Without any new support S. builds his whole argument on the Jaegerian hypothesis that the works which Ar. published during his lifetime were intended for a wider public and that they did not contain his true, scientific philosophy. Perhaps, however, this hypothesis should be fundamentally questioned. For, on the basis of this presupposition it remains very curious that Ar., in the *Corpus Arist.*, inserts several large citations from those lost works and refers to them for important doctrines which he still seems to consider relevant. His rejection of the theory of Ideas and of the Idea of the Good must have been discussed in those 'exoteric' works, and the *Corpus* seems to presuppose acquaintance with their contents.

S. accepts that some of Ar.'s now lost dialogues were circulating and well-known, also in Stoic circles. Therefore, the convincing proof for his thesis is not actually delivered. S.'s book, however, does demonstrate anew, how much of the history of philosophy after Plato we do not know.
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In 1954 Rudolf Pfeiffer asked for good commentaries on Callimachus' *Hymns* (JHS 75 (1955), 68 ff.). Until 1984 McLennan, Williams, Bornmann produced commentaries on *Hymns* I, II, and III, and the gap for the three remaining poems has been filled in 1984 and 1985 with the commentaries of Mineur, Bulloch and Hopkinson. Not all of these are on the same level, but Mineur's commentary is one of the best. His work is the more to be praised inasmuch as being a teacher in a secondary school he could do his research in spare time only.

This commentary is not a slim volume, but that is almost impossible when one wishes to account for the multiple aspects of Callimachus' craftsmanship, such as vocabulary, metre, prosody, historical, mythological, and geographical allusions, purpose and structure, and that in a hymn which in itself has over 300 lines. Nevertheless, one is grateful that the author has been able not to go beyond some 250 pages without neglecting conspicuous features of the poem. Laudable cautiousness is shown everywhere and often Mineur just points out possible explanations. Sometimes this virtue...
seems to be upheld too much, but in the case of a Hellenistic poem a commentator must be very careful indeed.

The Introduction competently deals with the Structure, Purpose and Date of the Hymn, and with aspects of language, style, metre and prosody. The most prominent contribution to Callimachean studies here is the hypothesis that the fourth Hymn is a kind of genethliakon for Ptolemy Philadelphus written by Callimachus on the occasion of his admission to the Museum and delivered on the anniversary of the king's birthday and accession to the throne. This anniversary would have been celebrated on 7 March 274 B.C.

The dating of the Hymn in 274 will not come as a surprise, the terminus post quem being the revolt of the Gaulish mercenaries, which is prophesied in ll. 171 ff. and occurred most probably in 275 B.C. This allusion would be more in place shortly after the revolt than many years later. To look at the hymn as a birthday offering is very attractive, for this view explains the insistence on the birthday theme (Apollo, Philadelphus) and links the last fifty lines about yearly gifts sent to Delos with the sending of gifts to Philadelphus on his birthday. On the other hand, the hypothesis is not necessary. It is equally possible to imagine that Callimachus has chosen a literary example, i.e. the Homeric hymn to Apollo, picked out specific parts and 'thought these to the end'). He was probably influenced in this by other poems about Delos (cp. Mineur p. 76), but these are lost now. The main change he introduced, was making Asteria/Delos, not the birth of Apollo, the subject of the Hymn. By this change he could introduce another one, now in the myth itself, viz. that Cos did not flee for Leto, offered itself but was not chosen by Apollo because of its being reserved for the birth of Philadelphus. McKay makes this change the pivot of his interpretation that Call. "intends in this hymn to honour, not so much Delos, as Kos" (Erysichthon (Leiden 1962), 143). Surprisingly, Mineur (pp. 60 and 158) plays down this change in the myth, although he could have used it for his hypothesis. Whether or not this Hymn was Callimachus' first, is difficult to decide. The references to primitiae (ll. 283, 298 and 291 together with 4 f.) may be taken as just giving ailia, as is done in other hymns and in Theocr. Id. 18, 42 ff. The address to 'my Muses' (82) is less self-assertive than when Theocr. (Id. 16, 107) speaks about 'our Muses', and will only support Mineur's hypothesis if one accepts his other arguments.

The commentary follows Pfeiffer's text, but several times Mineur argues for a change. I mention the following: