

Callimachus, *Hymn 2* and the Genre of Paean

J. L. Lightfoot

New College, Oxford

Abstract

The essay considers the affiliations of Callimachus' second *Hymn* with the paean. Formal features are important in the reworking of the genre, as is to be expected from a composition by a Hellenistic poet, but Callimachus has also remained faithful to what we can discern of its wider associations, broad as these were. This can be seen in the concern with the identities of deity (Carneian Apollo), worshippers (a group of young men on the verge of maturity), and community (the historical foundation of Cyrene). But while *Hymn 2* seems to retain much of the sensibility of the paean (as evidenced by Pindar, *Pythian 5* as well as the paeans proper), it is hard to find any such fidelity to a recognisable archaic genre in either of the other so-called "mimetic" hymns; the use of a single label diverts attention from the very different ways in which Callimachean "mimesis" works. Given these differences, it is worth enquiring further into the, presumably authorial, arrangement of the collection as a whole.

Keywords: Apollo, Carneia, chorus, *euphemia*, genre, identity, mimesis, mimetic, paean, performance context, Pindar, refrain.

My starting-point is Ian Rutherford's suggestion that the poem as a whole can be seen as a Hellenistic scholar's recreation of the paean.¹ Obviously no account that reduces this (or any other Hellenistic) poem to a single genre is going to convince, but that also applies to Claude Calame's interpretation of the poem as a programmatic work that "re-articulates the epic prooemion".² Rather, the work sends out mixed signals, as the metre points to the rhapsodic

¹ I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*, Oxford, OUP, 2001, p. 128–130.

² C. Calame, "Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*", in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus*, Hellenistica Groningana 1, Groningen, Egbert Forsten, 1993, p. 37–55, at p. 54; cf. *ibid.*, p. 37: "Perhaps the form of the *Homeric hymn*, with its epic rhythm and language, was felt to be the best way of treating the story in terms of linear development ... Was the choice of the Homeric prooemium a simple literary critical decision?"; p. 38: "This tripartite study will lead up to a few reflections

tradition while the poem's other major formal marker is the paean refrain or quasi-refrain. It begins by evoking the presence of a choir, but concludes – as do all the hymns – with a sign-off formula evoking rhapsodic hymn. The *coda* suggests *both* the discontinuity between the main body of a Homeric hymn and its sphragis *and* the poetics and imagery of Pindar, who dominated what has come before. Messages are thus deliberately mixed, and trying to assert the primacy of one over the other does not seem a sensible way forward. My proposal is to concentrate on the poem's "paeanic" quality as *one* element in it. The aim is to offer a case-study in the Hellenistic understanding of genre – its scholarly classification and its mobilisation by one particular scholar-poet.

Fortunately we are not obliged to struggle with what a paean essentially *is*,³ but "only" with what Callimachus himself thought it was. The big clue is of course that the ἰὴ cry, which occurs in a high proportion of archaic poems classified as paeans,⁴ occurs five times here (21*bis*, 25*bis*, 80*bis*, 97*bis*, 103*bis*) in the form with the rough breathing.⁵ A fragmentary papyrus seems to contain polemic by Aristarchus against Callimachus' view that this was a defining feature of paean, though there is textual uncertainty about the crucial word, which Edgar Lobel restored as [τὸ ἐπίφθ]ε[γ]γμα, "refrain".⁶ It would, however, support the notion that Callimachus thought this formal feature was a genre-marker, and although the papyrus is not further informative about Callimachus' theoretical views, it is notable that the first and last two occurrences of ἰὴ in the poem also reproduce a pattern that according to Giambattista D'Alessio (art. cit.) is essential to the true paeanic refrain. That is, it is accompanied by the *paian* word. As if to make sure we do not miss the point, it is even repeated on its first occurrence (21 ἰὴ παιῆον ἰὴ παιῆον), while in the *envoi* at 97 and 103 we get twice-repeated ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον.

raised by the function and target audience of the poem, placing the circumstances of performance in relation to the ritual character of the *Homeric hymn* form".

³ On the difficulty, see L. Swift, *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*, Oxford, OUP, 2010, p. 66; G. B. D'Alessio, rev. of S. Schröder, *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian*, Stuttgart and Leipzig, Teubner, 1999, *BMCR* 2000.01.24.

⁴ S. Schröder, op. cit., p. 49–61; I. Rutherford, op. cit., p. 18–23; G. B. D'Alessio, art. cit.; A. Ford, "The Genre of Genres: Paeans and *Paian* in Early Greek Poetry", *Poetica* 38, 2006, p. 277–296, at p. 286. The aspiration in Callimachus suggests the connection with ἦμι that is posited in 103: see I. Rutherford, op. cit., p. 25 and nn. 7–8; Pfeiffer and Harder on Callim. *Aet.*, fr. 18.6.

⁵ See now J. Danielewicz, "The Metrical Aspects of the Paean Cry in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*", *Eos* 103, 2016, p. 123–125, suggesting that the metrical sleight by which the cry has been accommodated to the initial position in the hexameter enables, or at least does not preclude, the traditional, iambic, scansion, thereby suggesting its "paeanic" character.

⁶ *P. Oxy.* 2368 = *SH* 293; G. B. D'Alessio, art. cit.; I. Rutherford, op. cit., p. 90, 97–99, 237; A. Ford, art. cit., p. 286. The restoration occurs in line 18.

The clarity that emerges on this formal point contrasts – typically for Hellenistic poetry – with the muddled signals given out about performance context. Instead of the given setting of an archaic poem, Callimachus supplies a constructed one with a superfluity of detail which tends, or has tended, to throw dust in the reader’s eyes: there are resonances of Delphi (1, laurel; 19, a form of *Λυκωπεύς*, the epithet referring to Parnassus; 97–104) and Delos (4, the Delian palm;⁷ 5, the swan; 58–64), but a major Cyrenean section dominates the second half where the speaker rises to particular emotional engagement and identification. If genre had depended on setting, that might have been confusing – although it is true that Delphi and Delos are the two canonical paeanic locations, and the Cyrenean festival of the Carneia is at least compatible with the paeon, as will be argued below.

But can we progress beyond the satisfaction that is provided by formal niceties alone? The Hellenistic poets were formalists but not merely formalists, and we need next to see whether the paeon is being evoked in more subtle ways.

Structure is not particularly helpful. One way of dividing up the poem splits it into three sections, the mimetic frame (1–31), an aretalogical section (32–64), and a section that focuses in on Cyrene (65–96), almost identical in length (31, 33, 32 lines). In practice the second and third of these sections vacillate between “attributive” and “mythic” sections, past and present, the excursions into the past for Admetus (48–49) and the foundation of the Delian altar (58–64) preparing for the more substantial retrospectives on the founding of Cyrene (65–68, 72–78, 85–95). They are followed by two epilogues (97–104 and 105–112), also of identical lengths. But this tripartite division is not inevitable (32–96 could be taken as one long section), and it is hard to be persuaded by any attempt to discern triadic structure.

The use of the *paian* theme is a more promising line of enquiry. On its first occurrence (21) it is linked with the notion of *euphemia*, which might be a clue about genre given that from Simonides onwards it seems that the two were closely linked.⁸ *Paian* words typically occur at the end of a strophe.⁹ Callimachus does not do that, nor should we expect him to. Occurrences of *paian* in the second *Hymn* are not distributed regularly throughout it, but give the impression of recurrence without turning up on the stroke of a clock. What they do is add

⁷ Though, as G. B. D’Alessio, *Callimaco I: Inni, Epigrammi, Ecclie*, Milan, BUR, 1996, p. 80, n. 2, notes, on Delos itself the epithet is superfluous.

⁸ I. Rutherford, op. cit., p. 53–54 and n. 69, and id., “Paeans by Simonides”, *HSCP* 93, 1990, p. 169–209, at p. 173 and n. 10, adding Ach. Tat. 2.32.2 *παιανισμὸς ἦν ... εὐφημοῦντες*; Cels. ap. Origen, *C. Cels.* 8.66 *Ἐὰν δὲ κελεύῃ τις εὐφημῆσαι τὸν Ἥλιον ἢ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν προθυμότερα μετὰ καλοῦ παιᾶνος εὐφημεῖν...*

⁹ I. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans*, op. cit., p. 71.

character and *Affekt*. Rather than being uttered by the speaker as a ritual cry, the occurrences are “narrativised” in some way, meaning that they are worked into the context rather than being dropped into it. The first is quoted as a cry Thetis hears (21), the second is a “lemma” (97) the narrator will go on to explain, and shortly afterwards the third is the punch-line of the aetiological story (103) of the paean cry. The first, in particular, nicely illustrates Callimachus’ practice: in the first of several lists and accumulations in the poem, there is a threefold accumulation on the theme of pious silence beginning with that of the worshippers, continuing with that of the sea, and concluding with that of Thetis when she ceases her mourning for Achilles at the sound of the paean cry.¹⁰ The result is that, instead of *euphemia* and *paian* being simply, straightforwardly, syntactically, connected, they take their place in a more fluid and sophisticated structure. Callimachus seems to have taken this traditional ritual cry and uses it to create a wide range of tones and effects. So far so good. That is just the sort of thing we should expect him to do.

The presence of the aetiology of the paean may also be a pointer to the identity of the poem as a whole. Ian Rutherford has suggested that this aetiology already figured in Pindar’s *Paeans*,¹¹ and, although other sources that offer the same etymology as Callimachus are not themselves hymns,¹² it does appear in Apollonius 2.701–713, where Orpheus accompanies the Argonauts on his lyre as they sing a paean for Apollo Heoios on his way to the Hyperboreans. The order of composition of the two passages is unclear, but Apollonius does suggest a connection between the singing of the paean song and the narrative of its etymology.

Finally we come to the very complex and shifting presentation of the first person speaker. What might Callimachus have been trying to signal here? What we find is something complex enough to have caused long hesitation as to whether it is a solo singer or a chorus, whether there is an internal change of speaker (and if so where), or whether there is a single speaker but one who shifts, at a certain point, into mediating a choral hymn (which *he* hears, but *we*

¹⁰ 17 εὐφημεῖτε ... 18 εὐφημεῖ ... 20 οὐδὲ ... κινύρεται ... 22 ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα. Other examples include the accumulation of gold (32–34), with tricolon of χρύσεια ... χρύσεια ... πολύχρυσος; four specialisms of Apollo (43–46), and three close-ups or cameos of Phoebus’ activity (47 Φοῖβον καὶ ... 55 Φοῖβφ δὲ ... 65 Φοῖβος καί); how the Delian horned altar was constructed, in three stages (62–63); three names of Apollo (69–71); three city-foundations of Carneian Apollo (72–73), and two human colonists (74–76); two institutions founded by Battus in Cyrene itself (77–78); three descriptions of Apollo’s altar, in spring, in winter, and all year round (80–84).

¹¹ I. Rutherford, “Paeans by Simonides”, art. cit., p. 194 and n. 85, on the evidence of *Paeans* 7c.(c).3 and 6.121–122.

¹² I. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans*, op. cit., p. 25 n. 8.

hear only through *him*).¹³ Francis Cairns' view was that all this is perfectly conceivable in the voice of a chorus, following the archaic convention that that voice is a "mobile compound of chorus, chorus-leader and poet".¹⁴ That could quite readily account for the self-instructions (8, 25) and first persons singular referring to the speaker's local circumstances (26–27, 65, 69–71), though it accounts less well for the references to boys in the third person (12–16) and for the first seven lines, with their vivid evocation of their surroundings and emotive address to a single individual. Another interpretation is possible, that Callimachus is following the – putative – archaic performance-convention that "a large part of the song was sung by a single member of the χορός while the other members sang the refrain, or other parts of it, and perhaps danced".¹⁵ That accounts for the second person plural imperatives in 8 and 25, is just as compatible with the first-person references to "my king" (26–27) and "my city" (65), and is perhaps a better fit with 16, where a first person speaker expresses approval of a third.

There is no definitive "answer" to the problem of the hymn's speaker, but if this was a convention for the performance of archaic paeon, it is the one most compatible with Callimachus' ambiguous set-up. The first person speaker of any given paeon usually remains stable, but a few (notoriously Pind. *Paeon* 6) give the impression of shifting about, and over the course of a collection Callimachus could have observed a speaker who adopted "local", choral, and even bardic *personae*, a multiplicity which lent itself to further elaboration. Of course, he presents us with tergiversations which far exceed anything that he inherited from his archaic models. Mobile first-persons appear in paeans (and epinicia), but in Callimachus are combined with an equally mobile addressee (an individual onlooker [4], the boys [8], the collectivity of worshippers [17], Apollo himself [69, 72]). No historical paeon known to us provides precedent for this poem's combination of excitement, choral preparation, autobiographical statement, and bardic *coda*. Its complexities go beyond the capacity of archaic models to explain; different models need to be combined, and then pushed beyond their original limits. The problem does not arise in the other mimetic hymns: 5 has no chorus

¹³ For a review of some of the positions, see P. Bing, "Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*", *TAPA* 123, 1993, p. 181–198, at p. 186–189 = *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2012, p. 33–48, at p. 39–41. For the fluidity of the identities implied for the speaker, see A. D. Morrison, *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge, CUP, 2007, p. 123–137.

¹⁴ F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge, CUP, 1979, p. 121; cf. id., "Theocritus, *Idyll* 26", *PCPS* 38, 1992, p. 1–38, at p. 10–11.

¹⁵ I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans*, op. cit., p. 66; cf. C. Calame, *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role, and Social Functions*, transl. D. Collins and J. Orion, Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2001, p. 79.

at all, while in 6 the narrator instructs them to sing the refrain at the beginning and end and that is all we hear. More on this later.

Moving on from formal conventions to the inner features of the poem, we note that the opening section, however extravagant, does nevertheless have points of departure in literary and cult hymn: (i) choral imperatives, with directions to get the song underway,¹⁶ and (ii) cletic prayers and invocations.¹⁷ But they have been heightened in a way that can only be paralleled by a fantasy like Alcaeus' hymn to Apollo (fr. 307 Voigt), describing the god's actual epiphany and its effect on nature. Was this one of Callimachus' actual models, or is he just following a common cultural pattern? The imminence of the god's presence is the immediate stimulus to song and dance – as D'Alessio notes, the same schema as in Pindar's second *Partheneion*¹⁸ – and the song, which begins with the swan (5) and is taken up by the boys (8), both “accompan[ies] the god's advent and ... induce[s] in the participants the *feeling* that the god is among them”, a *topos* that is not genre-specific and can be paralleled in cult hymn and Pindaric epinician.¹⁹ The important quality is the conjuration of novelty – the unprecedentedly immediate mimesis of an ongoing ritual action in an urgent, febrile atmosphere – out of plausible and recognisable features of hymns, both literary and cultic.

Callimachus' recycling of lyric material that is not necessarily strictly paeanic but “fit for purpose” is best illustrated by the similarities with *Pyth.* 5, whose own performance context may have been the Carneia.²⁰ Whatever Carneian Apollo's general connections with

¹⁶ Examples in inscriptional hymns collected in W. D. Furley and J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*, I–II, Tübingen, 2001 (= F.–B.): Isyllus, *Paeon to Apollo and Asclepius* (6.4 F.–B.), line 37; *Erythraean Paeon to Asclepius* (6.1 F.–B.), line 1; Macedonius, *Paeon to Apollo and Asclepius* (7.5 F.–B.), lines 1–6; *Erythraean Paeon to Seleucus*, in J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford, OUP, 1925, p. 140; Hor. *Carm.* 1.21.1–2.

¹⁷ Cletic: e.g. Philodamus of Scarpheia, *Paeon to Dionysus* (2.5 F.–B.), lines 1–4. Invocatory: Aristonous, *Paeon to Apollo* (2.4 F.–B.), lines 1–8; invocation of Dionysus by the women of Elis (12.1 F.–B.); hymn to Poseidon (12.2 F.–B.).

¹⁸ G. B. D'Alessio, *Callimaco I*, op. cit., p. 81 n. 3; Pind. fr. 94b Snell–Maehler.

¹⁹ W. D. Furley and J. M. Bremer, op. cit., II, p. 88 (their italics), discussing Athenaios' paeon to Apollo (2.6), lines 4–6, and comparing Pind. *Nem.* 5.37–38. See too the opening of *Pyth.* 1, which also parallels *Hymn* 2 in the association of Apolline music with the cessation of discord, and in aligning Apollo with Zeus as ultimate authority (Callim. *Hymn* 2.29, *Pyth.* 1.13). For P. Bing, “Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*”, art. cit., p. 185–186 = *The Scroll and the Marble*, op. cit., p. 38, song occurs *in lieu of* an epiphany; the relationship is one of substitution.

²⁰ For bibliography see E. Krummen, *Pysos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)*, Berlin and New York, 1990, p. 98 n. 1 (the suggestion goes back to Wilamowitz); C. Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*, Princeton, N. J., and Oxford, OUP, 2003, p. 85–86.

colonisation,²¹ Callimachus certainly seized on Pindar’s connection between the Carneia and Apollo’s role as archegete of Cyrene (*Pyth.* 5.78–81), and read the poem as confirmation that this was the god’s character at that specific festival.²² Some modern scholars have seen *Pyth.* 5 as having a “paeanic” character.²³ Did Callimachus already share that perception?

We cannot quite close the circle and demonstrate that paeans were performed at the Carneia, at Cyrene or elsewhere,²⁴ but an inscription from Cyrene does at least seem to contain the record of a paean.²⁵

1 τοῖς ἄλλοις Βαττιά[δαις ...
5 ἄναξ αἰδῶ ἠὲ ἰὼ ἠὲ Παιάν

 ...]μα ἀνάκτων σὺν

]ου μὸλ’ εὖφρων τᾷδε πο-

]φιλοὶ δυνάσται

 ἠὲ ἰὼ ἠὲ] Παιάν

The date and context, unfortunately, are not specified, but the paean seems to have praise of the Battiad ruling house. That is the entire *raison d’être* of *Pyth.* 5, and a theme Callimachus will develop. Once again, in *Hymn* 2 we have something that is at least compatible with the paean.

Of course, for Callimachus’ purposes, *Pyth.* 5 lacked the formal markers that might have “confirmed” its status as a paean. But it does refer to the present *komos* as something in which

²¹ I. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, Cambridge, CUP, 1994, p. 149–152, cf. C. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*, New York and Oxford, OUP, 1993, p. 114.

²² 71–73, and the ongoing significance of the temple and festival established by Cyrene’s founder in 76–80.

²³ E. Krummen, op. cit., p. 150–151: “Auch im formalen Bereich wirkt das aktuelle Karneenfest auf die Gestaltung ein, indem sich einige Verse (63 ff.) im Sinne einer größtmöglichen Integration in die Aktualität der hymnisch-paeanischen Gattung annähern. Das Epinikion und die Gründung Kyrenes werden auf diese Weise zum Preislied Apollons, doch ohne je aufzuhören, Epinikion zu sein.”

²⁴ Though other Apolline festivals (the Hyacinthia and Gymnopaedia) did involve paeans (I. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans*, op. cit., p. 30–32).

²⁵ G. Oliverio, G. Pugliese Carratelli, and D. Morelli, “Supplemento epigrafico cirenaico”, *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente* 39–40 (= n.s. 23–4), 1963, p. 219–375, at p. 262 no. 80 (= Rutherford, R69).

Apollo takes delight (22–23), and later to a song for Apollo sung by young men (103–107). The ambience is right, and Callimachus seems to have built on that.

The two poems have a remarkably similar set-up. Beyond broad and fairly extensive correspondences in structure there are also some fine details which Callimachus has taken care to reproduce, such as the double narration of the colonisation of Cyrene (*Pyth.* 5.55–62 + 87–93 / Callim. *Hymn* 2.65–68 + 75–79).

– In both authors, the first narrative stresses Apollo’s oracular role and good faith, the second the founder’s two new institutions.

– In both, the first names “Battus”, the second “Aristoteles”.

– Both glide forwards from past to present, with an evocation of ongoing cult practice (in Pindar, the worship of Battus; in Callimachus, the Carneian altar).

– Both shift from third person narrative, for the colonisation of Cyrene, to second person apostrophe, at precisely the point where Apollo starts to be called “Carneian” (*Pyth.* 5.60 ff., 79–80 / Callim. *Hymn* 2.65 ff., 69–72).

– Both equivocate between first person singular and first person plural, in such a way that the singular could be read as autobiographical, but without contradicting the impression given elsewhere that the poem is in the mouths of a group of local worshippers. In Pindar this happens within the space of a few lines (76 ἐμοί, 80 σεβίζομεν²⁶), while Callimachus distributes it over the whole middle section of the poem (71 ἐγώ, ἐμοί, 47 κυκλήσκομεν, 97 ἀκούομεν).

The parallelism comes slightly adrift precisely in the notorious reference to “my fathers”. Pindar’s narrator does this when he mentions “his fathers” the Aegeidae and their colonisation of Thera from Sparta (72–76), while Callimachus does it to crown a priamel in which he identifies Carneian Apollo as his ancestral deity (71). But Callimachus at no point contradicts Pindar. He goes on to make clear that Thebans were involved in the settlement of Thera *via* Sparta, and indeed makes this clearer than Pindar by referring explicitly to the race of Oedipus (74). The implication of what he is saying is that he, as a Cyrenean with distant roots

²⁶ C. Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*, op. cit., p. 85: “Pindar thus makes profitable use of the undifferentiated forms *I/we* employed in Archaic choral lyric to coincide, within the choral performance of *Pythian* 5 at Cyrene, perhaps at the Carneia, with his own position as author of the ode and the position of the chorus invited to sing it.”

in Sparta and, still further back, in Thebes, in fact has a basic kinship with Pindar which comes out in their shared worship of Carneian Apollo.²⁷

Pindar's poem is remarkable for its unevenness, for its disconcertingly rapid transitions between first persons singular and plural (76, 78–80), third to second person address to Apollo (79–80), past tense narrative and present-tense descriptions of ongoing realities. Evidently this attracted Callimachus, who contrives a particularly thick texture of imitation of these features in his own lines 65 ff. (Ἀπόλλων > ὅππολλον; ἐμήν, ἡμετέροις, ἐγώ, ἐμοί; transitions from “mythical” to “attributive” passages and back again in 65–68 / 69–71 / 74–78 / 78–84 / 85 ff.). In a way this shuttling backwards and forwards between persons and tenses – in both authors – gives a sense of repeatedly drawing near to the god. The ancient prosperity of Pindar's Battus continues into the present (55); the oracular power Apollo once delivered to Battus is a function he still exercises (62, 68–69); he settled the Heraclidae in the Peloponnese (69–72), and from there began a chain of transmission which continues in present-day festivities. Our attention is drawn to occasions in both past and present when the speaker and/or his ancestors have been privileged with special favour or proximity, and we are shown how links forged in the past remain strong and sound in the present. It might even be suggested that in Callimachus this sense of an overlapping past and present replaces the simple and perspicuous logic that one finds in the cultic paeans and other hymns that use familiar logic of the *quid pro quo*. For instance, appeals to the god arise directly out of the previous narrative, aetiology or aretology in a *Paeon to Asclepius*,²⁸ in Isyllus,²⁹ and in the *Delphic Paeon* of Limenius.³⁰ In Aristonous, the god is solicited in return for the pleasure generated by the hymn.³¹ In Callimachus, however, instead of the straightforward language of barter in *da quia dare tuum est, da quia dedisti* (and so on), the sense of proximity to the god comes about through very different, and more Pindaric, means – shifts from third to second person, from past to present, which bring us suddenly, syntactically, face to face with the god.

Callimachus, I propose, is not being merely perverse or displaying a hyper-Pindaric “fracturedness” or dislocation, or whatever. Rather, his Pindaric imitation is at home in a

²⁷ W. Kofler, “Kallimachos' Wahlverwandtschaften: zur poetischen Tradition und Gattung des Apollonhymnos”, *Philologus* 140, 1996, p. 230–247, at p. 238–239; A. D. Morrison, op. cit., p. 132–3; F. P. Manakidou, “Callimachus' Second and Fifth Hymn and Pindar: A Reconstruction of *Syggeneiai* between Old and New Greece”, *RFIC* 137, 2009, p. 350–379, at p. 364–366.

²⁸ 6.1 F.–B., lines 1–13 + 14–26.

²⁹ 6.4 F.–B., *E* 37–57 + 58–61.

³⁰ 2.6.2 F.–B., lines 1–33 + 34–46.

³¹ 2.4 F.–B., line 45 χαρείς ὕμνοις ἡμετέροις.

hymn which, throughout its whole course, examines a series of alternative “ways of being” with the gods.

The first comes at the beginning through the self-assurance that “we shall see you because we are worthy”; it is an ethical or spiritual criterion. The god’s initial appearance (which never quite happens) is an encouragement to the worshippers to suppose that they are among the privileged (ἐσθλοί) and not among the little people (λιτοί).

In the central portion of the poem, it comes though the speaker’s identification with his city and with his king (65, 68), with whom the god had a close bond in myth. It is then developed in a remarkable section of apostrophe beginning with the speaker’s commitment to Carneian Apollo as his ancestral deity (69–84). The relationship is now one of communication, in past and present. The god communicates with Battus; there are oaths and undertakings; the god is “brought” to Cyrene by the colonists, but also actively looks on and rejoices at their celebrations; and finally there is mutual regard, with Apollo giving blessings and the sons of Battus honouring him. 94–96 is where the poem comes closest to the traditional *quid pro quo*.

A final model is provided by the *coda*, where instead of a prayer for success, prosperity, or the common weal (which even *Hymns* 5 and 6 are not so eccentric as to withhold), the closing paragraph is on poetics. Here, the speaker’s affinity with Apollo implies a privileged relationship. The closing emphasis is on shared aesthetic values.

Calame notes the importance of the “song” theme in *Hymn* 2,³² and this is crucial. Calame observes the prominence of words for song (ἀείδειν, ἀοιδός, ἀοιδή) throughout the poem, in a limited number of metrical positions which draws attention to their continuity, as the “song” theme transforms itself from swans, through the chorus, to the bard and Apollo’s patronage of him, to the aetiology of the paean refrain, and finally to the implied equation with the poet’s own stance.³³ This hymn is far more self-consciously “poetic” than the others. As far as the use of the “song” root is concerned, the other Apolline hymn, the fourth, comes second, but of course, it is almost three times as long, the distribution is patchier, and it is less easy to

³² C. Calame, “Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*”, art. cit., p. 47–55; K. A. Cheshire, “Thematic Progression and Unity in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*”, *CJ* 100, 2004–2005, p. 331–348, at p. 346–347.

³³ The sudden appearance of metapoetics at the end can thus be seen as the climax of a running theme, and its most sophisticated development. It can also be compared with other compositions that end with a metapoetic flourish (e.g. *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 165–178; *Timoth. Pers.*, *PMG* 791.202–236 – invoking the aid of Paian (205 ἱεὺς Παιάν), in defence of his *μοῦσαν νεοτευχῆ*). The Pindaric origin of Callimachus’ imagery is also familiar (M. Poliakoff, “Nectar, Springs, and the Sea: Critical Terminology in Pindar and Callimachus”, *ZPE* 39, 1980, p. 41–47).

discern any meaningful progression or sequence. Did Callimachus have any eidographic or literary-historical basis for putting so much emphasis on the theme of music, beyond the obvious fact that it is Apollo's specialism (singled out in *Pyth.* 5.65 and *Hymn* 2.33, cf. 43–44)? Perhaps there was something slightly more specific than the god's universal character, for even if a historical connection cannot be established between the paeon and the Carneia, the historical association of the Carneia with citharody goes back to the tradition that Terpanter won his first victory there, at Sparta.³⁴ And *Pyth.* 5 itself provides a certain basis for Callimachus' development of the song theme: it instances Apollo's specialism on the lyre (65), applies water-imagery to poetics (99–100), and concatenates the notions of revel songs (100 κώμων), victory-song (106–107 τὸ καλλίνικον ... μέλος χαρίεν), and a choral song by young men praising Apollo (103 ἐν ἀοιδᾷ νέων) which is apparently fulfilled simultaneously with its enunciation,³⁵ though, given the specific reference to young men, perhaps carries connotations of the paeon at the same time.

Callimachus' set-up is therefore compatible with a paeon. There is a chorus of young men.³⁶ The speaker expresses concern for their maturation, socialisation, and the strength of the community as a whole (14–15).³⁷ Matching and representing them is a young god (36–37), who perhaps undergoes a certain maturation of his own, from the four-year-old who establishes his first altar on Delos (58), to the mature figure who by the end is contemplating his latest one, trophy bride at his side (90). He is a golden god (32–34), like his mother in Pindar (fr. 128c Snell–Maehler) and like the whole Letoid family in a thousand paeans since. After opening the poem with the rising generation, the speaking subject eventually turns his attention to another aspect of the community, its foundation traditions. This, too, is compatible with paeon. Several Pindaric examples deal with colonisation, others with cultic

³⁴ Ath. 14.635e; cf. Tryphon, *AP* 9.488.

³⁵ C. Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*, op. cit., p. 86; compare *Ol.* 6.87–90, with W. J. Slater, "Futures in Pindar", *CQ* 19, 1969, p. 86–94, at p. 89.

³⁶ They are identified as νέοι (8), παῖδες (13, 16), and are unmarried (14). Both boys and young men are plausible singers of paeans (I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans*, op. cit., p. 58–59; Pind. *Paeon* 6.121–122 μέτρα παιηό-|v]ων ἱή|τε|, νέοι; κοῦροι in e.g. the *Paeon to Asclepius* (6.1 F.–B.), the *Erythraean Paeon to Apollo* (J. U. Powell, op. cit., p. 140, line 2), that of Macedonicus to Apollo and Asclepius (7.5 F.–B., lines 4–5). In a scheme that distinguishes young men, adult males, and old men, they constitute the youngest class (Plut. *Lyc.* 21.2; *Mor.* 238a–b [*Inst. Lac.* 15]; Ath. 15.678b–c; Poll. *Onom.* 4.107; cf. Pind. *Nem.* 3.70–74), but if Callimachus has in mind a scheme where παῖδες and νέοι are separate (Pl. *Leg.* 664c; Plut. *Mor.* 544e [*De laud. ips.* 15]) they represent a hazy distillate of the two youngest classes.

³⁷ I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans*, op. cit., p. 59, 62–63.

foundations.³⁸ And for these purposes *Pyth.* 5 is again a usable model, given its shared concerns. From *Pyth.* 5, Callimachus derives an image of the Carneia from which he selects, amplifies, and curtails certain Pindaric themes. Of course, what a god “is”, or what a festival is “about”, is very much in the eye of the beholder.³⁹ Aside from the “song” theme, what has caught Callimachus’ eye in *Pyth.* 5 seems, broadly, to have been questions of identity; once more, there is at least a *compatibility* with paean. While the identities most obviously in question are those of the speaker and of his city, there could be a sense in which both of these are bound up with the identity of the god himself, as the Dorians’ “national deity”. If so, here we might find an affinity with the genre of paean once again. Andrew Ford’s insightful discussion of the archaic and early classical paean has suggested that “in various ways most of our early references to paean songs suggest a heightened attentiveness to naming”; indeed, that it can be seen as “a song that masters a new situation by reaffirming, vocally, adherence to traditional forms, including the most ancient names of all”.⁴⁰ It is no accident that Callimachus’ speaker concludes his priamel on Apollo’s epithets with a “cap” phrase asserting that the “Carneian” is the name of his ancestral god (71). Unlike Ford’s examples, in which the interest tends to concentrate on the name of Paeon itself, here the spotlighted term is the epithet “Carneian”. The ἦ cry so often coupled with Paian accompanies this epithet in 80 ἦ ἦ Καρνείε πολύλλιτε (“*hiē, hiē*, much-invoked Carneian”), reinforcing the idea that here, in this choice, consists the traditional, correct name, the appropriate one in the present context, one that is also constitutive of the identity of the speaker.

To return to the identity of the city, Cyrene is a colonial foundation with rich and tangled cultural traditions. It is noteworthy that this has involved the disappearance of Pindar’s Trojan colonists, the Antenorids, whose own worship may have coincided with the Carneia.⁴¹ Callimachus, in a poem which foregrounds Dorianness and “his own” ancestral traditions, perhaps found them distracting and unnecessary. On the other hand, he has introduced an element which is new with respect to Pindar, and that is the armed dance by young men in company with native women. If this is to be seen as a male rite of passage for those at the end

³⁸ I. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans*, op. cit., p. 166. Examples are *Paeans* 2 and 5 (his D2 and 5); fr. 140a Snell–Maehler (G8), possibly from a Paeon, concerns Heracles’ conquest of Paros under the protection of Apollo Archegetes (b30), the same god who oversees the colonisation of Cyrene (*Pyth.* 5.60). For paeans and cultic foundations, see e.g. *Paeon* 6 (the Delphic Theoxenia) and again fr. 140a (the cult and altar of Apollo on Paros).

³⁹ S. Scullion, “Interpreting Festivals: The Spartan Karneia”, in D. Ogden (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Religion*, Malden, MA, and Oxford, Blackwell, 2007, p. 193–196.

⁴⁰ A. Ford, art. cit., p. 288, 295.

⁴¹ F. Vian, “Les Anténorides de Cyrène et les Carneia”, *REG* 68, 1966, p. 307–311; C. Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*, op. cit., p. 81, 85; C. Dougherty, op. cit., p. 115.

of their military training,⁴² then the question of “identity” is at stake here as well: the young men are about to embark on a new stage of life, represented by Apollo as he contemplates the scene in the company of his young bride,⁴³ and perhaps with a glance at the very choir who are performing the hymn in the present. It is not clear that the young men’s dance with the native women itself has anything to do with the paean. But the military ethos of the festival does not contradict the frequently military ambience of the song,⁴⁴ and its association with an age-group, those on the cusp of maturity, clearly does not.

Implications

To repeat: any account of a Callimachean hymn that restricts itself to a single genre is sunk before it can float. But if we can see the paean, or lyric hymn in general, providing a kind of ground bass for *Hymn 2*, we can derive some insight into how one scholar-poet read a particular body of archaic and early-classical material and how he went about mobilising it for his own purposes.

This is not unimportant. Andrew Ford has drawn a broad contrast between two kinds of scholarly approach. Representatives of the first type “see significant discontinuities between the musical culture of the archaic and early classical ages – when kinds of poetry were distinguished mainly by the social contexts in which they were found and the occasions they accompanied – and the scholarly reception of texts in the Hellenistic age – when genre became a set of demonstrable, usually formal properties that a set of texts exhibited (or ought to)”. Representatives of the second “den[y] that there was a fundamental change from descriptive to prescriptive genres, and stress the many long-term continuities in musical practice and tradition”.⁴⁵ The insistent use of the paean refrain in *Hymn 2* would seem to support the first, the “formalist”, analysis to the hilt. And it is also a commonplace of

⁴² R. Nicolai, “La fondazione di Cirene e i Karneia cirenaici nell’Inno ad Apollo di Callimaco”, *MD* 28, 1992, p. 153–173, at p. 168–169 (with comparative Cretan material); P. Ceccarelli, *La pirrica nell’antichità greco romana: studi sulla danza armata*, Pisa and Rome, Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1998, p. 106–108. Already A. Brelich, *Paides e parthenoi*, Rome, Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1969, p. 149–150, taking Hesychius κ 838 *Λαττε Καρνεῖται· οἱ ἄγαμοι, κεκληρωμένοι δὲ ἐπὶ <τὴν> τοῦ Καρνείου λειτουργίαν* as his point of departure, suggested that *Karneatai* was the name of an age-class at Sparta, those between completion of the *agoge* and marriage.

⁴³ C. Calame, “Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*”, art. cit., p. 42.

⁴⁴ Demetrius of Scepsis, fr. 1 Gaede ap. Ath. 4.141e–f; I. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans*, op. cit., p. 45–47.

⁴⁵ A. Ford, art. cit., p. 281.

criticism of the poem that, in place of the absent performance context, Callimachus has supplied an overplus of compensatory detail, perhaps precisely in order to baffle any attempt to identify place and manner of performance. I suggest, though, that Callimachus was a subtle and sensitive reader of other aspects of the ancient paean, and that he has understood and elaborated other elements that he took to be essential. He creates a plausible conceptual whole, the distillate of an occasion, and a song that is appropriate to the circumstances. He may use formalist means to suggest (not enforce) a specific genre; but his amplitude of means and very breadth of reference is something in which he has been encouraged by the generic expansiveness of the paean itself. He has availed himself of culture-patterns attested in both compositions intended for cultic performance and literary works. He has also drawn on specific literary models which could be adapted into his conceptual universe whether or not they fitted a strict generic rubric. Without contradicting its basic presuppositions, he explores the potential of the genre.

The “paeanic” character of *Hymn 2* raises questions about the structure of the collection of a whole. Those questions are relevant whether the arrangement is authorial or that of an editor; I share the consensus that the arrangement here is very likely to be authorial, but I also acknowledge the problem of circularity in postulating authorial arrangement, then looking for sophistications and niceties which ingenuity only serves to confirm.

One possible principle of arrangement, ring composition, does not seem promising, even if it might at first seem nicely to account for the mimetic *Hymns 2* and *5* and the longer, non-mimetic central pair, given the difficulties in finding any principle of balance between *1* and *6*. Nor do the *Iambi* seem to provide any analogy, with their apparent progression through a series of ventriloquised voices from Hipponax’s to the narrator’s own, and further suggestions of ethical and aesthetic progress.

Neil Hopkinson’s analysis of the collection as consisting of three pairs is surely right. The first pair are masculine; the second pair dedicated to a brother-sister pair; the second feminine; two short, two long, two short; the last pair Doric.⁴⁶ But the suggestion that the flanking pairs are broadly “mimetic”, the middle pair “epic”, needs some qualification. On the one hand, mimetic elements may be discerned throughout the whole collection; on the other, the realisation of “mimesis” in each of the hymns is so different that it ceases to be very useful as a description. Perhaps we should see both as alternative beginnings. *A Hymn to Zeus*

⁴⁶ N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter*, Cambridge, CUP, 1984, p. 13, and p. 13–17 on ways in which *5* and *6* are to be read as a complementary pair.

stands in first place, alluding to the traditional libation to Zeus and to the rhapsodic practice of beginning with him.⁴⁷ A *Hymn to Apollo* comes next, evoking another apparently fairly widespread way of prefacing a collection.⁴⁸

But if the second *Hymn* is in some way a distillate of lyric hymn, what of the other poems in the collection, and what explains the distribution of the so-called mimetic hymns (nos. 2, 5–6)? The *Hymns* close affiliation of nos. 3 and 4 with rhapsodic hymn is reasonably clear. Of the fourth *Hymn*, Mineur writes that “[i]n a formal analysis, a comparison with the Homeric hymns imposes itself”, and (properly) dismisses attempts to analyse it as a citharodic *nomos* or a Pindaric epinician: “the comparison with the Homeric hymns is both the most obvious and the most satisfactory”.⁴⁹ (*Hymns* 2 and 4 might be seen as “lyric” and “rhapsodic” complements, teasingly misdirected by their *titles*, which point respectively to *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* and to titulature imposed by Hellenistic editors of Pindar such as “for the Athenians, to Delos”, Ἀθηναίοις εἰς Δῆλον.) *Hymn* 3 looks Homeric as well, with a recognisably rhapsodic opening,⁵⁰ transition to the mythological section, and thereafter extended vacillation between mythical and attributive material; the morphology of a rhapsodic hymn is distorted but recognisable. *Hymn* 1 seems positively to want to advertise generic promiscuity, with an opening recollection of the beginning of a Pindaric prosodion, combined with an allusion to libational hymn, and leading into a myth which shadow-boxes with the variant birth stories of Dionysus in *Hymn. Hom.* 1.⁵¹ Nevertheless, the dominant mythical section and its gradual metamorphosis (from approximately line 55) into an aretalogy of the god’s permanent powers leaves discernible the rhapsodic underlay, which is confirmed by the sign-off (χαῖρε, ἀεΐδειν) and the quotation from *Hymn. Hom.* 15.9 and 20.8 (δίδου δ’ ἀρετὴν τε καὶ ὄλβον).

⁴⁷ Pind. *Nem.* 2.1–3, 5.25; cf. Terp., *PMG* 698 and Alc., *PMG* 29.

⁴⁸ And may have been even more widespread if the opening hymn in Pindar’s collection (fr. 29–35 Snell–Maehler) was addressed, in fact, to Apollo: see G. B. D’Alessio, “Il primo *Inno* di Pindaro”, in S. Grandolini (ed.), *Lirica e teatro in Grecia: il testo e la sua ricezione: atti del II incontro di studi, Perugia, 23–24 gennaio 2003*, Naples, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2005, p. 113–149. His other examples are Alc. fr. 307 Voigt and Thgn. 1–10.

⁴⁹ W. H. Mineur, *Callimachus, Hymn to Delos: Introduction and Commentary*, Leiden, Brill, 1984, p. 4–9 (with quotations on 4 and 9).

⁵⁰ It opens with the goddess’ name in the accusative, followed (after a parenthesis) by the verb that governs it. An attributive sentence is introduced by the traditional relative pronoun (2 τῇ), then the mythical portion is introduced by ἀρχμενοι ὥς (4); compare Callim. *Aet.*, fr. 7c.7 Harder ἀρχμενος ὥς ἡρώες, which introduces a mythological narrative with various epic stylistic devices in the *Aetia*.

⁵¹ Pind. fr. 89a Snell–Maehler Τί κάλλιον ἀρχομένοις(ιν?) ἢ καταπαυομένοισιν | ἢ βαθύζωνόν τε Λατώ | καὶ θοᾶν ἵππων ἐλάτειραν ἀεῖσαι; *Hymn. Hom.* 1.1–8 (and compare line 6 ψευδόμενοι with Callim. *Hymn* 1.7 πότεροι, πάτερ, ἐγυῖσαντο;).

So why are the “mimetic” hymns distributed as they are? Perhaps we should be looking to complicate our understanding of the unhelpfully catch-all term “mimesis”. If *Hymn 2* conjures the spirit of paean, or creates a mirage of Apolline lyric, it is not at all clear that the same can be said of the last two poems in the collection, especially not the fifth one, where the first-person speaker is not addressing a *chorus* at all.⁵² Not one of the verbs uttered by this individual pertains to musical performance. The attendants are instructed to go about their business, but since, unlike the Apolline boys’ choir, they are not expected to *sing*, the speaker might, for once, be properly described as a “master of ceremonies”⁵³ precisely because she has a sort of managerial oversight, but not as a chorus director. Anthony Bulloch’s analysis here seems to me excellent.⁵⁴ The poem is mimetic in a way that can be compared to Herodas and Theocritus. It is a rendition and recreation of voice and atmosphere, and I would suggest that this is its fundamental difference from the mimesis of *Hymn 2*. *Hymn 2* recreates an act of worship suitable for Carneian Apollo, erected on literary foundations oriented towards that goal, or adaptable to it. In *Hymn 5* it is the occasion, the atmosphere, the hustle and bustle, that Callimachus wants to evoke. He has a certain basis for choral exhortations that mention ritual equipment (for example, Macedonius’ *Paeans to Apollo and Asclepius* speaks of a suppliant branch and suppliant laurel).⁵⁵ But Callimachus lays it on with a superfluity that suggests his eagerness to summon up occasion and atmosphere. Religious rational slips from view, with the notorious disconnect between ritual frame and mythical centrepiece. How different from the conjuration of a ceremonially and literarily plausible act of worship in poem 2.

As for the final *Hymn*, the lack of a determinate location⁵⁶ and the even more baffling disconnect between frame and narrative means that – despite all the ritually plausible detail – there is not even the ghost of an attempt to evoke a coherent occasion. What there is is a

⁵² I take the first-person singular (line 3) at face value. C. Calame, *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece*, op. cit., p. 129, however, interprets the hymn as the enunciation of a chorus to their companions, inviting them to attend the rite. “The hymn composed by Callimachus is the hymn of invocation that the girls of Argos were reputed to sing during the ritual.” Of course, if this reading is correct, the hymn remains extremely eccentric, with a chorus addressing, and instructing, not each other, but their non-choral companions, at some length.

⁵³ F. Cairns, op. cit., p. 121, justifiably objects to the application of this term to *Hymn 2* (though it continues to be used, e.g. by P. Bing, “Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*”, art. cit., p. 184 = *The Scroll and the Marble*, op. cit., p. 37).

⁵⁴ A. W. Bulloch, *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary, Cambridge, CUP, 1985, p. 6.

⁵⁵ Macedonius, *Paeon to Apollo and Asclepius* (7.5 F.–B.), line 3 ἰκτῆρα κλάδον ἐν παλάμῃ θέτε καλὸν ἐλαϊνεὸν κ[αὶ δάφνης] ἀγλαὸν ἔρνος.

⁵⁶ N. Hopkinson, op. cit., p. 37–39.

summation or even a feast of most of what we have had hitherto. While, unlike its partner, it *does* evoke cult hymn, with vestiges of a refrain (1–2 ~ 118–119), the long central narrative panel and sign-off formula suggests rhapsodic tradition.⁵⁷ The first person speaker leads the chorus of women in their chanting, and perhaps the mimesis of ritual includes a touch of *ethopoeia* of personal character, in the way the Erysichthon narratives tails off into comically snobbish deprecation of undesirable neighbours. A study of *Hymn 2* by Ivana Petrovic discovers parallels with inscriptional sacred laws.⁵⁸ Might we extend her findings to the closing poem, especially the beginning and end (lines 3–6, instructions about who is allowed to watch the ceremony and who is not; lines 128–132, instructions about how far various categories of celebrant should follow the procession)? In any case, Callimachus’ mimesis extends beyond formal concerns to ambience and setting and environment. But a generic “ground bass”, variously discernible in *Hymns* 2, 3, and 4, fails to make itself heard. So might one suggest one final pattern, even at the risk of schematism: that, of the first four hymns, three at least are broadly what Ian Rutherford calls “diachronic” in their approach to genre,⁵⁹ meaning that they adhere to inherited types – but that the last two are not?

⁵⁷ The last two lines of the narrative (116–117) could be seen as an adaptation of a convention in rhapsodic hymn, where the myth may have a brief prolongation that returns it to the present time (R. Janko, “The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre”, *Hermes* 109, 1981, p. 9–24, at p. 14–15). Examples include *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 485–489, practically a mirror-image of the present instance, as Demeter and Persephone confer wealth and blessings on those whom they love (the makarismos contrasts with the deprecation, and 486–487 μέγ’ ὄλβιος ὃν τιν’ ἐκεῖναι | προφρονέως φύλωνται ~ 116 μὴ τῆνος ἐμὶν φίλος, ὅς τοι ἀπεχθήης). For added *ethopoeia*, see above.

⁵⁸ I. Petrovic, “Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo* and Greek Metrical Sacred Regulations”, in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Gods and Religion in Hellenistic Poetry*, Hellenistica Groningana 16, Leuven, Peeters, 2011, p. 264–285; ead., “Callimachus and Contemporary Religion: The *Hymn to Apollo*”, in B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. A. Stephens (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Callimachus*, Leiden, Brill, 2011, p. 264–285.

⁵⁹ I. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans*, op. cit., p. 4.