ' ἔπαιζες and changes ἀλλά μιν εἰς (v. 122) into ἀλλ' ἰοῖς: "The fourth time you were no longer sporting, but struck the city of unjust men with your arrows." Barber[13] proposes οὐκέτ' ἔπαισας (or ἔπαιξας) and ἀλλά τιν': "The fourth time you sported no longer, but shot (your arrow) into a certain city of wrongdoers."

In my opinion, this conjectural approach is the most promising: after three practice throws, with the fourth one Artemis became the goddess of vengeance *par excellence.*

I would like to propose a new emendation in accordance with the last approach to the text. My proposal is based on the close similarity between our verses and a passage from the story of Acontius and Cydippe in the third book of Callimachus' *Aitia*[14].

After Cydippe had unwittingly sworn by Artemis that she would marry Acontius, her wedding with another youth was three times prevented by the goddess, who plagued the girl firstly with epilepsy, secondly with quartan fever and thirdly with a deadly chill. The fourth time Cydippe's father waited no longer, but consulted the Delphian Apollo. On learning the truth, he gave his daughter to Acontius in marriage. Within the story, the following verses are the most relevant for our purpose (*fr.* 75.14–21 Pf.):

ἥ τότ' ἀνιγρή (scil. epilepsy)
τὴν κούρην Ἀΐδεω μέχρις ἔτηξε δόμων.
δεύτερον ἐστόρνυντο τὰ κλισμία, δεύτερον ἡ πα[ῖ]ς
ἑπτὰ τεταρταίωι μῆνας ἔκαμνε πυρί.
τὸ τρίτον ἐμνήσαντο γάμου κἀτα, τὸ τρίτον αὖτ[ε
Κυδίππην ὀλοὸς κρυμὸς ἐσῳκίσατο.
τέτρατον [ο]ὐκέτ' ἔμεινε πατὴρ ἐ . . . . φ . . ο . . . [
Φοῖβον· ὁ δ' ἐννύχιον τοῦτ' ἔπος ηὐδάσατο.

The two passages resemble each other from many points of view: 1) They present a series of the same numeral adverbs: τὸ δὲ δεύτερον (Hymn) = δεύτερον ... δεύτερον (*Aitia*); τὸ τρίτον αὖτ' (H.) = τὸ τρίτον ... τὸ τρίτον αὖτε

11 The *digamma* of δήν is metrically effective in Homeric poems (cf. *Il.* 1.416 and many other passages), but is constantly disregarded by Hellenistic and imperial authors: cf., e.g., A.R. 2.135 etc., Euph. *fr.* 9.8 Powell, Nonn. *D.* 23.11.

12 C. Gallavotti, *PP* 8 (33) (1953) 469.

13 E. A. Barber, *CR* 68 n.s. 4 (1954) 229.

14 The resemblance is pointed out by H. Herter, "Kallimachos und Homer. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des Hymnos auf Artemis", in: *Xenia Bonnensia. Festschrift zum 75jährigen Bestehen des philologischen Vereins und Bonner Kreises* (Bonn 1929) 96 = *Kleine Schriften* (München 1975) 409, Pfeiffer *ad locc.*, Bornmann *ad loc.*

(*A.*); τὸ τέτρατον (H.) = τέτρατον (*A.*). 2) In both places three preliminary occurrences are followed by a fourth one, which develops (H.) or solves (*A.*) a situation. 3) In both passages the culminating fourth event is introduced by the phrase (τὸ) τέτρατον οὐκέτ', which – thanks to its retarding effect – emphasizes the transition[15].

Given this striking similarity, I suspect that Callimachus used the same verb in *fr.* 75.20 Pf. and *Dian.* 121. Therefore, in the latter passage, I would change οὐκέτ' ἐπὶ δρῦν into οὐκέτ' ἔμεινας[16]: after three practice throws, "the fourth time (you Artemis) waited no longer", but hit the city of wrongdoers. The erroneous μιν in v. 122 is possibly an itacistic trace of the previous ἔμεινας.

At the beginning of v. 122, I would tentatively replace ἀλλά μιν with ἄρδιν δ': you Artemis waited no longer, "but shot the point of your arrow at the city of unjust men". The rare word ἄρδις is to be found in Call. *fr.* 70.2 Pf.

To sum up, I propose correcting Call. *Dian.* 121f. as follows:

τὸ τέτρατον οὐκέτ' ἔμεινας,
ἄρδιν δ' εἰς ἀδίκων ἔβαλες πόλιν.

15 Callimachus elaborates a typical Homeric pattern, according to which three attempts are followed by an unforeseen event or (more rarely) by a successful outcome: cf. *Il.* 5.436–439; 13.20; 16.702–706, 784–787; 20.445–448; 21.176–179; *Od.* 21.125–129 (similarly *Od.* 2.106–109; 19.151–155; 24.141–145 and – in a broader context – *Il.* 22.188–213). While Apollonius Rhodius (3.654f.) faithfully imitates this outline, Callimachus extends and refines it. On the one hand, the Homeric τρίς is changed into a detailed account of the three initial occurrences; on the other, the following event is first presented in a negative form (οὐκέτ') and then related. (The latter feature is also to be found in Call. *Del.* 249–255 κύκνοι ... ἐκυκλώσαντο ... ἑβδομάκις περὶ Δῆλον, ἐπήεισαν δὲ λοχείῃ ... ὄγδοον οὐκέτ' ἄεισαν, ὁ δ' ἔκθορεν.) See Herter, *op. cit.* (n. 14), F. Göbel, *Formen und Formeln der epischen Dreiheit in der griechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart/Berlin 1935) 44f.

16 For the position of the phrase at the end of the hexameter, cf. [Hom.] *Batr.* 301 οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔμειναν, *Orac. Sib.* 5.520 μηκέτι μεῖναι.