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INTRODUCTION

The premature death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. created a power void in the empire which he had masterfully assembled and organized. He had provided no means of succession through which his idealized world government could be continued. Almost immediately a quest to fill this void was undertaken by his generals which resulted disastrously in violence and the ultimate dissolution of Alexander's empire, a process aptly described by Tarn as "... a struggle for power among his generals, in the shape of war between the satraps (territorial dynasts) and whatever central power aimed at general control; the battle of Ipsus in 301 definitely decided that the Graeco-Macedonian world could not be held together, and that world presently returned very much to the political shape it had before Alexander, though under different rulers and a different civilisation."¹ The aftermath of these struggles precipitated a world divided by three dynasties: the Seleucid which ruled, in general terms, Asia; the Antigonid which

possessed Macedonia; and finally the Ptolemaic which basically held Egypt under its aegis. Nor did the violence cease with the establishment of the three dynasties; it continued not only among the successors of Alexander, but even among their successors. From the chaos which dominated the late fourth and early third centuries B.C. arose one man, who because of his military, political and cultural accomplishments seems to stand out among the countless successors, rulers, pretenders and military personalities who inundated the period. That figure was Ptolemy, son of Lagus (an apparent member of the Macedonian nobility) who eventually was to become known as Soter. His domain was Egypt, although he periodically acquired and forfeited possessions outside of the borders of Egypt, such as the Cyrenaica and Cyprus.

Ptolemy's success (as compared to the misfortunes of many of his colleagues) during this period is evidenced by his retention of his basic possession, Egypt; by his successful and peaceful transferal of power to his son Philadelphus; and by the fact that, as Tarn notes, he was "... the only successor who died in bed." 2

Culturally, Ptolemy established the famous Museum at Alexandria to which the most reputable and illustrious

scholars and literary figures of the day were attracted. It is not surprising then that Alexandria became the cultural hub of the new age which has consequently been termed the Hellenistic Age. Among the literary devotees gathered at the Museum was a poet from Cyrene, Callimachus, whose literary ideals as expressed in the prologue of his Aitia have become definitive of the new directions of Hellenistic poetry. Casting aside traditional literary values, Callimachus advocated short, delicate poetry and asked that his literature be judged by his τέχνη rather than by its length.\(^3\) It is this poet, his poetic technique (as exemplified by two of his compositions), and his literary relationship to the ruling Ptolemaic family which will be the concern of this paper.

Among the works of Callimachus is a collection of six hymns, two of which, Hymn I (to Zeus) and Hymn II (to Apollo), are truly unique and consequently have received considerable attention from classical scholars. The two hymns are unique for Callimachus in the sense that they are politically oriented. Each hymn contains at least one mention of a king or kings, the identity

\(^3\)Callimachus Aitia 17-18.
of each of whom has been the object of scholarly debate.4 In addition to the controversy surrounding the proper identification of the historical figures noted by Callimachus in the hymns, various political interpretations according to which both Zeus and Apollo represent members of the Ptolemaic dynasty also have been proposed; far too often, however, political interpretations and the direct political references contained in the hymns do not neatly coincide, a fact demonstrated most recently by McKay.5 Nevertheless I believe that the approach involving political interpretation is valid, and that harmonious interpretations of the hymns can be achieved. Such will be the partial task of this paper. It will also be demonstrated that Callimachus' style is subtle and clouded by his utilization of several poetic techniques. It is through these poetic techniques, in combination with political interpretations, that we shall demonstrate that the first two hymns are an inter-related

---

4*Hymn IV*, to Delos, also contains political references, but there is no doubt as to the identification of the Ptolemy to whom Callimachus alludes. There is unanimous agreement both among ancient and modern scholars that Callimachus was referring to Ptolemy Philadelphus in the prophetic passage of *Hymn IV*. We will also point out many other areas in which the first two hymns differ from the fourth.

pair, political and encomiastic in nature, in honor of
the first two Ptolemies.

After a survey of past scholarship on Hymn I, I
will discuss the hymn in light of the identification
of Zeus with Ptolemy Soter. I shall demonstrate that,
contrary to the beliefs of most scholars, Zeus represents
Ptolemy Soter, and that many of the events surrounding
the assumption of power of Zeus related by Callimachus
in truth represent events in the life of the first
Ptolemy.

Following the same basic format employed in the
first chapter, Chapter II will be concerned with an
interpretation of Hymn II based on the equation of Apollo
with Ptolemy Philadelphus. We will see once again that
the divine figure and events narrated in the hymn have
earthly counterparts; but on this occasion it is in the
life of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

The concluding chapter presents a discussion of
two literary motifs - the aition and the epiphany - used
by Callimachus in the first and second hymns to bring
forth the full meaning and relationship of the two hymns.

Several points of clarification need to be made
here before beginning with the body of this paper. It
will be implied throughout that the two hymns refer to a
particular historical period, the co-regency of Soter
and Philadelphus in 285-283 B.C.; we must recognize,
however, the distinction between the date of composition and the dramatic date. The two dates may be coincident, but in truth need not be. Many years may separate the incidents portrayed through the images of the hymns and the actual date of composition. My concern in the following discussion will be with the dramatic rather than the compositional date. I will not make any attempt to establish a date of composition for either hymn. This particular problem has been treated by many scholars, and the wide variety of dates proposed suggests that the question is, at the least, vague, and possibly even unanswerable.

Secondly, I have used exclusively as a text of Callimachus Pfeiffer's masterful edition. All references to the works of Callimachus are therefore based upon his edition. Finally, since the paper treats a period several centuries before the birth of Christ, I have taken the liberty of eliminating the abbreviation B.C. after all dates. Henceforth all dates are to be considered B.C. unless otherwise noted.

---

CHAPTER I

PTOLEMY SOTER AND THE HYMN TO ZEUS

SECTION A

THE HYMN AND PAST SCHOLARSHIP

Traditionally, Callimachean scholars have considered Ptolemy Philadelphus to be the focal point of historical references in the first hymn. This identification is based neither upon any overt or specific references to Ptolemy II in the poem nor upon definite mention of him in the scholia; rather the literary identification of Zeus with Philadelphus is based upon an interpretation of various political allusions throughout the poem which I believe have been misconstrued. These interpretations may be the result of scholars imposing their historical preconceptions upon the hymn, i.e. forcing the allusions to coincide with their own historical views rather than allowing the hymn to speak for itself.

Otto Richter sets the tone for most historical and allegorical interpretations of the hymn in his work on the first two hymns of Callimachus.\(^1\) In his analysis,

\(^1\)Otto Richter, Kallimachos: Hymnen auf Zeus und Apollo (Guben: 1871).
he postulates both a definite date of composition and also the intent of each poem. He concludes that the Hymn to Zeus must have been written in 285 to celebrate Ptolemy Philadelphus' accession to the co-regency with his father Ptolemy Soter. ²

Richter bases his conclusion upon the known historical fact that the accession of Philadelphus resulted almost immediately in conflict between the young co-regent and his older brother Ceraunus. Consequently, Richter claims, the occasion required literary acclaim commensurate with the pomp and grandeur with which Ptolemy Soter, the abdicating monarch, celebrated the event. ³

Auguste Couat, although he is in basic agreement with Richter concerning the allegorical identification of Zeus in the hymn, takes exception to Richter's suggested date of composition. ⁴ Couat notes that "... the entire hymn culminates in the glorification of a powerful king..." ⁵ As we shall see shortly, Couat

²Ibid., p. 4; "... es ist zur Feier des Regierungsantrittes des Philadelphus geschrieben."

³Ibid.


⁵Ibid., p. 209.
believes that the figure of Zeus reflects a king who has firmly established his authority and not one who has just ascended the throne. I consider Couat's statement to be fundamentally correct, for it captures the true spirit of the hymn and the purpose of Callimachus in writing it; as in the case of Richter, however, I believe that Couat has failed to appreciate the significance of the historical references in the poem.

Couat's judgement that Zeus represents the divine counterpart of the second Ptolemy is based primarily upon his interpretation of the scholia to *Hymn I*. Couat notes: "According to the scholiast, this king is none other than Ptolemy Philadelphus, the patron of Callimachus."\(^6\) This statement completely distorts the scholium to line 86 and leads to considerable misunderstanding concerning the *Hymn to Zeus*. for nowhere in the scholia do we find Ptolemy identified specifically as Philadelphus. The scholium reads: \(\text{περὶ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ταύτα λέγει} \). Since the name of Philadelphus does not occur in the scholium, it is difficult to accept Couat's categorical statement that the reference points specifically to Philadelphus.

The scholia to *Hymn I* refer to "Ptolemy" two

\(^6\) *Ibid.*
additional times: verse 87: κυῖος ὁ Πτολεμαῖος; and
verse 90: αὐτὸς ὁ Πτολεμαῖος. Again, in neither of
these brief notices is the king specifically identified as
the second Ptolemy. Interestingly enough the scholia
do not hesitate to make precise identification of the
Ptolemies when commenting on the other hymns. In the
scholium to verse 26 of Hymn II the scholiast remarks:
(βασιλῆς) τῷ Πτολεμαῖῳ τῷ Εὐεργέτῃ; and again in Hymn IV
the scholium to verse 167 refers to (Μακηνόνι) τῷ
Φιλαδέλφῳ Πτολεμαῖῳ; and finally the scholium to verses
175-187 of Hymn IV mentions . . . Ἀντίγονος τῆς φίλος τοῦ
Φιλαδέλφου. Regardless of the textual evidence which
Couat employs to reach his conclusion, it is clear that
the ambiguous remarks in the scholia do not permit us to
construe Callimachus' comments as pointing definitely to
Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Since the name of Ptolemy Philadelphus occurs
neither in the text of the hymn nor in the scholia, other
methods have been employed to ascertain the identity of
the king. If it is justifiable to read the poem, at
least in some parts, as a political allegory, it is reason-
able to expect that Callimachus incorporated into its
structure several veiled references to contemporary
history. But, due to the paucity of reliable sources
concerning the early years of the Ptolemaic dynasty or
the internal affairs of the court of Alexandria, it is
difficult, if not impossible, to identify those incidents in the life of Zeus which Callimachus might have treated symbolically. Indeed, his poetry is frequently so subtle and contrived that it is difficult to imagine the limits to an allegorical interpretation of this or any other of his hymns. Nevertheless scholars have been undaunted in their attempts to unravel historical references in the Hymn to Zeus and to infer from these its date of composition, occasion and symbolic king.

Such is the method of Richter and to a certain extent, Couat. Although the two scholars agree on the identity of the monarch (Philadelphus), they are at variance concerning the date and reason for the composition of the hymn. Couat rejects Richter's view that the hymn was composed for the accession of Ptolemy II. The arguments which Couat employs to discard Richter's thesis proceed along the following lines: (1) In 285, Callimachus was quite young and relatively unknown. Why, then, among all the great poets at Alexandria, would an obscure poet from Cyrene be chosen to celebrate the accession of the monarch? And, (2) there is in the hymn a complete lack of expression of hope, promises, etc., concerning the new king and his reign. Shouldn't one expect such topics in a coronation hymn? But Couat's arguments

7Ibid., p. 214.
in rejecting Richter's theory are themselves basically unsatisfactory. Couat's first argument above is based on a biographical interpretation of the hymn, and unfortunately we know practically nothing about Callimachus' life. His second point is an argumentum ex silentio, and we must judge the hymn by what is contained within, not by what is absent.

Couat prefers to assign the composition of the hymn to the period between 280-275 when the reputation of Callimachus as a poet had spread. He argues that the description of the reigning monarch contained in verses 85-90 refers not to a young man just assuming power, but to a mature king who is experiencing a happy period of his reign. According to Couat the Zeus of Hymn I, the mighty lord of the world, had achieved his position of power over man and the gods not by the casting of lots, but by his mighty deeds. As a result, the phrase ἐργα δὲ χειρῶν, ἕν τε βίω τὸ τε κάρτος reflects Philadelphus shortly after his successful defense of his crown against his brothers in 280-279.

---

8 Ibid., p. 216.
9 Ibid., p. 211.
10 Hymn I 66-67.
It was during this period that the brothers of Philadelphus, dissatisfied with their father's election of a successor, made overt and covert attempts at deposing Philadelphus.

Cohen and Caesi argue along lines similar to Couat, yet arrive at totally different conclusions involving the date of composition. In his commentary on the hymns of Callimachus, Cohen states that Hymn I was written shortly after 280. Cohen's dating is based primarily upon two verses of the hymn: 12

\[
\text{τῷ τοις καὶ γνατοῖς προτερηματίας περ ἔστης οὐρανόν οὐκ ἐμέγησαν ἐχεῖν ἐπιθασίων οἶκον.}
\]

(I. 58-59)

Upon consideration of these verses Cohen argues as follows: 13

les vv. 58-59 ne peuvent pas ne pas se rapporter aux événements qui marquèrent l'avènement de Philadelphé, à la rébellion des fils aînés de Soter contre leur frère plus jeune. Supposons-les

---


13 Ibid., p. 10.
en effets écrits avant eux; ils deviennent presque ridicules, avec leur air de pré-diction dont tout l'inverse s'accomplit; c'ëtût été déplaire au souverain que de publier un tel texte et quoi? dans un poème où sa louange fait un motif essentiel. Ils n'ont pu être écrits qu'après les événements.

Caesi's arguments closely coincide with those of Couat, although the former postulated a much later date of composition.\textsuperscript{14} The two cardinal factors in determining the date of the hymn according to Caesi are:\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. il silenzio intorno alle nozze del Filadelfo, sia con Arsinoe I, sia con Arsinoe II;
  \item and
  \item b. l'allusione nel v. 58 sq. all' occupazione del trono d'Egitto da parte del Filadelgo.
\end{itemize}

Consequently the hymn must have been written around 266-263 when Philadelphus appeared to be the strongest of the Eastern monarchs. It was at this time, claims Caesi, that Philadelphus concluded the Syrian War with a great victory which expanded his kingdom to the coast of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{16}

Wilamowitz employs the same basic techniques as

\textsuperscript{14}C. Caesi, "Studi Callimachei," Studi italiani di Filologia classica 7 (1902), 301 ff.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 340.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 349.
the others to conclude that Philadelphus is the object of the political allusions in *Hymn I.* He declines to assign the hymn to a definite date, however, although he does suggest that it must have been composed during the early years of the reign of the second Ptolemy. His early dating is also based upon the obvious reference to Philadelphus' accession to the throne (vv. 58ff.) and the *argumentum ex silentio* that there is no allusion in the hymn to the monarch's marriage to his uterine sister Arsinoe II. Wilamowitz, however, is adamant in his conviction that the political allusions in the hymn refer to Philadelphus: "Darin hat man nicht verkannt und kann nicht verkennen, dass Kalliamchos auf Ptolemy II zielt . . ."  

Lesky, like Wilamowitz, does not assign a definite date or occasion to the poem, but concedes that it was early, indeed the earliest of all the Callimachean hymns. In his analysis of the hymn, Lesky also notes

---


18 Ibid.


that vv. 58 ff. refer to Philadelphus' accession and that the action of Zeus' brothers in the hymn (their peaceful acceptance of Zeus' rule) should act as an exemplum for Ptolemy Ceraunus. Lesky sees further evidence to support an early date of composition in the tone of the poet in the sphragis of the hymn (vv. 91-96). Since Callimachus here begs for virtue and riches, he argues that the hymn must have been written while Callimachus was in financial straits. Callimachus experienced such financial problems early in his career when he was not very close to the Ptolemaic court. The objection to such a strictly biographical argument is obvious.

Handel also points to the sphragis of the hymn in concluding that it was written early in the poet's career at Alexandria. Commenting on the final verses of the hymn, Handel remarks: "Dies versteht man als eine Anspielung auf Kallimachos' Bedürftigkeit und setzt danach den Hymnus in die frühen alexandrinischen Jahre des Dichters . . . "

It is evident from the foregoing that scholars

22 Ibid., p. 706.
23 Ibid.
25 Ibid., p. 25.
generally agree that the king referred to in *Hymn I* is Ptolemy II (Philadelphus) and that vv. 58ff. allude to his accession to the throne. The scholars, however, do vary in their views concerning the date of composition. Richter's 285 and Caesi's 266-263 represent the two extremes of the chronological spectrum in terms of date of composition. We have also witnessed the method used by scholars in determining the date of the hymn. Since precise references to an exact date are lacking in both the hymn and the scholia, they have been required to infer a date from supposed historical allusions contained within the poem. As mentioned earlier, scholars have attempted to impose their historical views upon the hymn, and the result has been a number of contrived and, at times, self-contradictory interpretations. Indeed the disparity of views concerning the date of composition and the differences in interpretations should arouse suspicions and definitely leave one, in Callimachus' words, "ἐν δοσιν μάλα ἑυμός." (H. I).

In such a case, where we have almost complete unanimity among scholars concerning the king to whom Callimachus alludes in the hymn, but vast differences of opinion concerning the date of composition, we should at least begin to question the validity of our identification. In short, we should ask ourselves the following question:
Must there be only one king to whom Callimachus alludes in the *Hymn to Zeus*? Are there no other monarchs who could better be the objects of the political allusions of the hymn, whose identifications will remain constant throughout the poem, thus insuring a unified, non-contradictory historical interpretation of the hymn? It must have been this type of reasoning which has led scholars more recently to seek another monarch, another Ptolemy whose identification in the hymn would be more appropriate.

K. J. McKay has delivered the first serious refutation of preceding Callimachean scholars when he proposed his theory of double images.\(^{26}\) In recognizing discrepancies in previous arguments, McKay describes Callimachus as "... the 'mischievous poet' who delights in the ebb and flow of images and challenges us to detect when his semantic tide is on the turn."\(^{27}\) McKay further states that one should not expect simple images from Callimachus and that the poet delighted in "kaleidoscopic variety."\(^{28}\) The mischievous facet of the poet's technique reveals itself in Callimachus' use of double images, which has lured most scholars into recognizing


\(^{27}\) Ibid., p. 12.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., p. 13.
Philadelphus as the person to whom Callimachus alludes in Hymn I. As a substitute for strict historical criticism McKay has made the ingenious suggestion that Callimachus, the clever poet, is actually deceiving us by alluding not to one Ptolemy, but to two: Philadelphus and Soter. McKay offers the suggestion that certain passages in the hymn equate Zeus with Philadelphus, others with his father, Soter. In his discussion of lines 58ff. McKay's views are traditional. In this passage he recognizes in Zeus an allusion to Ptolemy Philadelphus shortly after his rise to power: "Zeus is now Ptolemy Philadelphus and, we may conclude, freshly risen to power;" 29 this is as far as McKay allows himself to be guided by tradition, however. He does not permit himself to be misled by "Callimachean mischief." He refuses to view Philadelphus as the object of every political allusion in the hymn. McKay observes a change in the historical figure represented by the image of Zeus in lines 79-90:

\[\text{ἔκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς', ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων θειότερον τῇ και ἵνα τῇν ἐκρίναο λάξιν, δῶκας δὲ πτολεμαῖα φυλασσέμεν, ἵππο οὐ αὐτοῖς ἁκρη, ἐν πολίνας, ἐπόγιος οὐ τῷ ὅσσις λαὸν ὑπὸ σκολίης' οὐ 'ἔμπαλιν θύσομεν' ἐν δὲ μυρηνίᾳ ἐβαλές σφίσιν, ἐν δὲ άλλοις ἱλβον. πάσι μὲν, οὐ μάλα ο' ἱσον. ἔοσι όδε τεκμήρασθαι.}\]

\[29\text{Ibid.}\]
"From Zeus come kings" and the best of all is "our ruler." McKey observes: "That is to say, kings are diogeneis, and especially Philadelphus. Is Zeus now Philadelphus' father, Ptolemy Soter? Possibly. At least he is not Philadelphus." 30

McKay's arguments are most valuable, for he realizes the futility and inaccuracy of making Philadelphus the sole object of all political allusions in the hymn. Although his theory is unique and certainly not traditional, we must be cautious not to accept it without question simply because of its novelty. We must definitely avoid the use of the terms "mischievous poet" and "Callimachean mischief." When we remember that Callimachus' literary career at Alexandria depended primarily upon the patronage of the Ptolemies, at the very least we can raise serious doubts and objections to the view that Callimachus would "play games" and treat lightly images concerning the ruler(s) of Egypt and thereby risk misinterpretation and subsequent jeopardy to his position. We need only recall

the disastrous fate of Sotades who in 276 played the "mischievous poet" in his verse as he commented upon the marriage of Philadelphus and Arsinoe II: 31

εἰς ὁθὲ ὁβείην τρυμαλίην τὸ κέντρον ὅθεις

We must also ask whether McKay's historical and political interpretation of the hymn (even with his theory of double images and therefore two Ptolemies) is correct.

If we then reject the traditional view that Philadelphus is the only earthly king alluded to in Hymn 1 and have definite reservations concerning McKay's more recent interpretation involving double images, is there any solution? I believe there is. The solution of this poetic enigma shall be our immediate task in the following section.

31 Sotades was at first imprisoned by Philadelphus, but after his successful escape, he was eventually drowned by Ptolemy's admiral Patroclus off the coast of Crete. Cf. Athenaeus 14.621A and Plutarch Moralia 11A.
SECTION B
ZEUS AND PTOLEMY SOTER

McKay's thesis that in truth there are two Ptolemies in the Hymn to Zeus is basically sound and to be accepted, although, as I will show, his identification is incorrect. In his abbreviated discussion of the first hymn, however, I believe that he failed to realize and recognize the complete poetic techniques and poetic artistry of Callimachus. In reality the poet combines myth and religion, scholarship, history and poetic structure to produce an encomiastic hymn glorifying the first two Ptolemies. The above four elements have been treated independently by many scholars, but as we shall see these elements of Callimachus' artistry are only effective as they interact and combine harmoniously to form a cohesive organic unit. It is Callimachus' manipulation of the four elements which has, for the most part, escaped the notice of the scholars, and the result has been confusion and uncertainty in interpretation.

The best method of illustrating this point is to review the entire hymn as a unity, a procedure which will also demonstrate that the poem, taken on its own
terms, leaves no doubt concerning the identity of kings involved in the poem. The hymn opens with a rhetorical question, the full significance of which has generally not been appreciated:

\[
\text{εὖοι τί κεν ἄλο παρὰ σπονθέζειν δείθειν}
\text{λάθον ἦ θέον αὐτῶν, δεὶ μέγαν, γίεν ἀνακτή,}
\text{Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικαιοπόλον Οὔρανόθεν;}
\]

(I. 1-3)

As innocent as the question appears, careful investigation will reveal that these three verses subtly attract the reader's thoughts to one man, Ptolemy Soter. Many scholars have claimed that the \text{σπονθέζειν} of line 1 refer to the libations offered to Zeus Soter.\textsuperscript{32} We learn from ancient sources that the third cup of wine at a banquet was offered to Zeus Soter. A fragment of Sophocles states:\textsuperscript{33}


\textsuperscript{33}Sophocles, fragment 425.
In addition, Pindar comments: 34

The cult of Zeus Soter was not only prominent throughout the Greek world, but it was the dominant cult of Zeus at Alexandria. 35 From an inscription at Halicarnassus, attributed to Arsinoe, we learn further that Ptolemy I was honored with the title Soter as early as 306. 36 Consequently, the setting of Hymn I and the emphasis upon libations to Zeus Soter point directly to another Soter, Ptolemy. This association between Zeus Soter and Ptolemy

34 Pindar Isthmian VI, 7-9. For further references to Zeus Soter in ancient literature cf. Aeschylus, fragment 55; Eumenides 760; Suppliles 26; Choephoroi 1073; Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae 1009; Plato Republic 583b; Symp. 176a; Charmides 167a; Philebus 66d; Xenophon Symp. 2.1; Diod. Sic. 4.3. For a discussion of the cult of Zeus Soter cf. A. B. Cook, Zeus: A Study of Ancient Religion (3 vols; Cambridge, England: 1914-1940), I, p.350 and R. F. Willetts, Cretan Cults and Festivals (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1962), p.248.


Soter surely would suggest to the reader that the cult title also has a specific political point of reference and that Callimachus, from the outset, intends the reader to keep this relationship in mind.

The association of Zeus and Soter is extended by Callimachus in the following two verses:

\[ \delta\epsilon\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu, \ \alpha\iota\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha, \]
\[ \Pi\nu\lambda\alpha\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\ \varepsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\iota\rho\alpha, \ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\lambda\nu\ \iota\omicron\varphi\omicron\alpha\nu\gamma\delta\omicron\nu\iota\sigma\iota; \]

(I. 2-3)

This description of the power and accomplishments of Zeus applies equally as well to those of Ptolemy I. By means of the image of Zeus the reader is now inclined to envision Ptolemy Soter as a very powerful ruler (\(\delta\epsilon\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu\ \alpha\iota\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\)), who is able to claim at least one impressive military victory (\(\Pi\nu\lambda\alpha\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\ \varepsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\iota\rho\alpha\)) and who is the ultimate dispenser of justice within his kingdom. Ptolemy's military career was indeed illustrious, and it is difficult to ascertain any specific victory to which Callimachus might be referring.\(^{37}\) In truth the poet may be alluding to the general success which Ptolemy experienced while defending his kingdom against his

---

\(^{37}\) The use of the words \(\delta\epsilon\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu\ \alpha\iota\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\) which imply immortality and divine status is truly not mere banal flattery. In the previously cited inscription, from Halicarnassus there is also mention of Soter's divine status. Diodorus Siculus 20.100-104 informs us further that Ptolemy was honored as a god by the Rhodians before his death.
colleagues, the successors of Alexander. Ptolemy's legal career was equally distinguished, as evidenced by his participation in the establishment of the Constitution of Alexandria, his codification of the laws of Alexandria and his granting of a constitution to Cyrene in 308-307. 38

The element of Callinachean scholarship and erudition has not been totally absent from these verses. Through the subtle use of his scholarship he has further extended the association between Zeus and Ptolemy Soter, and simultaneously has cleverly set the stage for the next portion of the hymn. The phrases "conquerer of the Pelagonians" (whom the scholia identify as the Giants) and "dispenser of justice to the children of Uranos" remind one of Hesiod's Theogony. These references to the Theogony suggest that Callimachus is inviting his readers to think of the foundation of a new divine order represented by the new dispensation of Zeus in the Theogony; consequently the image of Zeus fits Ptolemy Soter nicely, since it was he who established a new political order in Egypt. Finally, the indirect reference to Hesiod's Theogony has a twofold significance: first, Callimachus is about to relate his own theogony (the birth of Zeus); secondly, he is about to discuss in poetic terms the

38 Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, I, pp. 94-95; 113-115; 48.
birth of a new kingdom (Egypt).

With vv. 2-3 serving as an introduction, the hymn now proceeds to the birth of Zeus. As the hymn opened with a question, so this portion of the poem opens with a question: Was Zeus born in Crete or Arcadia?

πῶς καὶ νῦν, Δικταῖοι δείσομεν ἢς Λυκάτον;
ἐν δοινῷ μαλὰ θυμὸς, ἐπεὶ γέγος ἀμφίριστον;
Ζεῦ, σὺ μέγα Ἰδαίοις ἐν οὐρείσι φασί γενέσθαι,
Ζεῦ, σὺ ὅ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ πάτεροι, πάτερ, ἐψύχατο;
Ἱῆρες ἔδει ψαύσασι· καὶ θαρ τάφον, ὥ ἄνα, σετὸ
Ἱῆρες ἔτεκτηκαντο· σὺ δ' οὖ θάνες, ἐσοὶ γάρ σιεῖ.

(I. 4-9)

Callimachus rejects the standard version, offered by Hesiod, that Zeus was born in Crete.39 Instead he accepts a lesser known birth myth according to which Zeus was born in Arcadia. His announced reason for rejecting Crete and choosing Arcadia as Zeus' birthplace is really a simple joke: 'Ἱῆρες ἔδει ψαύσασι'. The poet then devotes a major portion (forty-five lines) of the remainder of the hymn to the narration of Zeus' Arcadian origins. As one would expect, this portion of the hymn has been the occasion of much scholarly debate: why would Callimachus devote approximately one half of his poem to the problem of the birth of Zeus? Upon careful investigation we can see that this section

39Hesiod Theogony 453-506.
of the hymn fulfills a threefold purpose for Callimachus. It is in this portion of the hymn that Callimachus takes advantage of the opportunity to exercise his poetic talent and erudite background.

In the first place, the selection of a minor version of the birth of Zeus allowed Callimachus to display his erudition to the scholars and poets in residence at the Museum and Library at Alexandria. This erudition is further evidenced by the poet's extensive use of aitia throughout the hymn, e.g. the aition of the "Plain of the Navel" in line 45 (the approximate physical center of the poem). Such a display of knowledge and scholarship would certainly delight and challenge the members of the scholarly milieu of Alexandria. Callimachus' artistic genius in terms of poetic structure is brilliantly captured in his use of the birth motif. In his lengthy description of the birth of Zeus, Callimachus injects another "birth," that of the waters in Arcadia from Mother Earth (I. 18-31). As a result we have the birth of the waters framed by the birth of the god Zeus in the following manner:

Birth of Zeus - vv. 10-17
Birth of Waters - 18-31
Birth of Zeus - 31-41

Secondly, it is conceivable that Callimachus had
another purpose in mind when he selected Arcadia as the place of Zeus' birth. Ptolemy Soter was a Macedonian noble, born on the Greek mainland. The equation of Zeus with Soter is enhanced by the poet's emphasis that the king of the gods was born not on an island (as was Philadelphus, who was born on Cos) but on the mainland of Greece. In this way Callimachus perhaps intended to avoid any confusion between Soter and Philadelphus at this point of the hymn.

Callimachus' third, but probably most important, purpose in the birth of Zeus passage is concerned with the poet's authority as a reliable and truthful source. We can certainly attribute Callimachus' choice of a lesser known version of the birth of Zeus to his erudition and desire to establish further the association between Zeus and Ptolemy I, but I believe that the problem of credibility is of cardinal importance; for it is concerned not only with this passage, but with the entire hymn.

By affirming that tradition of an Arcadian birth of Zeus, Callimachus in effect adopts what might be considered a "minority report" and emphatically rejects the more widely accepted Hesiodic version. In making this choice Callimachus presents himself as the established authority: it is he who speaks the truth; others lie.
More importantly, however, by maintaining his position of authority here, he directly imposes the stamp of poetic validity upon the entire hymn. Callimachus must establish himself as a credible source in order to prepare the reader for what is to come. Once again the poet's indebtedness to Hesiod is revealed in this passage. Before beginning his *Theogony*, Hesiod also establishes his authority as a credible source by relating his experience with the Muses, who appeared to him and provided him with the divine inspiration to relate truthfully the birth of the gods.\(^{40}\)

Thus far in the hymn we have seen the development of the association between Zeus and Ptolemy Soter. By the conclusion of the birth section we can safely state that Callimachus has firmly established the literary equation of Zeus with Ptolemy Soter. We should expect this equation to remain constant throughout the poem, but in fact we shall presently observe that not only does the identification of Ptolemy Soter with Zeus remain fixed, but actually becomes allegorical, i.e. many of the events in the life of Zeus have their earthly counterparts in the life of Soter and should be interpreted as such.\(^{41}\)

\(^{40}\) *Theogony* 1.115.

\(^{41}\) The view that Ptolemy Soter is the allegorical counterpart of Zeus has recently proposed by J. Carrière, "Philadelphe ou Soter? A propos d'un hymne de Callimaque," *Studii Classicae* 11(1969), pp. 85-93. I have accepted many of his arguments in the following discussion.
Before Callimachus can unfold the remainder of his hymn (which in allegorical terms contains the climax of the hymn), he must dispose of a problem similar to that which confronted him earlier in the poem. Once again we witness a discrepancy between the opinion of Callimachus and that of his predecessors, this time with regard to the manner in which Zeus attained heavenly domination. Callimachus is in basic agreement with previous poets in the conviction that Zeus, unchallenged by his kin of an earlier generation, received heaven as his domain:

τῇ τοῖς καὶ γνωτοὶ προτερηγηγέτες περ ἐόντες
ουρανὸν οὐκ ἐμέγηραν ἔχειν ἐπιασθένον οἶκον.

(I. 58-59)

But here the agreement between Callimachus and the others ends. Exactly how and why Zeus received the heavenly kingdom now becomes the point of contention. Callimachus doubts the validity of the assertion of the ancient poets:

δυνατοὶ Ἔος πάμπαν ἀληθεῖς ἤσαν ἔσοδοι,
φάντο πάλιν Κρόνηδοι διάτριχα δώματα νεῖμα.

(I. 60-61)

"Utter nonsense" scoffs Callimachus: "Who, being of sane mind, would draw lots for such unequal portions as Olympus and Hades? People draw lots for equal portions:"
Zeus' right to heavenly rule is not dependent upon the chance inherent in the casting of lots. In Callimachus' view this right was obtained not by luck, but by the strength and power of Zeus himself, and by his very accomplishments:

οὔ δὲ θεῶν ἑσωθεν πάλαι ἔσσαν, ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν,  
σή τε βίη τὸ τε κάρτος, ὦ καὶ πέλας ἐίναι ὑψώσεως.

The nature and actions of the god, not mere chance, are responsible for his position of power.

This view is essential to the equation of Zeus with Ptolemy Soter. Callimachus emphasizes his position as the fountainhead of truth on the subject: he could not possibly promulgate fabrications; for if he were to lie, he would do so in such a manner calculated to persuade the listener:

ψευδοσύμην, ἄνοιγεσά καὶ κεν πεπέθεσέν ἄκουσίν.

But, as the reader should logically conclude, Callimachus is not lying. As he did previously with regard to Zeus'
birth place, he is once again speaking the truth, and he is to be believed. But why does he reject the traditional version concerning Zeus' acquisition of heavenly power? More Callimachean erudition to test his colleagues? I believe not. As we shall see, Callimachus must adopt a version of Zeus' assumption of heavenly power which will coincide reasonably well with events in the life of Soter.

With these prefatory comments, then, it is appropriate to consider in depth the remainder of the poem. The partition of the world among Zeus and his brothers as related by Callimachus has been traditionally interpreted as a reference to Ptolemy Philadelphus' accession to the throne of Egypt in 285.\textsuperscript{42} Those who defend this interpretation suggest that Soter chose Philadelphus to succeed him, not because of some whimsical chance, but because of the young Ptolemy's accomplishments and power. Consequently, they argue, Callimachus has chosen a lesser known version of the partition of the world in order that his readers might recognize

\textsuperscript{42}This interpretation was originally put forth by Richter, \textit{op. cit.}, in 1871 and has for the most part been readily accepted by most scholars. To be sure other scholars take exception to Richter's dating of the hymn, but there seems to be basic agreement that this portion of the hymn does refer to Philadelphus and the events surrounding his succession.
actual historical events surrounding the succession of Philadelphus. Further, the acquiescence of Zeus' kin to his newly established authority is to be the model followed by the older brothers of Philadelphus, especially Ceraunus.

There are, however, several objections to this interpretation. Firstly, Callimachus' primary reference here is to the partition of the world among Zeus and his elder brothers. Zeus of course obtained heaven (Olympus); Hades received the underworld; and, although Callimachus does not say so specifically, Poseidon obtained the sea. On the historical level we know this division among the gods might refer to the succession of Philadelphus. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that Callimachus thought so highly of Egypt that he could equate Egypt with heaven on the divine level. We can reasonably proceed no further with such an allegorical interpretation. If it was common knowledge that Hades received the underworld and Poseidon the sea, do we then assume that Philadelphus' brothers received other kingdoms from Soter as compensation? We cannot, for indeed history contradicts such an assumption.  

\[43\]  

\[43\] Our chief literary sources for this period from Alexander's death through Soter's lifetime are Diodorus Siculus and the epitome offered by Justinius of the Historiae Philippicae of Pompeius Trogus. Pausanias' Description of Greece treats several key figures of the period including Ptolemy Soter.
Philadelphus' older half-brother, also named Ptolemy but known as Ceraunus, left Alexandria shortly after the accession of his brother. Having been overlooked by his father, he sought aid from foreign kings in an overt attempt to wrest the Egyptian throne from Philadelphus. His career at this point became stormy and violent. The first venture in his quest for power took him to the court of Lysimachus of Thrace. Here, together with Arsinoe II (Philadelphus' full sister and eventual wife), Ceraunus plotted the death of Agathocles, the crown prince of Thrace. He eventually arrived at the court of Seleucus, whom he managed to provoke into a conflict with Lysimachus. The war ended with the death of Lysimachus at Corpedion in 281. Ceraunus next assassinated Seleucus, possibly on the grounds that Seleucus failed to fulfill a pledge to help recapture the Egyptian throne for him. He was greeted by the army and navy of Seleucus as king, and suddenly found himself in full command of Seleucus' empire. His attention was then diverted from his arch rival Philadelphus to Antigonus, who was approaching Macedonia. In the end Ptolemy Ceraunus, who attained power by the most treacherous and violent methods, died just as violently at the hands of the invading Gauls in
Ceraunus' brother made an attempt to rule after his brother's death but was unsuccessful. Pausanias informs us of the fate of the surviving brothers of Philadelphus:

It is apparent then that the historical events concerning the fate of Soter's Egypt do not coincide with the peaceful partition of the divine world as presented by Callimachus in Hymn I.

Secondly, if we continue to consider Zeus as the divine image of Philadelphus, we will assuredly encounter problems later in the hymn, as McKay has pointed out. Maintaining the equation of Zeus with Philadelphus, who then is the ἱερετέρως μεθέωντι of line 86? McKay, as we have already noted, resolves the problem by postulating a fluctuation of images: "In Hymn I the image fluctuates between Zeus, Ptolemy=Zeus and Ptolemy who derives his

---

44 Justin, 24.3, in commenting upon Ceraunus' death, gives us an insight into the nature and character of this unsuccessful pretender to the Egyptian throne: "Sed nec Ptolemaeo iniuta scelerà fucrunt: quippe diis immortalibus tot perjuria, et tam cruenta parricidia vindicantibus, brevi post a Gallis spoliatus regno captusque, vitam ferro, ut meruerat, amisit."

45 Pausanias 1.7.1.

46 McKay, "The Poet at Play," Ch. 1.
power from Zeus."\textsuperscript{47} Although there is considerable value in this theory, McKay, as I will demonstrate, was erroneous in his interpretation.

Finally, the description of the method by which Zeus obtained power, \ldots \varepsilon \rho \gamma \alpha \delta \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \iota \rho \alpha \nu \varsigma / \sigma i \gamma \tau e \beta \iota \eta \tau o \tau o s, hardly reflects the character of Philadelphus. Unlike his father, Philadelphus was not an active military campaigner, and even McKay admits that the above description does not correspond to Philadelphus' true nature: "To be sure history tells another story \ldots."\textsuperscript{48} McKay then dismisses this seemingly minor discrepancy with the statement: "\ldots but the conceit was harmless."\textsuperscript{49} Indeed we can disregard the phrase on the grounds that it is mere flattery, which was, of course, a feature of court poetry as evidenced by Idyll 17 of Theocritus; when the phrase is applied to another figure (specifically Ptolemy Soter), however, it is not only encomiastic, but in truth honestly descriptive. There appear to be just too many inconsistencies which obviate the theory that the partition of the world in Hymn I represents the events surrounding the accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus to the throne of Egypt.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., p. 18.
\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., p. 13.
\textsuperscript{49}Ibid.
It is my contention that the passage does not reflect the rise of Philadelphus, and in fact the identification of Zeus with Philadelphus is erroneous. There was another division of kingdoms of which a Ptolemy was a principal beneficiary, and one which could easily have been represented by the partition of the world among Zeus and his brothers. I refer, of course, to the division of Alexander’s vast empire by his generals in the year 323. The amount of territory which Alexander had brought under Macedonian control was so extensive that it could easily be imagined as the entire world. As a result of this division, Ptolemy was awarded Egypt (of which he became satrap) by Perdiccas, who had assumed nominal control of the empire upon Alexander’s death:

\[\text{Ο} \delta \text{παραλαβὼν τὴν τῶν ὄλων ἡγεμονίαν καὶ συνεδρεύοντος μετὰ τῶν ἡγεμόνων Πτολεμαῖος μὲν τῷ Ἀδγὸν τὴν Ἁγυπτὸν ἐδωκεν . . .}\]

According to my interpretation Olympus (heaven) of the hymn still represents Egypt, but now Egypt is truly only a part of a much larger world. More importantly, however, Zeus represents Ptolemy Soter, and the king of the gods will closely maintain this earthly identification for the remainder of the hymn.

---

50Diodorus 18.3.1.
The interpretation can be extended; for as Zeus' authority was unchallenged by his brothers, so Ptolemy's claim to Egypt was at first accepted by the other successors (at least history says nothing concerning any immediate violent reaction to Ptolemy's acquisition of Egypt). In addition, the phrase ἐργα οὐ χειρῶν, οὐ τε βιή το τε κράτος is much more descriptive of Soter's character and career than that of Philadelphus. Soter's military career after 323 was illustrious and highlighted by several significant victories. In addition to withstanding threats from Perdiccas and Antigonus, Soter recaptured Cyprus in 314 (and again in 295); defeated Demetrius, the son of Antigonus, in Coele-Syria in 312; and took Cyrene in 308. After the battle of Ipsus in 301, Soter became less active in foreign military campaigns and seemed to concentrate on consolidating his power within Egypt. Such are the events which reflect the true military character of Soter and to which Callimachus alludes in lines 66-67. While other successors of Alexander had fallen from power, Soter had firmly established himself on the throne of Egypt by the time of the accession of Philadelphus as co-regent in 285.

One could counter with the reasonable objection that the partition of the world in the hymn involves
Zeus and his kinsmen (γνωτόι), but the division of Alexander's empire was accomplished by his generals who were not blood relatives. Carrière has solved this difficulty with a convincing argument: Alexander's generals, he suggests, were all members of a Macedonian military aristocracy and were indeed "brothers" in the sense that they belonged to an elite military clique: "... les membres de cette caste, de cette aristocratie militaire, ces frères d'armes, en somme, gens de la même maison royale, 'οι σύντροφοι οί ἐκ τοῦ γένους', diront les Cronographes pour désigner ces participants à la succession de l'empire..." 51

Further evidence to support the identification of Zeus with Soter is provided by the following verses:

θησαυρόθεος μεγίστης ὁ περὶ ἀγγελίας ὁ τεράσων

(I. 68-69)

The eagle, the royal bird of Zeus, which became the symbol of the Ptolemaic dynasty, was closely associated with Ptolemy Soter. 52 This is evidenced by a series of coins minted by Soter which displays the head of Soter on the obverse and an eagle perched on the fulmen on the reverse; the reverse side also bears the words


52 For a discussion of the eagle as symbolic of the Ptolemaic dynasty, see Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, I, p. 203.
Soter's choice of the eagle to be exhibited on minted coins established a precedent followed by his successors. Soter's connection with the eagle was even more personal, however, than the numismatic evidence suggests. Aelian relates a story concerning the relationship between Soter and the eagle:

Consequently Callimachus' remarks concerning Zeus' choice of the eagle points to Soter's adoption of that bird as the symbol of his dynasty.

Working upon the premise that Zeus is equivalent to Soter (which I feel we have adequately established), we may now proceed with an interpretation of the remainder of the poem to ascertain whether this equation

---


54 Ibid., pp. 13-14.

55 Aelian fragment 285.
is still workable. In verses 70-85 Callimachus relates that Zeus allocated certain duties to lesser gods, but reserved for himself the guardianship of earthly kings:

εἶλεο δ' αἰχήνιν ὅ τι φέρτατον· οὐ σὺ γε νην ἐπεράμους, οὐκ ἄνδρα σακέσπαλον, οὐ μὲν ἀοιδόν· ἄλλα τὰ μὲν μακαρεσσίν ὄλιοσιν αὐθί παρῆκας ἄλλα μέλειν ἔτεροισι, σοὶ δ' ἔξελεο πτολιάρχους αὐτούς, ἃν ὑπὸ χέιρα γεωμόρος, ἃν ἰδρίς σῖχης, ἃν ἐρέτης, ὃν πάντα· τι δ' οὖ κρατέοντος ὑπὶ ἵσχυν;
(I. 70-74)

Everyone, including the farmer, the warrior, the oarsman and the minstrel, eventually comes under the ruler's jurisdiction; but each area has its own patron god. As a result Callimachus states:

αὖτικα χαλκῆς μὲν ὑδείομεν Ἡφαῖστοιο·
φευχητάς δ' Ἅρης· ἐπακτήρας δὲ Χιτώνης,
Ἀρτέμιδος. Φοίβου δὲ λύρης ἐδ ἐιδότας σίμους.
(I. 76-78)

Yet above all looms the figure of omnipotent Zeus. Do the above verses suggest earthly events, and is our equation that Zeus is equivalent to Soter still valid? Unquestionably the answer is an emphatic yes.

In the hymn Callimachus paints a picture of a divine bureaucracy in which Zeus as king allocates duties and functions to lesser heavenly authorities. As Callimachus lauded the military accomplishments of Soter (through the image of Zeus) earlier in the hymn, so now he treats Soter the bureaucrat who organized
Egypt into an efficient governmental organization. Although we know comparatively little concerning Soter's administration of Egypt, I believe it is reasonable to state with Rostovtzeff that Soter "... would naturally surround himself with a civil staff composed in the main of officials possessing the same training and mentality as his own, and therefore congenial to him." To this staff, we can safely conclude, Soter allocated various duties in the administration of the Egyptian government. Yet at no time, as a result of this process, would Soter sacrifice any of his supreme monarchical power or prestige. The picture painted by Callimachus becomes apparent. As Zeus assigned duties to lesser gods in heaven, so Soter distributed administrative responsibilities to members of his staff. Both Zeus' and Ptolemy's position of ultimate power and responsibility remains unquestioned.

Zeus retains one definite privilege under his aegis: the selection of πολιταρχοὺς αὑτοὺς; he alone makes decisions concerning earthly kings. Callimachus has now brought us to the symbolic climax of the hymn. He has laid the foundation precisely and has logically

---

guided the reader to an inescapable conclusion: it is the right and privilege of Ptolemy Soter, the earthly Zeus, to choose kings, for from Zeus come kings:

"ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς', ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων θειότερον."

(I. 79-80)

Undoubtedly the later years of Soter's reign were devoted to one cardinal consideration, the selection of his successor. He alone among Alexander's successors had managed to survive and to retain his satrapy through the violent aftermath of the empire's partition. Soter must have fully realized that a smooth transition of power to a competent and capable heir was essential to the preservation of the kingdom which he had created. In an era which was marked by constant and bitter warfare among Alexander's generals and then even among their successors, in various attempts to re-establish the empire, Soter's decision was crucial in determining the survival of his dynasty. In spite of the turbulence of the period, Soter had managed to create a relatively stable kingdom, and now he had to provide for its continuance. A decision of such consequence was unlikely to be made in haste and on a whim. Ptolemy had several sons (from two wives) from whom he could choose a
successor; the problem was to select the most capable.\textsuperscript{57}

The process of selecting an heir to the throne must have included an examination of each of his sons to determine their competence and potential for ruling an empire. As his sons matured and became involved in state affairs and bureaucratic operations of the government, Soter observed, judged their performances, and evaluated their abilities. Callimachus relates this process on the symbolic divine level in the following verses:

\begin{quote}
δὲ ἢκας ἔπολεσθαι φυλασσόμεν, ἤξο ο’αὐτὸς
ἐκήγο’εν πολέσσοις, ἐπύμωνος ο’ ἐν ἐνήκοςι
λαόν υπὸ σκολιῆς ο’ ἐπέπαλιν θεύνουσιν.
\end{quote}

(I. 81-83)

As Zeus watches over kings to determine who rules well and who rules poorly, so Soter watches over future kings to determine who administers well enough to succeed him.

\footnote{I disagree with Bevan's evaluation in A History of Egypt that Philadelphus was chosen because he was the son of Soter's beloved wife Berenice. Although such a consideration may have partially influenced his decision, I prefer to follow E. A. W. Budge's reasoning in A History of Egypt (The Netherlands: Oosterhout, 1968), IV, p. 189. He states: "... there must have been strong reasons why his father should have set aside the claims of Ptolemy Keraunos and Neleager, his sons by Eurydice, the daughter of Antipater, in favor of his youngest son. Ptolemy I does not appear to have been a man who would allow his emotions to sway his judgement in the choice of a successor, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary it must be assumed that he chose the son he thought best fitted to rule Egypt."}
Finally, in lines 84-85 we see Zeus bestowing wealth and prosperity, but certainly not in equal measure:

€ν δὲ ἰδιότητι ἐβαλείς σασιν, €ν δ' ἀλλις ὅλοις.
πάσι μὲν, οὐ μάλα δ' ἰδέοι.

(I. 84-85)

In a similar manner Soter must have endowed his sons with lavish financial benefits; but it was Philadelphus who received much more than the others, for he received the kingdom of Egypt.

Now that Callimachus has firmly established that Zeus represents Soter, he turns next to direct political reference in the next six verses:

€σιε, δὲ τεκμηριασθεὶς.
毌ὲτερφ μεδεόντ᾽, περιπρό γὰρ εὐρυ βεβηκέν.

€σπέριος κείνος γε τελεί τα κεν ἤρι γοήσει.

€σπέριος τα μέγιστα, τα μεγάλα δὲ εὐτε νοῦσῃ.

οι δὲ τα μεγ πλειάνι, τα δ' οὐχ ἐνί πάν ταῖν δ' ἀπὸ πάμπαν
αὐτὸς ἄνην ἐκδολουσας, ἐνεκλασσάς δὲ μενοινήν.

(I. 85-90)

Zeus does not distribute wealth equally among the kings, and this is fully proven by ἤμετερφ μεδεόντι who surpasses all others by far. The phrase ἤμετερφ μεδεόντι is a direct reference to Philadelphus, who, in McKay's words "... derives his power from Zeus," the king of the gods who throughout the hymn has been equated with Soter. His authority and right to rule Egypt has been justified by Callimachus in Hesiodic terms: ἐξ δὲ Δίδ
βασιλεὺς, and throughout the hymn Soter has been identified with Zeus. McKay then was correct when he saw two Ptolemies present in the hymn, but his identification of the kings was unsatisfactory. By employing the equation that Zeus represents Soter, Callimachus devotes a major portion of the hymn to the events of the reign of Soter, from the division of an empire which gave him Egypt, to one of his last, yet certainly most important, official acts: the selection of Philadelphus as his successor. Callimachus reserves the direct political references for Philadelphus; he therefore avoids confusion about the proper identification of the kings.

Philadelphus, who has not only been justified in his reign, but also sanctified by the poet (since he is descended from Soter), receives mild flattery from Callimachus in lines 87-90. But more importantly these verses explain why Philadelphus was chosen by Soter over his brothers. History reveals far more concerning Egypt during the reign of Philadelphus than that of Soter. From it we learn that Philadelphus was a superior organizer, administrator and reformer. These talents obviously made themselves evident prior to his succession.

and most probably influenced Soter considerably in his choice. These four verses, then, serve as a comparison of the administrative abilities of Philadelphus and his brothers, and they offer the explanation why the youngest of the sons of Soter was chosen to take the throne of Egypt.

Let us recall now the setting of the hymn: libations to Zeus Soter (most likely at a symposium). On such occasions a hymn to Zeus was traditionally sung, and the text of Callimachus' first hymn constitutes, in a formal sense, the body of such a song. Now that a proper hymn has been recited, Callimachus closes with a prayer for virtue and wealth:

χαῖρε μέγα, Κρονίων πανυπέρτατε, δῶτορ έσθων, δῶτορ ἀπποιμίησις τελ ὧ ἐργατα τίς εξεν ἀείθοι: οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἐσταίς τις κεν διὸς ἐργατ' ἀείθες; χαῖρε, κατέρ, χαῖρ' αὐθι. δίδου δ' ἀρετὴν τ' ἀφενός τε. οὑτ' ἀρετῆς αὕτε δὲβος ἐπιστάται άνδρας δέξειν οὑτ' ἀρετήπαθένοιο. δίδου δ' ἀρετὴν τε καὶ δὲβουν.

(I. 91-96)

Cahen argues that Callimachus' requests are directed to Ptolemy as well as to Zeus: "Comme Zeus pour les hommes, le souverain est, pour le poète, dispensateur des biens . . ." 59 Lesky, as we have seen, extends

59 Cahen, Commentaire, p. 42.
this suggestion to date the hymn at a relatively early stage of Callimachus’ career when the poet was not very close to the Ptolemaic court.\textsuperscript{60} The two phrases which Lesky cites to support his view concern Callimachus’ apparent financial embarrassment at the time of composition:

\[
\ldots\, \delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\ \delta'\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon\eta\nu\ \tau'\alpha\varphi\epsilon\nu\delta\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon
\]

and

\[
\ldots\, \delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\ \delta'\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon\eta\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\lambda\beta\omicron\upsilon\nu
\]

In truth such requests are not unique to the Callimachean hymn, but are formulaic elements in the hymnic form and can be traced back to the \textit{Homerica Hymns}, two of which close with the very same phrase as \textit{Hymn I} of Callimachus: \[
\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\ \delta'\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon\eta\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\lambda\beta\omicron\upsilon\nu
\]

Because of this hymnic \textit{topos} one could argue that it is impossible to prove or disprove that Callimachus was making a personal appeal to Ptolemy in the personnage of Zeus.

Upon consideration of the language employed by Callimachus in the conclusion, however, I believe that the poet was further emphasizing the identity of Zeus

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. pp. 15-16 above.

\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Homerica Hymns} 15.9 and 20.8.
as Zeus Soter who, as we have seen, is identified with Ptolemy Soter throughout the poem. In verses 91-92 Zeus is called both διός εδώ and διός ἀπήμονις. Pausanias informs us that Zeus Soter was known as ἰπτιατης. Furthermore, Farnell states that Zeus was "regarded as the god who dispensed all good things, as the ἄγαθος δαίμων of the life of man." In addition Farnell notes that Zeus Soter was worshipped as ἀπήμιος; so there can be no doubt that Callimachus is praying to Zeus Soter and through his divine image to Ptolemy Soter. The conclusion then becomes a personal sphragis, as suggested by Cahen, in which Callimachus asks his king for blessings. But we need not, and indeed should not, attempt with Lesky to cull any evidence concerning Callimachus' private life and date of composition from this passage.

We have now seen that the divine figure of Zeus in the first hymn has an earthly and human counterpart in Ptolemy Soter, and that this poem was composed at least in part to justify the rise to power of the second Ptolemy, Philadelphus, in 285. In similar fashion, I suggest that Hymn II, to Apollo, is a companion piece

---

62 Pausanias 8.9.2.
64 Ibid., p. 60.
to the first and that the divine figure in that poem corresponds to Philadelphus. It is to this hymn that we must now turn our attention.
CHAPTER II.

PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS AND THE HYMN TO APOLLO

SECTION A

THE HYMN TO APOLLO AND PAST SCHOLARSHIP

In his second hymn, To Apollo, Callimachus employs a favorite poetic device: the epiphany motif. McKay, however, correctly observes: "Although an 'epiphany' hymn, H. 2 is a companion piece to H. I. Both Zeus as king and Apollo as patron of the arts have earthly counterparts." I agree fully with McKay's views and will attempt to ascertain the identity of the earthly counterparts and to discover if any relationship exists between the first two hymns of Callimachus. I believe it necessary at the outset, however, to review the major scholarship concerning this hymn in order to establish

---

1Hymns V and VI also employ the epiphany motif. Recently a case has been made by L. J. Bauer, Callimachus, Hymn IV: An Exegesis (Dissertation, Brown University, 1970) for the existence of the motif in the Hymn to Delos.

a proper and useful background for our discussion.

Like the Hymn to Zeus, the Hymn to Apollo contains references to earthly monarchs:

*ος μαχεται μακαρεσιν, έμψ Βασιλη, μαχοντοθεσις έμψ Βασιλη, και Απολλωνι μαχοντο.*

(II. 26-27)

and

*και άρος τε θεοδωτειη ήμετερος βασιλευσιν, δει ο έυθυκος Απολλων.*

(II. 67-68)

The scholia identify the king mentioned by Callimachus in the hymn as Ptolemy III, Euergetes. The scholium on verse 26 reads:

*<βασιλης>, την Πτολεμαιων τη Ευργετη δια δε το φιλολογον αυτον ειναι δε θεον τιμη.

On the other hand, the scholium to verse 68 simply reads:

*<την ημετερος βασιλευσι>, την Πτολεμαιω.*

Despite the scholia's identification of Euergetes in verse 26, scholars have not attained unanimity concerning the identity of the earthly king or the date of the hymn's composition.

Once again it is Richter who set the precedent from which more recent scholars have worked in their inter-
pretations. In his discussion of the hymn Richter once again sees Philadelphus, but in this hymn he is in the guise of the god Apollo. It is not, however, the Philadelphus who has just acceded to the throne in Hymn I, but a mature Philadelphus who by the end of his reign had brought Cyrene under his aegis by the royal marriage of his son Euergetes to Berenice, the daughter of Magas. Therefore, according to Richter, the phrase ἐνεργεῖ Βασιλῆι in line 26 refers to Philadelphus and not to Euergetes as the scholiast suggests. This identification of course does not explain the use or the meaning of the plural ἡμετέροις βασιλείσιν in verse 86. I believe it imperative to examine the possible implications of Callimachus' use of the plural here in order that we may arrive at a valid interpretation of the hymn.

Richter offers a reasonable, yet, I believe, erroneous, solution to the difficulty: the phrase ἡμετέροις βασιλείσιν refers to both Philadelphus and his son Euergetes, who became king of Cyrene in 248 upon the conclusion of a peace treaty between Egypt and Callimachus' native state. Philadelphus, of course,

3Richter, Hymnen auf Zeus und Apollo, pp. 6-16.
4Ibid., p. 11: "Der Hymnus fiel also in die allerletzten Lebenszeit des Philadelphus . . . ."
5Ibid., p. 14.
was still alive at this time; since the second Ptolemy died in the following year, however, Richter points with certainty to the year 248 as the date of composition and suggests that the hymn extols the second and third Ptolemies. Richter concentrates on the latter section of the hymn to extend his interpretation. He envisions Apollo's defeat of the serpent Pytho as symbolic for Ptolemy's victory over Demetrius. In addition, from Callimachus' reference to the nymph Cyrene, who scattered the lions and whom Apollo ravished, Richter infers that the poet was pointing to Berenice, who assisted in the plot to assassinate Demetrius.

Such an interpretation of the final portion of the hymn raises immediate objections. Couat, for example, notes: "... is it not improbable that Demetrius, the enemy of Philadelphus, who subsequently is to be compared to the serpent Pytho, should here be compared with Apollo, because Apollo is the ravisher of Berenice?" Couat's

---


7. Demetrius the Fair, son of Demetrius Poliorcetes and half-brother of Antigonus II (Gonatas). Justinianus (26.3) informs us that Magas, king of Cyrene, had promised his young daughter Berenice to Euergetes in marriage. Upon his death in 258, however, his wife, in an apparent attempt to free Cyrene from the yoke of Egypt, asked Demetrius to her court and promised Berenice to him. He consequently became involved in an affair with Magas' widow and was eventually assassinated at the instigation of Berenice. Berenice and Euergetes were eventually married in 248.7.

objection is well taken. Although Callimachus' style may be considered illusive, we can question whether he would identify the infamous Demetrius with the serpent Pytho in one section of the hymn and the blessed god Apollo in another.

With regard to the remainder of the poem, however, Couat's conclusions coincide with Richter's: "... the Hymn to Apollo was composed in 248, in honor of Ptolemy Philadelphus and for the annual festival of the Carneian Apollo at Cyrene."\(^9\) Couat adds convincing and substantial evidence to the claim that Apollo is to be identified with Philadelphus in Hymn II. He presents a comparison of the portrait of Apollo painted by Callimachus in his hymn and the picture of Philadelphus presented by Theocritus in Idyll 17. In his comparison Couat discovers a very close similarity in characteristics between the Apollo of Callimachus and the Philadelphus of Theocritus and then concludes: \(^10\)

Hence it certainly is Philadelphus whom Callimachus wished to represent in the guise of Apollo. In the first hymn, in honor of Zeus, the poet had sung of the invincible power of his sovereign; in the second hymn, in honor of Apollo, it is rather the fertile and active intelligence that he celebrates. Hymn I

---

\(^9\) Ibid., p. 245.

\(^10\) Ibid., p. 244.
extolled the definite establishment of his long reign; Hymn II tells of its final results, and especially of the annexation of the Cyrenaica by Egypt.

The foregoing arguments concerning the earthly identification of Apollo and the date of composition are typical and seem to prevail among most Callimachean scholars with only minor variations. 11

Susemihl, and more recently Von der Muehll, are among the few scholars who date the hymn much earlier than 248-7. Susemihl prefers to place the poem around 263 as Philadelphus and Magas terminated their struggle through the engagement of their children Euergetes and Berenice, an event which offered the prospect of the reversion of Cyrene to Egypt. 12 He admits the possibility that the poem could have been written in 248-7 when the annexation was completed. He rejects this view, however, on the basis of the sphragis (II. 105-112); for in this segment of the hymn he sees direct allusions to the

11 Cf. Wilamowitz, Hellenistische Dichtung, II, pp. 77-87; Cahen, Commentaire, 46-47; Herter, "Kallimachos," 438-439; Lesky, History of Greek Literature, 707, and Franz Studniczka, "Kyrene und Kallimachos," Hermes, 28 (1893), 1ff. also date the hymn late in the career of Callimachus but follow the scholia in identifying Apollo with Euergetes. Caesi, "Studi Callimachei," although dating the hymn in 247-6, does not find either Philadelphus or Euergetes represented by Apollo.

alleged literary dispute between Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes. According to Susemihl, therefore, the years 248-7 are obviously too late to be of any importance to this quarrel. Consequently he argues for an early date.

Most scholars, then, believe that the Hymn to Apollo was written late in the career of Callimachus (as most believe that the Hymn to Zeus was a product of the early period of the poet's career). Most also envision an earthly king represented by the god Apollo.

It has only been recently proposed that the first two hymns, with their political references, are internally related. McKay views Hymn II as a "companion piece" to Hymn I. In his discussion of the symbolic meaning of the hymn he notes: "... Apollo assuredly stands for a Ptolemy, Ptolemy the patron, the champion; and we may suspect H. 2 is the poet's paean to him."\(^{13}\) McKay then concludes: "If then H. 1 is reasonably regarded as an early plea for royal favour and recognition, H. 2 seems a later act of thanksgiving for royal protection."\(^{14}\)

McKay also recognizes the existence of one very basic problem. Should one assume that both Zeus and

\(^{13}\) McKay, "The Poet at Play," p. 16.

\(^{14}\) Ibid.
Apollo in *Hymn II* have earthly counterparts, or does Callimachus intend only Apollo to have a specific human equivalent? If one supposes that both gods are involved as the divine analog for human kings, then there appear to be two possible interpretations.\(^{15}\) The first would have Zeus equivalent to Philadelphus (the same formula put forth by McKay for *Hymn I*) and Apollo equal to Euergetes, who was Euergetes' co-regent in 267-266.\(^{16}\) The alternative is to see Apollo as Philadelphus, an identification which would then create the formula that Zeus represents Ptolemy Soter. Such an assumption, according to McKay, is most difficult, since the co-regency of Soter and Philadelphus occurred in 285-283, and the tense of ἡρα in verse 29 "... demands a present reality."\(^{17}\) The other possibility of course is to claim that Zeus has no earthly counterpart and is merely "his celestial self."\(^{18}\)

Using this form of reasoning, McKay concludes: \(^{19}\)

---


\(^{16}\) *Ibid.* McKay does recognize the objection that Philadelphus' co-regent was never identified positively as Euergetes, but only as Ptolemy, the son of Philadelphus.

\(^{17}\) *Ibid.*


\(^{19}\) *Ibid.*
Philadelphus then becomes Zeus' most honoured son, just as at one stage in H. 1 this king is the divinest of kings, honoured by Zeus... That is to say there would be a development in the imagery. At this stage in the first hymn Ptolemy is 'divinest of the kings of Zeus,' while in the second he is unequivocally a god. This would suggest that Hymn 1 precedes while H. 2 follows Philadelphus' open assumption of divine honours (c. 271/0).

Before continuing with an interpretation of the hymn we should clarify one additional point. In their discussions of the second hymn, many scholars (especially those who adhere to the belief that Apollo represents Euergetes) argue that Callimachus' digression on Cyrene implies that relations between Cyrene and Egypt were peaceful at the time when Callimachus composed the hymn. Otherwise any mention of Cyrene would result in a hostile reaction on the part of Ptolemy. The two periods during which Cyrene and Egypt enjoyed their closest relations were the late 260's when Magas had promised Berenice to Euergetes (a contract which was the harbinger of unification) and also the early 240's when the annexation was completed by the royal marriage. Consequently scholars have argued that the hymn was written during one of these periods.

I believe, however, that it is not valid to posit a date of composition on such grounds. As McKay observes "... Kallimachos had valid reasons for
discussing Cyrene since it was his native city." It is entirely conceivable and even appropriate that Callimachus would allow his patriotic and nationalistic feelings to come to the surface in the Cyrene episode. What the true motive of Callimachus was in his use of the Cyrene story will be discussed in the following section.

\[20^{\text{Ibid.}}\]
SECTION B

APOLLO AND PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS

Earlier I mentioned the possibility of the inter-
relationship of the first two hymns of Callimachus.
McKay's position that the two are "companion pieces"
is correct; but the details of his arguments are subject
to objections at several points. I also readily
agree with McKay's suggestion that both Zeus and Apollo
of the hymn have earthly counterparts. The crux of
the issue then becomes the identity of the counterparts
of the gods. The difficulty of McKay's argument stems
from his identification of Zeus' human counterpart in
the first hymn; at one moment Zeus represents Philadelphus,
at another possibly Soter. McKay did not envision one
definite earthly counterpart for Zeus in Hymn I; as a
result (even with his "companion piece" theory) he is
in doubt concerning the god's earthly identity, if he
has one at all, in Hymn II. I firmly believe that the
two hymns are inter-related, with the second naturally
following the first; we can also see that the identities
of earthly kings represented by gods remain fixed.
throughout both hymns. We shall begin our discussion of the hymn proper with the controversial verses:

\[\text{ἡ ἤ̣} \ 
\text{φθέγγεσθε \ καὶ \ ὁ ἀκάρπεσσιν \ ἔριξέν.}
\text{ὁς μᾶ̣ χεταὶ \ ἀκάρπεσσιν \ ἐμφ θασιλῆς \ μάχοιτο.}
\text{ὅστις \ ἐμφ θασιλῆς, καὶ \ Ἀπόλλων \ μάχοιτο.}

(II. 25-27)

As already demonstrated in the initial section of this chapter, these lines have resulted in much scholarly debate. The question still remains: to whom does the phrase ἐμφ θασιλῆ refer in lines 26 and 27? According to the scholia it is Euergetes; but need it be? I believe that it is not unreasonable to posit the theory that the reference is in fact to Philadelphus and that these verses refer to his troubled accession to the throne of Egypt. It is here that Callimachus admonishes those (especially the brothers of Philadelphus) who would challenge the legitimacy of Philadelphus' claim to the throne; for "those who would fight with Philadelphus fight also against Apollo." Therefore the divine figure of Apollo should be equated on the earthly level with Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Our claim receives confirmation in the following two verses of the hymn:

\[\text{τὸν ἄπολλων, ὅ τι \ οἱ \ κατὰ \ θυμὸν \ ἄεί \ ὡς.}
\text{τιμῆσει \ δύναται \ γὰρ, ἐπεὶ \ Δί \ δεξιὸς \ ἦσται.}

(II. 28-29)
Apollo is not an impotent or ineffectual son of Zeus; he has power; he has strength. Symbolic of his heavenly power is his position at the right hand of his father, Zeus. Callimachus has thus portrayed a divine association, Zeus the father and Apollo the son, both sitting in judgement and wielding power over all. None, to be sure, can deny the ultimate authority of Zeus; for he is the same Zeus whom we saw in Hymn I: it is he who assigns duties to the lesser gods, and it is he who is the dominant power on Olympus. Among the gods to whom he assigns duties is his son Apollo; yet Apollo's power is not to be overlooked or underestimated; on the contrary, it is to be highly respected, for it ranks second only to the power of the almighty Zeus. Of special privilege under the aegis of Apollo is the chorus; for, as Callimachus states, "it sings according to Apollo's heart."

This unique picture of Apollo sitting at the right hand of Zeus is not accidental nor coincidental; it is an overt attempt by Callimachus to picture the closeness of the divine relationship by means of an apparent co-regency, for both Zeus the father and Apollo the son have power.²¹ This portrayal of the divine

²¹Although the very close relationship and connection between Zeus and Apollo is well attested, e.g. Homeric
pair, bound not only by their close familial relationship but also by their position of power, lends solid support to an interpretation based on divine representatives. We know of two co-regencies among the early Ptolemies which could be easily represented by the picture of Zeus and Apollo in verses 28-29: the two year co-regency of Soter and his son Philadelphus in 285-283, and that of Philadelphus and his son Ptolemy (probably Euergetes). It has been demonstrated, however, that Apollo has been associated with Philadelphus earlier in the hymn. Therefore we now have the picture of Philadelphus, the young co-regent, sitting at the right hand of his father ruling over Egypt, just as Zeus and Apollo rule over the world. Zeus then maintains the same earthly identity which he had in Hymn I, that of Ptolemy Soter. The picture of Zeus in Hymn II does not vary from that of the first hymn. He is still the almighty god, who wields ultimate power over men and gods alike. In like manner his earthly counterpart, Ptolemy Soter, remains, even during the co-regency, the ultimate power in Egypt. We now have two equations based upon divine images which are at work in

Hymn to Hermes 468ff., there is no apparent evidence earlier than Callimachus to support Apollo's position at the right hand of Zeus.
the Hymn to Apollo: Zeus representing Ptolemy Soter and Apollo, Zeus' son, being equivalent to Philadelphus, Soter's son. The scene of Zeus and Apollo sitting together in an apparent divine partnership in power represents the co-regency of Soter and Philadelphus. Both partnerships, divine and human, involve a father who is the ultimate authority and a son whose supreme power is unquestionable and second only to his father's.

Philadelphus' position of co-regent is further reflected later in the hymn:

```
ιὴ ἴπ ταῖς ἑλεοσ, εὐθύς σα μην ἄναν
γενναὶδιοςσήπος. τὸ δὲ ἔξητι κεῖθεν ἄειδη.
```

(II. 103-104)

The word δοσσηπός, "assistant," is used by Callimachus not only to emphasize the beneficial nature of Apollo but also to define the god's heavenly responsibility. This responsibility he held in common with Philadelphus at one time; for indeed Philadelphus served as an "assistant" to his father between the years 285-283. Once again, therefore, we can see Ptolemy Philadelphus represented by the divine figure of Apollo.

We are, then, justified in identifying Philadelphus with Apollo in the second hymn. We must now view the entire poem to ascertain if this equation
is valid throughout. Unlike the first hymn, which has its setting at tranquil libations to Zeus (Soter), the all-powerful god who is the personification of order in the universe (just as Ptolemy Soter is all-powerful and the personification of order in Egypt), the Hymn to Apollo opens with an aura of anticipatory excitement; for we are about to witness the epiphany of Apollo at his temple. The enthusiastic commotion accompanying such a divine visitation affects not only human beings but extends to the environs of the temple:

οἶνον ὁ τῶπολλωνος ἐσείσατο ὁφυνῖνος θρησκ.,
οῖα δ’ ὕλον τὸ μέλαθρον ἕκας ἕκας ὅσις ἀλητρός.

(II. 1-2)

and

αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχής ἄνακλινατε πυλᾶν
αὐται ἐς κλητοὶς ὃ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακρὴν.

(II. 6-7)

Apollo himself is at the door: καὶ ὅ που τὰ θυρετρα
καλῇ ποιής φθίβος ἁράσσει. (II. 3), and it is time to cele-
brate: οἴ δὲ νέοι μολῆν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε (II. 8).

Much scholarly debate has been concentrated upon the question of whether the Hymn to Apollo was written for an actual religious occasion.22 I believe

22 Cahen, Commentaire, pp. 45ff.
consideration of such an issue tends to obfuscate a deeper purpose of Callimachus. The epiphany of Apollo at his temple in the beginning of the hymn is intended to direct the reader's attention not only to a religious ceremony or occasion, but also to an analogous historical event. There was indeed one occasion in Alexandrian history (i.e. during the lifetime of Callimachus) which would have been received with the excitement and joy similar to that portrayed in the epiphany of Apollo at his temple in the second hymn. I allude, of course, to the accession of Philadelphus as co-regent with Soter in 235. Philadelphus' accession must have been celebrated with much pomp at Alexandria, and probably was received by many, especially the scholars and literary figures at the Museum and Library, with joy and optimism.

Consequently, Callimachus has employed a joyful religious experience at the beginning of the poem to focus the reader's attention upon an actual historical event and figure. The divine subject of the first hymn is Zeus, that of the second his beloved son Apollo whom Leto bore on the island of Delos; yet in each of the hymns we find Callimachus directing our attention and thoughts to earthly subjects. The first hymn opens with libations to Zeus Soter in a ceremony which directs our
attention to Ptolemy Soter. The epiphany of Zeus' son Apollo opens the second hymn; in this instance our thoughts are directed to another son, Philadelphus, the son of Soter, who made a symbolic epiphany when he ascended the throne as co-regent with his father. Thus we have at the very beginning of the poem the divine personnage of Apollo representing an earthly figure, Ptolemy Philadelphus.

For the first twenty-four lines of the hymn Callimachus establishes the religious setting and tone while simultaneously alluding to the accession of Philadelphus. Through the association with the epiphany of Apollo, Callimachus instills the accession of Philadelphus with religious meaning and significance. In short, he sanctifies Philadelphus as co-regent.

The literary equation that Apollo is equivalent to Philadelphus receives further support when we compare the character and duties of Apollo presented in the hymn with those of Philadelphus. As already mentioned, verses 28-29 relate that Apollo held special honor for the chorus, for it sang according to his heart. Such a reference assumes broader significance when we recall Philadelphus' continued patronage of the arts and his support of the Museum and Library. His literary interests were generally well known and were the subject
of at least one additional poem, Theocritus' *Idyll 17*.

We see, then, Philadelphus represented by Apollo, the patron of the arts.

Callimachus concludes the first portion of the hymn with an hymnic topos similar to that expressed by Theocritus. In lines 30-31 Callimachus relates the abundance of themes available when writing of Apollo:

Theocritus found himself in a similar predicament as he searched for a way to begin his idyll in honor of Philadelphus, and compared himself to a woodsman among the forests of Mt. Ida:

---

23 Verses 55-56 prove that the idyll was written in honor of Philadelphus. For a further discussion on Philadelphus and his patronage of the arts consult A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* (2 vols. 2nd. ed; Cambridge: 1965), II, p. 343.

24 The same topos concerning the abundance of themes surrounding Apollo is employed in the *Homerica Hymns* to Delian and Pythian Apollo.
To be sure it would be premature to advance any conclusions concerning the equation of Apollo with Philadelphus based upon this obvious similarity in the passages of Callimachus and Theocritus. What we are able to observe, however, is that both passages serve to introduce specific descriptions of figures who appear strikingly similar, Philadelphus and Apollo.

Following line 31 there is a transition in the hymn. Cahen believes that lines 25-31 conclude the ritual material of the hymn and that Callimachus now moves to a eulogy of Apollo. Cahen is entirely correct in his assertion, for in the first twenty-four lines we are witness to a religious experience (the epiphany of Apollo at his temple). Verse 32, then, initiates an elaborate description of the god himself. Serving as a transition passage are verses 25-31 in which we are informed of Apollo's position of power on Olympus and his devotion to the chorus.

Included in Callimachus' following description

---

25 Cahen, Commentaire, p. 56: "Fin du tableau rituel; passage au sujet, l'Éloge d'Apollon."
of Apollo are the god's physical appearance, and his
divine responsibilities and duties. The question
should then arise: Is Apollo the sole object of the
description or is he representative of some earthly
counterpart, namely Philadelphus? I believe that
a complete review of Callimachus' description of Apollo,
when considered in light of the description of Philadelphus
by Theocritus, will positively reveal that Apollo is
the divine image of Philadelphus, and that in the god
we are invited to see the second Ptolemy.

The poet opens his description of Apollo with the
awe-inspiring wealth and possessions of the god:

χρύσα τῶπολοιν ὁ τ' ἐνδυτὸν ἡ τ' ἔπιπορπής
ἡ τε λύρη τοῦ τ' ἐκείμα τὸ ἄμυτον ἡ τε φαρέτρη,
χρύσα καὶ τα πέδιλα. πολύχρυσος γὰρ Ἀπόλλων
καὶ πολυκτένος.

(II. 32-35)

That Apollo was surrounded by gold and other riches
was, of course, a well known tradition. This portrait
of Apollo coincides with the commonly accepted picture
of Philadelphus, whose wealth was obvious to all and
often extravagantly displayed. 26

26 To be sure Ptolemaic wealth in general is legendary,
but it appears that Philadelphus held a special niche among
the early Ptolemies in terms of material wealth. The account
of the Pompay of Philadelphus related by Callixeinus and
found in Athenaeus 5. 200f-201a, and also Appian's state-
ments in his Praefatio, 10, reflect upon the massive wealth
of Philadelphus. Appian states that Philadelphus had
accumulated 740,000 talents of silver.
Callimachus continues his portrait of Apollo with a discussion of the god's physical beauty and youth:

καὶ μὲν ἄεὶ καλὸς καὶ ἄεὶ νέος· οὕποτε φοῖβον ἀθλείας ὑπὸ δόξον ἐπὶ κόσμον ἄθεόν παρειμαῖς, αἱ δὲ κόραι εὐδέντα πέδας λείψουσιν ἐλαια.

(II. 36-38)

Couat, who believes that the hymn was written late in the poet's career (the year 248), feels that these lines would have been well received by the aging Philadelphus, who, "... when he was tormented with gout and felt his end approaching, publicly acclaimed that, for himself alone, he had discovered the secret of immortality."27 Couat's assertion is indeed feasible, but not necessarily the only or correct explanation. If, instead of flattery of an aging Philadelphus, we consider the above passage as descriptive of the monarch very early in his career, i.e. at the time when he assumed the co-regency, our interpretation assumes an entirely different meaning. Philadelphus was born on Cos in 310. He would have been

---

a relatively young, yet mature twenty-five when he joined his father as co-regent in 285. I believe it more valid to state that the figure of Apollo, who was after all a member of the younger generation of Olympian gods, suggests not an aging king, but one who is still young and strong. In addition, like his divine counterpart, the young Philadelphus possessed golden hair. The theory of a young Philadelphus then corresponds more closely to the portrait of Apollo as drawn by Callimachus in the hymn than Couat's view of an aging monarch.

Callimachus adds still another note concerning Apollo's hair:

οὐ λίπος Ἀπόλλωνος ἀποστάξουσιν ἔθειραι,
ἀλλ' αὐτὴν πανάκειαν ἐν ἀστέι β' ὡς κεν ἐκεῖναι
πρώτες ἔραξε πέσοσιν, ἀκήρια πάντ' ἐγένεντο.

(II. 39-41)

These verses reflect the joyful optimism of a poet welcoming a young ruler. For, as the drops from Apollo's locks will keep the cities upon which they fall free from harm, so Callimachus here envisions Philadelphus protecting and keeping safe the many cities under the Ptolemaic aegis as his father before him had done.

---

28 Theocritus Idyll 17.103 states that Philadelphus possessed yellow hair.
Specifically, Callimachus might be referring to his native city of Cyrene, and urging it to accept Philadelphus, not as a foreign king imposed upon the people, but as a god who will protect the city from harm. Such an exhortation would not be entirely unusual for a poet who was fully aware of the turbulent and chaotic history of his native city, especially in its relations with Egypt.\textsuperscript{29} Callimachus felt two allegiances: one to his beloved native city Cyrene and the other to his newly established home and residence of his patron, Alexandria. Although we can only speculate, it is reasonable to believe that Callimachus desired relations between the two states to be harmonious under the leadership of Philadelphus. Our interpretation, therefore, involves not only flattery of Philadelphus, pictured as the protector of cities; it also recognizes the poet's subtle encouragement to these cities, in particular Cyrene, to welcome the new co-regent with enthusiasm.

The list of Apollo's skills follows in a fairly obvious reference to Philadelphus:

\textsuperscript{29}For a concise summary of Cyrenian history see the introduction of E. S. G. Robinson's Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyrenaica (Bologna: 1965), pp. xiii-xviii; P. Chamoux's Cyrène sous la Monarchie des Battiades (Paris: Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1953), gives a much more detailed account of Cyrene's history.
Apollo has many skills, primary among which are those of song and archery. In a similar manner Philadelphus is praised by Theocritus as being talented in both areas:

τοῖς ἄγρα πλατέσσαν ἐγγεμφάται πεδίοις
ζανθοκόμας Πτολεμαῖος, ἐπιστάμενος δόρῳ πάλαιν,

(Idyll 17.102-103)

and

οὐδὲ διανύσσου τις ἄγρα ἑρωὺς κατ' ἀγωνίας
ὑπερέπιστάμενος λιγυρῶν ἀναμέλεις ἀοίδαν,
ψ' οὐ διήγεν ἀντάξιον ὅπασα τέχνας,
Μουσῶν ἐ' ὑποφήται ἀείδοντι Πτολεμαῖον
ἀντ' ἐνεργεσίας.

(Idyll 17.112-116)

The addition of prophecy and healing among the skills of Apollo is, of course, automatic and would here enhance the prestige of Apollo's earthly counterpart. The reference to the healing skills of Apollo in addition suggests the politically therapeutic talents of Philadelphus as he attempts to heal the wounds caused by his accession. The additional flattery, nevertheless, would have been well received by the young monarch.
The foregoing comparisons of Apollo and Philadelphus can only lead one to conclude with Couat that "... it certainly is King Philadelphus whom Callimachus wished to represent in the guise of Apollo."30

Having completed his physical description of Apollo, which, as we have seen, is in most parts representative of Philadelphus, Callimachus proceeds to relate the origin of several epithets of Apollo. Lines 47-54 relate the circumstances surrounding two of these: Phoebus and Nomius. We are informed by Callimachus that Apollo has borne these particular epithets since the time he tended the flocks of Admetus. It is quite possible that the titles and the manner in which Apollo acquired them point to Philadelphus in the sense that he, as king, is the shepherd of the people.

Following this paragraph, Callimachus turns to a far more relevant mythological discussion: Apollo's reputation for founding cities. The reason why Callimachus chose to discuss this aspect of Apollo's mythological background is indeed important and germane to a correct interpretation of the hymn. As we shall demonstrate, Apollo's association with the founding of cities, especially Cyrene, is essential to the purpose of Callimachus in composing the hymn. The discussion

30Couat, Alexandrian Poetry, p. 244.
of Apollo and his relationship with the foundation of cities begins as follows:

Φοίβῳ δὲ ἐστὶν πόλις διεμετρήσαντο ἄνθρωποι. Φοίβος υἱὸς ἰπποκοῦς φιλάθλου κτίσομενος; αὐτὸς δὲ θεμελία Φοίβος ὑπαίνει. (II. 55-57)

Couat sees in these verses additional references to Philadelphus; for the son of Soter apparently did take much initiative in establishing new cities throughout the empire:

Asia Minor, Lycia, Cilicia, Coele-Syria abounded in new cities founded by Philadelphus. As far away as in Aetolia we find the name of Arsinoë, his wife, and from the delta of the Nile which had been connected with the Red Sea by the "canal of the two seas," to the confines of Aethiopia, trading harbours established by Ptolemy secured the commercial relations of Alexandria with Africa and Arabia.

Couat's interpretation here is correct and should be accepted, but I believe he failed to observe the significance of these verses to the remainder of the poem. Callimachus' discussion of Apollo's role as founder of cities is a general preface to a more specific

---

situation, a situation which is the very crux of this topic. I refer of course to Apollo's participation in the foundation of Cyrene, and his relationship to that city. Since Callimachus has already identified Philadelphus with Apollo, the young king's possible affiliation with Cyrene and his importance to that city is also revealed here.

With the Ptolemies (in particular Philadelphus) maintaining the prominent position thus far in the hymn, Callimachus proceeds immediately to a direct historical reference which has been the focal point of much controversy:

Φοίβος καὶ βασιλεῖοι ἐμὴν πόλιν ἔφρασε Βάττη
καὶ Λιβύην ἐσιὸντε κόρας ἡγήσατο λαῷ,
δεξιὸς οἰκιστήρι, καὶ ἀμοσὲ τείχεα ὅσειν
ἡμετέροις βασιλεύσιν.

(II. 65-68)

Here we are faced with a question similar to that posed by verses 26-27, namely to whom does the plural ἡμετέροις βασιλεύσιν of line 68 refer? The importance of the proper identification of the "kings" to the correct interpretation of the hymn cannot be emphasized enough, for Cahen may be entirely correct when, commenting on the ἡμετέροις βασιλεύσιν, he states: "... les deux mots sont la clé de tout l'Hymne, au moins dans sa
signification politique." Studniczka is the leading proponent of the view that the "kings" are the Battiiadae, to whom Cyrene was promised, as evidenced by Herodotus 4.155 and 157, Diodorus Siculus 8.29 and Pindar Pythian 4.4ff.33 The more commonly accepted interpretation, however, is that the allusion is to the Ptolemies, specifically Philadelphus and Euergetes. The theory that the words are a reference to the Ptolemies rather than the Battiiadae receives support from the scholia which read ΄ΗΜΕΤΕΡΟΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΙΝ ΣΦ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΩ. Cahen does not wish to limit "kings" to individual members of the Ptolemaic family, but to the entire dynasty, and the same god who promised Cyrene to Battus now offers the city to the masters of Egypt.34

Mais l'expression peut designer aussi bien, et mieux, toute la <dynastie> des Ptolémées . . . Nos rois les Ptolémées aujourd'hui, comme autrefois, les Battiiades, et Battos tout le premier. Le même dieu qui guidait la marche d'Aristotélès donne aujourd'hui, dans son égoïsme, les ramparts de Cyrene aux maîtres de l'Egypte. La légitimité est la même ici et là; le dilemme Battiiades et Ptolémées, ce qui n'empêche que, dans la bouche du poète du Musée, toute la force sentimentale de l'expression s'applique aux souverains d'aujourd'hui.

32Cahen, Commentaire, p. 70.
34Cahen, Commentaire, p. 70.
The view that this portion of the hymn is, in effect, a declaration of Ptolemaic mastery over Cyrene is quite valid; but I adhere to the belief that particular kings are the objects of this reference. Since we have exhibited that Apollo represents Philadelphus and Zeus is equivalent to Soter in the early portion of the hymn, it seems that any reference to "kings" in the plural would direct the reader's thoughts to the first two Ptolemies during their co-regency. Consequently we have here a proclamation of Ptolemaic power over Cyrene. This political declaration receives religious sanctification in the following verses:

\[ \text{ἡμετέροις βασιλεύσιν ἵμαρτε τε βάσις τε βάσειν.} \]

(II. 67-68)

What better propaganda material for the Ptolemies than for a Cyrenaean to proclaim their legitimacy to rule over his native Cyrene? Wilamowitz considers the hymn a propaganda piece, since it would have been read both at Alexandria and Cyrene.\(^{35}\) Such propaganda would have been graciously welcomed by the Ptolemies not, as Wilamowitz claims, after the peaceful unification of Cyrene and Egypt by the marriage of Euergetes and

\(^{35}\)Wilamowitz, Hellenistische Dichtung, II, p. 80.
Berenice II, but at a time when friction existed between the two states. Such a period had existed in the reign of Soter and immediately after Philadelphus became sole ruler.

Magas had ruled Cyrene as governor under Soter, but revolted against Philadelphus, his half-brother, shortly after Soter's death. It is very likely that the antagonism which existed between the two was visible to most prior to Philadelphus' assumption of sole rule in 283. Future trouble between Philadelphus and Magas was probably evident during the years of the co-regency. It would be far more appropriate during this period for a Cyrenaean, composing at the court of Alexandria, to recognize the mastery of the Ptolemies in a statement declaring their divine right to rule Cyrene. Such a statement could be used as propaganda to urge the Cyrenaecans to abandon the rebellious inclinations of Magas and accept peacefully the sovereignty of the Ptolemies, especially Philadelphus, as their kings. At any rate it certainly would have pleased the kings, Soter and Philadelphus, and would ingratiate Callimachus to them.

Callimachus abandons his overt political reference at line 68 and from verses 69-104 he indulges his nationalistic sentiments by narrating the founding of
Cyrene and the important origin of the cry Hie, Hie, Paecon. With the hymn now being basically complete, Callimachus takes the opportunity to propagandize on his own behalf in a personal sphragis which concludes the hymn:

\[\text{Ω} \ \text{Φθόνος} \ '\text{Απολλάνως} \ \varepsilon \ ' \ \text{οὐ} \ \text{χάρις} \ \varepsilon \ ιππειν.}
\[\text{'οὐκ} \ \text{ἀγαμὴ} \ \text{τὸν} \ άδιδθον \ άς \ οὐδ', \ \text{όσα} \ \text{πόντος} \ \text{ἀείδει.}
\[\text{τὸν} \ \text{Φθόνον} \ \text{ἀπόλλων} \ \text{ποδὲ} \ τ' \ \text{ήλασεν} \ άδε \ t' \ έξειπεν.}
\[\text{Λασσυρίον} \ \text{ποταμεῖο} \ \text{μέγας} \ βόσος,} \ \text{άλλα} \ \text{τὰ} \ \text{πολλά}
\[\text{λύματα} \ \text{γῆς} \ \text{kai} \ \text{πολλόν} \ \text{έφ' θάται} \ \text{συρμετόν} \ \text{έλκει.}
\[\text{Δηδ.} \ \text{οὐκ} \ \text{άπό} \ \text{παντός} \ \text{υδώρ} \ \text{φορέσωσι} \ \text{μέλισσαι,}
\[\text{άλλ' ἡτις} \ \text{καθαρὴ} \ \text{τε} \ \text{kai} \ \text{ἄχραντος} \ \text{ἀνέρπει}
\[\text{πλέανος} \ \text{έξ} \ \text{λειψὶς} \ \text{όλιγη} \ \text{λίβας} \ \text{άκραν} \ \text{άιων,'}
\[\text{χαίρε,} \ \text{ἀναξί} \ \text{ό} \ \text{δὲ} \ \text{κόμως,} \ \text{ιν'} \ \text{ό} \ \text{Φθόνος,} \ \text{ένεα} \ \text{νέοιτο.}
\]

(II. 105-113)

The use of the personal sphragis, as we have seen, has been employed by Callimachus in Hymn I in his request for blessings from Soter. In the second hymn, however, the sphragis is in mythological form and requires additional explanation. That Apollo is to be identified with Philadelphus here there can be no doubt, for Philadelphus, like Apollo, was a true patron of the arts and both the Library and the Museum flourished under his reign. The task of discovering the identities of historical figures represented by Μάρος and Φθόνος is much more difficult. The traditional theory is that Apollonius of Rhodes is Φθόνος and that the Assyrian river
is his *Argonautica*. 36

It is also quite possible, however, that the hymn at this point refers to no particular individuals or literary works, but rather to schools of thought. That there was a dispute between those who adhered to quite different literary values has been noted by both ancient and modern critics. Basically, the dispute arose between those who advocated short, well-structured and balanced poetry and those who promoted more traditional forms, such as lengthy epic. The former group had Callimachus as the champion of its cause as demonstrated by his doctrine of poetry presented in the prologue of the *Aitia* and in *Iambus* 13. The opponents of Callimachus and his followers possibly had as their primary figure Apollonius. But to believe that this was a purely personal feud between Callimachus and Apollonius is naive and suggests that they were the only two prominent literary figures in Alexandria.

This was a professional literary debate concerning the trend of literature and it is quite possible that every literary figure in the area would have some feeling on the subject and would espouse one of the causes.

---

36 For the most recent discussions of the alleged feud between Callimachus and Apollonius cf. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, I, Ch. 11, and R. Pfeiffer, A History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
Allegations, possibly accusations, as well as statements of literary self-righteousness would have been exchanged by both sides.

It is in the σφραγις of Hymn II that Callimachus asks Philadelphus, the revered patron of the arts, to intervene and pass judgement. To no one's surprise, as Apollo spurned Envy and preferred the pure and undefiled waters of a holy fountain to the Assyrian river, so Philadelphus is entreated by Callimachus to reject the traditional literary style espoused by the opponents of Callimachus in favor of the short, delicate style.

Consequently, Callimachus has used the technique of a personal σφραγις in each of his first two hymns to seek special dispensations from the appropriate members of the co-regency of 285-283. Each request would of course greatly enhance his position in Alexandria. From the older and more powerful Zeus, equivalent to Soter, he has asked in Hymn I for general blessings and favor. From the younger patron of the arts, Apollo, who is to be identified with Philadelphus, he has sought literary acceptance, if not prominence, and the rejection of the values of his literary opponents.
CHAPTER III

THE ALTION AND EPIPHANY MOTIFS

As already noted McKay observes that "... Hymn II is a companion piece to Hymn I." His consequent discussion of the subject is enlightening, but I believe he fails to reveal the more important aspects of the relationship of the two hymns. There are many similarities between the Hymn to Zeus and the Hymn to Apollo which set them apart from the other four pieces of the Callimachean hymnic corpus as a natural pair to be read and considered at the same time.

One element which the first two hymns have in common is their length. As individual pieces they represent the shortest of the six hymns composed by Callimachus, being respectively 96 and 113 verses in length. The comparative brevity of the poems does serve to separate these hymns from the remainder of the collection. The third and fourth hymns represent Callimachus' most lengthy efforts in the literary genre of the hymn. The Hymn to Artemis consists of 268 verses, while the Hymn to Delos is the longest of the
entire collection at 326 lines. The last two hymns of Callimachus return to a more moderate length: *Hymn V (The Bath of Pallas)* and *Hymn VI (The Hymn to Demeter)* are 142 and 138 lines long. As a result we have a division of the entire collection into three pairs according to their length:

Zeus - Apollo  Artemis - Delos  Pallas - Demeter

Such a division physically separates the first two from the other four.

The close relationship between the first two hymns extends far beyond a consideration of length. There is also a mythological relationship which further supports the claim that the two constitute a pair which should be read and considered separately from the other four. The *Hymn to Zeus* and the *Hymn to Apollo* represent the only male oriented hymns of the entire collection. The two gods Zeus and Apollo personify the very qualities an attributes commonly identified as being inherent within the male character. Their combined qualities, virtues and characteristics, e.g. strength, power, a sense of justice and intellectual enlightenment, embody the very essence of masculinity. The primary subjects of the first two hymns, Zeus and Apollo, stand in marked contrast to the deities of the other four hymns.
In addition to their both being male deities, Zeus and Apollo share a close familial relationship, that of father and son. The closeness of this father and son relationship is well attested and intentionally emphasized by Callimachus in his portrayal of Apollo sitting at the right hand of Zeus in verse 29 of Hymn II. Such a picture can only entice one to consider each god not only as an individual, but also as an inextricably bound pair. Also, this father and son combination has served as a divine image for an earthly pair, Ptolemy Soter (the father) and Ptolemy Philadelphus (the son).

The order of the hymns in the collection - Zeus the father in Hymn I followed by Apollo, the son, in Hymn II - is indeed a natural sequence when considering the patriarchal political organization of Olympus. Thus the similarity in length and subject material enables us to reflect upon the first two hymns of Callimachus as a companion pair to be considered both individually and as a grouping.

Another important argument in favor of the inter-relationship of the first two hymns of Callimachus is the proper identification of a key deity present in each hymn. That figure to whom I refer is Zeus, and it is he and the earthly figure whom he represents that provides the thread of continuity which connects the two
hymns. We have shown that, contrary to McKay's theory of fluctuating images, Zeus in the first hymn is a divine counterpart of Ptolemy Soter and that this identification remains constant throughout the hymn. The figure of Zeus also maintains a prominent position in the Hymn to Apollo, for it is at his right hand that Apollo sits. Consequently, it is necessary to identify Zeus properly in order to achieve a correct interpretation of Hymn II. There is no need to postulate another Ptolemy to be Zeus' earthly counterpart in Hymn II; for it is entirely possible that Zeus' identity remains unchanged from Hymn I. Therefore we can reasonably conclude, after reviewing the evidence provided by the hymns, that Zeus represents Ptolemy Soter in both Hymn I and Hymn II, an identification which enables us to achieve harmonious and correct interpretations of the two hymns as individual pieces and also as a paired unit.

The final and probably most convincing argument is that both hymns serve a common purpose, i.e. they are pieces of encomiastic propaganda which support, justify, glorify and indeed even sanctify the Ptolemaic regime. Although each hymn considered separately clearly reveals its inherent encomiastic nature, the two form a unit of encomiastic propaganda relevant to one specific period of time.
As we have suggested, with each hymn individually there is only one period to which both hymns as separate pieces and as a two work whole could be directed: the co-regency of Ptolemy Soter and his son Ptolemy Philadelphus in 285-283. This was a period of transition which was, of course, crucial to the existence of the Ptolemaic family as rulers of Egypt. The entire future of the Ptolemaic dynasty and the very peace of Egypt itself depended upon the successful transition of power from Soter to Philadelphus. So vital was the transferal of power that Soter attempted to secure its success by elevating Philadelphus to co-regent in an apparent violation of tradition: "... contra ius gentium minimo natu ex filiis ante infirmatatem regnum tradiderat."¹ Soter's decision without a doubt would have been highly controversial and could have split the ruling Macedonian aristocracy into hostile factions.² Such a rift among the Macedonians could have easily resulted in war and the destruction of an Egyptian empire which Soter had managed to create and preserve during the chaotic and violent period of the late fourth and

¹Justinius 16.2.

²That Soter's selection was controversial is evidenced by Hermippus (fragment 69), who says that Demetrius of Phalerum, a trusted confidant of Soter, advised the king to ignore the children of Berenice in favor of those of Eurydice in his consideration of a successor.
early third centuries. To be sure any literature which would justify Soter's choice and sanctify his and Philadelphus' position and authority would have been most welcomed by the court.

Callimachus uses two literary motifs which serve to embellish his encomiastic hymns. The two motifs, the aition in Hymn I and the epiphany in Hymn II, are favorites of Callimachus and are the pivots around which the basic political interpretations of the respective hymns revolve.\(^3\)

Aitia dominate the entire first hymn. The very topic of the hymn, the birth of Zeus, is aetiological. Callimachus rejects traditional mythology and relates his version of the birth of Zeus and the origin of his supreme power among the gods. In addition, dispersed throughout the aetiological narration of the birth of Zeus and his eventual acquisition of supreme power are several minor aitia, e.g. the name of the river Neda in lines 37-38 and the selection of the eagle as the messenger of Zeus in lines 68-69.

It also appears that Callimachus attempts to accentuate the importance of the aetiological motif to the hymn by placing an aition at the approximate

\(^3\)His partiality for the epiphany motif is evidenced by the fifth and sixth hymns, while his constant use of the aition is attested by his lengthy work entitled the Aitia.
physical center of the poem:

'Ομφάλιον μετέπειτα πέδου καλεούσι κυδώνες.

(Ι. 44-45)

The hymn itself is 96 verses in length, but the last six lines contain Callimachus' personal plea to Zeus and Ptolemy. Consequently, if we disregard Callimachus' sphragis and consider only the hymn proper (which consists of 90 verses), this aition occupies the exact center of the hymn. No other passage is more indicative of Callimachus' poetic skill than the aition explaining the "Plain of the Navel." The aition fulfills a two-fold purpose for Callimachus. Simultaneously it dramatically reflects the genius and cleverness of Callimachean poetic structure; yet by its very position in the hymn the aition emphasizes the importance and true meaning of the aition motif in the Hymn to Zeus. Callimachus displays his poetic artistry and cleverness in this aition by announcing the navel of the hymn with the word 'Ομφάλιον.

I believe that Callimachus did not intend the reader to place cardinal importance upon his poetic cleverness or his erudition as demonstrated by the aition of the "Plain of the Navel." As a specific aition is located at the hymn's center, i.e. Ομφαλὸς,
so we also discover that the aition motif makes up the center of the hymn's thematic development. The aition motif is at the very core to a complete understanding of the hymn; in order for one to appreciate fully the complete meaning of the Hymn to Zeus, one must realize that the aition motif is at its very heart. Consequently, Callimachus attracts our attention to the physical center of the hymn, not only to witness this one specific aition, but also to realize that the aition motif is indeed the center of the poem.

Callimachus provides us with the reason why the aition motif is so vital for a correct understanding of the hymn and why the motif dominates the poem; for in line 79 he reveals the most important aition of the entire work:

ἐξ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς

(I. 79)

Earthly kings have their origin in Zeus. Here the poetic technique of Callimachus revealed in the aition motif and the political meaning of the hymn coincide and harmonize, producing an inescapable conclusion. As shown earlier, Soter was operating contra ius when he chose his youngest son, Philadelphus, to become his co-regent in 285. Such a move had to be justified,
legitimatized and indeed glorified. It is apparent that Callimachus' equation of Zeus with Soter throughout the hymn is ample glorification of the monarch, but in line 79 the poet justifies and legitimatizes Soter's selection and shields it with the very sanctity of the name of Zeus.

Soter has been identified with Zeus during the course of the hymn. This equation is constant; there is no variation or fluctuation. Therefore, when we read the words 'ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς' we must yield to the inevitable conclusion: the kings (of Egypt) are from Ptolemy Soter. Through this particular aition, the origin of kings, Callimachus has now established the authenticity of the rule of Philadelphus. He has answered the critics who objected to Soter's choice of a successor, and he has done so in a masterful manner. It is necessary to realize the importance of the aition motif in order to appreciate the hymn as a brilliant political encomium which declares the right of Ptolemy Soter to make his choice of Philadelphus and also legitimatizes the younger Ptolemy's accession to power through the aition of the origin of kings in line 79. The role of the aition in the hymn cannot be underestimated or ignored, for it is the means by which Callimachus brings to fruition the full meaning of the hymn.
Once Callimachus has pronounced Philadelphus as the legitimate successor to the Egyptian throne in Hymn I, he turns to a glorification of Soter's youngest son and his accession to the co-regency in Hymn II. As previously shown in Chapter II, the glorification of Philadelphus is evidenced by his identification with the god Apollo throughout the entire second hymn. For the occasion of his accession, however, Callimachus selects another literary motif to glorify further and even sanctify both the man and the event. I refer, of course, to the epiphany motif, which Callimachus often employed in his hymns.

In his discussion of the hymn Cahen states: "L'Hymne II, à Apollon, comme les Hymnes V et VI, est en quelque mesure un poème mimétique, qui suit le développement d'une cérémonie religieuse." He notes further that the subject of the hymn is the epiphany of Apollo at his temple in Cyrene. Cahen is of course correct in his comments, but he fails to recognize the true relationship of the epiphany motif to both the second hymn and to the first two hymns as a paired unit. Following my theory that the first two hymns are in actuality political encomiastic companion pieces, it

---

4Cahen, *Commentaire*, p. 45.
5Ibid.
seems only natural that Callimachus would follow a hymn proclaiming the legitimacy of a new ruler with a glorification of the occasion of his assumption of power. The poet accomplishes this task beautifully by employing the epiphany motif to begin the second hymn.

Considering our equation in which Zeus is equivalent to Soter, Apollo becomes identified with Philadelphus. Therefore, at the narrative level of the hymn, we have Apollo arriving at his temple; but such a scene is representative of Philadelphus appearing as co-regent, and we witness the excitement and enthusiasm which surrounded the event. Callimachus has, then, expanded the encomiastic nature of the hymn; he has truly sanctified an historical event, the accession of Philadelphus, by veiling it beneath the epiphany of the god Apollo. By so closely affiliating Apollo with Philadelphus, Callimachus has suggested, if not declared, the inviolability of the young Ptolemy's person, the divine aura of his reign, and the joyful excitement with which his epiphany as co-regent should be greeted. As the aition motif was essential to a correct understanding of Hymn I, so the epiphany motif is at the core of a proper interpretation of the Hymn to Apollo.

In sum, Callimachus composed two encomiastic hymns glorifying, justifying, and legitimatizing the position
of the first two Ptolemies. Although we cannot safely assign a definite date of composition to the hymns, the historical events represented in them are those surrounding the co-regency of Ptolemy Soter and Ptolemy Philadelphus in the years 285-283. The opportunity was indeed there to propagandize overtly on behalf of Soter and his son. Instead, however, Callimachus created two masterful poems (which still accomplished the same purpose) by employing various poetic techniques and motifs, which proves that above all Callimachus was primarily a poet.
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