

# Imaginary gods? : poetic theology in the hymns of Callimachus

Autor(en): **Hunter, Richard / Fuhrer, Therese**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **48 (2002)**

PDF erstellt am: **15.08.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660821>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

RICHARD HUNTER & THERESE FUHRER

IMAGINARY GODS?  
POETIC THEOLOGY IN THE *HYMNS*  
OF CALLIMACHUS

1. *Introduction*

The Alexandrian poets' familiarity with popular cult hymns and the great hymns of the choral and lyric traditions, as well as the so-called *Homeric Hymns*, is obvious from the surviving texts. What ideas they had, however, about what constituted the form and nature of 'a hymn', as indeed of poetic genres in general, remains in need of further research and, perhaps, new information. We have traces of scholarly attempts to classify the lyric poems, among which there were several types of 'hymns' in a broad sense (paean, dithyramb, 'hymn' in the narrow sense, etc.)<sup>1</sup> and, in addition, we have Hellenistic poems which correspond in form and content to whatever we may call 'a hymn' in a general sense. As for Callimachus, his obvious close familiarity with the work of Simonides, Pindar<sup>2</sup>, and Bacchylides may

<sup>1</sup> On the Alexandrian classification of poetry cf. A.E. HARVEY, "The classification of Greek lyric poetry", in *CQ* 5 (1955), 157-75; L. KÄPPEL, *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Berlin 1992); I. RUTHERFORD, *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford 2001), 152-8; cf. also M. DEPEW, "Enacted and represented dedications: genre and Greek hymn", in *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, ed. by M. DEPEW and D. OBBINK (Cambridge, Mass./London 2000), 59-79; C. CALAME, "La poésie lyrique grecque, un genre inexistant?", in *Littérature* 111 (1998), 87-110, esp. 103.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. esp. T. FUHRER, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel/Kassel 1992).

safely be assumed to have extended to their lyric hymns (paean, dithyrambs, etc.) which were also the subject of intensive scholarly activity in the Alexandrian Library. The *Homeric Hymns* have, on the other hand, left very little trace in the papyrus record and do not seem to have been the subject of serious Alexandrian exegesis<sup>3</sup>; this apparent neglect, however, contrasts strikingly with their obvious importance as model texts for the Alexandrian poets (Callimachus and Theocritus) and for, at least, Ovid after them<sup>4</sup>.

What features of the *Homeric Hymns* were particularly attractive for third-century élite poets is a question which is asked too rarely. Why did Callimachus pay such attention to these poems? Any answer to this question must, of course, remain speculative, but in this paper we wish to approach the subject from a number of angles in the hope, at least, of establishing some important parameters within which the matter may be considered. It is worth saying at once that one possible answer which we will not consider may lie in the opportunities for poetic performance afforded by the Ptolemaic court<sup>5</sup>; it may be that hymnic writing was positively encouraged, in part for the encomiastic opportunities it offered (cf. Section 5 below). Our concern, however, will be with the inner dynamics of the hymnic form, not with its social setting, and four broad concerns will structure the argument:

1) Hymnic form allowed poets to display their knowledge of cults and rites from all over the Greek world, both in

<sup>3</sup> That they were not completely neglected is suggested by two places where *h.Ap.* seems to have affected the Homeric text, cf. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, ed. by S. WEST (Köln/Opladen 1967), 32-5.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, ed. by N. RICHARDSON (Oxford 1974), 67ff; S. HINDS, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge 1987); R. HUNTER, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge 1996), Chapter 2; A. BARCHIESI, "Venus' masterplot. Ovid and the Homeric Hymns", in *Ovidian Transformations*, ed. by Ph. HARDIE, A. BARCHIESI, S. HINDS (Cambridge 1999), 112-26.

<sup>5</sup> On this topic cf. G. WEBER, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft. Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer* (Stuttgart 1993).

'mimetic' form and through the use of elements of more traditional hymnic encomia (divine epithets, aetiology etc.). The gradual freeing of the hymnic form from necessary ties to a particular cultic locale allowed poets to include cultic material from the widest possible area: hymns, in other words, become panhellenic.

2) Hymnic *narrative* becomes correspondingly free, and poets are no longer tied to particular narratives for particular settings. Hymns can now accommodate both the arcane and the alarming, and the criticism of myth now also plays a much greater rôle.

3) Hymnic form allows poets to lay bare and experiment with the technique and rhetoric of encomium, for it is 'praise' towards which every element of the poems is directed. In particular, poets broke down the boundaries of 'mortal' and 'divine' praise, thus re-drawing the very categories of existence.

4) We will make use — as a heuristic device — of the possibility that Callimachus put his *Hymns* together in a poetry-book, thereby creating a dynamic system, a 'language' if you like, in which each poem and each divinity may be read in relation to all others; the resulting set of overlapping relations in a divine hierarchy turns this poetry-book into a kind of *Theogony*. This assumption of a poetry-book is, of course, a large one, but one whose suggestiveness, to which we hope that the present essay contributes, seems to us to justify it<sup>6</sup>. Even if we stop short of the assumption that the six extant poems which we call 'hymns' are intended to be read as a unity, it is still legitimate, and now common practice in literary scholarship, to see them as a (loose) system with inherent cross-references to each other.

<sup>6</sup> For some bibliography cf. A. KERKHECKER, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford 1999), 277, adding M.W. HASLAM, "Callimachus' *Hymns*", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER (Groningen 1993), 111-25 and V. KNIGHT, "Landscape and the gods in Callimachus' *Hymns*", in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 7 (1993), 201-11.

## 2. *The cultic imagination*

The 'rhapsodic' *Homeric Hymns* were probably performed in very similar circumstances to that of the epic recitations which they often preceded — competitions at festivals, aristocratic symposia and so on. It is standard scholarly practice to distinguish these hexameter poems from 'cult hymns', usually choral and lyric, the performance of which formed an important part of the religious celebration itself; whereas the hexameter 'hymns' concentrate upon praise of the god and an account of his or her place in the divine scheme, and there is merely an understated (or even just implied) request for the god to favour the poet in return for his song, 'cult hymns' have at their centre a request to a god for specific or general favour<sup>7</sup>. Such favour may extend to the very appearance or epiphany of the god; the 'cletic' hymn, literary versions of which are most familiar from the poetry of Sappho, will assume a special importance for Callimachus, as two of his hymns (*Apollo* and *Athena*) recreate the experience of (waiting for) epiphany, and there are reasons for thinking that the phenomena of epiphany did indeed assume new importance within Hellenistic religious experience. Nevertheless, the distinction, at least in form, between rhapsodic and cultic hymns can be seen breaking down well before the Hellenistic period, and from the fourth century onwards survive a number of hexameter 'hymns' which clearly occupied a genuine place in cultic performance. Callimachus' hymnal experiments with a semi-dramatic, mimetic mode are in part a reflection of (and upon) this gradual fusion of originally separate forms.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. A. MILLER, *From Delos to Delphi. A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (Leiden 1986), 1-5; W.D. FURLEY, "Praise and Persuasion in Greek Hymns", in *JHS* 115 (1995), 29-46. A useful introduction is J.M. BREMER, "Greek Hymns", in *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, ed. by H.S. VERSNEL (Leiden 1981), 193-215. There is also much relevant material in *AION* 13 (1991) which is devoted to *L'inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico*.

In this changed situation of the gradual divorce of the cultic referents and aetiology of literary hymns from the actual cultic experience of the audience<sup>8</sup>, the most important experience of the audience to which the poet appeals is that of prior texts, though we must acknowledge that the power of these poems cannot be explained solely in these terms. Much in the *Hymns* of Callimachus also appeals to a cultic *imagination*, which may of course be grounded in a shared experience of literary representations and local chronicles. Nevertheless, the so-called 'mimetic' *Hymns to Apollo, Athena and Demeter* are merely the limit case of a constant appeal to active engagement with what is being described<sup>9</sup>. Such mimeticism greatly elaborates the important rôle of deixis and of (self-) reference to the festival and its choruses in early hymns by actually scripting a context for performance, whereas such a context needed no such script when the poem was indeed part of a real performance<sup>10</sup>. Discussion of Callimachus' *Hymns* has too often been bedevilled by the (normally silent) running together of two questions which should, at least in the first instance, be kept separate: "What kind of audience reception do these poems construct?", and "How were these poems first presented and subsequently received?"<sup>11</sup> An understandable fascination with the second 'historical' question may obscure the merits of asking the first. A similar dichotomy operates with the world of cult which these poems call into being. Of primary importance is not how widely

<sup>8</sup> This has been the subject of a series of papers by Mary DEPEW, cf. "Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' *Hymns*", in *Callimachus* (n.6 above), 57-77; "Delian Hymns and Callimachean Allusion", in *HSCP* 98 (1998), 155-82; "Enacted and represented dedications" (n.1 above); cf. also W.D. FURLEY, "Apollo humbled: Phoenix' Koronisma in its Hellenistic literary setting", in *MD* 33 (1994), 9-31, esp.25-30; RUTHERFORD (n.1 above), 128-30 with the cautionary remarks 177-8.

<sup>9</sup> 'Mimetic' is in fact a rather unhelpful term (cf. M.A. HARDER, "Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus", in *CQ* 42 [1992], 384-94), but it would be foolish to imagine that we can now get away from it.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. DEPEW, "Dedications" (n.1 above).

<sup>11</sup> A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 64 does seem to acknowledge the separateness of some version of these questions.

familiar and practised such a cult as the Delian tree-biting (*h.* 4.316-24) 'really' was;<sup>12</sup> as it happens, the antiquarian tendencies (and a developing tourist trade?) of the third century may in fact have increased the actual practice of rites believed to be ancient. Rather, what matters is that the poems construct an audience interested in rites practised by others, often very remote 'others', to a far greater degree than the lyric hymns and the major *Homeric Hymns*<sup>13</sup>; rites, real or imaginary, now exist in a decontextualised space from which they can at any time be drawn into poetic description. From a theological point of view, then, a god may be the sum of the rites practised, stories told, and epithets ascribed to him or her; the *Hymn to Artemis* is a very good example of this<sup>14</sup>. Such a text offers itself as, to some extent, a historical record, a poetic version of a 'On the cults of Artemis'; its very form has been affected by contemporary readerly and scholarly practices. Though the hexameter *Homeric Hymns* are themselves more 'all-inclusive', less narrowly bound in their concerns to a specific performance context than are lyric cult hymns, these tendencies inherent in the form are taken to new levels and in new directions in the third century.

In the *Hymns to Athena* and *Demeter* Callimachus abandoned the traditional Ionic language of the hexameter hymn in favour of a Doricising *Kunstsprache*, itself heavily indebted to the language of epic. This choice has been plausibly traced to a creative imitation of the public choral poetry of the archaic *polis*, in

<sup>12</sup> W.H. MINEUR (*Callimachus. Hymn to Delos. Introduction and Commentary* [Leiden 1984], on v.317) asserts that the aorists of the description show that there is no certainty that the rite was still in existence; he is right to call attention to this, but these tenses may fall into the very broad category of 'the gnomic' (Kühner-Gerth II 158-61).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. DEPEW, "Delian hymns" (n.8 above), 180.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. below pp.161-4, and G. VESTRHEIM, "Meaning and Structure in Callimachus' Hymns to Artemis and Delos", in *SO* 75 (2000), 62-79. The *Hymn to Artemis*, whose structure and pattern has always been found so confusing, is the one example among the *Hymns* of a lengthy account of a major Olympian in the traditional mode of the *Homeric Hymns*; as such it has a particular importance which has not always been recognised.

which Doric was the predominant dialectal colouring<sup>15</sup>; it must also be relevant that the *Hymn to Athena* is set in Doric Argos (and is perhaps indebted to Argive sources)<sup>16</sup>, and the *Hymn to Demeter* would, at least, not be out of place in Callimachus' home city of Cyrene<sup>17</sup>. The imaginative reconstruction of the choric mode in these hymns extends also to form; a central narrative is framed by dramatic indications of a cult celebration currently taking place (*Demeter*) or just about to begin (*Athena*), whereas in the *Hymn to Apollo*, which advertises its debt to the Ionic tradition, the opening mimetic indications do not recur at the end<sup>18</sup>. 'Choral' poetry composed to be read and recited thus sought a partial analogy to the performative element inherent in the archaic texts<sup>19</sup>. As for the elegiac metre of the *Hymn to Athena*, this may not have had the central importance for ancient readers which it has assumed for some modern scholars, whose aesthetic sense is often shaped by the programmatic importance which the Roman elegists gave to the difference between hexameters and elegiacs. Callimachus may have been gesturing towards a real or believed tradition of Argive elegy<sup>20</sup>,

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. FANTUZZI, "Preistoria di un genere letterario: a proposito degli *Inni* V e VI di Callimaco", in *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di B. Gentili* (Roma 1993), 927-46.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*, ed. by A.W. BULLOCH (Cambridge 1985), 16-17 on the possible use of the *Argolika* of Agias and Derkylos.

<sup>17</sup> That the *Hymn to Demeter* has a Cyrenean setting has often been argued, as Demeter had important cult sites there (cf., e.g., A. LARONDE, *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique* [Paris 1987], 363-5; L. BACCHIELLI, "I 'luoghi' della celebrazione politica e religiosa a Cirene nella poesia di Pindaro e Callimaco", in *Cirene. Storia, Mito, Letteratura* [Urbino 1990], 5-33), and is not improbable, but N. HOPKINSON (Ed.), *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge 1984), 38 is correct that there is not "a scrap of real evidence". The festival is of a kind familiar throughout the Greek world; for the cult of Demeter in Alexandria and Egypt cf. D.J. THOMPSON, "Demeter in Graeco-Roman Egypt", in *Egyptian Religion. The Last Thousand Years*, ed. by W. CLARYSSE, A. SCHOORS, H. WILLEMS (Leuven 1998), 699-707. To what extent the dialect of *Hymns* 5 and 6 is distinctively Cyrenean (Ruijgh's thesis) is disputed.

<sup>18</sup> Note however v.97: ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῶν ἀκούομεν.

<sup>19</sup> See the bibliography cited in n.7 above.

<sup>20</sup> For the evidence cf. BULLOCH (n.16 above), 36-8. For an argument that, in one section of the poem at least (the lament of Chariclo), traditional associations



but the two metres had traditionally shared much common subject-matter, and elegiac hymnal poetry is found elsewhere in both literary (e.g. Simonides' *Hymn to Achilles* in his Plataea elegy, fr.eleg.22 West) and non-literary (the *Second* and *Fourth Isis Hymns* of Isidorus)<sup>21</sup> contexts.

A closely related appeal to cultic imagination is found in the *Hymn to Apollo*. Important to the design of this poem are not only cult hymns to Apollo (esp. paeans, as the frequent *ἰὴ ἰή-* cries suggest) but also the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, a poem upon which Callimachus was also to draw extensively in the *Hymn to Artemis* and the *Hymn to Delos*, which re-tells the same birth myth as the 'Homeric' poem. It may indeed be that the absence of any explicit treatment of the birth myth in the *Hymn to Apollo* is in part to be connected with the existence of the *Hymn to Delos*; although the opening of the *Hymn to Apollo* does gesture towards the analogy between epiphany and birth (or perhaps rather suggests birth as the originary epiphany) — the natal palm-tree (v.4), the swan (v.5, cf. *h.* 4.249-55), the opening of doors attended by song — and although the birth of the god recurs in the Pythian aetiology at the end of the poem (v.104), the hymn's comparative silence about the divine birth may otherwise surprise. If, however, we are to think of the hymns as in some sense a group to be read both separately and together, the surprise will be less.

The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is unlike the other poems in its collection in at least two important respects. First, it seems to combine two, presumably originally distinct, hymns, one a 'Delian' hymn (vv.1-181) and the other a 'Pythian' composition which tells of the foundation of the most important centre of Apolline cult, Delphi. Secondly, the closing verses of the Delian section both describe explicitly a festival on Delos such

between elegiac metre and lament for the dead resonate strongly cf. R. HUNTER, "Writing the God: Form and Meaning in Callimachus, Hymn to Athena", in *MD* 29 (1992), 9-34, esp.18-22.

<sup>21</sup> E. BERNAND, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine* (Paris 1969), 633-6. These are, of course, of a much later date, but may well point to a persistent tradition.

as that at which the poem itself might well have been performed, and are also the only passage in the *Homeric Hymns* in which the poet makes extended reference to himself (*Hom.h.Ap.* 165-77):

ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἰλήκοι μὲν Ἀπόλλων Ἀρτέμιδι ζύν, 165  
 χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμεῖο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε  
 μνήσασθ', ὅππότε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων  
 ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ζεῖνος ταλαπείριος ἐλθών·  
 ὦ κοῦραι, τίς δ' ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ ἤδιστος ἀοιδῶν  
 ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέω τέρπεσθε μάλιστα; 170  
 ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθ' ἄμφ' ἡμέων·  
 τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἴκει δὲ Χίῳ ἐνι παιπαλοέσση,  
 τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαί.  
 ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν ὅσσον ἐπ' αἴαν  
 ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας· 175  
 οἱ δ' ἐπὶ δὴ πείσονται, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐτήτυμόν ἐστιν.  
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οὐ λήξω ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα

At the conclusion of his *Hymn to Apollo*, Callimachus imitates the archaic hymnal poet ('Homer') by making a claim for the artistic superiority of his — the poet's — own verse and puts this in the mouth of the very god of poetry himself (*Call. h.* 2.105-13)<sup>22</sup>:

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὐατα λάθριος εἶπεν· 105  
 'οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει.'  
 τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὧδέ τ' εἶπεν·  
 'Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ **πολλά**  
 λύματα γῆς καὶ **πολλὸν** ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.  
 Δημοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι, 110  
 ἀλλ' ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει  
 πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.'  
 χαῖρε, ἀναξ· ὁ δὲ Μῶμος, ἔνθα νέοιτο.

It is Apollo, rather than the poet himself, who thus proclaims that Callimachus' "songs are supreme for ever more" (*Hom.h. Ap.* 173) and who places Callimachus in a structural parallel with the poet of the *Homeric Hymn*, thus authorising the claim of the

<sup>22</sup> The Callimachean passage is, in one sense, isolated from the rest of the poem (cf., e.g., HASLAM [n.6 above], 117), but the importance of the model in the *Homeric Hymn* is regularly overlooked.

poet to artistic superiority and subsequent *kleos*. Whatever the verses mean in detail<sup>23</sup> — and one of the few things which ought to be undisputed is that Apollo here speaks, appropriately enough, in the riddling language of oracles — it is clear that they privilege quality of verse over quantity. The familiar etymological play between πολύς and Ἀπόλλων (cf. vv.34-5, 69-70 etc.) is here given a new direction with the suggestion that the god's name signifies ἄ-πολύς, i.e. 'not a lot' (cf. vv.108-9)<sup>24</sup>. The point is made sharper if we compare the archaic hymn in which the poet promises never to cease from hymning the god (vv.177-8); Callimachus' Apollo has other ideas about how he would like to be celebrated. Moreover, in the *Homeric Hymn* the usual promise "to remember the god (and another song)" has already been converted into a request to the Delian choir to remember the poet (vv.166-7); god and poet are thus far more closely bound together in this archaic hymn than is usually explicit in the hymnic mode. Callimachus takes this one stage further by virtually equating the epiphany of the god with the performance of his poem, and by making the god the spokesman for the poet's own aesthetic principles.

The description of the Delian festival may have influenced Callimachus' hymn in another way also. Instead of inscribing such a description in his hymn, Callimachus makes his poem dramatic by inscribing it within a festival in the god's honour, imagined as taking place during the performance of the hymn and thus making it a representation of a cult hymn. Moreover, Apollo is precisely the god of singing and dance, and the performance of the Delian choir in the *Homeric Hymn* to this god re-enacts on earth the Olympian music which Apollo leads

<sup>23</sup> The bibliography is now very large, but may conveniently be followed through M. ASPER, *Onomata allotria. Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos* (Stuttgart 1997), 109-25 and D.A. TRAILL, "Callimachus' Singing Sea (*Hymn* 2.106)", in *CPh* 93 (1998), 215-22.

<sup>24</sup> Note too how Apollo's words (vv.108-10) pick up the play between πολύς and πᾶς of vv.9 and 69-70. The paradox is sharpened by a suggested association between Φθόνος and φθονέω / (ἄ)φθονία.



chorus tells of the 'mythical' model for their present performances, namely the dances of the Dorians and the Libyan women which brought pleasure to Apollo (vv.85-96)<sup>27</sup>. The emphasis on performative re-enactment of an event in the immemorial past is typical of the Hellenistic historical sense; the closing sections of the *Hymns to Artemis* and *Delos* offer a number of parallel examples.

The exciting, but potentially frightening, experience of the god's nearness and his power to cleanse men of disease (vv.45-6), of threatening monsters (vv.100-4), and of the impure poison of envy and bad poetry (vv.105-12), is a form of 'possession', such as that felt by the Pythia at Delphi, and that possession should not be disassociated from the 'mimetic' form which the poem dramatises. The opening seismic movements which mark the nearness of the god (vv.1-5)<sup>28</sup>, indicated for us by an unidentified voice which speaks with pious authority<sup>29</sup>, are a dramatic version of the 'natural' phenomena which standardly attend divine epiphany<sup>30</sup>, and are thus seen to be particularly 'Apolline'. The fact that *Hymns* 5 and 6 also employ 'mimetic' frameworks should not obscure the meaning of such *mimesis* in *Hymn* 2. The presence and power of Apollo inevitably evokes immediate

<sup>27</sup> Cf. C. CALAME, "Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*", in *Callimachus* (n.6 above), 37-55, esp.46.

<sup>28</sup> It is tempting to see here some echo of the 'trembling' with which the other gods greet the epiphany of Apollo on Olympus in the *Homeric Hymn* (v.2 τρομέουσιν). For the subsequent history of this motif in Roman poetry cf. A. BARCHIESI, "Immovable Delos: *Aeneid* 3.73-98 and the Hymns of Callimachus", in *CQ* 44 (1994), 438-43.

<sup>29</sup> S. KOSTER, "Kallimachos als Apollonpriester", in *Tessera. Sechs Beiträge zur Poesie und poetischen Theorie der Antike* (Erlangen 1983), 9-21, argues that the speaker is a "priest of Apollo" and the addressee (cf. v.4) a young man being introduced into the cultic mysteries of the god. The difficulty with this reading is that the label 'priest' is misleading, even allowing for the validity of the category; this is merely one of the relationships between speaker and god which the poem evokes.

<sup>30</sup> Particularly relevant, of course, is APOLL.RH. 2.679-80 (the epiphany of Apollo at Thynias), "the whole island shook beneath his feet"; for other links between that scene and CALL. *h.* 2, cf. R. HUNTER, "Apollo and the Argonauts: two notes on Ap.Rhod. 2, 669-719", in *MH* 43 (1986), 50-60, esp.57-60.

praise; this is the lesson of the aetiology of the ritual cry in vv.97-104. As this hymn is itself a manifestation of the god, it demands our active response of praise; it cannot simply be received as a narrative. The reception of the poem is itself the presence (τὸ ἐπιδημεῖν) of the god. We *must* respond. This Callimachus has ensured by the 'mimetic' mode in which he has constructed his poem; *our* response is choreographed by the response of the choir.

The centre of the poem is formed from a series of verse-paragraphs marked out by the god's name (vv. 32, 42, 47, 55, 65) which celebrate the powers and spheres of the god. Pride of place is assigned to Apollo's traditional rôle in the founding of cities, an activity which, at least in cultural memory, standardly began with an oracular response of the god<sup>31</sup>. The longest section of the poem (vv.65-96) tells of the founding of Cyrene, Callimachus' home city, and the celebrations of the god there under the specifically Dorian epithet, Καρνεῖος<sup>32</sup>. That the poet's city is a central site of Apolline cult is a manifest sign of the god's favour towards the poet and the special authority with which he speaks; this divine approval, and specifically approval for the extraordinary narrative construction of the Cyrenean foundation story, is then most clearly confirmed in the Apolline epilogue<sup>33</sup>. Beyond this, however, it has also often been argued that we are to understand that the poem is in fact set at a celebration of the Cyrenean Karneia; such a view fits the evocation of the model for Karneian choral performance at vv.85-96 (cf. above), but it may be more accurate to imagine a fluid 'ritual context' which can at one moment be the Cyrenean Karneia and at the next a celebration in Delphi, for vv.97-104 (the Pythian

<sup>31</sup> For an 'Egyptian reading' of this section cf. D.L. SELDEN, "Alibis", in *ClAnt* 17 (1998), 392-404.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. R. NICOLAI, "La fondazione di Cirene e i Karneia cirenaici nell'Inno ad Apollo di Callimaco", in *MD* 28 (1992), 153-73. These myths have also been much discussed by Claude Calame; his publications are conveniently listed in the article cited in n.27 above. For the Karneia cf. W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1985), 234-6.

<sup>33</sup> We hope to discuss this matter elsewhere.

aetiology of the *ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῶνον* cry) provide a further 'mythical model' for the celebration being enacted through the poem.

Nevertheless, the central section of the poem owes a very clear debt to Pindar's *Fifth Pythian*<sup>34</sup>, an epinician (celebrating the same chariot victory as *Pythian* 4) for Arcesilas IV of Cyrene, which, at the very least, gives a particular prominence to the cult of Karneian Apollo at Cyrene, if indeed its setting is not the Karneia itself (71-81):

ἔνασσαν ἀλκάντας Ἡρακλέος  
 ἐκγόνους Αἰγίμιοῦ τε. τὸ δ' ἔμὸν γαρούει  
 ἀπὸ Σπάρτας ἐπήρατον κλέος,  
 ὅθεν γεγενναμένοι  
 ἴκοντο Θήρανδε φῶτες Αἰγεῖδαι, 75  
 ἔμοι πατέρες, οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, ἀλλὰ Μοῦρά τις ἄγεν·  
 πολύθυτον ἔρανον  
 ἔνθεν ἀναδεξάμενοι,  
 Ἄπολλον, τεῖα,  
 Καρνήι', ἐν δαιτὶ σεβίζομεν 80  
 Κυράνας ἀγακτιμέναν πόλιν·

It is thus not improbable that it was precisely the ambiguous identity of the singers of *Pythian* 5, a matter discussed in antiquity as well as (endlessly) by modern scholars<sup>35</sup>, from which Callimachus developed the apparently shifting location of the "speaking voice" in his *Hymn to Apollo*. As so often, he goes one step beyond his models. His reworking highlights by exaggeration the problems that arise when a performative text, such as *Pythian* 5, is read away from performance; it is the read and written text that offers the limit case of the text as script. Be that as it may, the reworking of *Pythian* 5 (cf. esp. vv.71-72 of Callimachus' hymn) confirms the *Hymn to Apollo* as an offering to

<sup>34</sup> Cf., e.g., M.T. SMILEY, "Callimachus' debt to Pindar and others", in *Hermathena* 18 (1919), 46-72; M.R. LEFKOWITZ, "Pindar's *Pythian* V", in *Entretiens Hardt* 31 (1985), 33-63, esp. 44-9; E. KRUMMEN, *Pyrros Hymnon* (Berlin/New York 1990), 95-151; FUHRER (n.2 above), 40-2; W. KOFLER, "Kallimachos' Wahlverwandtschaften", in *Philologus* 140 (1996), 230-47.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. KRUMMEN (n.34), 138-9; KOFLER (n.34).

Callimachus' "king" (v.27), although it would be rash to infer from this alone that that king must therefore, like Arcesilas, be 'king of Cyrene'<sup>36</sup>. The Callimachean scholiast — on what authority we do not know — identified Callimachus' "king" as Euergetes, and it is at least worthy of remark that Euergetes' marriage to the Cyrenean princess Berenice, celebrated by Callimachus in the *Coma Berenices*<sup>37</sup>, would make an appropriate (though, of course, by no means necessary) context for the prominence of Cyrenean traditions in the hymn<sup>38</sup>. Callimachus' poem thus not only effects the epiphany of the god, but demonstrates, rather than merely describes, his power.

Finally, the relatively greater prominence of ritual in Hellenistic hymnic poetry (cf. Theocritus 26), the fact that, as Albert Henrichs has often observed, myth is increasingly presented as explanatory of ritual (i.e. aetiological), may also be seen, in part, as a related instance of the appeal to the cultic imagination. It is again important to remember that such poems are modern 'versions' of choral hymns, as well as of the hexameter *Homeric Hymns*. When reading becomes a, if not the, standard mode of reception, poets must accommodate a potentially very wide plurality of sites of reception. There is no longer a performative context which allows 'the unspoken' to be understood by a collective audience. Ritual is thus inscribed within the text.

### 3. 'How shall I hymn you?'

In the *Hymns to Athena* and *Demeter*, the relation between the choice of narrative and the cultic frame is self-consciously problematised in ways which it is hard to imagine in 'real' choral poetry:

<sup>36</sup> That the king is indeed Magas of Cyrene has often been suggested, cf. most recently CAMERON (n.11 above), 408-9. The position of a Ptolemy as Horus/Apollo is perhaps more relevant than Cameron seems to allow.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. above p.155.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *Callimachus*, ed. R. PFEIFFER, II (Oxford 1953), pp.XXXVIII-XXXIX.



5.55-6

πότνι' Ἀθαναΐα, σὺ μὲν ἔξιθι· μέσφα δ' ἐγώ τι  
ταῖσδ' ἐρέω· μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων.

6.17-23

μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμες ἃ δάκρυον ἄγαγε Διοῖ·  
κάλλιον, ὡς πολίεσσιν ἐαδότα τέθμια δῶκε·  
κάλλιον, ὡς καλάμαν τε καὶ ἱερὰ δράγματα πρᾶτα  
ἄσταχύων ἀπέκοψε καὶ ἐν βόας ἤκε πατῆσαι, 20  
ἀνίκα Τριπτόλεμος ἀγαθὰν ἐδιδάσκετο τέχνην·  
κάλλιον, ὡς (ἵνα καὶ τις ὑπερβασίας ἀλέηται)  
π ἰδέσθαι

It would be difficult indeed to find an archaic parallel for the insouciant *τι* of 5.55. Nevertheless, the starting-point for Callimachus' technique may well be reflection upon the actual practice of archaic and classical lyric; modern scholars were certainly not the first to ask "Why is this story told here?"<sup>39</sup> We may perhaps think of this problematising of the central narrative as a version of the traditional hymnic question "How shall I hymn you?" Implicit in that traditional *topos* was the question of the poet's freedom to choose (*Hom. h. Ap.* 19-27):

**Πῶς τάρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὐμνον ἐόντα;**  
πάντη γάρ τοι, Φοῖβε, νομὸς βεβλήαται ὠδῆς, 20  
ἡμὲν ἀν' ἠπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἠδ' ἀνά νήσους.  
πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαί τοι ἄδον καὶ πρόωνες ἄκροι  
ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ποταμοί θ' ἄλλα δὲ προρέοντες,  
ἀκταί τ' εἰς ἄλλα κεκλιμέναι λιμένες τε θαλάσσης.  
ἦ ὡς σε πρῶτον Λητώ τέκε χάρμα βροτοῖσι, 25  
κλινθεῖσα πρὸς Κύνθου ὄρος κραναῆ ἐνὶ νήσῳ  
Δήλῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ;

In the archaic poem the hymnic rhetoric functions like a priamel to throw the poet's choice into relief<sup>40</sup>, but that 'choice' seems itself to have been contextually (pre-)determined (cf. 169-76). It is this inherited hymnic rhetoric which Callimachus lays bare.

<sup>39</sup> Good general remarks on hymnic myth in W.D. FURLEY, "Praise and persuasion in Greek hymns" (n.7 above), 43.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. W.H. RACE, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden 1982), 47-53; DEPEW (n.8 above), 61-62.

The two Callimachean narratives are, however, also importantly different. In the *Hymn to Demeter* an obviously relevant<sup>41</sup>, if very untraditional, tale is told by the fasting women during their procession, which was the normal place for such hymnic myth. Whereas the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* records and celebrates the establishment of Demeter's cult and tells a tale of separation and famine followed by re-integration, blessedness and plenty, Callimachus' hymn confirms the continuing power of the goddess of the crops through an apotropaic tale of plenty wasted by folly and leading to ultimate separation and misery. Erysichthon's punishment is to break those distinctions in social behaviour, established by Demeter the θεσμοφόρος (v.18), which separate us from the animals. In the *Hymn to Athena*, however, the story of Teiresias is apparently told to fill in the time before the procession begins. If μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων (56) is not merely an 'Alexandrian footnote' acknowledging the use of sources, but also a cautionary apology to the goddess for any offence the story might cause<sup>42</sup>, there is here a further self-conscious invitation to the reader to reflect on why the tale has been chosen, for potential offence is the very last thing that a hymn ought to offer<sup>43</sup>. Be that as it may, the crucial point is that, whereas for the archaic performer a Delian context demanded a Delian narrative, the Argive context of the *Hymn to Athena* no longer 'requires' an Argive narrative: the poet claims to be really 'free', to have that power of choice to which the archaic hymnist could only pay lip-service.

The story of Teiresias, who while hunting on Mt Helicon in Boeotia inadvertently saw Athena and his mother Chariclo

<sup>41</sup> The meaning of the Erysichthon story within a hymn to Demeter is discussed in HUNTER, "Writing the god" (n.20 above), 30-33.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. T.C.W. STINTON, "Si credere dignum est': some expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others", in *PCPS* N.S.22 (1976), 60-89, p.66 (= *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* [Oxford 1990], 243). The relevant parallels are collected in BULLOCH's note and D. KIDD on Aratus, *Phaen.* 637.

<sup>43</sup> On this passage cf. T. FUHRER, "A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus", in *AJP* 109 (1988), 53-68, esp. 66f.

bathing in the stream Hippocrene and was punished with immediate loss of sight, has of course many links to the Argive festival which Callimachus conjures up, in which a statue of the goddess received a ritual bath<sup>44</sup>. Pherecydes seems to have been the main source for this rare story of Teiresias, and there is no good reason to think that it was connected with the Argive Palladion before Callimachus brilliantly juxtaposed two different 'baths of Pallas', thus making the Teiresias story a quasi-aetiological warning to Argive men not to catch sight of Athena. What is clear is that such a myth about 'looking' is peculiarly appropriate to a *written* text of this mimetic, quasi-performative nature<sup>45</sup>. First, the poem evokes the similarity and difference between the mental images excited by literary *enargeia* and the experience of 'epiphany': is there a difference between our 'seeing' Teiresias seeing Athena and epiphanic experience? Secondly, we will never in fact 'see' the goddess, not only because 'we' are men, but also because the poem ends as she appears (or does she?), and because the acknowledged divorce of the written recreation from any 'real' occasion emphasises the artificiality of the *mimesis*. Moreover, in exploiting the traditional slippage between an image and what that image 'represents' — i.e. the whole problem of how to represent the divine — Callimachus raises the question of whether, in seeing an image or statue, we are 'seeing' the god as Teiresias saw her<sup>46</sup>.

The 'oddness' of this usurpation by Athena of an 'Artemis' rôle further illustrates (and celebrates) the real freedom which poets now enjoyed. The inherited pantheon was a dynamic system of overlapping relations, narratives, and spheres of influence. By exploiting the new possibilities offered by the use of written records, what we might in fact call 'the pursuit of oddness', and by a highly allusive textual practice, Callimachus' interlocking

<sup>44</sup> Cf. HUNTER, "Writing the god" (n.20 above).

<sup>45</sup> 'Looking' and 'seeing' are, of course, also very important in the *Hymn to Apollo*, another epiphanic text.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. N. LORAUX, *Les expériences de Tirésias* (Paris 1989), 253-71 (= *The Experiences of Tiresias* [Princeton 1995], 211-26).

*Hymns* exaggerated these tendencies to make the system more, rather than less, dynamic, and in so doing to foreground the controlling power of the poet.

#### 4. *Intruding upon Apollo*

Like the *Hymn to Zeus*, the *Hymn to Artemis* begins with the god's name, but whereas Zeus imposes himself as the only possible subject for song<sup>47</sup>, in the *Hymn to Artemis* a novel variation of the common hymnic *topos* of 'forgetting'<sup>48</sup> may suggest that praise of the goddess has been deferred, if not indeed, actually overlooked (*h.* 3.1-2):

Ἄρτεμιν (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι)  
ὕμνέομεν

Who might have forgotten Artemis? Two related answers suggest themselves. The first is the (hexameter) hymnic tradition as a whole: there are two fairly perfunctory *Homeric Hymns to Artemis* (9, 27), and the goddess makes only a few brief appearances as an adjunct to her brother in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. More pointedly, however, there is the case of Callimachus himself. In the corpus of his *Hymns* as we have it, the *Hymn to Artemis* is surrounded by two contrasting rewritings of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and, more specifically, the goddess appears only once in the immediately preceding *Hymn to Apollo*: at vv.60-3 her endless labour supplies the raw material from which her brother weaves the wondrous altar of goats' horns. To

<sup>47</sup> Cf. below p.171.

<sup>48</sup> Cf., e.g., *Hom.h.Dion.* 19. In view of this *topos* at the opening of Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* it may be important that the motif occurs in the opening verse of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν most naturally means 'it is no light thing...' (i.e. it has dire consequences) not 'it is not easy...' (as P. BING and V. UHRMEISTER, "The Unity of Callimachus' Hymn to Artemis", in *JHS* 114 [1994], 19-34, p.27). The consequences of annoying Artemis are uncomfortably familiar from well-known stories, and a closing catalogue of those whom she has punished (vv.260-67) secures a ring around the poem.

add insult to injury, her birthplace, according to the *Homeric Hymn*, was 'Ortygia' which in Callimachus had become the site of Apollo's marvel (*h.* 2.59). Artemis gets her own back, however: in Callimachus' hymn to her, Apollo appears in the servile rôle of unloading the dead animals from her chariot as she returns to Olympus, in a scene which 'steals' Apollo's arrival on Olympus from the *Homeric Hymn* in his honour (Call. *h.* 3.140-69 - *Hom.h.Ap.* 1-13). Thus Callimachus has broken the *Homeric Hymn* into its constituent parts of 'Apollo', 'Artemis' and 'Delos', and ensured divine favour by a strategy of ever-increasing length; if Apollo approves of short poems, then he will (of course) not be able to complain since his is the shortest of the poems<sup>49</sup>.

The opening of Callimachus' poem, therefore, appears to use the fact of a 'poetry-book' to set up a dialogue between poems and between gods. The shrine of Artemis at Ephesus "would easily surpass Pytho" (v.250), a jibe whose full force derives from being read against the praise of *h.* 2.34-5:

χρύσεια καὶ τὰ πέδιλα· πολύχρυσος γὰρ Ἀπόλλων  
καὶ πουλυκτέανος· Πυθῶνί κε τεκμήραιο.

So too, the opening of the *Hymn to Artemis* (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι) invites us to look back to the last poem, the *Hymn to Apollo*, and to read it again for signs of forgetting. Once we have done this, such signs are not difficult to find. Consider, for example, the case of Niobe, cited as one of the victims of Apollo who nevertheless falls under the spell of poetry in his honour (*h.* 2.22-7):

καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος,  
ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερὸς λίθος ἐστήρικται,  
μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς οὐζυρόν τι χανούσης.  
ἰὴ ἰὴ φθέγγεσθε· κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν.

25

<sup>49</sup> Delos' poem, on the other hand, is the longest of all, and this may be seen as a recompense for the fact that she has never before had a 'hymn'; if, moreover, she feels that she has had to wait too long, then it is the poet's *thumos*, not the poet himself, who is to blame (*h.* 4.1). For this ironic strategy cf. CALL. fr.75.5. There are excellent remarks on the *Hymn to Artemis* in HASLAM (n.6 above), 117.

ὅς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῷ βασιλῆι μάχοιτο·  
ὅστις ἐμῷ βασιλῆι, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο.

The model here is Achilles' famous account to Priam (in *Iliad* 24.602-17) of Niobe, also used as an *exemplum* of behaviour which might be thought paradoxical, in which Artemis kills Niobe's six daughters and Apollo her six sons. In Homer there is an even distribution of killing between the sibling gods; in Callimachus there is no word of Artemis. We could read her into the plural μακάρεσσιν of v.25, but — particularly when we read back from the *Hymn to Artemis* — the chiasmic game of the following verses (26f.) even squeezes her out of that by bringing the poet's king into the equation<sup>50</sup>. The best that the poet can do is to allow her to turn his words of praise against her brother (*h.* 3.6-9):

ἴδος μοι παρθενίην αἰώνιον, ἄππα, φυλάσσειν,  
**καὶ πολυωνυμίην, ἵνα μή μοι Φοῖβος ἐρίζῃ,**  
ἴδος δ' ἰοὺς καὶ τόξα—ἕα πάτερ, οὐ σε φαρέτρην  
οὐδ' αἰτέω μέγα τόξον·

The inversion of *h.* 2, and the childish desire for supremacy over her brother in a poem (the 'Artemis') at whose heart will indeed lie *eris* with 'Phoebus', makes plain the textual game upon which this encomium is based. The infant god's request for πολυωνυμίη is perhaps not just a request for 'many names', as her brother has, but also for 'the name of πολύς', a standard etymology for Apollo's name, of which Callimachus has made much in the preceding poem (cf. *h.* 2.34-5, 69-70). By the middle of the poem, the poet will have granted her even this (137-9):

εἶην δ' αὐτός, ἄνασσα, μέλοι δέ μοι αἰὲν αἰοιδή·  
τῇ ἔνι μὲν Λητοῦς γάμος ἔσσεται, **ἐν δὲ σὺ πολλή,**  
ἐν δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλων, ἐν δ' οἱ σεο πάντες ἄεθλοι...

<sup>50</sup> There is much characteristic verbal smartness in these verses: πέτρος is a surprise for πατήρ, as a counterpoint to the pathetic μήτηρ at the end of v.20. Ἀναβάλλεται has a musical sense which is momentarily evoked by the parallel κινύρεται (a related 'pun' at fr.75.43); just as v.21 foreshadows the etymology of the ritual cry from παῖ, παῖ, so v.25 suggests the etymology from ἴημι, given the fate of Niobe's children. On this passage cf. also SELDEN (n.31 above), 378; RUTHERFORD (n.1 above), 122.

The prominence of 'sibling rivalry' as a motif and narrative impulse in the *Hymn to Artemis* is in fact too obvious to require lengthy discussion; in the *Homeric Hymns* in her honour, Artemis' identity was already crucially dependent upon that of her brother, and Callimachus explores the potential tensions within such familial structures. If, however, he rewards the sister with her own hymn, he restores the balance in the *Hymn to Delos* from which she is all but entirely absent.

Artemis makes in fact at most two appearances in the *Hymn to Delos*: the slavish<sup>51</sup> Iris is compared to one of her hunting dogs (v.228-9), a comparison which casts at best an ambiguous light on the goddess, and the final verse may refer to her by circumlocution, 'the girl whom Leto bore', though both text and interpretation are disputed. Artemis' painless gestation and birth (*h.* 3.24-5) is thus written against Leto's sufferings with the foetal Apollo in the following poem. The relative age of Apollo and Artemis is indeed a very grey area in the tradition. That they are twins is an idea "surprisingly rare outside Pindar"<sup>52</sup>, and nothing in Callimachus' *Hymns* suggests such a notion; though Delian cults of Artemis are amply attested<sup>53</sup>, it is Apollo alone with whom the island is intimately associated. The place of Artemis' birth remains as mysterious as the 'Ortygia' of the archaic *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (v.16).

##### 5. 'From Zeus are kings'

Throughout the first four hymns<sup>54</sup>, we are engaged in a constant struggle to control a shifting set of ways of talking about

<sup>51</sup> She is in fact a 'comic' *serva currens*, cf. HUNTER, *Theocritus* (n.4 above), 96; for the 'breathlessness' motif cf. SOPH. *Ant.* 224; AR. *Au.* 1122; R. HUNTER, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge 1985), 165. On this scene cf. also DEPEW, "Delian Hymns" (n.8 above), 171.

<sup>52</sup> I. RUTHERFORD, "Pindar on the Birth of Apollo", in *CQ* 38 (1988), 65-75, p.72.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Ph. BRUNEAU, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris 1970), 171-206.

<sup>54</sup> It is worth pondering how the *Hymns to Athena* and *Demeter* are different from the rest in many more ways than just dialect.

the nature of power — similes, analogues, suggestive juxtapositions<sup>55</sup>. In any state with strongly centralised power, be it Alexandria or even Cyrene, writing of this kind is ‘political’, because of the distribution of power within society. The divinity or quasi-divinity of the ruler, even before the formal institution of ruler cult, can change the contours of the pantheon by offering a point of reference (the ruler) through which new overlapping spheres within the ‘generic system’ are created; here too it is reasonable to think that poets often ran ahead of more broadly disseminated representations. Moreover, the first two hymns in the collection, *Zeus* and *Apollo*, establish fairly explicit links between human and divine power; thereafter, the reader is always held by the possibility of a thoroughgoing ‘system’ running through the corpus, particularly as both Olympian and Ptolemaic structures are based on family relationships. Thus, for example, it is tantalising that a poem about Artemis is surrounded by two poems in honour of her brother Apollo, one of which at least makes quite explicit the similarities between Apollo and Philadelphus<sup>56</sup>. The hymns must be contextualised within the social structures which produced them, and it is here that Callimachus’ Alexandrian context becomes determinative upon interpretation.

Hymnal writing and performance flourished at all levels of Hellenistic society, as papyri and inscriptions amply attest, and the range of beings who were the object of hymnic praise was also greatly increased. The political upheavals of the later fourth century had placed the safety of cities (and later empires) in the hands of powerful military dynasts, and we find many of these celebrated in similar terms and similar poetic modes to those in

<sup>55</sup> DEPEW, “Delian Hymns” (n.8 above), 175 n.51 makes the nice suggestion that “Iris’ sycophantic address to Hera (*h.* 4.216-39) provide[s] a negative exemplar of more overt praise”.

<sup>56</sup> P. BING, *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen 1988), 126 n.57 suggested, on the basis of certain shared motifs between *h.* 3 and *h.* 4, that they were “originally companion pieces, the one perhaps written for Arsinoe, the other for Philadelphus”.



which the Olympian 'saviours' or 'protectors' of cities had earlier been, and continued to be, glorified<sup>57</sup>.

The distinction between men and gods, rather than some unchanging value associated with the language in which they were each described, was the crucial issue. Traditional Greek culture had always been uneasy with men whose good fortune seemed to threaten the privileges of the divine, and Pindar (like Homer before him) is constantly at pains to warn of the dangers and the unbridgeable divide which separates the two; in the third century and after, some men did in fact cross over, but only in very particular circumstances and often only after death. The old pattern persisted with remarkable tenacity: the apparently drily scholastic division in late antique rhetoric between 'hymns' to gods and 'encomia' to men is a manifestation of that persistence. Nevertheless, poems such as Theocritus 17 (*Encomium to Ptolemy Philadelphus*) and Callimachus' *Hymns to Zeus and Apollo*, like the epinician tradition before them, creatively explore the boundaries between 'analogy' and 'identification' in ways which must have reflected the fluid search for new modes of praise in a changed situation<sup>58</sup>. One modern difficulty in understanding this poetry arises from the assumption that there must be a simple and consistent analogy between two classes of being who are described or praised in similar language; rather, we must consider the occasion-specific rhetoric of Greek praise and always be prepared to ask after the *function* of praise, rather than after some (probably illusory) 'essential meaning' for the terms in which the praise is couched. Praise exists to offer thanks for benefactions received and/or to create the circumstances for benefactions in the future; the

<sup>57</sup> For a helpful discussion and list of references to such compositions cf. CAMERON (n.11 above), 291-5; KERKHECKER (n.6 above), 289 draws attention to Callimachus' generic sensitivity in avoiding 'hymns' directly addressed to mortal kings.

<sup>58</sup> This will be discussed in greater detail in R. HUNTER, *Theocritus. The Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley, forthcoming).

pragmatics of hymnal discourse may thus be a more useful subject than its 'religion'.

A feature of the *Homeric Hymns* which assumes great importance within the changed conditions of poetic composition which prevailed in the Hellenistic period is that these poems have at their heart the link between the past and the present. The hymns tell of the birth of gods or the establishment of their powers or of incidents in the heroic past which exemplify that power. Like mythological narrative in general, the hymns look to the past for the validation of the present order, particularly where they touch upon the position of kings and patrons, for here, more than anywhere else, an authorising tradition is of the greatest significance. Hymns thus take their place within the array of techniques by which Hellenistic poets both sought continuity with the past and also advertised their disjunction from it<sup>59</sup>.

There is no major *Homeric Hymn to Zeus*<sup>60</sup>, but the opening of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* evokes a setting where the celebration of Zeus was a familiar act: the third introductory libation before the start of the symposium proper was to Zeus Soter (Athenaeus 15.692f-693c), and the singing of paeans was a regular part of the symposium<sup>61</sup>. In the absence of a formal model in the *Homeric Hymns*, Callimachus' narrative of the birth and power of Zeus is, as has long been recognised, in part a re-writing of sections of Hesiod's *Theogony*<sup>62</sup>; in describing the creation, coming to power and *timai* of Zeus, the *Theogony* is, in any case, importantly like a hymn. If the central concern of the

<sup>59</sup> Cf. BING (n.56 above), *passim*.

<sup>60</sup> *Hymn 23* is a four-verse proem to Zeus.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. RUTHERFORD, *Paeans* (n.1 above), 50-2; thus, for example, Ariphron's paeon to Hygieia (*PMG* 813) is most naturally associated with the standard sympotic toasts in honour of that goddess (HUNTER on Eubulus fr.94.2 [= *PCG* 93.3]). Relevant also are the hymnal themes of some of the Attic skolia, cf. *PMG* 884, 885, 886, and cf. also the self-referential opening of one of Alcman's paeans (*PMG* 98).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. especially H. REINSCH-WERNER, *Callimachus Hesiodicus* (Berlin 1976), 24-73; W. MEINCKE, *Untersuchungen zu den enkomastischen Gedichten Theokrits* (Diss. Kiel 1966), 165-82.

major *Homeric Hymns* is the placing of their respective gods within the overall Olympian scheme, what Jenny Clay has termed “the politics of Olympus”, then the absence of a hymn to Zeus, the god who is responsible for that scheme, is unsurprising; a ‘theogony’ which tells of the creation of the whole scheme *must*, on the other hand, inevitably be in some sense a ‘hymn to Zeus’. Moreover, Hesiod’s poem explicitly foregrounds the relationships between Zeus and powerful men on earth, the aristocrats whom Hesiod calls *basileis*, and between the *basileis* and poets (*Theog.* 80-103). Both of these relationships are of crucial importance to Callimachus writing in the world of the Alexandrian court, under the patronage of a new kind of *basileus* whose ‘assimilation’ to Zeus seems to have been a commonplace of contemporary Greek poetry (Theocritus 17 etc.)<sup>63</sup>. The analogy between the master of Olympus and the great king on earth became a commonplace of Hellenistic kingship theory, by no means restricted to the ambit of the Ptolemaic court, and is indeed foreshadowed in the *Iliad* in the similarity (and tragic dissimilarity) of Zeus and Agamemnon. A poem such as Pindar’s *First Pythian* which establishes a close analogy between Zeus’ harmonious control of the cosmos, based upon the crushing of his enemies, and Hieron’s harmonious guidance of his people shows how powerful, and how traditional, such ideas were. In his *Hymn to Zeus* Callimachus cites this passage of Hesiod — ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες — to position himself within a traditional negotiation between poetic encomium and kingly

<sup>63</sup> We hope that uncertainty as to the date of the hymn and the identity of “our ruler” (v.86) does not rob these general considerations of all their force. We ourselves would identify the ruler as Philadelphus (cf. J.J. CLAUSS, “Lies and allusions: the addressee and date of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*”, in *ClAnt* 5 [1986], 155-70; CAMERON [n.11 above], 10), but other proposals are current (Magas: C. MEILLIER, *Callimaque et son temps* [Lille 1979], 61-78; Soter: J. CARRIÈRE, “Philadelphie ou Sôter? À propos d’un hymne de Callimaque”, in *Studi Classici* 11 [1969], 85-93). For a reading of the *Hymn to Zeus* in the light of Egyptian as well as Greek ideas cf. S. STEPHENS, “Callimachus at court”, in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER (Groningen 1998), 167-85.

power, while celebrating what was (in some ways) a radically new kind of power.

One crucial difference, however, between Callimachus and Hesiod is that, in the *Theogony*, the good king on earth follows (or imitates) the immortal pattern of Zeus, at least in the functions of *diakrinein*, “of physical and intellectual distribution”, and imposing dispute settlement. In Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*, however, Zeus and the good king are, at least potentially, fused together: we are *almost* dealing with one paradigm, rather than two related figures. Both the political and religious reality of the Ptolemy-Pharaoh, the first of whom was called, like Zeus, Soter, and the evolution of Greek poetic encomium contribute to this change. Such a fusion, however, foregrounds questions of ‘control’: *When* is Ptolemy ‘like’ Zeus? Always, or only at certain moments and in certain circumstances? *How* and *when* is Arsinoe ‘like’ Helen (Theocr. 15.110)?<sup>64</sup> As Egyptian monarchs, the Ptolemies were both in some sense divine, but were also mortals under the special protection of the gods; this doubleness can be amply illustrated from the iconography of the early reigns<sup>65</sup>. A sense of overlapping, of shared but not identical characteristics, and of present copies of timeless models is thus built into the very nature of kingship. It is perhaps no accident that the allusive practice of Alexandrian poetry shows similar features: can a reader’s receptiveness to explicit allusion be controlled in such a way as to block off (as far as possible) unhelpful associations and echoes; is one of the criteria of ‘rightness’ in reading knowing how far to read ‘intertextually’ and when to stop?<sup>66</sup>

The *Hymn to Zeus* begins on a note of certainty (1-3):

Ζηνὸς ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδῆσιν ἀείδειν  
 λῶϊον ἢ θεὸν αὐτόν, ἀεὶ μέγαν, αἰὲν ἄνακτα,  
 Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικαστόλον Οὐρανίδησι;

<sup>64</sup> Cf. HUNTER, *Theocritus* (n.4 above), 165-6 on the “process of selective memory” which the use of such mythological figures imposes and which poets dramatise and ironise.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. SELDEN (n.31 above), 350-1, 386 (with bibliography).

<sup>66</sup> Some of the issues are set out with great clarity in S. HINDS, *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge 1998), esp. Chapter 2.

Zeus' name stands, as is only proper, at the head of the hymn, and perhaps of the collection of hymns. Within this certainty, however, unsettling doubts lurk, and not merely about the meaning of the riddling third verse<sup>67</sup>. At first we assume that the opening words mean "What other than Zeus would it be better to sing at libations?", and it is only when we reach ἦ θεὸν αὐτόν in v.2 that we realise that the opening Ζηνός actually belongs with σπονδῆσιν, "at libations to Zeus"<sup>68</sup>. Although we have 'misconstrued' the syntax of the opening verse, we have in fact correctly appreciated the meaning: Zeus is the only possibility, regardless of grammatical construction. Zeus, whose precocious power (v.57) is shared only with "our king" (vv.87-8) and overturns all our accepted notions of progression and generational succession (vv.58-9), is the only certainty amidst the treacherous shoals of competing 'mythologies' (vv.4-9), Cretan paradoxes (v.8) and the untruths of poets (vv.60-5). That the opening verses themselves appear to be written 'in competition' with a famous Pindaric opening is itself a manifestation of the shifting layers of tradition<sup>69</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> On Πηλαγόνων (*Etym. Gen.*: Πηλο-MSS) cf. PFEIFFER II 41. The traditional interpretation, current already in antiquity (cf. *Scholia ad loc.*; NONN. *Dion.* 18.266, and perhaps HOR. *carm.* 3.1.6-7 *Iovis | clari Giganteo triumpho*, in a very Callimachean context [S.J. HEYWORTH, "Some allusions to Callimachus in Latin poetry", in *MD* 33 [1994], 51-79, pp. 54-6]), of the first half is "router of the Mud-born, i.e. the Giants (the γηγενεῖς, "born from earth") and/or the Titans"; if this were correct, we would have a brief allusion to the establishment of Zeus' rule, and this interpretation would seem to find support in *Theogony* 820, "when Zeus had driven (ἐξέλασε) the Titans from heaven...". Adolf KÖHNKEN, "Πηλογόνων ἐλατήρ. Kallimachos, Zeushymnos v.3", in *Hermes* 112 (1984), 438-45, however, has argued that the 'Mud-born' are mortals, traditionally fashioned by Prometheus from mud; ἐλατήρ will, therefore, mean "gatherer, controller", as of flocks of sheep, and this would be a Callimachean way of re-writing the Homeric ποιμὴν λαῶν, "shepherd of the people". Not only would this interpretation offer the witty equation of human beings to sheep, but it would also play off the origins of men ('mud') against the origins of the gods ('sons of Ouranos').

<sup>68</sup> The syntactic ambiguity is noted already by the scholiast.

<sup>69</sup> The brilliant insubstantiality of the poetic voice in the *Hymn to Zeus* has often been discussed, and we shall say little about it here; among recent accounts cf. N. HOPKINSON, "Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*", in *CQ* 34 (1984), 139-48; S. GOLDHILL, "Framing and Polyphony: Readings in Hellenistic Poetry", in *PCPS*

The verbal style of Callimachus' opening is close to the opening of a Pindaric prosodion (fr. 89a Sn.-M., presumably to Artemis):

Τί κάλλιον ἀρχομένοισ(ιν?) ἢ καταπαυομένοισιν  
ἢ βαθύζωνόν τε Λατώ  
καὶ θοᾶν ἵππων ἐλάτειραν ἀεῖσαι;

Nevertheless it seems very likely that we are primarily to think of Pindar's own *Hymn to Zeus*<sup>70</sup> which began with a priamel listing of possible Theban themes for song (fr. 29 Sn.-M.):

Ἴσμηγόν ἢ χρυσαλάκατον Μελίαν  
ἢ Κάδμον ἢ Σπαρτῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἀνδρῶν  
ἢ τὰν κυανάμπυκα Θήβαν  
ἢ τὸ πάντολμον σθένος Ἡρακλέος  
ἢ τὰν Διωνύσου πολυγαθέα τιμὰν  
ἢ γάμον λευκωλένου Ἄρμονίας  
ὑμνήσομεν;

5

Against Pindar's embarrassment of choice is set by Callimachus a confidence that there is only one possible subject for song. Pindar's hymn appears to have made extensive use of Hesiod's *Theogony*, especially if Bruno Snell was correct in arguing that Pindar depicted Apollo and the Muses performing at the wedding of Kadmos and Harmonia "ein grosses mythisches Gedicht... das vom Werden der Götter und Menschen erzählte"<sup>71</sup>. In reading the *Theogony* as a 'Hymn to Zeus' Callimachus is also interpreting Pindar. As Callimachus here appropriates Pindar and is

212 (1986), 25-52; K. LÜDDECKE, "Contextualizing the voice in Callimachus' 'Hymn to Zeus'", in *MD* 41 (1998), 9-33.

<sup>70</sup> This poem seems to have stood first in Aristophanes of Byzantium's seven-teen-book edition of Pindar (cf. PFEIFFER [1968], 183-4), but we cannot necessarily extrapolate back from this to the scholarship of a previous generation; there must, however, be a strong suspicion that Callimachus' contemporaries also knew it in a very prominent position. For Horace's use of Greek poems which were significantly placed in their respective books cf. A. BARCHIESI, "Rituals in ink: Horace on the Greek lyric tradition", in DEPEW-OBBINK, *Matrices* (above n.1), 167-82, esp. 171-3.

<sup>71</sup> *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (Göttingen <sup>4</sup>1975), 82-94. With fr.30 M. cf. HES. *Theog.* 901-6, which Pindar appears partially to 'correct'.

soon to incorporate Homer, whose account of Achilles' killing of Lykaon is re-written in Rheia's creation of rivers to wash the new-born infant<sup>72</sup>, so Zeus surpasses all other gods; the eternal constancy of Zeus' power (v.2) is set off against the agonistic struggles of poets and the myriad voices of the poetic tradition.

Another one of those voices also demands special attention. As has long been recognised, vv.5-6 which oppose the Cretan and Arcadian birth legends of Zeus seem to rework parallel verses from the fragmentary *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (1-7):

οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνω σ', οἱ δ' Ἰκάρω ἠνεμοέσση  
 φάσ', οἱ δ' ἐν Νάξω, δῖον γένος εἰραφιῶτα,  
 οἱ δέ σ' ἐπ' Ἀλφειῶ ποταμῶ βαθυδινήεντι  
 κυσαμένην Σεμέλην τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνω,  
 ἄλλοι δ' ἐν Θήβησιν ἀναξ σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι  
 ψευδόμενοι· σὲ δ' ἔτικτε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε  
 πολλὸν ἅπ' ἀνθρώπων κρύπτων λευκώλενον Ἥρην.

Whereas the archaic poet himself declares the variant traditions of Dionysus' birth to be 'lies' and imposes the 'true' account, in the case of Zeus Callimachus leaves the choice up to Dionysus' father himself<sup>73</sup>. Despite the loss of so much hymnic poetry, the relationship between the two passages seems reasonably clear<sup>74</sup>. There may in fact have been a formal reason for Callimachus' choice of model. Although the quoted verses survive only in the indirect tradition, the close of what is pretty certainly the same poem introduces the text of the hymns in the damaged

<sup>72</sup> Cf., e.g., A. GRIFFITHS, in *JHS* 101 (1981), 160. J.K. NEWMAN, "Pindar and Callimachus", in *Illinois Classical Studies* 10 (1985), 169-89, pp.184-5 makes the interesting suggestion that the stress on the sudden appearance of water carries particular resonance as the Ptolemies, the heirs of the Pharaohs, were lords of the Nile; the reign of Zeus/Ptolemy thus ensures abundant fertility for thirsty Egypt. Cf. further STEPHENS (n.63 above).

<sup>73</sup> Is πατήρ in v.7 a hint at the model text being used?

<sup>74</sup> The *Hymn to Dionysus* also shares with the story of Zeus' birth the motifs of hiding the baby from the wrath of another god (in Dionysus' case, Hera) and birth on a thickly wooded mountain (cf. CALL. *h.* 1.11, perhaps a rewriting of the description of Nysa in vv.8-9 of the archaic hymn). On this *Homeric Hymn* see now M.L. WEST, "The fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus", in *ZPE* 134 (2001), 1-11.

Mosquensis manuscript of the early fifteenth century. This manuscript, which by common consent is the best witness to the text of the hymns<sup>75</sup>, also preserves uniquely the *Hymn to Demeter* which follows the Dionysus-fragment; all other manuscripts begin with the *Hymn to Apollo* (*Hymn 3* in T.W. Allen's standard Oxford edition). It is not possible to tell from the manuscript how much of the *Hymn to Dionysus* is lost nor whether this was the first hymn in that text, though this seems indeed very likely. As the order of the preserved hymns is standard in the vast majority of witnesses<sup>76</sup>, there is a presumption that this order goes back to the collection of *Homeric Hymns* which was at some date incorporated into a larger collection of hymnic and Homeric material. If so, we must at least reckon with the possibility that the *Hymn to Dionysus* was the first poem in a collection of *Homeric Hymns* known to Callimachus. In the opening verses of his opening hymn, therefore, Callimachus may have alluded to the 'opening' poems of the two major hymnic collections of the past, the 'Homeric' and the Pindaric. In doing so, Callimachus not merely places himself within a tradition, but calls attention to the written form of collected 'poetry-books' which offered new possibilities for beginnings and ends.

The ludic wit with which Callimachus juxtaposes "the eternal Zeus" with the story of his birth in all its physical detail is of a piece with the games which he plays with notions of truth-telling and the 'Hesiodic' claim of poetry to be able to convey both truth and falsehood (*Theog.* 22-28)<sup>77</sup>; the poet's demand for "plausible fiction" (v.65) is not merely a way to dismiss the Homeric account of the division of the universe among the three sons of Kronos in favour of the Hesiodic version<sup>78</sup>, but it

<sup>75</sup> The most accessible account is the Introduction to the edition of T.W. ALLEN - W.R. HALLIDAY - E.E. SIKES (Oxford 21936).

<sup>76</sup> A small sub-group (HJK) have the order 8-18, then 3.1-186.

<sup>77</sup> Particularly valuable is A. BARCHIESI, *Il Poeta e il Principe. Ovidio e il discorso augusteo* (Bari 1994), 169-75.

<sup>78</sup> *Iliad* 15.187-93. Appeals to τὸ εἰκός and τὸ πιθανόν are very common in the Homeric *scholia*, and we should catch here the tones of the scholar, as well as the calculating peasant. There was a rich tradition of allegorising this Iliadic



also of course undermines any temptation we might have to 'believe' his own narrative of Zeus' birth. The physical vividness of this narrative is not merely a technique for disorienting the reader, let alone a tool of 'realism', but is rather one of the ways in which it is made clear that what is at issue is not literal 'belief' in the story. The strategy of the poem is to divorce the power and nature of Zeus from the 'mythology' of Zeus, so that the former does not depend upon the latter. The learned poet can have lots of fun with the absurdities of traditional stories and the inconsistent tales of poets, and yet still expound the realities of power.

There is, moreover, a broader context of 'religious' ideas into which Callimachus' poem and its tradition fits<sup>79</sup>. Greek poetic reflection upon the nature of Zeus, and hence upon the nature of power, tended to stress not the god's (perhaps original) rôle as the elemental sky-god, but rather the universality and uncertainty of supreme power. When Callimachus excuses himself at the end of the hymn (92-3),

δῶτορ ἀπημονίης. τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν αἰίδοι;  
οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' αἰίσει;

this is not to be dismissed as merely a "bold-faced inversion of one of the most conventional motifs of praise-poems"<sup>80</sup> or as a 'scholarly' allusion to the absence of a major 'Homeric Hymn

passage, and it is not impossible that Callimachus alludes to an actual scholarly argument; cf. Ps.-Heraclitus, *Probl.* 41.5 where the division is described as ἀνώμαλος. Moreover, in the *Iliad* 'Hades' is the name of one of the brothers, not a term for the Underworld, and 'Olympos' remains common to all three (15.191-3); Callimachus is, therefore, demonstrating how scholars "play fast and loose" with the text in their interpretative arguments.

<sup>79</sup> S. PIETSCH, *Die Argonautika des Apollonios von Rhodos* (Stuttgart 1999), 181-92 is a serious attempt to pay attention to the background of theological ideas in the *Hymn to Zeus*, as well as to the poem's obvious humour, though our analysis would be very different.

<sup>80</sup> HASLAM (n.6 above), 116, cf. also VESTRHEIM (n.14 above), 63-4. More promising, though equally limiting, is NEWMAN (n.72 above), 185, "evidently [Zeus' deeds] have been sufficiently replaced by what we have heard of the deeds of Ptolemy".

to Zeus', though it is, of course, both of those things; there is no point seeking to celebrate or catalogue 'the deeds of Zeus', to write, if you like, a *Hymn to Zeus* on the lines of Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis*, because to do so is to misrepresent the nature of Zeus, and it is that nature which is the object of hymnic form. To an important extent, Zeus is 'process', to be perceived only as the pattern of events which have already unfolded, what Aeschylus calls 'Zeus' valid law', *πάθει μάθος*, "learning through experience". Everything which happens is 'Zeus'.<sup>81</sup> This is, however, not a matter of 'what Callimachus believed' (which we shall never know) or 'the religion of Callimachus', but rather of the literary and cultural tradition in which his poem fits. So much about the style of his poetry seems revolutionary, that the traditional matrix of ideas into which it fits is often forgotten.

<sup>81</sup> Some key texts: AESCHYL. *Ag.* 160-83; SOPH. *Trach.* 1278; EUR. *Tr.* 884-8; CLEANTH. *Hymn to Zeus*; ARAT. *Phaen.* 4.

## DISCUSSION

*M.A. Harder:* You use as a working hypothesis the idea that the *Hymns* form a deliberately organised 'poetry book', but I wonder whether you would be prepared to go further than this: just how strong is the evidence for such an arrangement?

*R. Hunter:* It must be freely admitted that the strongest evidence is precisely the interpretative advances which the hypothesis allows, and 'evidence' of this kind is, of course, never going to be conclusive or convince everyone. I should also add that we should perhaps not put too much stress on the (physical) idea of a poetry *book*. Poems may 'use' other poems in a variety of ways, even when they do not (originally) travel together; thus, for example, Theocritus' *Sixth Idyll* can be seen to 'use' the *Eleventh Idyll*, regardless of how we imagine the first transmission. Perhaps we should be thinking of a stage preliminary to, but foreshadowing some of the effects of, the later 'poetry book'. If so — but I would not wish to push the analogy too far — we may compare some of the other ways in which the Latin poets sharpened the focus of and made more explicit features merely adumbrated in Hellenistic poetry.

*Th. Fuhrer:* Rather than going further, I would like to be even more sceptical and say that we should always take into consideration that the six Callimachean poems which we call 'hymns' might always have circulated separately. But even then we may say that these six poems or even only a part of this corpus (e.g. 2 to 4 or 2, 5 and 6 or 1 and 4 etc.) contain features or material pointing towards a common system of signs (e.g.: the Hellenic pantheon, mimesis of performance, the Ptolemaic kings etc.) that may be read as cross-references. In this sense most of our observations on the extant corpus can be maintained, even

if the possibility that Callimachus composed a poetry book of hymns be denied.

*S. Stephens:* Alexandrian scholars were collecting individual works of previous writers like Pindar and gathering them together; they were *de facto* creating poetry books. The narrative potential for this new form may perhaps be thought of as no more than an extension of the narrative freedom you have already attributed to the choice of the hymn form.

*R. Hunter:* This is indeed a very important consideration and, as you are aware, very interesting work has been done on how the shape and order of the Alexandrian arrangement of archaic and classical poets has influenced subsequent 'poetry books', particularly at Rome. We expressed ourselves cautiously about the positioning of the Pindaric *Hymn to Zeus* — the question of the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* remains even more speculative — because of the inevitable problems of chronology when attempting to relate Alexandrian scholarship to Alexandrian poetry. The basic point, however, remains fundamental.

*Th. Fuhrer:* The *narrative* potential of entire corpora of poems or even of less clearly defined groups of poems is in fact something that deserves further discussion: to what extent do the single poems refer to each other and thereby, taken together, form a 'narrative'?

*A.S. Hollis:* It is worth noting too that, to judge from the methods of citing from the *Hymns* in late antiquity, there does seem to have been a sense that these formed a 'collection'; a rough count from Pfeiffer reveals 10 examples of citations from 'the *Hymns* of Callimachus' and 8 from 'Callimachus in the *Hymn to X*', a method which perhaps facilitated the finding of a reference. This does not, of course, prove anything for the intentions of Callimachus himself.

*L. Lehnus:* Perhaps I may also add that it is at least tantalising that, as far as our evidence allows us to judge, the *Hymns* could have been composed in the order in which they have been transmitted, and this would certainly suit your hypothesis of an organic collection.

May I raise two other matters which are relevant to the question of the *Hymns* as a meaningful collection? First, I wonder how highly Callimachus rated the importance of these poems within his oeuvre as a whole; were they a kind of *parergon* to the main poetic business? Secondly, I wave the possibility that the *Hymn to Athena* is elegiac because Callimachus originally conceived it as part of the *Aitia*; I note his use of the *Argolika* of Agias and Derkylos at least thrice in the great elegiac collection and the fact that the *Hymn to Athena* is apparently lacking in *POxy.* 2258A.

*R. Hunter:* On the first point, we cannot of course say how Callimachus regarded the different areas of his own work. At most, we can look to the reception of his work and note that, although he is – particularly, though not exclusively, for the Romans – the poet of the *Aitia* and the *Hecale*, the *Hymns* (and I am not just thinking of the end of the *Hymn to Apollo*) are echoed (*inter alios*) by Horace, Virgil, Propertius and, of course, Ovid; no sign there that they were regarded as of little importance.

As to the second point you make, that is a very interesting suggestion, but I would add three notes of caution. First, the Doric dialect of the poem certainly does not suggest the *Aitia*, whereas of course we have another hymn in precisely this linguistic form. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the fate of Teiresias suggests, though the poet does not make this explicit, why men should not see Athena naked or, more specifically, why Argive men should not look upon the statue of Athena while it is being bathed. As such, the story differs from the *aitia* in the *Aitia* both in not being *explicitly* aetiological of the cult at issue and in not being specifically tied to the area of the cult; indeed, Callimachus parades the fact that this is a Boeotian story told at an Argive cult. Viewed from this perspective, the structure

of cult and aetiological tale seems closer to the concerns of the *Hymns* ('How shall I hymn you?') than to the (apparently regular) pattern of the *Aitia*. We must, of course, always make allowance for the gaps in our knowledge of the *Aitia*, but the humour of that poem at the expense of aetiological structures seems to me to be rather different.

Finally, we cannot ignore the juxtaposition, whether it is to be traced to Callimachus or an 'editor', of the narratives of Teiresias and Erysichthon, two young men whose punishment also brings suffering to their mothers, but whose 'errors' seem morally worlds apart; this is a further demonstration of the power of the hymnist to shape his material (and our response to it), though it does, of course, 'prove' nothing about the original circumstances of composition. If the 'moral' of both stories — divine power — is the same, our response to them is quite different; everything lies, after all, in the telling, and Teiresias could so easily have been made a voyeuristic Actaion and Erysichthon a naïve woodcutter. Not dissimilar, perhaps, is the effect of the paired stories, quite different in tone and direction, in Theocritus' *Hymn to the Dioscuri* (*Idyll* 22): Polydeuces overcomes a rude bully, thus making the world a safer place, whereas Kastor appears to exercise a more random and purposeless violence against a polite young hero.

*M.A. Harder*: For juxtaposed stories which are very similar but also importantly different we may also think of the stories of Heracles and the Lindian peasant and Heracles and Theiodamas in *Aitia* 1.

*R. Hunter*: That is a very nice example. Thank you.

*S. Stephens*: Antecedents for Callimachus' hymns should not be restricted to Homeric and Pindaric collections that were known to him. Whether or not it has left a textual residue, there would still have been contemporary public performance of hymns for ritual occasions. Also, there are the near contemporary

examples of the hymnic form now detached from cult and, as in Aristotle's *Hymn to Arete* or Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*, already at a relatively high degree of abstraction. Another tradition that I think has been neglected is that of *Orphic Hymns*. Nor should we forget the admittedly late, but suggestive, *Hymns* of Isidorus, written to Isis, in hexameters and elegiacs and dated to the end of the first century BC. These display language in part derived from Homer and Hesiod. All these suggest that the hymnic form was quite fluid by the early Hellenistic period both for subject matter and style. (The *Hymn to Artemis* has something in common with Isis aretalogies, for example, with its many lists.) In this context writing Hymns need not be construed as antiquarian or a response to an obscure inheritance of the literary tradition, but an attempt to position appropriate divinities of the panhellenic pantheon in new contexts. Nor should one assume that novel elements that first appear in Callimachus are necessarily his invention.

*R. Hunter*: I entirely agree that the situation is complex, and there is much that we should know which we cannot; we by no means wished to limit Callimachus' 'models' to the Homeric and Pindaric collections. The Isidorus *Hymns* to which we drew specific attention are very suggestive.

*Th. Fuhrer*: I would like to confirm your statement that the hymnic form was something rather fluid from the perspective of poets like Callimachus and Theocritus. We even cannot be sure whether Callimachus would have called these six poems 'hymns' (the *Hymn to Apollo* might well be called a paean).

*P.J. Parsons*: Does the dissociation of myths from their original context and the 'cultic imagination' of which you speak correspond to the dissociation of (immigrant) Alexandrians from their native cities and a related willingness to accept an 'olde worlde' view of old Greece?

*R. Hunter:* There must indeed be something in this: Pollis is one kind of 'implied reader' for the *Aitia*, as Theogenes is another. I am, nevertheless, cautious (as I imagine Professor Parsons is) about grand theories of deracination and alienation, as they have been applied to Alexandrian Greeks of the early Ptolemaic period.

*P.J. Parsons:* As you mention 'implied readers', may I ask whether the meaning of the text is so transparent that it is really possible to treat the two questions about performance and audience which you raise as entirely separate: in other words, can we really use only 'the text' without certain assumptions about the knowledge and imagination of any contemporary audience, which must to some extent be a 'historical' question?

*R. Hunter:* I entirely accept the thrust of this question: for both writer and critic, all notions of 'implied audience' must to some extent be constructed on the basis of 'historical' experience and (in the case of the critic) judgement.

*Th. Fuhrer:* But of course there is a crucial difference between what critical theory calls the implied and the historic reader or audience: the implied audience is entirely inherent in the texts themselves.

*M.A. Harder:* For the so-called 'mimetic' hymns, we must also remember that the presence of *both* an audience within the poem *and* an 'implied audience' makes the situation particularly complex.

*P.J. Parsons:* On the division between man and god, the now long-established heroisation of the dead (e.g. Brasidas) and the tradition of paeans for the living (Lysander, Demetrius Poliorcetes etc.) is obviously of great importance. May I, however, ask whether it was your intention to suggest that we are to sense the sister-wife Arsinoe behind Artemis' access to the seat of power in Callimachus' *Hymn*?



R. Hunter: Yes. It seems to me very hard to see how one can avoid this sense in a world in which the 'real' rulers are brother and sister. Callimachus' divine sister has access to the ultimate source of power (Zeus), and can act as his agent in dealings with ordinary mortals; it would not have been difficult to think of parallel structures here on earth.

I should note that Michael Erler ("Das Recht ( $\Delta\text{IKH}$ ) als Segensbringerin für die Polis. Die Wandlung eines Motivs von Hesiod zu Kallimachos", in *SIFC* 80 [1987], 22-36) has suggested that, in the account of the goddess' punishment of the unjust and her corresponding blessings upon those whom she favours (*h.* 3.121-37) which is very obviously a rewriting of the description of the just and unjust cities in the *Works and Days* (225-47), the Callimachean Artemis is shaped in such a way as to appear "eine Art Vorbild und einen Spiegel für die Monarchin Ägyptens" (35): on her depends the fruitfulness of the land and the peace and prosperity of the people. The change from communal responsibility for prosperity, through the practice of justice, in Hesiod to a dependence upon the care and bounty of the ruler is, in Erler's reading, a measure of the ideological shift which the appropriation of certain Egyptian ideas of kingship had wrought. The idea is an attractive one, particularly if the hymn can be associated with Arsinoe, whose associations with Isis-Demeter, the bringer of fertility and agricultural prosperity, are well known, and in *Idyll* 17 Theocritus clearly depicts the Egypt of Arsinoe's brother-husband Philadelphus as the Hesiodic 'Just City' on a grand scale. Two cautionary footnotes to this important reading are, however, necessary.

First, it is true that, unlike Hesiod, Callimachus does not make explicit how men earn the god's favour, but it is in fact no large interpretative leap to understand from vv.122-3 that Artemis favours 'the just', and if it is correct to associate the damaging  $\delta\text{ι}\chi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\eta$  of v.133 with the  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\ \delta\text{ι}\chi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\eta\varsigma$  which are ended by Solon's  $\text{E}\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\eta$  (fr. 4.37), in a passage which itself rewrites the two cities of the *Works and Days*, it will be even clearer how one comes to enjoy Artemis' favour. It may be, moreover, that Callimachus wishes to create an association

between his Artemis and the Hesiodic Dike, another *parthenos* who sits with her father Zeus and tells him of the outrages of unjust men. Secondly, there is, unfortunately, very little evidence for Artemis' importance or association with Arsinoe at Alexandria, where the bliss of mutual marital affection was given a far higher status than Artemis' stern chastity. For some ambiguous evidence for the association of Arsinoe with Artemis on Delos cf. A. Plassart, *Les sanctuaires et les cultes du Mont Cynthe* (Paris 1928), 227-8. The earlier re-naming or re-foundation of Ephesos as 'Arsinoe' by Lysimachus (Strabo 14.1.21) perhaps made Arsinoe somewhat reluctant to stress her links with Artemis, once she was safely married to Ptolemy II. I must also stress that the date of the *Hymn to Artemis* is quite uncertain; C. Meil-lier, *Callimaque et son temps* (Lille 1979), 107-14 argues forcefully, but inconclusively, for a Cyrenean origin for the poem.

*P.J. Parsons:* Is there then no *Hymn to Aphrodite* (cf. *Collectanea Alexandrina* p.82) and no *Hymn to Sarapis* because these would be too obvious exploitations of the royal house and its ideology?

*R. Hunter:* That is an attractive inference, though of course the 'historical' explanation for the lack of such poems might be entirely different. As for a 'Hymn to Sarapis', I believe that our stress on the importance of Greek (literary) heritage in the writing of Callimachus' *Hymns* can help to explain why a 'Hymn to Sarapis' would have been an entirely different exercise than the six *Hymns* which we possess.

*S. Stephens:* I would say that the hymns are constructed to position familiar Greek gods in such a way that they may be seen to correspond to or share elements in common with the principal deities of pharaonic state cult. Hence Zeus, Apollo, and Delos all correspond to Horus in some measure and the three hymns to the goddesses, all of whom are *megalai theai*, can be understood as avatars of Isis. Moreover, the cults and myths

that are included for each deity are selected not so much for occasion but for viability of their myths in this new milieu. Hence, for Apollo we get Delos, Cyrene, and Delphi as the three cult sites most of interest for or relevant to the Ptolemies. This also, I think, accounts for the absence of a Sarapis hymn. Sarapis represents an attempt at syncretism that does not depend on panhellenic divinities — its direction is from solely Egyptian (Osiris, Apis) to a hybrid specifically reconstructed for Greek consumption. Callimachus approaches the problem from the opposite direction to move from panhellenic Greek to an intermediate position of Greek plus recognizable Egyptian elements. Herodotus, Hecataeus of Abdera, and Dionysius Scytobrachion all behave similarly in that they associate Egyptian divinities — Isis, Osiris, Horus — with the Olympic pantheon.

*P.J. Parsons:* One final point. Your view of the *Hymn to Zeus* is suggestive also for Cleanthes' *Hymn*: another revolutionary re-definition of the elemental god who defies ordinary hymnic technique.

*R. Hunter:* That is very interesting, and one could add in the stoicising hymn which opens Aratus' *Phainomena* as a further way of 'dealing with' the intractable Zeus.

*Cl. Calame:* La double intervention que l'on vient d'entendre le montre encore une fois clairement: pour une investigation sur la poétique alexandrine, aucun corpus transmis sous une même dénomination générique ne permet de mieux poser la question des genres et de leurs règles à la fois langagières et situationnelles que les *Hymnes* de Callimaque. Pour ne reprendre que l'exemple des deux poèmes commentés en parallèle (l'*Hymne au bain de Pallas* et l'*Hymne à Déméter*), l'aspect narratif qui rapproche ces deux compositions évoque à l'évidence le corpus des *Hymnes homériques*, et en particulier les quatre (ou cinq) poèmes qui, ouvrant pour nous cette collection, se distinguent par leur longueur en raison même du développement qu'y

connaît le récit. Dans cette mesure on pourrait supposer que les deux hymnes de Callimaque dont la narration est centrée sur un épisode unique de la biographie du dieu chanté reprennent la structure tripartite qui a été érigée par les critiques modernes comme le trait générique distinctif des *Hymnes homériques*: *evocatio* (brève présentation de la voix narrative dans une adresse indirecte à la divinité chantée) — *epica laus* (longue partie narrative en diction épique, introduite par le ‘relatif hymnique’) — *preces* (brève prière conclusive adressée directement à la divinité concernée dans un jeu de *do ut des*)<sup>1</sup>.

Or, même d’un point de vue structural qui devrait rendre la comparaison et l’étude des analogies particulièrement aisées, on constate que la partie d’*evocatio* de l’hymne que Callimaque consacre à *Déméter* consiste en fait en une suite d’indications rituelles adressées aux femmes honorant la déesse (un appel cultuel à Déméter est ainsi mis en abyme), avant qu’en guise d’introduction à la partie narrative la déesse ne soit invoquée (et non pas évoquée) directement. Quant à l’*Hymne au Bain de Pallas*, la même partie introductive d’ordre rituel occupe près de la moitié d’une composition qui, conformément à son titre, est moins focalisée sur l’éloge de la déesse que sur le culte dont sa statue est l’objet; sous la forme d’adresses répétées aux jeunes Argiennes honorant Athéna, l’*evocatio* s’y développe donc en une description du rituel qui va être accompli, chacune des phases qui le composent étant assortie d’un bref élément narratif d’ordre étiologique.

Aussi narratifs soient-ils, les deux derniers hymnes de Callimaque ne sauraient donc être assimilés à des *Hymnes homériques*. Du point de vue fonctionnel, ce ne sont pas non plus des proèmes à des récitations aédiques ou rhapsodiques qui, comme c’est le cas pour les *Hymnes homériques*, se dérouleraient en particulier à l’occasion du culte évoqué dans le poème. Non

<sup>1</sup> Voir les différentes études que j’ai mentionnées et commentées à ce propos dans “Variations énonciatives, relations avec les dieux et fonctions poétiques dans les *Hymnes homériques*”, in *MH* 52 (1995), 2-19.

contents d'assumer une couleur dialectale doriennne, sinon un rythme élégiaque, qui se distancie de l'usage lexical et formulaire de la diction homérique rhapsodique, ces deux hymnes de Callimaque brisent une loi essentielle du genre. En effet, dans les *Hymnes homériques* les plus longs, la géographie de l'épisode biographique auquel correspond le récit de l'*epica laus* présente une relation forte, d'ordre souvent étiologique, entre l'un des points d'appui du récit et l'un des lieux de culte de la divinité concernée: Eleusis pour Déméter, Délos et Delphes pour Apollon, le Mont Cylléné en Arcadie pour Hermès, Chypre pour Aphrodite. Or, dans les deux derniers hymnes de Callimaque, cette relation spatiale est l'objet d'une reformulation complète. Dans le poème adressé à Déméter, le rituel décrit est si composite qu'il est impossible de le mettre en relation avec un lieu précis, et dans le poème consacré au bain de Pallas, la relation spatiale entre le rituel argien et l'épisode narratif de Tirésias apercevant Athéna au bain sur l'Hélicon est si lâche qu'on a parfois parlé d'incohérence<sup>2</sup>. En fait, l'un et l'autre récits doivent être référés moins au rituel que chacun d'eux est censé commenter et légitimer qu'à l'exposition indirecte de l'un des principes fondant la poétique de Callimaque lui-même: dialectique de l'éloge et de la critique pour le poème adressé à Déméter, exactitude artisanale pour le poème consacré au bain de Pallas.

On pourrait formuler des observations semblables à propos des relations complexes que les *Hymnes* de Callimaque entretiennent avec les autres formes hymniques de la poésie classique: non seulement les hymnes poétiques d'adresse directe à une divinité tel le fr. 1 Voigt de Sappho, non seulement les formes cultuelles 'littéraires' tels les *Hymnes* et les *Péans* de Pindare ou les *Dithyrambes* de Bacchylide (formes dont les dénominations elles-mêmes montrent les difficultés d'une définition homogène en termes de genre poétique), mais surtout les hymnes dits

<sup>2</sup> Voir respectivement *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*. Ed. by N. HOPKINSON (Cambridge 1984), 32-43, et *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*. Ed. by A.W. BULLOCH (Cambridge 1985), 14-25.

‘épigraphiques’. Correspondant souvent à des péans en raison de leur consécration à Apollon, ces hymnes également poétiques décrivent en général la ‘performance’ (chorale?) dont ils sont l’objet en tant qu’actes de culte intégrés à la séquence des gestes rituels et des offrandes destinés au dieu chanté à une occasion précise, dans un sanctuaire particulier<sup>3</sup>. Ce sont en particulier ces indications d’ordre cultuel que Callimaque insère dans les plus ‘mimétiques’ de ses propres compositions hymniques pour reconstruire, par des moyens poétiques, les circonstances d’exécution rituelle dont étaient certainement coupés ces poèmes savants<sup>4</sup>. Par la combinaison de traits distinctifs empruntés à différentes formes hymniques traditionnelles, Callimaque crée donc un genre nouveau, un genre auto-référentiel, un genre conforme à sa propre poétique de poète érudit.

<sup>3</sup> Les relations entre ces hymnes de culte et les *Hymnes* de Callimaque sont explorées dans la thèse (à paraître) de M. VAMVOURI-RUFFY, *La fabrique du divin. Les Hymnes de Callimaque au carrefour des Hymnes homériques et des Hymnes épigraphiques* (Lausanne 2002).

<sup>4</sup> La question des hymnes ‘mimétiques’ de Callimaque est traitée avec clairvoyance par M.R. FALIVENE, “La mimesi in Callimaco: *Inni* II, IV, V, e VI”, in *QUCC* 65 (1990), 103-128.

