CALLIMACHUS' *HYMN TO ZEUS*

Recent work on Callimachus has tended to concentrate on the technicalities of his poetry. Commentaries on the *Hymns* have dealt exhaustively with vocabulary, metrics, Homeric allusion,[1] historical background. What remains to be done is to use these detailed pieces of work in readings of the individual poems, showing how the commentator's minutiae can be assimilated into an overall view of each hymn. In *Hellenistische Dichtung*[2] Wilamowitz attempted such an appreciation; but since his time literary approaches have changed considerably. With the thorough commentary of G. R. McLennan[3] as foundation, it may be worth while to make a re-assessment of the *Hymn to Zeus* in less technical terms. In the reading which I offer here I hope to escape the tyranny of the individual word; but I hope, too, that what I have to say will not appear too loosely founded on the text.

The poem begins with two questions. The first is rhetorical: 'At libations to Zeus whom should we rather sing than the god himself, always great, alway the Lord, router of the Mud-born, dispenser of justice to Those in Heaven?' This first hymn's[4] first word confirms the primacy of its subject; but what are the σπονδαί at which we honour him? The opening sentence, superficially so certain in its proclamation of omnipotence, raises in the reader's mind a doubt which the rest of the poem will not dispel. The roles of both poet (author? 'declaimer'? 'master of ceremonies'?) and reader ('audience'? 'participant'?) are left ill defined by this slight hint of 'mimesis'. Such role-manipulation forms an important part of Callimachus' poetic technique in these hymns. Here, contextually disorientated, we trip on the threshold. There will be no further clue.

The 'setting', then, is a (any?) symposium, a libation of thanksgiving to Zeus Soter. Through ἀείδειν (1) the poem typically proclaims itself as a hymn; line 2 adds another dimension to the concept of singing. At this point the repetition of 'always' might seem mere convention; but at 8 f. we learn that the Cretans allege that Zeus is dead. On the contrary, Zeus lives 'for ever'; and ἀεί (2), repeating the first two syllables of ἀείδειν (1), suggests that his immortality is gained through song, and in particular through this song.[5] Already in these opening lines the rhythm is repetitive, balanced, secure: after ἀεὶ μέγαν, αἰὲν ἄνακτα (2) resounds Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον Οὐρανίδῃσι (3), a line which contrasts through precise chiasmus benignity and vengeance, the heights of heaven and earth's lowest mire. Later we shall be surprised to note that this hymn stresses only the milder aspects of Zeus' nature.

---

[1] Usually in a rather mechanical way. A notable exception is A. W. Bulloch, 'Callimachus' *Erysichthon*, Homer and Apollonius Rhodius', *AJPh* 98 (1977), 97 ff.

[2] U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung* 2 (Berlin, 1924), 1 ff.

[3] *Callimachus. Hymn to Zeus. Introduction and Commentary* (Rome, 1977). Similar in scope, but less detailed, is D. W. Tandy, 'Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus: Introduction and Commentary' (diss. Yale, 1979).

[4] I intend to discuss elsewhere the order of the six hymns. There is no evidence to suggest that we have not the poet's own arrangement.

[5] A similar point is implied at Theoc. 16. 1. ff. (cf. *h. Hom.* 10. 1 ff.):
αἰεὶ τοῦτο Διὸς κούραις μέλει, αἰὲν ἀοιδοῖς,
ὑμνεῖν ἀθανάτους, ὑμνεῖν ἀγαθῶν κλέα ἀνδρῶν.
Μοῖσαι μὲν θεαὶ ἐντί, θεοὺς θεαὶ ἀείδοντι·
ἄμμες δὲ βροτοὶ οἵδε, βροτοὺς βροτοὶ ἀείδωμεν.

The first three lines, interrogative in tone, have established a doubt and a certainty: doubt over the particular (or generalized) setting παρὰ σπονδῆσιν contrasts with traditional hymnic complacency in divine omnipotence. A second question now reinforces the mood of doubt: should we speak of Zeus as Cretan or Arcadian by birth? Similar questions, where the poet or worshipper affects inability to choose which cult-title he should employ to address a multivalent deity, are a hymnic *topos*:[6] here we see a conversion of conventional ἀπορία into 'genuine' doubt on a question of fact. The passage is modelled on the opening lines of the fragmentary *h. Hom.* 1 (to Dionysus);[7] but line 5 is a 'corrected' (?) quotation of a line which Antagoras had applied to Eros in a similar hymnic context of doubtful lineage.[8] Time and again in Hellenistic verse verbal allusion is given an extra significance by reference to the original context.

The syntactical parallelism, which has hitherto reinforced certainty, now reflects division. After the easy balance of lines 2–3 come a rhyming pair of alternatives, this time mutually exclusive (Δικταῖον, Λυκαῖον 4); ἐν δοιῇ and ἀμφήριστον (5) emphasize the point. There follow two pairs of lines linked in opposition by anaphora (Ζεῦ/Ζεῦ ~ Κρῆτες/Κρῆτες 6–9). Note the subtle texture of literary cross-reference: Antagoras' γένος (5) echoed by *h. Hom.* 1. 5's γενέσθαι (6), Call.'s ἐψεύσαντο (7) by Epimenides' ψεῦσται (8).[9] A neat allusion exploits and elaborates the opening sentiment: the concept of 'always', repeated from 1 ff., is used not only to confirm Zeus' immortality, but to damn the wretched Cretans as 'ever liars' (note, too, ἄνακτα 2 ~ ὦ ἄνα 8).

Since Cretans are liars, Callimachus will dispense with the myth of Zeus' Cretan ancestry: the doubts of 5–7 are dispelled. The surface meaning is clear enough; but what of the details? In line 7 Zeus, piquantly addressed as πάτερ during a discussion of his own birth, is asked not which faction is telling the truth, but which nation are liars; the importance of Callimachus' phraseology will become apparent later. At once we hear the answer: "Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται", a quotation from Epimenides. But who speaks these words? Callimachus? Epimenides himself? Or Zeus replying on his own behalf? We cannot be sure: as with παρὰ σπονδῆσιν (1), there is not enough information to decide. The result is an isolation of these three words within the text: firmly united in sense with the surrounding lines, they stand out as foreign even to the reader unfamiliar with Epimenides' dictum.

[6] cf. *h. Ap.* 19, A. *Ag.* 783 ff., Ar. *Pax* 520 ff.

[7]   οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνῳ σ', οἱ δ' Ἰκάρῳ ἠνεμοέσσῃ
       φάσ', οἱ δ' ἐν Νάξῳ, δῖον γένος εἰραφιῶτα,
       οἱ δέ σ' ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ ποταμῷ βαθυδινήεντι
       κυσαμένην Σεμέλην τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ,
       ἄλλοι δ' ἐν Θήβῃσιν ἄναξ σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι
       ψευδόμενοι· σὲ δ' ἔτικτε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε...

[8] Antag. fr. 1. 1 p. 120 Powell
       ἐν δοιῇ μοι θυμός, ἐπεὶ γένος ἀμφίσβητον (Meineke: ἀμφιβόητον codd.),
       ἤ σε θεῶν τὸν πρῶτον ἀειγενέων, Ἔρος, εἴπω,
       τῶν ὅσσους Ἔρεβός τε πάλαι βασίλειά τε παῖδας
       γείνατο Νὺξ πελάγεσσιν ὑπ' εὐρέος Ὠκεανοῖο·
       ἤ σέ γε Κύπριδος υἷα περίφρονος, ἠέ σε Γαίης,
       ἤ Ἀνέμων· τοῖος σὺ κακὰ φρονέων ἀλάλησαι
       ἀνθρώποις ἠδ' ἐσθλά· τὸ καὶ σέο δῶμα δίφυιον.
    Note, too, ἀειγενέων (2) ~ ἐσσὶ γὰρ αἰεί Call. *h.* 1. 9.

[9] Epimen. fr. 5 Kinkel Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί. It is interesting to note that Epimenides' line is itself a parody of Hes. *Th.* 26, ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον, the Muses' opening address to Hesiod.

Popular etymology connected Ζεύς with ζῆν, the oblique cases with διά:[10] thus e.g. [Arist.] *Mu.* 401 a 13 καλοῦμεν αὐτὸν καὶ Ζῆνα καὶ Δία...ὡς ἂν εἰ δι' ὃν ζῶμεν. The link may underlie σὺ δ' οὐ θάνες, ἐσσὶ γὰρ αἰεί (9), where Callimachus echoes the Homeric clausula θεοὺς αἰὲν ἐόντας (*Il.* 1. 494, *al.*) in asserting Zeus' immortality. As Wilamowitz observes,[11] this assertion of eternal existence makes a 'naïve' contradiction to the birth-narrative of which it forms a part.

Instead of tacitly rejecting alternative accounts in order to concentrate on one particular myth, this hymn has brought the selection process out into the open. Having finally made his choice of myth, Callimachus begins the Arcadian birth-narrative at line 10: the goddess Rhea bore Zeus in a densely wooded part of Parrhasia. No woman or animal in labour is allowed there now; and the place is known to the inhabitants as 'Rhea's erstwhile childbed'. This is the first of several aetiologies in the hymn. In Hellenistic poetry such passages are often dismissed as learned excrescences foreign to modern taste; but two points, one general and one particular to this hymn, deserve to be made. (i) Aetiologizing, especially in mythological contexts, was more than a learned game: it provided a link between past and present highly valued in Greek society. Within a hymn its importance is even greater: aetiology points to visible manifestations of divine activity, rationalizes ritual, accounts comfortably for existence, dispels doubt by producing final causes;[12] its deep appeal should not be under-estimated. That aetiologizing became a Hellenistic affectation was partly a result of the Alexandrian Greeks' delight in obscure detail; but we must assess each case on its merits. So (ii) how do aetiologies work in this particular hymn? Perhaps resolution of doubt can be achieved in ways other than (in the case of Zeus' birth) the simple choice between alternatives. Aetiologies 'prove' the truth of *this* poet's assertions on the origin of Zeus by an appeal to names and places still in existence. And what of the implicit references to word-derivation sprinkled throughout the poem? Are not these, too, reassuring points of fixity in the text, pinning down precise meaning, ἐτυμολογία, by a neat, internal reference? This hymn is largely concerned with truth and lies: αἴτια, or the origins of objects, and etymologizing, or the origins of words, provide a satisfying and demonstrable truth. Perhaps that is why they are generally considered 'unpoetic': the ποι-ητής, it seems, is happier to lie, ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα.

Some points of detail. (i) McLennan is probably right to see an inverted sexual allusion in γυνὴ ἐπιμίσγεται (13), μίγνυσθαι being a common euphemism for sexual union. (ii) Note the recondite Ἀπιδανῆες (14) = Arcadians: in view of what follows it seems that Callimachus is hinting at a derivation from ἀ-πίνειν.[13]

After giving birth Rhea was at a loss because she could find no water in which to wash her infant: all the rivers of Arcadia were as yet subterranean. I have argued elsewhere[14] that an undercurrent of etymologizing on the name of Rhea is discoverable in this passage: ῥόον ὕδατος (16),[15] ἔρρεεν (18) and Ῥέη (21) point the paradox that

---

[10] See O. Weinreich, 'Menekrates Zeus und Salmoneus', *Tübinger Beiträge* 18 (1933), 105 ff. = *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Darmstadt, 1968), pp. 409 ff., West on Hes. *Op.* 3.

[11] *Hell. Dicht.* p. 12.

[12] On pre-Callimachean aetiology see G. Codrignani, 'L' "aition" nella poesia greca prima di Callimaco', *Convivium* n.s. 26 (1958), 527–45. One need look no further than the closing passages of Euripides' plays for ample evidence that the aetiological link was highly regarded.

[13] See F. von Jan (de Ian) 'De Callimacho Homeri interprete' (diss. Strassburg, 1893), 80 n. 1; Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* 6 n. 4.

[14] 'Rhea in Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*', *JHS* (forthcoming).

[15] A linguistic parallel overlooked by McLennan: *AP* 9. 679. 3 (anon.) ἔξοχα δὲ κραναῇ ῥόον ὕδατος ὤπασεν Ἄσσῳ,/πολλῶν πετράων σκληρὰ μέτωπα τεμών.

a goddess named from flowing water (᾿Ρεία) was unable to find even a spring.[16] One wonders whether the choice of δίζητο (Δι-, Ζη-) is entirely coincidental.

On 18 ff. McLennan comments, 'The next few lines constitute a digression which allows Callimachus to display his geographical erudition. He was, of course, the author of a περὶ ποταμῶν (fr. 457). Such digressions are a feature of Callimachus' style in the Hymns (cf. Diehl, Der Digressionsstil des Kallimachos).' A predictable reaction; but there is surely more to say. Why dismiss as digressive a passage so perfectly integrated in style, conception and manner with the poem as a whole? Is there to be no criterion of unity but narrative coherence, smoothness of transition, presence of 'plot'? An overall view of this hymn must take into prime account a denominator common to all its formally heterogeneous and disproportionate elements: it is the 'style', a unique combination of learning and 'naïveté', apparent lucidity and unobtrusive internal and external allusion, which helps to make this poem coherent, satisfying, 'whole'. No other Greek poet ever wrote in this way.

Like Arcadia with its underground streams, this portion of the text conceals things not apparent to the casual observer. (i) Erymanthus is 'the whitest of rivers' (19); soon we shall hear of Μέλας, its polar opposite. (ii) At 25–6 we find a pair of anatomical opposites: a man on foot (πεζός 26) passes thirstily over rivers whose names suggest head and brow (Κρᾶθιν, Μετώπην 26). (iii) ᾿Αζηνίς (20) neatly implies both ἄζα, 'dryness', and Ζην-:[17] no Zeus, no water. (iv) διερός (24) is commonly associated with Δι-.[18]

In her desperation Rhea addressed the earth, saying, 'Dear Earth, do you give birth too: your birth-pangs are not hard'. She struck the mountainside with her sceptre, and the blow caused a great spring to well up. Here she washed her child and handed it to the ancient nymph Neda for secret rearing. In honour of Neda the new spring (and its river) were named after her: it is still to be seen flowing past the Cauconian town of Lepreum (28–41). In this passage we see a second birth, this time of a spring/river: the parallel is pointed by Rhea's words Γαῖα φίλη, τέκε καὶ σύ· τεαὶ δ᾿ ὠδῖνες ἐλαφραί (29), a fascinatingly dissonant combination of Homeric allusions: Odysseus' address to his nurse (μαῖα φίλη Od. 20. 129, al.) and the last words of Achilles to Lycaon (Il. 21. 106 ἀλλά, φίλος, θάνε καὶ σύ) join with a proverbial reference[19] to the earth's productivity, an oxymoron (ὠδῖνες ἐλαφραί) and perhaps an elaborate pun on Γαῖα = ᾿Ρεία/ἐλαφραί = ῥεῖα (adverb).[20] The three following lines continue to exploit the Iliadic context:[21] the goddess's arm is raised to strike (not a deadly, but) a birth-dealing blow which produces from the wound not blood, but water. With another repetition of the Δι- root (τὸ δέ οἱ δίχα πουλὺ διέστη 31) the waters break from Gaia's gaping wound:[22] what is normally a prelude to birth is here the birth itself. The medical allusion is hardly out of place in a passage so concerned with anatomical detail. Gaia's 'big' chasm produces a 'big' river, as we learn from

---

[16] Cf. Leont. AP 9. 650. 3 τούς ῥα θεησάμενος καὶ τῷδ᾿ ἐνὶ χρῶτα λοέσσας/δεῦρο καὶ ἄμπνευσον δαιτὶ παρ᾿ ἡμετέρῃ.

[17] Wilamowitz, Hell. Dicht. 6, McLennan ad loc.

[18] See F. J. Williams, 'ΔΙΕΡΟΣ: further ramifications', MPhilLond 5 (1981), 84 ff., 89 n. 18.

[19] A commonplace: cf. e.g. Men. et Phil. Σύγκρισις 1. 112 p. 92 Jäkel ἡ γῆ τόκους δίδωσι μὴ λυπουμένη·/ἀπὸ γῆς ἔφυ τὰ πάντα κεἰς γῆν οἴχεται.

[20] See McLennan ad loc. for details. ᾿Ελαφρός was an epithet of Zeus in Crete according to Hsch. ε 1922 s.v.

[21] See A. Griffiths, JHS 101 (1981), 160.

[22] Release of the amniotic fluid was of course well known as a prelude to birth: Hp. Virg. 8 (vol. 8, p. 480 Littré), [Arist.] HA 586b32 ff., ibid. 586a30, Gal. de usu part. lib. 15 (vol. 4, p. 236 Kühn).

38, where τὸ μέν ποθι πουλὺ κατ᾽ αὐτό echoes in words and rhythm 31 τὸ δέ οἱ δίχα πουλὺ διέστη. These words for 'big', picking up πολλάς/-άς/-ά/-όν (22, 23, 24, 27), contribute cumulatively to an impression of immense size, suitable for Zeus, king of gods; they contrast, too, with the small scale of the poem. Note (i) κευθμόν (34) is a Homeric ἅπ. λεγ.; with κρύφα Callimachus probably suggests derivation from κεύθειν.[23] (ii) After λευκότατος ποταμῶν (19) and its opposite Μέλας (23) we find 36 Στύγα τε Φιλύρην τε, suggesting στυγεῖν ∼ φιλεῖν. (iii) Λυκαονίης ἄρκτοιο (41): the Arcadian section ends with an animal paradox which forms a spondeiazon of very unusual rhythm (– ‖ – – ×). (iv) πίνουσι (41) refers back to the etymology of ᾽Απιδανῆες (14): the Arcadians, who were formerly 'non-drinkers', now drink the waters of Neda.

A topographical sleight-of-hand shifts the narrative to Crete, the more commonly recognized location for Zeus' birth: places called Thenae existed in both Crete and Arcadia, and Call. is careful to point this fact with an explanatory parenthesis, delayed for momentary ambiguity.[24] This section of the hymn is concerned largely with aetiology and definition of roles: the Omphalian plain was so called because Zeus' umbilical cord fell to earth there; the baby god was dandled by the Corybants and lulled to sleep in his cradle by Nemesis; the goat Amalthaea provided his milk; the bees of Panacra suddenly appeared in order to supply him with nourishing honeycomb; and the Curetes performed a loud war-dance to prevent Cronus from hearing the infant's cries.

This, the central passage or ὀμφαλός of the hymn, is a quintessentially Callimachean piece of work, typifying many characteristics of the poet's art. (i) Whilst referring to two places named Thenae, Callimachus presents two forms of the word 'Cnossus', and in addition varies the prosody before each (42 ἐπὶ Κνωσοῖο ∼ 43 ἐγγύθι Κνωσοῦ). Although the double variation is particularly noticeable, this technique is at work throughout the hymn: Callimachus is playing with traditional dialectal variants of the epic language to produce a new, self-conscious style which exploits even morphological and prosodic resources for literary effect.[25] (ii) The vocative Ζεῦ πάτερ (43) not only contrasts with the narrative of Zeus as baby: its formal dignity (reminiscent of Ζεῦ πάτερ, ᾽Ίδηθεν μεδέων, κύδιστε, μέγιστε, *Il.* 3. 276, *al.*) is incongruously juxtaposed with the anatomical detail of falling navel-string, itself given a learned twist through aetiology of the Omphalian plain. (iii) Zeus' nursing and nourishment provide more mythological detail, culminating in the sudden and spontaneous production of honeycomb by the bees of Panacra. Variation and repetition of the phrase 'Idaean mountains' from line 6 (οὔρεσιν ᾽Ιδαίοισιν 6 ∼ ᾽Ιδαίοις ἐν ὄρεσσι 51) implies that Neda's transportation represents an attempt to reconcile the two birth-stories. (iv) The concluding anecdote is one of deception, this time of hearing rather than sight (the underground rivers). Three ponderous verbs, all – – – × (ὠρχήσαντο 52, πεπλήγοντο 53, κουρίζοντος 54), reproduce the heavy tread of men in armour; and this section, like the last, ends with the distinctive rhythm of a spondeiazon incorporating a verbal play (κουρίζοντος 54 ∼ Κούρητες 52).

[23] Cf. Σ A.R. 3. 1213 p. 253 Wendel κευθμῶν· τῶν κρυφῶν, EM 507. 1, Hsch. κ 93, Suid. κ 1438 (vol. 3, p. 104 Adler).

[24] See A. Griffiths, 'Six Passages in Callimachus and the Anthology', *BICS* 17 (1970), 32 f., G. Arnott, 'Two Functions of Ambiguity in Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus', *RCCM* 18 (1976), 13 ff.

[25] 2 ἀεί ∼ αἰέν ∼ 9 αἰεί; 4 νιν ∼ 40 μιν; 6 ᾽Ιδαίοισιν ἐν οὔρεσι ∼ 51 ᾽Ιδαίοις ἐν ὄρεσσι; 8 ὦ ἄνα ∼ 33 ὦνα; 10 ῾Ρείη ∼ 21 ῾Ρέη; 17 χρῶτα ∼ 32 χρόα; 30 θεά (?) ∼ 37 θεή; 43 ἔσαν ∼ 60 ἦσαν; 45 κλείουσι ∼ 51 καλέουσι; 64 τόσσον ∼ ὅσον; 67 κάρτος ∼ 75 κρατέοντος; 70 εἷλεο ∼ 73 ἐξέλεο; 81 πτολίεθρα ∼ 82 πολίεσσιν.

With a swiftness characteristic of gods' growth[26] the young Zeus shoots to maturity. Nice variations of mood ($\eta\epsilon\xi\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\varsigma$ 55), of adverb and adjective ($\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ 55, $\overset{\backepsilon}{o}\xi\acute{v}$ 56, $\tau\alpha\chi\iota\nu o\acute{\iota}$ 56), of subject (-$\epsilon\varsigma$, -$\alpha\varsigma$ ~ -$o\nu$) and of prosody ($\kappa\bar{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, $\kappa\bar{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}$) complement his 'fair' growth; an allusion to Hesiod[27] increases the literary resonance; and the epithet $o\mathring{v}\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\epsilon$ looks forward to the following lines: supernatural speed of growth was matched by effortless and unlimited power, so that Zeus' elder brothers did not begrudge him the $o\mathring{v}\rho\alpha\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (59) as his habitation.

There follows another piece of polemic: Callimachus inveighs against the $\delta\eta\nu\alpha\iota o\acute{\iota}$ $\mathring{\alpha}o\iota\delta o\acute{\iota}$ who assert that Zeus acquired heaven by lot rather than as rightful token of his supremacy. Not only is their version a lie – it is an incredible lie, one unlikely to convince an audience. 'Let me at least lie persuasively', says Callimachus: $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta o\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\nu$ $\mathring{\alpha}\acute{\iota}o\nu\tau o\varsigma$ $\mathring{\alpha}$ $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\theta o\iota\epsilon\nu$ $\mathring{\alpha}\kappa o\upsilon\acute{\eta}\nu$ (65). 'The poet as liar' is a *topos* dating back at least to Hesiod;[28] and this whole passage is sprinkled with Hesiodic references. Foremost among the unnamed $\delta\eta\nu\alpha\iota o\acute{\iota}$ $\mathring{\alpha}o\iota\delta o\acute{\iota}$ is Homer, who at *Il.* 15. 187 ff. narrates the allotment of heaven, seas and underworld (Hesiod's account is closer to Call.).[29] More important, these lines constitute open discussion of a theme which has been present from the beginning of the poem: $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta o\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\nu$ (65) hearkens back to $K\rho\mathring{\eta}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\mathring{\alpha}\epsilon\mathring{\iota}$ $\psi\epsilon\mathring{v}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ (8), while $\mathring{\alpha}\acute{\iota}o\nu\tau o\varsigma$ and $\mathring{\alpha}\kappa o\upsilon\acute{\eta}\nu$ echo the sounds of deception at 53 f. ($\mathring{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $K\rho\acute{o}\nu o\varsigma$ $o\mathring{v}\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ $\mathring{\eta}\chi\mathring{\eta}\nu/\mathring{\alpha}\sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\delta o\varsigma$ $\epsilon\mathring{\iota}\sigma\alpha\mathring{\iota}o\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\mathring{\iota}$ $\mu\mathring{\eta}$ $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}o$ $\kappa o\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta o\nu\tau o\varsigma$). Deception of the eyes and ears (hidden waters, lies, clashing shields) is a relatively simple matter; but what of the poetic art, which has just described all these things – is not that, too, a form of deception? In context, line 65 can mean 'When I *do* lie, I hope to perform better than that!'; but when we remember Odysseus' words to Penelope[30] and, more suggestively, the Muses' address to Hesiod,[31] we cannot but note an alternative translation 'May my "lies", my poetry, be good, satisfying, "real".' The stuff of poetry is not 'truth', but artistic integrity, the convincing presentation of a set of facts or emotions adopted for a particular occasion.[32] Whether or not Callimachus believes in the Zeus he here represents, and, if he did, whether he believed these particular myths of his birth and portion to be the true ones – these questions are as irrelevant as they are unanswerable. The poem's 'truth' lies in the success of its illusion, in a satisfying working out of themes and ideas. One important theme of this hymn is lies and deception, on both factual and artistic levels. We shall do well to bear this in mind through the following lines.

Two points of detail. (i) Having mentioned the deception of Cronus at 52 ff., Callimachus makes oblique references to his sons' inheritance with the rare plural $K\rho o\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\sigma\iota$ (61), followed immediately by $\underline{\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\iota\chi\alpha}$, another instance of the play on Zeus' name. (ii) '$\nu\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\eta\lambda o\varsigma$... kann nur aus der Kindersprache stammen':[33] a nursery-

---

[26] See Richardson on *h. Cer.* 235, cl. *h. Ap.* 127 ff., *h. Merc.* 17 ff., *h. Hom.* 26. 5, Hes. *Th.* 492 f., Q.S. 6. 205 ff., *al.*

[27] Hes. *Th.* 492 f. (Zeus) $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\varsigma$ δ' $\mathring{\alpha}\rho$' $\mathring{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu o\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\mathring{\iota}$ $\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\mu\alpha$ $\gamma\upsilon\mathring{\iota}\alpha/\underline{\eta\mathring{v}\xi\epsilon\tau o}$ $\tau o\mathring{\iota}o$ $\mathring{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\tau o\varsigma$.

[28] See McLennan ad loc., Norden on V. *Aen.* 6. 14.

[29] For accounts of the allotment see Pease on Cic. *ND* 2. 66 (p. 719).

[30] *Od.* 19. 203
$\mathring{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon$ $\psi\epsilon\acute{v}\delta\epsilon\alpha$ $\pi o\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha}$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ $\mathring{\epsilon}\tau\acute{v}\mu o\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\mathring{o}\mu o\iota\alpha$·
$\tau\mathring{\eta}\varsigma$ δ' $\mathring{\alpha}\rho$' $\mathring{\alpha}\kappa o\upsilon o\acute{v}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\mathring{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon$ $\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\alpha$, $\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\tau o$ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ $\chi\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma$.

[31] Hes. *Th.* 27 f.
$\mathring{\iota}\delta\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\psi\epsilon\acute{v}\delta\epsilon\alpha$ $\pi o\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha}$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\mathring{\epsilon}\tau\acute{v}\mu o\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\mathring{o}\mu o\iota\alpha$,
$\mathring{\iota}\delta\mu\epsilon\nu$ δ', $\epsilon\mathring{v}\tau$' $\mathring{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\mathring{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ $\gamma\eta\rho\acute{v}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

[32] Hence too much stress should not be placed on fr. 612 $\mathring{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\rho o\nu$ $o\mathring{v}\delta\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\mathring{\alpha}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$, whose context we lack.

[33] Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* 13.

word in a hymn dealing largely with Zeus' infancy (but here with his maturity) encapsulates the silliness of those who relate the story of allotment.

It was Zeus' might which gave him supremacy in heaven – a might confirmed by his patronage of the eagle, king of birds, and of earthly rulers. Other occupations he leaves to the lesser gods:[34] but kings belong to Zeus,[35] who watches over their actions and notes who is just and who unjust. This transition to the subject of kings is made in a passage which again owes much to Hesiod. σή τε βίη τό τε κάρτος (67) are borrowed from *Th.* 385 ff.;[36] Zeus' patronage of rulers not only agrees with *Th.* 96 (quoted verbatim), but contradicts the Homeric account at *Il.* 13. 730 ff.;[37] and 82 ff. contain several reminiscences of *Op.* 256 ff.[38] The effect of these allusions: (i) Appeal to factual authority: these are not new-fangled sentiments, but well-proven articles of faith propounded by a most reliable archaic source. (ii) Appeal to literary authority: Callimachus is using elements of the Hesiodic tradition of short, 'naïf', learned mythological poetry in his hymn rather than the extended narrative form of the hymns attributed to Homer. (iii) In view of the stress on ὄλβος and ἄφενος in the following lines, we must note carefully the context of Callimachus' verbatim quotation from the *Theogony*. The subject of *Th.* 94 ff. is not Zeus, but the poet's relationship to the Muses and Apollo, and his role as hymner of the gods:

> ἐκ γάρ τοι Μουσέων καὶ ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
> ἄνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ κιθαρισταί,
> ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες· ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὅντινα Μοῦσαι
> φίλωνται· γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή.
> εἰ γάρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέι θυμῷ
> ἄζηται κραδίην ἀκαχημένος, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς
> Μουσάων θεράπων κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων
> ὑμνήσει μάκαράς τε θεοὺς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν,
> αἶψ' ὅ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται, οὐδέ τι κηδέων
> μέμνηται· ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.

[34] Cf. *tr. adesp.* F 353 K.-S. Ζεὺς γὰρ τὰ μὲν τοιαῦτα φροντίζει βροτῶν,/τὰ μικρὰ δ' ἄλλοις δαίμοσιν παρεὶς ἐᾷ.

[35] For a long discussion of the peculiar sanctity of kings see Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *c.* 1. 12. 50.

[36] (Styx)
> καὶ Κράτος ἠδὲ Βίην ἀριδείκετα γείνατο τέκνα.
> τῶν δ' οὐκ ἔστ' ἀπάνευθε Διὸς δόμος, οὐδέ τις ἕδρη
> οὐδ' ὁδὸς ὅππη μὴ κείνοις θεὸς ἡγεμονεύει,
> ἀλλ' αἰεὶ πὰρ Ζηνὶ βαρυκτύπῳ ἑδριόωνται.

[37] For *Th.* 96 see below; *Il.* 13. 730 ff.
> ἄλλῳ μὲν γὰρ δῶκε θεὸς πολεμήια ἔργα,
> ἄλλῳ δ' ὀρχηστύν, ἑτέρῳ κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδήν,
> ἄλλῳ δ' ἐν στήθεσσι τίθει νόον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
> ἐσθλόν, τοῦ δέ τε πολλοὶ ἐπαυρίσκοντ' ἄνθρωποι,
> καί τε πολέας ἐσάωσε, μάλιστα δὲ καὐτὸς ἀνέγνω.

[38]
> ἡ δέ τε παρθένος ἐστὶ Δίκη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
> κυδρή τ' αἰδοίη τε θεοῖς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν.
> καί ῥ' ὁπότ' ἄν τίς μιν βλάπτῃ σκολιῶς ὀνοτάζων,
> αὐτίκα πὰρ Διὶ πατρὶ καθεζομένη Κρονίωνι
> γηρύετ' ἀνθρώπων ἄδικον νόον, ὄφρ' ἀποτείσῃ
> δῆμος ἀτασθαλίας βασιλέων οἳ λυγρὰ νοεῦντες
> ἄλλη παρκλίνωσι δίκας σκολιῶς ἐνέποντες.
> ταῦτα φυλασσόμενοι, βασιλῆς, ἰθύνετε μύθους,
> δωροφάγοι, σκολιέων δὲ δικέων ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθεσθε.
Cf., too, *Op.* 7 f. ῥεῖα δέ τ' ἰθύνει σκολιὸν καὶ ἀγήνορα κάρφει/Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης.

Although not directly patronized by Zeus (71) – though he may well enjoy the support of Ptolemy – the poet already has wealth in abundance: ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὅντινα Μοῦσαι φίλωνται.

Three times the poet lists inferior 'occupations': 70–1, sailors, warrior, poet favoured by Zeus; 74–5 farmer, soldier, sailor all ruled by kings, themselves ruled by Zeus; 76–8 smiths, warriors, huntsmen and poets have their own patrons, while kings belong to Zeus. This repetition of similar matter with elegant, periphrastic variation[39] (i) constitutes a wider form of anaphora, a hymnic technique with which we are familiar from the opening lines; (ii) shows (what should hardly need remarking) that 'the narrative has a literary momentum separate from its declared religious theme':[40] the poet, λύρης οἴμους εὖ εἰδώς, requires Apollo's patronage to sing even the mightiest god.

To all kings Zeus gives wealth, but to some more than to others: witness Ptolemy,[41] whose will is fulfilled as soon as thought. Some rulers are slow to achieve their aims; others are quite frustrated and ruined by Zeus (84–90). As the poem nears its close, the 'polarized' style of the opening lines reasserts itself: ἐν δὲ... ἐν δ' (84); πᾶσι μέν, οὐ μάλα δ' ἴσον (85); ἑσπέριος... νοήσῃ (87)/ἑσπέριος... νοήσῃ (88), with anaphora and homoeoteleuton; αὐτὸς ἄνην ἐκόλουσας, ἐνέκλασσας δὲ μενοινήν (90), with a similar chiastic arrangement to 3 Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον Οὐρανίδῃσι. In rhythm, this section looks forward to the crescendo of 91–6; but it forms, too, the final twist of important thematic strands. (i) Covert references to earlier poetry, recondite allusions to myth and etymology, the secret upbringing of Zeus, the hidden rivers of Parrhasia – at last we see that another figure has lurked unseen beneath this text, another all-powerful ruler to be *covertly* praised and *indirectly* proclaimed. The hymn began with doubt; but here, now, is certainty: Ptolemy[42] is a great ruler, favoured by Zeus and mighty above all other men. It is probably a mistake to attempt to identify particular historical events in the narrative of this hymn;[43] but Ptolemy has been present in spirit, if not in deed, throughout the latter half of the poem. No amount of overt flattery could have had the effect of this subtle identification. (ii) Ease and immediacy of action are characteristic of gods:[44] in the Zeus-narrative note 50 γέντο γὰρ ἐξαπιναῖα Πανακρίδος ἔργα μελίσσης, 56 ὀξὺ δ' ἀνήβησας, ταχινοὶ δέ τοι ἦλθον ἴουλοι, and especially 57 ἀλλ' ἔτι παιδνὸς ἐὼν ἐφράσσαο πάντα τέλεια. Ptolemy, too, has the power immediately to fulfil his wishes: ἑσπέριος κεῖνός γε τελεῖ τά κεν ἦρι νοήσῃ (87).

The final line of this section (90), whose construction has already been referred to above, is a typically Callimachean piece of heterogeneous allusion.[45] (i) ἄνη is found only at A. *Th.* 713 and Alcm. *PMG* 1. 83. (ii) μενοινή appears to be a Hellenistic coinage. (iii) κολούω is a Homeric ἅπ. λεγ. As so often with Callimachus, we should

---

[39] ἀοιδόν 71 ~ λύρης εὖ εἰδότας οἴμους 78; νηῶν ἐμπεράμους 70 f. ~ ἐρέτης 75; ἄνδρα σακέσπαλον 71 ~ ἴδρις αἰχμῆς 74 ~ τευχηστάς 77.

[40] Bulloch art. cit. (n. 1) 113 (in his discussion of *h.* 6).

[41] ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι (86): McLennan compares ἡμετέρῳ βασιλῆι at *h.* 2. 68, where Williams does not cite Tyrt. fr. 5. 1 (or Pantel. fr. 23. 2, vol 1, p. 81 Heitsch) for the identical words.

[42] If Carrière is right, the poem's opening libation to Zeus Soter is an allusion to the quasi-divinity of Ptolemy Soter: 'Philadelphe ou Sôtêr? A propos d'un hymne de Callimaque', *StudClas* 11 (1969), 85–93.

[43] See W. Meincke, 'Untersuchungen zu den enkomiastischen Gedichten Theokrits' (diss. Kiel, 1965), 167 ff., P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 2. 915 n. 284. Lines 57–9 are commonly taken to refer to the accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus in preference to his older brothers; but 'the difficulties, both historical and literary, are formidable' (Fraser, loc. cit.).

[44] Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *c.* 1. 12. 31, Friis Johansen & Whittle on A. *Supp.* 598.

[45] Cf. W. Clausen, 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry', *GRBS* 5 (1964), 183.

note context as well as rarity-value: at *Il.* 20. 369 f. Hector addresses his troops with the words οὐδ' Ἀχιλεὺς πάντεσσι τέλος μύθοις ἐπιθήσει,/ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν τελέει, τὸ δὲ καὶ μεσσηγὺ κολούει. Unlike those of Achilles, Ptolemy's wishes are all fulfilled. (iv) In view of νοήσῃ in 87–8, it seems probable that the words ἐνέκλασσας δὲ μενοινήν allude to the disputed reading at *Il.* 8. 408 αἰεὶ γάρ μοι ἔωθεν ἐνικλᾶν ὅττι κεν εἴπω (νοήσω vulg.),[46] μενοινήν here referring to 'purpose rather than word' (McLennan).

The deeds of Zeus will not be elaborated: they are too great for poetry. Instead we find the poet's/narrator's prayer for wealth and virtue,[47] neither of which is alone sufficient: in part these words echo Homer's description of the bard Demodocus.[48] Even more than at the beginning of the hymn, anaphora and paired clauses luxuriate.[49] In cletic contexts repetition is a standard technique;[50] but here the articulation has a hypnotic effect far more impressive than stock hymn-endings. The polyptotic circularity of ἀρετήν/ἄφενος (94), ἀρετῆς/ὄλβος (95), ἀρετή/ἀφένοιο (96), ἀρετήν/ὄλβον (96) is reminiscent of the three lists of occupations at 70–8; grammatical play continues with variation of the gender of ἄφενος;[51] and even the standard[52] closing platitude δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον (96) is redeployed as final piece in a complex game of words, pointing the difference between this and earlier hymns. With this incantatory and hermetic passage the poem draws to a close.

How are we to assess the mood and tone of this poem? Does Callimachus view the hymn-form only as a learned game, an opportunity to experiment clinically with a fusion of archaism and incongruous modernity, an effectively insincere and 'atheistic' combination of old gods and self-conscious, 'scientific' humour? Or do, for example, the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*, Callimachus' own *Coma Berenices* (fr. 110) and the sixteenth *Idyll* of Theocritus justify us in recognizing that for the Greeks eulogy of gods and men could be couched in terms which seem to us flippantly irreverent? Any portmanteau definition of Callimachus' *Hymns* is bound to fail. This is a new, unpredictable sort of poetry, which eschews alike structural proportion and consistency of 'emotion': the notorious πολυείδεια[53] characterizes individual poems as well as the complete *oeuvre*. It is poor consolation to reflect that a glint in the poet's eye or a particular inflection in his voice could at least have revealed 'the real meaning' when the *Hymn to Zeus* was first declaimed: like dramatic productions, these poems provide evidence for more than one interpretation. We must acknowledge that the *Hymns* are so difficult to appreciate because alternations between lightness and gravity, simplicity

[46] For a full discussion see von Jan, op. cit. (n. 14) 93 f. Σ T ad *Il.* 22. 370 actually links the two passages: κολούει· ἀτελὲς ποιεῖ, ὡς τὸ "ἐνικλᾶν, ὅττι νοήσω".

[47] On ἀρετή cf. Gow on Theoc. 17. 137; on 'money makes the man' West on Hes. *Op.* 235.

[48] *Od.* 8. 63 f.
  τὸν περὶ Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε, δίδου δ' ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε·
  ὀφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε, δίδου δ' ἡδεῖαν ἀοιδήν.

[49] δώτορ ἐάων,/δώτορ ἀπημονίης (91 f.); τίς κεν ἀείδοι, τίς κεν...ἀείσει (92 f.); οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται (93); χαῖρε, πάτερ, χαῖρ' αὖθι (94); δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τ' ἄφενός τε, δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον (94, 96); οὔτ' ἀρετῆς...οὔτ' ἀρετή (95 f.).

[50] Cf. Norden on V. *Aen.* 6. 46, *al.*, e.g. A. *Eum.* 1014 χαίρετε, χαίρετε δ' αὖθις, ἐπαναδιπλοίζω (cf. Call. *h.* 1. 94).

[51] Neuter in 94, masc. in 96; and, as McLennan points out, ῥυηφενίην in 84 provides a fem. from the same root.

[52] *H. Hom.* 15 and 20 *adfin.*, and a metrical inscription: see McLennan's note, Allen/Halliday/Sikes on *h. Hom.* 15. 9.

[53] Fr. 203 (*iambus* 13), Dieg. ΙΧ 32 ff. Μοῦσαι καλαὶ κἄπολλον, οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω· Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς καταμεμφομένους αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδείᾳ ὧν γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπαντῶν φησιν ὅτι Ἴωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῆ σκεύη τεκταινόμενον.

and sophistication challenge our response and evoke a complex reaction which mirrors the poems' complex literary mixture of tradition and innovation. Much has been written on the identity of the Ptolemy whose name is kept out of this hymn; on parallels between the accession of heavenly and Hellenistic monarch; and on the likelihood that stress on ὄλβος and ἄφενος at the end of the poem implies a plea for patronage early in Callimachus' career. These are interesting questions; but they should not be allowed to dominate our appreciation of the poem. There is much to be said about Callimachus' poetry which does not depend on the solution of riddling historical problems.

Peterhouse, Cambridge[54]   N. HOPKINSON