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Preface

Central to classical religion are the twelve Olympian gods. They live in an hierarchy, in which Zeus has sovereignty over the other gods. Each god has dominion over a specific domain, has its own attributes and is very often the patron god of a particular city. The religion of ancient Greece was mostly practical, even if it only meant standing in front of the statue of a god in a temple. Classical cult practice involved heroes of semi-divine status as well: these are the heroes of legends or (dead) persons who were elevated to cult status due to conferring special benefits to a community.

It is not possible to describe classical religion in strictly defined terms. As the Greek world extended foreign divinities were incorporated into Greek religion: Plato’s *Republic*\(^1\) opens with Socrates descending to Piraeus to witness the ceremonial entering of Bendis, a new goddess. In the altered Hellenistic civilization it is often claimed that the status and cult of the Olympian gods declined by the rise of other religious cults.

With this thesis I try to assess how the image of the king of gods, Zeus, is brought forward in two Hellenistic hymns: the *Hymn to Zeus* by Callimachus and the *Hymn to Zeus* by Cleanthes. In order to identify the image of Zeus that both hymns depict I will analyze the composition and the linguistic aspects of the hymns. I will offer a short overview of the diverse depictions of Zeus that are provided by our ancient sources to offer an integral image of Zeus.

Firstly, I will provide a short introduction to Zeus. I will cover Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus* in the second chapter and Cleanthes’ *Hymn to Zeus* in the third. Finally, I will conclude my findings in the fourth and final chapter.

Four appendices are enclosed: (i) the Greek texts as well as translations of the *Hymn to Zeus* by Callimachus and (ii) the *Hymn to Zeus* by Cleanthes.\(^2\) A third appendix is enclosed, providing a context of the era in which both hymns are composed. The fourth and last appendix displays a study of the Homeric *Hymn to Zeus*, dating from the classical era, to provide a more substantial background for the Hellenistic hymns.

---

1. Pl. R. 327A.
2. All translations offered in this thesis are from the author.
Chapter 1: Introduction to Zeus

1.1 Introduction to Zeus.
Zeus, greatest of the Olympian gods, father of gods and men, ruled the heavens and the upper regions. He is called the most high and powerful among the immortals, the one god whom all others obey.

The name Zeus is derived from the Indo-European root *dei, which means to shine. This root is found in the Roman equivalent Jupiter, in the Latin deus, god and dies, day. It is found in the Greek ὄς, god and εὕβα, fair weather.

Zeus was the son of Kronos and Rhea, a brother of Poseidon, Hades, Hestia, Demeter and Hera. He was married to his sister Hera, with whom he had two sons, Ares and Hephaestus, and one daughter, Hebe. Zeus, like the other Olympian gods, resided on Mount Olympus in Thessaly, a mountain which was believed to reach into heaven itself. According to Homeric account government of the world was distributed by lot: Poseidon obtained the sea, Hades ruled the underworld and Zeus became king of the heavens. The earth and the Olympus remained to be governed by all three. Hesiod, on another account, relates that Zeus had to achieve dominion through struggle and protect his position against revolt. Before Zeus the Titans held sway and it was Kronos, Zeus’ father, who governed them. To prevent his children from overthrowing him, Kronos swallowed them immediately after birth, except for Zeus, whom his mother Rhea saved by tricking Kronos to swallow a stone instead. Once Zeus had reached maturity, he led the gods into war against the Titans, defeated them and confined them to Tartarus. As a result, the other gods pressed Zeus to reign and to rule over them.

Many functions have been attributed to Zeus: founder of kingly power, of law and of order, protector of the meetings of the council, of the assembly of people. He presides over every house and family as well as over the whole state. Zeus was the original source of all prophetic power. His will

---

4 Hom. Il. 7.10. 19.258.
5 For further information on the origin of Zeus, see Burkert 1985, 125–131.
6 Hes. Th. 116.
7 Hom. Il. 1.585. 5.806. Od. 11.604.
11 Hes. Th. 717.
12 Hes. Th. 881–885. Another version on this myth can be found in Apollod. 1.2.1 ed. Wagner 1894.
decided whether a good or evil fate awaited mortals.\textsuperscript{16} It was also Zeus who protected the law of hospitality, the sanctity of the oath and the suppliants.\textsuperscript{17}

In surveying different ancient sources, it seems that originally there were, at the very least three, different divinities that were considered the supreme one. In the course of time they became united into one great panhellenic divinity. Therefore, it seems justified to speak of (i) an Arcadian Zeus,\textsuperscript{18} (ii) a Dodonaean Zeus,\textsuperscript{19} (iii) a Cretan Zeus\textsuperscript{20} and (iv) a panhellenic Zeus.\textsuperscript{21}

His usual attributes are the sceptre, eagle and thunderbolt. The Dodonaean Zeus occasionally wears a wreath of oak leaves. Sometimes Zeus is depicted with a figure of victory in his hand, other times with a cornucopia.

\textsuperscript{17} Hom. \textit{Od}. 9.250. Paus. 5.24.2. There are many more functions attributed to Zeus other than the functions mentioned. They shall not be discussed here.
\textsuperscript{18} Paus. 8.38.2. Call. \textit{Iov}. 1.
\textsuperscript{21} Zeus is considered the supreme god of the Hellenic nation. His statue in the temple at Olympia was executed by Pheidias, inspired by the words of Homer. (Hom. \textit{Il}. 1.527).
Chapter two: Analysis of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*

2.1 The poet Callimachus

The poet Callimachus is the most famous and most influential author of the Hellenistic era, or, to speak with Kathryn Gutzwiller: ‘Callimachus reinvented Greek poetry for the Hellenistic age […] to influence the entire tradition of modern literature.’

Little is known about the life of Callimachus (ca 305 – 240 BC). He was a native of Cyrene, but spent most of his life in Alexandria. The tenth-century lexicon known as the Suda states that he was a schoolteacher at an elementary school in Eleusis, a village outside Alexandria, before entering the Ptolemaic court. According to John Tzetzes, the twelfth-century Byzantine polymath, Callimachus was a ‘court youth’ (νεανίσκος τῆς αὐλῆς). These details combined suggest that Callimachus caught the attention of Ptolemy II while teaching at Eleusis, came to Alexandria and there became a ‘court youth.’ Elizabeth Visser even suggests it was the *Hymn to Zeus* that attracted the attention of Ptolemy:

De oudste bijvoorbeeld, die aan Zeus, gaat bijna onmerkbaar over van de lofzang op den koning der goden in de lofzang op den aardsen vorst Ptolemaios, […]. […] Maar al spoedig werd hij (waarschijnlijk door zijn hymne op Zeus) opgemerkt door den koning […]. In Alexandria Ptolemy employed Callimachus at the *Mouseion*, an institution for the promotion of philological and scientific research, established by Ptolemy Soter. At the *Mouseion* Callimachus compiled the *Pinakes*, the first library catalog ever, in 120 scrolls. Callimachus thus became the first bibliographer and the scholar who organized the library by authors and subjects.

In some of his epigrams, the poet seems to offer some information about himself. He proudly states that his grandfather, whom he was named after, was a general in Cyrene. In a sepulchral epigram Callimachus calls himself *BattiaDES*, son of Battus. This might be an unsubstantiated claim of descent from the Cyrene royal house, since the legendary founder of Cyrene is called Battus. The Suda confirms the name of Callimachus’ father and additionally provides the name of his mother: Mesatme.

---

22 Gutzwiller 2007, 60.
23 It is highly unlikely that Callimachus was indeed an elementary schoolteacher. Elementary schoolteachers were at the bottom of the social scale, and the title was therefore used as an insult. As Booth (1981) puts it: ‘To demote a poet from teacher of men at a lofty level to teacher of boys at the meanest level was of course particularly tempting and galling.’ Another point of argument can be made from the title ‘court youth’; it would not be conferred on a village schoolmaster. It suggests that Callimachus’ father had been a member of Soter’s court and Callimachus himself must then have spent his childhood at court.
24 Tz. Proll. Aristh. 2.1.6.
25 Based on the evidence of Tzetzes (Proll. Aristh. 2.1.6), court youth (νεανίσκος τῆς αὐλῆς) was a Hellenistic court title. These ‘court youths’ are a body modeled to the ‘royal pages’ (παιδες βασιλικοί) of the Macedonian court. For further information, see Cameron 1995, 4-5.
26 Visser 1946, 38-41.
27 AP 7.525.3-4.
28 AP 7.415.
The year of Callimachus’ death is not known, but Aulus Gellius states he was still flourishing at the commencement of the first Punic war, and according to the Suda he was alive under the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes. This suggests Callimachus cannot have died before 245 BC.

Many classicists have identified Callimachus as one of the forces that helped shape the literature of the age. Bruno Snell even goes so far as to address Callimachus as the ‘father of Hellenistic poetry.’ His work certainly contrasts with the writers of the old and ‘Golden Age.’ Callimachus experimented with the boundaries of the genres of the works he was organizing in the Pinakes. According to himself, he followed the orders Apollo had given him:

\[\text{πρὸς δὲ σε καὶ τόδ’ ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέοισαι ἀμαξαὶ}
\text{τα στείβειν, ἔτερον ἵχνα μὴ καθ ὁμὰ}
\text{διόρον ἐλαν μὴ σίμον ἀνά πλατων, ἀλλὰ κελεύονσι}
\text{ἀτρίπτους, […]}.\]

Besides, I also urge you to go where big wagons never go to drive your chariot not in the same tracks as others and not along a wide road, but along paths untrodden, […]

He indeed breathed new life into old genres in the *lambi*, reworked tragic themes in epic meter in the *Hecale*, and even devised new models by arranging over fifty different tales into one discontinuous narrative of over four thousand lines in the *Aetia*. Callimachus maintained a varied and original output.

The influence of Callimachus extends far beyond the Hellenistic era. In the first century BC, grammarians, ‘who picked apart poetry for minor inaccuracies, were satirized as “bitter and dry dogs of Callimachus.”’ The Romans, especially the Augustan poets, held him in great reverence. Catullus’ *Coma Berenices* (Carmen 66) is a direct translation of Callimachus’ *Plokamos Berenikes* and Vergil’s Ecloga 6.4-5 is virtually a translation of Callimachus’ *Aetia* prologue 22-24 are only two of the many examples of the imitation of Callimachus.

The Suda states that the works of Callimachus are 800 in number. If this is true, it must mean that every separate poem and pamphlet was counted as a distinct work. Of all these works, only the *Hymns* and 60 of his *Epigrams* survive completely. The rest is, unfortunately, very fragmented. The following works are attributed to Callimachus:

---

29 Gell. 17.41.
30 Gutzwiller 2007, 60; Snell 1953, 265.
31 Snell 1953, 265.
33 AP 11.322.
34 Call. *Aet.* fr. 110.4 ed. Harder 2012.
1. *Aetia*: an elegiac poem in four books on the ‘causes’ of various aspects of customs, rites, names et al. It is the longest, most famous work of Callimachus;

2. *Iambi*: a compilation of thirteen poems in various metres with various subjects, artistically adapted from the work of Hipponax;

3. *Hymns*: six works, of which five in hexameter verse and one in Doric elegiacs, with a framework adopted from the Homeric hymns;

4. *Hecale*: an epyllion, featuring Theseus, providing a very different view of the hero and his well-known tale;

5. *Ibis*: a polemical poem directed against an unknown enemy, perhaps Apollonios of Rhodos;

6. *Epigrams*: 63 epigrams survive with different length and various subjects. They are preserved in the *Anthologia Palatina*.

7. *Victory song of Sosibius*: an elegy in honor of various victories of the Ptolemaic statesman Sosibius.

8. *Tragedies, comedies and satyr-plays*: no works in these genres have survived.

9. *Pinakes*: a bibliographic work containing the holdings of the *Museion* during Callimachus’ tenure there.\(^\text{36}\)

---

\(^{36}\) For a full account of the works of Callimachus, see Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus & Stephens 2011.
2.2 Structural outline of the Hymn to Zeus.

The global outline of the composition of this hymn, as provided below, is a schematic representation following the canonical tripartite division,\(^{37}\) based on the structure of Clauss.\(^{38}\)

(i) Invocation

(ii) Argument: Zeus’ origins and characteristics

a. First lie: the birth of Zeus
   - Rhea’s search for water and Zeus’ subsequent rearing on Crete
   II 15–54

b. Second lie: Zeus’ accession to the throne
   - Patronage of kings and Callimachus in particular
   II 55–65
   II 66–90

(iii) Concluding prayer

Salute
II 91–93

Plea
II 94–96

The opening sentence ill defines the roles of both poet and reader. Callimachus depicts a symposium, yet refrains from giving a clue to display which role the poet (author? declaimer?) and the reader (participant? audience?) plays. The opening sentence therefore establishes a doubt over the setting of the symposium;\(^{39}\) imaginary or real, particular or general.\(^{40}\)

The recipient of the hymn and of the imaginary symposium is mentioned at the very beginning: Ζηνὸς (1).\(^{41}\) The invocation stresses the greatness of Zeus by addressing him as ἀεὶ μέγαν (2), αἰὲν ἄνακτα (2), as Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα (3) and as δικασπόλον οὐρανίδῃσι (3).

The argument is by far the largest component of the hymn. It is divided into two sections, with lies about Zeus as marking points. These lies can be seen as two contestant points in the mythology relevant to Zeus. The argument starts by asking Zeus how he should be celebrated, as Dyctean or Lycaean. The god replies\(^ {42}\) that Cretans are always liars, a point Callimachus confirms by

---

\(^{37}\) A hymn follows a tripartite scheme. The first part has been identified as the *invocation* which establishes contact between the speaking person(s) and the divine addressee. The middle section has been called *pars epica, sanctio* and *pars media.* It contains arguments for the god to be propitious. The last part is the prayer. It is only when the worshipper has established contact with the god and won his or her favour, that he can formulate his petition. For further information, see Furley and Bremer 2001, 51–63.

\(^{38}\) Clauss 1986, 158.

\(^{39}\) Callimachus’ language for a symposium is a variation on ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα (Arat. Phaen. 1). This theme occurs frequently in Greek and Latin literature (Pl. N. 2.1, Ov. Fast 5.111). Whether this symposium was imaginary or real is still debated. Clauss (1986, 159): ‘I conclude that the poem was very likely presented to Philadelphus during the Basileia on 12 Dystros 285/284 BC or the same day in 284/283 BC.’ McLennan (1977, 26): ‘Callimachus’ language for the imaginary symposium […]’

\(^{40}\) Hopkinson 1984: ‘The first three lines, interrogative in tone, have established a doubt and a certainty: doubt over the particular (or generalized) setting παρὰ σπονδῇσιν contrasts with traditional hymnic complacency in divine omnipotence.’

\(^{41}\) The majority of the *Homeric Hymns* begin this way, as does the *Homeric Hymn to Zeus.*

\(^{42}\) Whether it is truly Zeus who replies is debated. See p. 12 of this thesis.
citing their claim to have Zeus’ tomb (8-9). Thereafter follows the birth of Zeus on mount Lycaeon, Rhea’s search for water to cleanse herself after the birth, the transfer of the divine child to Crete, and his upbringing in a cave (10-54).

In the second part of the argument, the poet exposes another lie about Zeus: the acquisition of power despite the presence of older brothers (55-59). Callimachus proceeds with the division of the earthly duties of the Olympian gods. As Zeus is the greatest god, he has chosen the greatest of birds, the eagle, as his messenger, and the greatest of men, kings, as his human objectives (60-80). The patron of Callimachus is the greatest of kings, and as thus receives the greatest abundance from Zeus. (81-90). In short: the argument has two themes: the origins of Zeus and the allotment and division of power, but the themes overall could be described as lies and deceptions, concerning facts as well as artistic remarks.

The concluding prayer is very short and functional. Zeus is saluted, surrounded by great and common epithets. His greatness is also manifested by stating that no singer will ever be able to sing of his deeds (95). The eventual plea of the prayer is for virtue ἀρετήν (96) and prosperity ὀλβὸν (96) amongst men.
2.3 Analysis of the characterization of Zeus in Callimachus’ Hymn to Zeus.

2.3.1 Invocation: introduction

Zeus’ name stands at the start of this hymn and most likely at the start of Callimachus’ collection of hymns as well.\(^\text{43}\) The first hymn’s initial word confirms thus the primacy of its subject. Verse 1 underlines this: Zeus is the only candidate to sing to. As the hymn devoted to Zeus is the first in a collection of hymns, it is implied that Zeus is the most important deity of all deities. This verse also clarifies that the poem is a hymn. The majority of the Homeric Hymns have a similar beginning, and the choice of words in the first verse follows the Hymn to Zeus almost exactly.\(^\text{44}\)

The poet chooses the qualifications ἀεὶ μέγαν (2) and αἰὲν ἀνακτα (2) for Zeus. Callimachus thus prefers to start this hymn with traditional characteristics, which mark Zeus as lord forever. The qualification ἀνακτα (2) is chosen deliberately, as a forerunner to the second part of the argument (Zeus’ ascension to the throne and the patronage kings). The remaining two characteristics, Πηλαγόνων ἐλατήρα (3) and δικασπόλον οὐρανίδῃσι (3), serve to demonstrate Zeus as ruler of people as well as Olympians. The invocation thus stresses the notion of Zeus as highest king of people and gods.

2.3.2 Argument: Zeus’ origin and characteristics.

One. First lie: the birth of Zeus, Rhea’s search for water and Zeus’ subsequent upbringing on Crete.

\(^{43}\) Most scholars agree that the order in which the hymns have been transmitted is determined by Callimachus himself. See Hopkinson 1984, 139.
\(^{44}\) Homeric Hymn to Zeus 1.
After the rhetorical question at the invocation, the hymn continues in doubt: is Zeus of Dictaen or Lycaeian origin? Three vocatives for Zeus – two of them forming an anaphora, emphasizing the god – surround this question. With the repetition of the vocatives and the anaphora it seems credible that...
the immediate answer \textit{Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται} \footnote{45} (8) derives from the subject of this emphasis, from Zeus himself.\footnote{46} This implies that the authority for the ‘true’ mythological variant of Zeus’ birth comes from Zeus directly. Zeus is called \textit{πάτερ} (7) and \textit{ἀνα} (8). The vocative \textit{πάτερ} (7) emphasizes the bond between Zeus and mankind as the bond between a father and his children. The more formal \textit{ἀνα} (8) on the other hand underlines the relationship of Zeus with mankind as the relationship of a ruler with his subjects. Both are common for Zeus,\footnote{47} yet are also remarkably humane. After determining which myth about Zeus’ birth should be accepted, the poet advances by narrating this story.

The narration of Zeus’ birth is very rich in \textit{aetia},\footnote{48} specifically geographical \textit{aetia}. The poet barely mentions Zeus directly. He does address him, calling him in order of appearance \textit{ὦνα} (33), \textit{Ζεῦ πάτερ} (43), \textit{δαῖμον} (44) and \textit{Ζεῦ} (46). Again, the way Zeus is depicted remarkably mundane. The profane emphasis of vocatives \textit{ὦνα} (33) and \textit{Ζεῦ πάτερ} (43) have already been discussed, yet even \textit{δαῖμον} (44) misses the explicit characterization of Zeus as immortal god. Homer uses \textit{δαῖμον} rarely for specific gods.\footnote{49} On the few instances that this does occur,\footnote{50} Zeus is not among the addressed gods. In fact, Cleanthes is the only other ancient author who uses the vocative \textit{δαῖμον} for Zeus. For Cleanthes, as will be discussed in chapter 3, \textit{δαῖμον} is the equivalent of ‘divine power.’ The concept of \textit{δαῖμον} is abstract and by no means need it refer to the immortality of Zeus.\footnote{51} The last direct mention of Zeus in the first part of the argument, the vocative \textit{Ζεῦ} (46), has no specific significance. Most striking in the depiction of Zeus in this section of the hymn is the humane aspect. Every characteristic or vocative of Zeus can be seen regarded thus and therefore it is significant that prominent divine features of Zeus are lacking. Callimachus starts the argument of this hymn with a remarkably mundane depiction of Zeus. The second part of the argument, especially vv 66- 7, will clarify his choice for doing so.

\footnote{45} The Liar Paradox is attributed to Epimenides of Crete. The only source is a 9th century Syriac commentary by Isho’dad of Merv on the Acts of the Apostles.\footnote{46} This is debated. Other possible narrators are Epimenides, Callimachus, or the addressee. See McLennan 1977, 35 and Hopkinson 1984, 140.\footnote{47} Homer makes use of \textit{πάτερ} for Zeus in the \textit{Iliad} 154 times, the \textit{Odyssey} 129 times. Hesiod calls Zeus 20 times \textit{πάτερ} in the \textit{Theogony}.\footnote{48} See Hopkinson 1984, 141–43.\footnote{49} The term \textit{δαῖμον} is applied to deities in general, without implying a particular divine person, that surpasses the human power and gives to people either happiness or misfortune. The word \textit{δαῖμον} often personifies these situations, as in Hom. \textit{Il.} 8.166; 11.792; 15.403; 17.98, 104; Hom. \textit{Od.} 16.64.\footnote{50} Hom. \textit{Od.} 21.196, 201.\footnote{51} Cleanth. \textit{Stoic. H.} 15.\footnote{52} For further information, see McLennan 1977, 76.
Two. Second lie: Zeus' accession to the throne and the patronage of kings and Callimachus in particular.

And you grew well, and you were well nurtured, heavenly Zeus and quickly you came to manhood, and quickly the dawn blossomed for you. But, while you were still a child, you demonstrated all perfect deeds; therefore your siblings, although earlier born, did not begrudge you to have heaven as your assigned domain. Well, the singers of old were not completely right; they said Fate divided the three folded gifts to the sons of Cronos; but who would draw Lot over Olympus and Hades, who but someone extremely naive? For it makes sense to draw for equal shares. But these are as much in pieces as is possible. Let me tell lies that convince hearers 'ear!

No lots made you king of the gods, no, but the deeds of your hands, your strength as well as your power, that you indeed stationed near your throne. And as your messenger you drafted the most magnificent of birds for your omens — may the things you show be favorable to my friends. And of the powerful men you chose him, who is bravest; not those skilled in the use of ships, not a shield-wielding man, nor a singer; no, these you dismissed at once to lesser diversities, other words for other gods to care for, but you reserved rulers of cities themselves, beneath whose hand is the landowner, the skilled warrior, the oarsman, everything; yes, what exists that is not under the rulers' might? Thus, we say, smiths belong to Hephaistos, warriors to Ares, huntsmen to Artemis of the tunic, and those who know the strains of the lyre well to Phoibos. But kings belong to Zeus, for nothing is more divine than the rulers of Zeus. That is why you selected them as your lot, and gave them citadels to guard. You yourself reside in the high places of the cities, keeping an eye on those who lead their men with crooked judgment, and those who rule justly. Upon them you casted riches, and prosperity abundantly. Upon all of them, but not at all in equal measure, if we may pass judgment by our ruler; for he is preeminent by far. In the evening he accomplishes what he'd thought of in the morning; yes, in the evening the greatest things, and the lesser, soon as he'd thought of them. While others complete some things in less than a year, other things not in one year, and others you yourself don't allow to finish completely, after diminishing their eager desire.
The distinction between the second section of the argument and the first is marked clearly by the use of the vocative οὐράνιε Ζεύ (55). Zeus’ infancy, which is attended to in the first half, proceeds into Zeus’ maturity, treated in the second half. It also forebodes Zeus’ ascension to the throne of οὐρανος, as opposed to his brothers’ gain of the underworld and the sea.53 Zeus’ reign of the sky as opposed to his brothers’ gain of the underworld and the sea is significant, since the poet states that Zeus’ brothers are προτερηγενέες (58).54 Zeus earned the right to rule because of πάντα τέλεια (57) in childhood and the ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν, σῇ τε βιή τὸ τε κάρτος (66-7).

By way of stating the topos δηναιοὶ δ᾽ οὐ πάμπαν ἀληθέες ἦσαν ἀοιδοί (60)55 the poet initiates the unfolding of the second lie. Foremost among the unnamed δηναιοὶ ἀοιδοί (60) is Homer, whose survey of Zeus’ ascension to the throne Callimachus rejects resolutely. Homer recites that the ‘division’ of the various divine realms was carried out by lot,56 whereas Hesiod states that Zeus came to hegemony because the other gods urged him to claim supremacy.57 The important distinction is that in the latter narration Zeus has acquired supremacy by recognition of his greatness from the other gods (remember πάντα τέλεια (57)). ‘Lot’ plays no part, Zeus has earned his supremacy. This distinction must be the reason why Callimachus chooses the Hesiodic tradition over Homeric tradition. The poet verifies this thought: οὐ σε θεών ἐσούν πάλαι θέσαν, ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν/ σῇ τε βιή τὸ τε κάρτος, ο καὶ πέλας εἶσαι δίφρου (66-67).58 The features of Zeus that are responsible for his rise to power are (i) ἔργα χειρῶν (66), (ii) βιή (67) and (iii) κάρτος (67). In other words: these virtues are the qualities Zeus needed to become king of gods. Are these the qualities that make a god rule over heaven, to be king of gods? In a hymn to Zeus one would expect these qualities to be the handling of the fire bolt, his control of the thunder, the ability to know and see all, or the granting of wishes, as the Homeric Hymn to Zeus shows.59 One would expect divine features like these to be the cause of supreme leadership of the pantheon, yet these are absent. What does this mean?

The qualities mentioned are certainly great and might promise a great king. It is however, once again,60 not compulsory to understand ‘king’ as ‘heavenly king.’ In fact, Zeus is not directly
addressed at all in the verses that state which qualities make him the king of gods. The qualities are therefore generalized and suitable for any (earthly) king.

This passage clarifies why the poet has been so reluctant to attribute divine features to Zeus. Up to this point, the hymn has been paving the way for a comparison between Zeus, king of gods, and an earthly king. In the next passage, the cautious possibility of such an equation is turned into an (almost) certainty.

At this point some attention must be given to the relationship between the Ptolemaic kings and Zeus. There was a legend in which Ptolemy I almost appears as a son of Zeus. Philip, the father of Alexander the Great, had a romantic relationship with Arsinoe, she herself a descendent of Heracles, son of Zeus. She and Philip had many common ancestors of the house of Philip. When Arsinoe was expecting Philip's child, he married her off to Lagos. This child, the later Ptolemy I, was exposed beneath the bare sky on a rock, but an eagle fed and protected him from the sun and the rain by his extending wings. The message is clear: as brother of Alexander, Ptolemy was the legitimate heir of the Egyptian throne. He was a descendent of Zeus. He was the exposed child whose father is not quite known and therefore may be divine. This message was spread through Ptolemaic coins: the face of the ruler was shown on the obverse, the eagle of Zeus on the reverse. The eagle sometimes spreads his wings as if flying up, and holds lightning bolts in his talons. It was Ptolemy I Soter I (367-283 BC), who went one step further than his father: on coins Ptolemy Soter wears the aegis of Zeus, presenting himself Zeus-like. This process was completed by his son and successor, Ptolemy II Philadelphus I (309-246 BC), who established the deification of θεός αυτήρ by introducing an official ruler cult. The king thus became a god-king. It is this Ptolemy II Philadelphus I, who most likely ruled Egypt at the time when Callimachus wrote the Hymn to Zeus.

Ptolemy II Philadelphus I first ruled Egypt with his father, Ptolemy Soter. He became sole ruler in 283-82 BC and purged his family of possible rivals. His dynastic strife led to the banishment of his first wife, Arsinoe I, and the defeat of his elder brothers. In time his reign grew solid. He had realized the most powerful fleet of the eastern Mediterranean Sea, which made Egypt a very powerful nation, and (ii) secured his reign indisputably. Ptolemy thus became king by outmaneuvering his elder brothers and safeguarded his reign by himself.

---

61 Koenen 1993, 44.
62 Ael. fr. 285.16.
63 The legend corresponds to two aspects of Egyptian kingship: (i) the king is the son of the highest god, of Amun-Re, the Egyptian equivalent of Zeus and (ii) the pharaoh is protected by the wings of Horus the falcon.
64 Idem.
65 For further information, see Koenen 1993, 51-53 and McKechnie and Guillame 2008, 387.
66 Most scholars agree that it was Ptolemy Philadelphus who ruled Ptolemaic Egypt when the Hymn to Zeus was composed. For a different view, see Depew 2004, 125. Another possibility is that Callimachus kept the identity of the king deliberately ambiguous: the hymn would continue to be relevant in the distant future.
With the phrase δηναιοὶ δ’ οὐ πάμπαν ἀληθέες ἦσαν ἀοιδοί (61) initiates Callimachus the second lie in the argument. It was not fate that realized the kingship of Zeus despite the presence of his elder brothers, as the singer of old, Homer, claims. Callimachus aligns himself with the tradition put forward by Hesiod, that Zeus himself was responsible for supremacy, due to his ἔργα χειρῶν (66), βίη (67) and κάρτος (67). The choice of the poet to follow Hesiodic tradition rather than Homeric tradition, as well as the choice to let humane and not divine features be the cause of Zeus’ supremacy, must have had its roots in the sovereignty of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, especially in the manner he achieved his reign.

It was not uncommon for poems written in the Hellenistic era to be preoccupied with their contemporary political context, mainly concerning the contemporary ruler. Callimachus’ own poetry functions as an example: his poem now known as the Coma Berenices refers explicitly to Berenice, wife of Ptolemaeus III Euergetes. Based on (i) the relationship of the Ptolemaic kings with Zeus, (ii) the humane manner in which Zeus is depicted, and (iii) an Hellenistic practice of political engaged poems, it seems justified to connect the Hymn to Zeus with the contemporary political context of the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Moreover, it seems justified to presume that Callimachus equates Zeus, the king of gods, with Ptolemy II Philadelphus, king of Egypt.

By taking the order of verses in the hymn into consideration, this conclusion is strengthened by the poet’s choice of attributes belonging to Zeus in verses 67 and 68. Callimachus chooses the throne (67) and the bird of prey (68). It is not unusual to depict Zeus on or near a throne, but again, this is not inevitably divine. The bird, which must refer to the eagle, is one of the most familiar symbols of Zeus and as such fits perfectly in an Hymn to Zeus. However, it seems no coincidence that the eagle is also used by the Ptolemaic dynasty as a symbol to represent their reign. The image of an eagle is shown on a vast majority of ancient Egyptian Ptolemaic bronze coins, as clarified previously. Once more we see that the attributes belonging to Zeus can be conceived as attributes belonging to a Ptolemaic king.

The poet then prays to Zeus that ἅ τ᾽ ἐμοῖ φίλοις ἐνδέξασθαι φαίνοι (69). The ‘friends’ are presumably literary associates of Callimachus. Zeus is asked to favour Callimachus and his literary

---

67 E.g. Call. Del: Apollo asks his mother Leto to avoid giving birth on Cos, since it is destined to become the birthplace of Ptolemy II. Theoc. Id. 17 is an encomium for Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the same king Callimachus equates Zeus with. For further information see Gutzwiller 2007, 193.
68 A difficulty in this conclusion arises from the attack of Ptolemy II Philadelphus’ brothers in answer to his claim of supremacy. According to Hesiod, the gods voluntarily granted Zeus his power and certainly did not dispute it. The fact remains, however, that both Zeus and Ptolemy II attained kingship over the natural claim to kingship, based on their earlier birth, by their brothers. Another solution is found by assuming that the poem was written after Philadelphus’ seizure of power, but before the revolt of his brothers. See Richter 1871, 2-3; Eichgrün 1961, 36-39; Carrière 1969, 85-93.
69 Friedburg and Friedburg 2009, 30.
70 McLennan 1977, 107.
associates. The identification of Zeus with Ptolemy II Philadelphus I makes it plausible the poet is asking for pecuniary or financial support from the king.\(^{71}\)

The connection between Zeus and kings is defined and further united when the poet stresses that Zeus concerns himself only with πτολιαρχος (73). All human offices are of less importance compared to being a king, and are therefore assigned to lesser gods.\(^{72}\) Zeus chose kings as his protégés, because ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς, ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων θείστερον (79-80). The explanation\(^{74}\) why kings are so inextricably linked with Zeus is presented here: there is nothing more divine than being a ruler of Zeus. The importance of θείστερον (80) to the conclusion that Zeus can be identified with the king is profound. Callimachus is very reserved in stating divine aspects of Zeus, yet he calls the king divine. In fact, the most divine one can be is being a ruler of Zeus. The Ptolemies also claimed their descent from Zeus through their ancestor Heracles. In this way, they are thus not only ‘rulers of Zeus,’ because kings are Zeus’ protégés, but they are also literally the ‘rulers of Zeus,’ because the Ptolemies originate from Zeus. The preposition ἐκ (79) applies perfectly to this context and has been used to refer to ancestry and parentage from Homer onwards.

The poet continues to elaborate on the relationship between Zeus and kings. Zeus guards over the management of kings and grants them all wealth, however to some more than to others. The living proof thereof is the poet's μεδέων (86), who is privileged above the others. The use of μεδέων to identify the king is significant. The participle is only used in the Iliad and Odyssey to address Zeus.\(^{76}\) Callimachus’ use of the word is absolutely unhomeric and very rarely used to indicate persons. It is a strong indication of the poets’ attempt to equate Zeus with his patron.

The poet’s μεδέων enjoys the privilege of achieving everything he desires in a minimal time schedule. This description of Ptolemy as a king well able to accomplish whatever he devises immediately, or at least at the end of the day, is an echo of Zeus, who in line 57 of this hymn was able to devise everything to perfection while still a child. Other monarchs do not share this privilege: οἱ δὲ τὰ μὲν πλειῶνι, τὰ δ᾽ οὐχ ἐνι, τῶν δ᾽ ἄπο πάμπαν (89). Ptolemy has been the subject of the preceding passage, but αὐτὸς (90), the authority allowing or forbidding affairs to happen, refers to Zeus. The ambiguity of αὐτὸς is probably a conscious choice of the poet: another reflection of Callimachus’ desire

\(^{71}\) McLennan (1977, 107): ‘In view of the poet’s desire to establish a comparison between Zeus and Ptolemy, there is possibly some allusion to financial or otherwise influential support from the court. Callimachus thus perhaps foreshadows the plea for ἀρετή, ἀφένος and ὀλβος which he makes more pointedly at the end of the hymn.’

\(^{72}\) After mentioning the lesser professions with their lesser gods (Hephaestus, Ares, Artemis and Apollo), Zeus appears, clearly the most important of the gods. Callimachus uses a climax whereby the last named is the most important, a common device in Greek literature. Another example is Hes. Th. 79.

\(^{73}\) The sentence ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς is derived from Hes. Th. 96 and from the Homeric Hymn to the Muses and Apollo 4.

\(^{74}\) That this is, in fact, an explanation becomes clear in verse 80: τῶ καὶ οφε τεϊν ἐκρινα λαζιν.

\(^{75}\) This is the first and only time the poet mentions his king directly in the Hymn to Zeus.

\(^{76}\) It is used as well of Hermes in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes 2.
to equate Zeus with Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The authority who controls the occurrence of affairs can be either Zeus or Ptolemy.

2.3.3 Prayer.

χαίρε μέγα, Κρονίδη πανυπέρτατε, δώτορ ἐάων, δώτορ ἀπημονίης. τεα δ' ἕργατα τις κεν αἰείδος; οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται, τις κεν Διὸς ἐργατ' ἄεισεν. χαίρε πάτερ, χαίρ' αὖθι· δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τ' ἀφενός τε. οὐτ' ἀρετῆς ἀτερ ὀλβας ἐπισταίαι ἀνήρας αέξειν. τε ζενα δ' ἀρετὴ ἀφενοι· δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τε και ὀλβαν.

A great salute, son of Kronos last in a line, provider of good things, provider of well-being. Who can sing of your deeds? He never was, nor ever will; who shall sing of the deeds of Zeus. Salute, father, salute again; and grant us goodness and prosperity. Without goodness happiness cannot bless men, nor goodness without prosperity. Give us goodness and happiness.

The prayer starts with a salute to Κρονίδης (91), repeated in verse 94. The ending of the Hymn to Zeus contains the characteristics πανυπέρτατος (91), δώτορ ἐάων (91), δώτορ ἀπημονίης (92) and πάτερ (94) for Zeus. By now it seems no surprise none of these have specific divine features.

The epithet πανυπέρτατος is an Homeric unicum. Callimachus is the first to apply the word to Zeus. In this context the most suitable translation seems to be ‘last in a line,’ referring to Zeus either as the last, the highest of gods or the last, the youngest brother of Hades and Poseidon. Considering the preceding Κρονίδη, the last option seems most fitting. This would then refer to the kingship of Zeus over his elder brothers, as the poet already illustrates in verse 58. Self-evidently, it would then also refer to the kingship of Ptolemy II Philadelphus over his elder brothers.

The clausulae δώτορ ἐάων (91) and δώτορ ἀπημονίης (92) depict Zeus as a generous god, distributing good things and prosperity. Again, although generosity is not an uncommon feature of Zeus, these clausulae contain nothing divine, no unique characteristics that belong to Zeus explicitly. They could just as easily be used to describe an earthly king. In fact, the eventual plea of the poet is for ἀρετῆς (94, 96), ἀφενὸς (94) and ὀλβας (96), matters that not only the highest of gods alone can provide, but matters that are expected from kings as well. Most scholars concur that these pleas should be regarded as a thinly veiled hint from the poet that he would welcome the (continuing) patronage of
Ptolemy, especially since the closing verse δίδου δ’ ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὀλβαν95 (96) is very similar to the ending of Theocritus’ *Idyll* 17, an *encomium* addressed at Ptolemy II Philadelphus I: ἀρετήν γε μὲν ἐκ Διὸς αἰτεί.96 Although it is uncertain which poem was written earlier, it is generally believed that Theocritus asks the same patron for support in this phrase.97

Another, more subtle indication of the Zeus-Ptolemy equation can be found in the lack of recount of the famous exploits of Zeus. Normally, in an extended hymn of this nature, the central parts of the hymn contain an account of the γοναί and the ἀρεταί of the god.98 Callimachus’ explores Zeus’ γοναί at great length, yet his ἀρεταί have barely received attention. An overtly detailed description of Zeus’ acts would undermine the collation of Zeus with Ptolemy II Philadelphus, and therefore: οὐ γένετ’, οὐκ ἔσται, τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ’ ἀείσαι (93). A less detailed description, in which Ptolemies’ acts show similarity with Zeus’ acts, would be possible, and it is a method the poet previously showed in his depiction of Zeus’ rise to power.99 The lack of this method regarding Zeus’ deeds can be explained, as far as an explanation is necessary, by assuming that Ptolemy II Philadelphus himself had not yet performed any exploits when this hymn was composed.100

The prayer thus follows, concurs and confirms the line constructed by Callimachus throughout the hymn. As the hymn continues, the Zeus-Ptolemy equation grows and is grounded more firmly. When the hymn reaches the prayer, this equation is set unambiguously and can therefore be used to ask Zeus/Ptolemy for prosperity and well-being for Callimachus himself, his φίλοι (69) and ἄνδρες (95) overall.

2.4 Preliminary conclusion

The depiction of Zeus by Callimachus is slowly and subtly shaped in the *Hymn to Zeus*. In surveying the outline of the *Hymn to Zeus*, the poet constructs and represents Zeus (in short) in this manner:

(i) **Invocation**  
Zeus as highest king of people gods;

(ii) **Argument**  
I. Zeus as a god displaying only mundane features;

II. Zeus as ‘reflection’ of Ptolemy II Philadelphus I, patron of Callimachus;

(iii) **Prayer**  
Zeus as Zeus-Ptolemy, king-god, who possesses the power to grant prosperity and well-being to the poet, his friends and mankind.

---

95 This clausula appears at the end of Homeric *Hymn to Heracles* and *Hymn to Hephaestus*.
96 Theoc. *Id.* 17.137.
98 McLennan, 1977, 129.
99 As explained in paragraph 2.3.2. of this thesis.
100 A suggestion made by Wilamowitz 1924, 11.
It seems that Callimachus has used the representation of Zeus in many ancient sources\(^{91}\) to serve the purpose of representing his patron Zeus-like.\(^{92}\)

\(^{91}\) Zeus as highest king of gods and men. See chapter 1 of this thesis.

\(^{92}\) The most specific remarks by which Callimachus reaches this purpose are (i) the depiction of Zeus with only humane characterististics, (ii) the choice for Hesiod over Homer regarding the account on Zeus’ accession to the throne, (iii) to declare that humane features let to Zeus’s supremacy (iv) the choice of the word μεδέων to represent Callimachus’ patron (v) to mention the eagle as attribute belonging to Zeus (vii) to refer to Theocritus’ Idyll 17 and (viii) the lack of recounting the famous exploits of Zeus.
Chapter four: Analysis of Cleanthes’ *Hymn to Zeus*

3.1 *The poet Cleanthes.*

Cleanthes of Assos, son of Phaenias, is better known as a philosopher than a poet. Diogenes Laertius’ evidence mentions him to have spent nineteen years as pupil of Zeno of Citium, founder of the Stoa, before succeeding him as second scholarch.\(^{93}\)

Reconstruction of the chronology of Cleanthes’ life has to rely above all on dates drawn from the *Stoicorum Historia* of Philodemus,\(^{94}\) considered together with the first sections of another work from Philodemus, *De Stoicis*\(^{95}\) and with information taken from pseudo-Lucian, Valerius Maximus, Censorinus and Diogenes Laertiuss.\(^{96}\) From Philodemus in particular it seems that Cleanthes, born during Aristophanes’ archonship (331/0), was head of the Stoa for thirty-two years, before dying in Athens during Jason’s archonship. Diogenes Laertius claims Cleanthes lived as long as Zeno, while Pseudo-Lucian, Valerius Maximus and Censorinus put Cleanthes’ age at ninety-nine. Dorandi presumes that in ancient times parallel chronologies existed for Zeno and Cleanthes.\(^{97}\) Based on these testimonia Thom offers the following chronology:

\[
\begin{align*}
331/30 & \quad \text{Cleanthes is born;} \\
262/61 & \quad \text{Zeno dies. Cleanthes becomes a scholarch;} \\
230/29 & \quad \text{Cleanthes dies.}^{98}
\end{align*}
\]

Most of what is known of Cleanthes’ life is anecdotal. Based on the evidence of Diogenes Laertius,\(^{99}\) Cleanthes was a boxer before starting his studies with Zeno. In Athens he watered gardens by night to support himself as a student. He learned slowly, which caused his fellow students to call him a donkey. In reply Cleanthes said that he alone was capable of carrying the burden of the teachings of Zeno, who compared Cleanthes to hard tablets: difficult to inscribe, but always retaining what was written on them. At an advanced age Cleanthes became gravely ill due to a dangerous ulcer. He started fasting on his doctor’s advice. When his health improved, Cleanthes decided to keep fasting until he starved to death.

\(^{93}\) D.L. 7.176.  
\(^{95}\) Phld. *De stoic.* 1-8.  
\(^{96}\) 38 [Luc.] Macr. 19; Val. Max. 8.7.11; Cens. 15.3 and D.L. 7.176.  
\(^{97}\) Dorandi 1999, 38.  
\(^{98}\) Thom 1995, 7.  
Of the early Stoics Cleanthes was considered the most religious. He developed a special interest in theology, composing arguments in favour of the existence of the gods. It was his belief that the truth about the gods was best expressed by means of poetry. 

The fact that Cleanthes wrote a hymn about the king of gods is not surprising, considering the above. It is still debated at what stage in his career Cleanthes wrote the *Hymn to Zeus*. Besides this hymn, there are a number of other poetic fragments attributed to Cleanthes, none of which are mentioned by name. In this category, the *Hymn to Zeus* is the only work to survive completely. Diogenes Laertius attributes another fifty-seven prose-writings to Cleanthes. In addition to the list of Diogenes Laertius, there are six other titles that are known to quotations ascribed to Cleanthes. In sum, Cleanthes' works can be depicted in the following categories:

1. *Ethics*. This genre contains circa 50% of his prose works;
2. *Physics*;
3. *Logic*;
4. *Poetry*.

---

1. Cicero states Cleanthes' arguments in favour of the existence of the gods in *De natura deorum* 2.24.
3. There seems to be a literary relationship between Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* and the *Phaenomena* by Aratus. Attempts to date the hymn based on this relationship remain fruitless. See Webster 1964, 36-37, 216; Kidd 1977, 166; Hose 1997, 62.
5. This division is roughly based on the division Thom (1997, 4) offers.
3.2 Structural outline of the Hymn to Zeus.

The global outline of Cleanthes’ *Hymn to Zeus* follows the canonical tripartite division of a cult hymn into (i) an invocation, (ii) an argument and (iii) a prayer. The structure of the hymn provided here is a simplified construction of the structure Thom offers.

(i) Invocation: Praise of Zeus
   - a. Zeus as ruler
     - ll 1 – 3a
   - b. Praise as the fitting response to Zeus’ rule
     - ll 3b – 6

(ii) Argument: Zeus’ rule and human recalcitrance
   - a. Description of Zeus’ rule
     - ll 7 – 17
   - b. Zeus restores order and creates harmony out of conflict
     - ll 18 – 21
   - c. Human recalcitrance
     - ll 22 – 31

(iii) Prayer: deliverance and insight leading to praise
   - a. Plea for deliverance and insight
     - ll 32 – 35
   - b. Goal of the prayer for deliverance and insight
     - ll 36 – 39

The invocation addresses Zeus as ruler of nature, mighty and most glorious of immortals. It defines and stresses the special bond existing between Zeus and human invocators:

\[
\text{ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἣσμὲν ἤχου μίμημα λαχόντες}
\text{μοῦνοι, ὅσα ζώει τε καὶ ἕρπει θνήτ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν} \quad [5]
\]

*For we have our origin from you, because we have received the likeness of god exclusively of all mortal creatures who live and wander on earth.*

This bond is the reason for human beings’ right and duty to call on Zeus and to praise him.

The argument prepares the ground for the petitions expressed in the final prayer of the hymn. It contains two major themes, namely (i) Zeus’ orderly rule over nature and (ii) human disobedience and recalcitrance to this rule. These two themes contrast each other sharply: Zeus governs nature in perfect harmony, yet the disobedience of humans creates disharmony. The contrasting themes are connected by a central subsection, stressing Zeus’ ability to restore order and to create harmony out of conflict.

In the final prayer Cleanthes asks Zeus to liberate human beings from their destructive ignorance so they will obtain the same insight on which Zeus himself relies to rule the universe. The prayer displays great likeness to the invocation by repetition of motifs (i) the praise of Zeus and his

---

105 As discussed in chapter 2.
works (ii) his guidance of the universe by universal law and (iii) the special connection existing between Zeus and humans. This narrative technique creates a ring-composition, meant to emphasize the argument. The symmetry of the hymn goes on beyond the correlation between the invocation with the prayer. The first subsection about Zeus’ rule over nature contrasts with the third subsection about human recalcitrance, and is connected by the middle subsection as a kind of center or turning point.

The corresponding parts are more or less of equal length: the invocation contains six, the prayer eight verses. The first subsection of the argument holds eleven, the third subsection ten verses. Both in terms of content and form the composition may be analysed as $a b c b a$ structure. The corresponding of the parts in this hymn as well as the length of these corresponding parts serves to emphasize the central subsection, containing only four verses.
3.3 Analysis of characterization of Zeus in Cleanthes’ Hymn to Zeus.

This hymn contains Stoic notions or Greek terms used to explain Stoic notions. They are laid down in their original Greek as not to compromise their original concepts. These notions will be explained as far as it is necessary to create a full understanding of the hymn.

3.3.1 Invocation: Praise of Zeus

One. Zeus as ruler.

κύδιστ’ ἀθανάτων, πολυώνυμε, παγκρατές aiei, [II] Most glorious of immortals, many-named, always almighty, Zeus, ruler of nature, governing everything with your law, hail!

Zεῦν, φυσεως ἀρχηγε, νόμον μετα πάντα κυβερνῶν, χαίρε:

Cleante firmly sets the tone of the Hymn to Zeus by creating a variation of the usual epithet μέγιστε107 for Zeus in Homer in the Hymn’s first two words, by stating κύδιστ’ ἀθανάτων (1) instead. This choice of words indicates that the poet starts the hymn by distinguishing Zeus from the other gods. The hierarchy of the Greek pantheon in classical mythology confirms that Zeus is indeed set apart from the other Olympians, as he is their leader. Homer uses the epithet κύδιστε mostly as epithets for Zeus and Agamemnon, the first of gods and men respectively.108 The poet thus wishes to emphasize the supremacy of Zeus to the other gods, conveying that he is the culmination of deity. Stoic theology tends towards monothelism:109 this phrase indicating the culmination of deity at the very start could therefore be an indication for a hymn containing Stoic philosophy.

The other features of Zeus in the first verse concur with this reasoning. The epithet πολυώνυμος is not commonly used for Zeus,110 although it is not unappropriate given the wide range of functions attributed to him in antiquity.111 However, Stoicism equates Zeus with the totality of the universe: Zeus is in everything and is the cause of everything.112 This totality is presented in the epithet πολυώνυμε (1). It seems that the poet might deliberately be using this term to express a praise of Zeus’ multiple qualities, conveying the Stoic notion that Zeus may be viewed from these multiple perspectives because of his omnipotence. The epithet παγκρατές113 (1), combined with aiei (1),

108 The epithet κύδιστε for Agamemnon: 10 times in the Iliad, twice in the Odyssey. For Zeus: 5 times in the Iliad.
109 Long (2002, 144): ‘Because the Stoic divinity is everywhere, Stoic philosophers could accommodate gods in the plural. They even applied the divine names of Greek and Roman popular religion to the elements earth, air, fire and water, especially to the heavenly bodies. Strictly, though, these gods are only symbolical ways of referring to the worlds’ most powerful constituents all of which owe their existence to the single ‘active’ named God in the singular of Zeus.’
110 The epithet πολυώνυμος is found with other deities, especially chthonian gods. E.g. Homeric Hymn to Demeter 18 and 32 to indicate Hades.
111 See chapter 2.
112 D.L. 7. 147.
113 The epithet παγκρατές for Zeus is most often used in dramatic text, and later in commentaries on Homer. See Thom 2005, 48.
illustrates that Zeus’ omnipotence is eternal. The first verse of the *Hymn to Zeus* thus promises a hymn with a Stoic content in a conventional outlook.

Subsequently Cleanthes addresses Zeus by his name. It is common to state the name of the god as one of the first elements in a hymn, as we have already seen in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus* and will see in the Homeric *Hymn to Zeus*.¹¹⁴ The poet continues by referring to Zeus as φύσεως ἀρχηγέ (2), a common term to use of Zeus as leader of the gods.¹¹⁵ Used in conjunction with φύσεως (2), the phrase φύσεως ἀρχηγέ (2) contains an additional Stoic notion of Zeus as first originator of the universe. This notion of Zeus is used in a similar sense by Stoics after Cleanthes.¹¹⁶ Cleanthes succeeds once more in combining a traditional term with a Stoic concept.

The positioning of the fifth and last phrase in the invocation marks the significance of νόμον μέτα πάντα κυβερνῶν (2). The phrase expresses an important doctrine in the dogma of the Stoa: νόμος.

The sentence seems to be derived from Heraclitus,¹¹⁷ who is frequently regarded as a decisive influence on the early development of Stoic doctrine.¹¹⁸ Cleanthes himself wrote books on the subject of νόμος. It refers to the principle of order on which Zeus’ rule is based and recurs in ll. 24 and 39.¹¹⁹ The second doctrine emphasizes the active role Zeus plays in maintaining the universe. This doctrine corresponds perfectly with the previous phrase φύσεως ἀρχηγέ (2).

The poet distinctively depicts Zeus as an omnipotent, eternal leader of the gods and originator of the universe. After firmly identifying the god Cleanthes wishes to address, he sends him his greetings: χαίρε (3).

---

¹¹⁴ See p. 10, respectively p. 44 of this thesis.
¹¹⁵ See Pl. Cre. 396a; b. 5.178-9 in Scol.Oxy. 1316; Aristid. Or. 43.8.
¹¹⁶ For example: S.E. M. 163.
¹¹⁷ Heraclit. in D.L. 9.1: ἐν τῷ σοφῷ, ἐπιστασθαι γνώμην, ὅτε ἐκπεφέρηκε πάντα διὰ πάντων.
¹¹⁸ For further information on the influence of Heraclitus on the Stoic doctrine, see Long 1996, 35–38.
¹¹⁹ Thom (2005, 51): ‘Generally speaking, νόμος is the regulating principle operating in nature by which human actions should also be guided. It is often called ‘divine’ and even identified with Zeus. Zeno, for example, is reported to have held ‘that the law of nature is divine, and that its function is to command what is right and to forbid the opposite.’ He furthermore called the law ‘the guiding principle of everything. According to Chrysip, the universal law, which is the right reason pervading everything [...] is identical to Zeus, who is this director of the administration of existing thing.’ However, in this hymn the poet does not equate νόμος with Zeus, but distinguishes Zeus from it. Zeus as king controls and uses νόμος governing the cosmos.’
Two. Praise as the fitting response to Zeus’ rule

The second section of the invocation serves to mark the relationship between humans and Zeus. Humans alone have received the likeness of god and therefore it is their duty and right to pay tribute to Zeus. The special connection between mankind and gods over other mortal creatures is well established in antiquity. The relationship between Zeus and mankind is often established as the special bond between a father and his children, just like we have seen in Callimachus Hymn to Zeus. The phrase ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γενόμεσθαι (4) is consistent and seems to portray this image, yet the next phrase θεοῦ μίμημα λαχόντες (4) signifies another ambiguity. Already in Plato’s Timaeus the idea of a divine spark in every human being can be found. The Stoic doctrine contains this same notion: stoics from Chrysippus onwards referred to the bond of a divinity with mankind as δαιμόν, an eternal divine element in a person’s being. Once more Cleanthes has combined the traditional mythological terms of genealogy with the technical philosophical terminology of participation in deity.

Cleanthes concludes the invocation by drawing together the different motifs of the previous verses and he connects these motifs by stating the reason for composing this hymn: because of the special connection between mankind and Zeus (4–5), it is their right (3) that they praise Zeus, which Cleanthes does by means of a hymn (6).

---

120 See for example Pl. N. 1-2; Hes. Op. 108.
121 Homer makes us of πάτηρ for Zeus in the Iliad 154 times, in the Odyssey 129 times. Hesiod calls Zeus 20 times πάτηρ in the Theogony.
122 See chapter three of this thesis.
123 Hom. Il. 5.896; Pl. N. 2.1; Ov. Fast. 5.111; Arat. Phaen.1.
124 Pl. Ti. 90a.
125 See D.L. 7.87-88 for a summary of the doctrine δαιμόν from Chrysippus. See also Arr. Epict. 1.14.11-14, 2.8.11-14; Sen. Ep. 41.2; Arat. Phaen. 5.
3.3.2 Argument: Zeus’ rule and human recalcitrance

One. Praise as the fitting response to Zeus’ rule.

The enormous might of Zeus marks the opening of the argument. Voluntarily the entire cosmos obeys and is being guided by Zeus, wherever his guidance may lead. The Stoic notion κόσμος indicates the world-order and more specifically, the universe of heavenly bodies. Cicero states that Cleanthes considered there to be four causes of belief in the gods, of which the greatest was ‘the uniform and beautifully ordered motion and revolution of the heavens.’ To see the perfect, harmonious paths the celestial bodies follow means proof of the existence of Zeus. The argument of this hymn thus starts giving evidence of (the greatness of) Zeus.

Now that Zeus’ existence is determined, the poet continues giving praise to the cause of Zeus’ ability to lead the κόσμος (1); his κεραυνός (10). Cleanthes depicts Zeus in terms of popular iconography with a thunderbolt in his hands. This thunderbolt has been given a copious description by adding ἀμφήκη (10), πυρόεντα (10) and ἀειζώοντα (10) as characteristics, thus underlining its importance. In artistic renderings of the thunderbolt it is often pointed at both ends, which may be the meaning of ἀμφήκης (10). Others conclude ἀμφήκης to be a metaphor for the image of a sword, for the active force of the universe. If this is true, ἀμφήκης stresses the piercing power of the thunderbolt. The following πυρόεντα (10) raises an image of this thunderbolt following a nature consisting of fire, again in line with conventional mythology. The combination of πυρόεντα (10) with ἀειζώοντα (10) immediately brings Heraclitus to mind.

---

126 Thom (2005, 70): ‘Kosmos is in Stoic thought used as (i) the god himself; (ii) the world-order and (iii) the combination of these two. In this context the second meaning must be intended.’

127 Cic. N.D. 2.15.

128 Carpenter (1991, 39): ‘Though the shape of this weapon [thunderbolt] may vary […] it is his most common attribute in Archaic and Early Classical art. Later he sometimes hold a long sceptre as well or instead of the bolt, particularly when is he pursuing a beloved.’ E.g. the fifth-century bronze statue known as Zeus Keraunios.


130 Thom 2005, 76-77.

131 Heraclit. in Clem. Al. Strom. 5.14.104.
Cleante's allusion πυρόεντ' ἀείζωνν̣ to Heraclitus' πῦρ ἀείζωνν̣, 'ever living fire,' seems most explicit. This 'fire' is identified by Hippolytus, a 3rd-century theologian in the Christian church, as the thunderbolt.  

This phrase is not found elsewhere to represent Zeus, yet both words are used individually from the time of Homer and Hesiod onwards to express his power to guide events. Hom. Il. 19.258; Od. 1.45. Hes. Th. 886.

The poet depicts him in terms of conventional iconography, in which Zeus is the wielder of the thunderbolt, a weapon employed to enforce his will and used as a vehicle for λόγος.

Nature, culminating in the heavens, thus voluntarily obeys the creative and sustaining force that Zeus sets in motion. Cleante stresses this point once again, stating: οὐδὲ τι γίγνεται ἔργον ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπισκέπτετα, ἀλλ' ἂν ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἐστίν καὶ ἐσται πῦρ ἀείζωνν̣, ἀπόθεμεν μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεβήμενον μέτρα.

This world, common to all, neither god nor man and made, no, it always was and is and will be an ever-living fire, lighting by measure and going out by measure.

---

132 Hippol. Haer. 9.10.7.
133 Thom 2005, 77. For further information see Cic. N.D. 2.23-24, 28-30.
134 This phrase is not found elsewhere to represent Zeus, yet both words are used individually from the time of Homer and Hesiod onwards to express his power to guide events. Hom. Il. 19.258; Od. 1.45. Hes. Th. 886.
135 The phrase διὰ παντός could have either a spatial, or a temporal meaning. Given the context of the last verses (9-14), which emphasize that Zeus is present everywhere and in all things through his firebolt and λόγος, it is more likely Cleante wishes to stress the former. For a different view, see Thom 1995, 92.
136 For the identification of god with the (fiery) thunderbolt, see Aet. Plac. 1.7.33; 1.7.23 in Ps. Plu. Plac. 1.7. For the identification of god with λόγος, see D.L. 7. 88.
This repetition serves to create a large contrast between the obedient nature and the deeds of people who are kakoi (17), who act while being ἄνοια (17) and σοῦ δίξα (15). Not all of mankind obeys Zeus' reign as willingly as nature does. Kakoi men are acting apart from Zeus, whose divine rule is present everywhere, but neglected by the kakoi. Zeus himself is addressed as δαίμον (15), a vocative that implies more neutrality than the other two vocatives in the Hymn that directly address Zeus (Zeũ (2, 32)). As Burkert states: 'Daimon is the veiled countenance of divine activity... Daimon is thus the necessary complement of the Homeric view of the gods as individuals with personal characteristics.' Accordingly this neutral form of addressing Zeus contributes to the more abstract, philosophical tone of the argument. The poetic raison d'être is introduced in these last, concluding verses of this section of the Hymn: the refusal of the kakoi to conform to Zeus' rule.

Two. Zeus restores order and creates harmony out of conflict.

As the analysis of the composition displayed, this section is the very center of the Hymn to Zeus and it marks a turning point in the argument. It is located between the first section in which Zeus' divine rule over an obeying cosmos is offered, and the third section in which the consequences for people who are kakoi by neglecting his divine rule are described. This section indicates the solution Zeus himself provides for the kakoi who disregard his rule.

The harmonious reign of Zeus over nature is disrupted by the kakoi, who, without his guidance, act ignorantly. Zeus on the other hand is capable of reconciling differences, a theme that frequently occurs in archaic Greek literature. The poet states that Zeus is able to change the

138 From the time of Pindar onwards, the concept ‘through God everything, without God nothing’ is common in hymnic literature. See Pi. O. 14.4, 5, 8; N. 2.6, 7.1; Ariphron fr. 813 in Ath. 15.702.
139 The phrase σοῦ δίξα (15) has sometimes been interpreted as freedom of will which allows mankind to rebel against the divine rule. For further information, see Thom 1995, 96-97.
140 Long (1971, 179): 'Cleanthes [...] is thinking of God as an absolute power, embracing all things and uniting good and evil. Yet evil actions are not planned by God in his identity as one omnipotent ruler. What he does is to unite all things in a harmonious whole. Can we say that evil actions are ones purposed by certain fragments of his logos? They would bear no more resemblance to God as such than does a brick to the house it helps to form [...]'
141 Burkert 1985, 180.
142 This motif occurs in Hes. Op. 5-9, with an emphasis on Zeus' omnipotent power to change the fortune of human beings. See also Hes. Th. 84-86; Op. 248-64 and Sol. fr. 4.32-39.
disharmonious into the harmonious. He describes this capacity by connecting three contrasting pairs: περισσά – ἄρτια (18), κοσμεῖν – τάκτομα (19) and ὅφιλα – φίλα (19). These three pairs contain a double chiasmus as well, respectively negative vs. positive, positive vs. negative and negative vs. positive. The stylistical cohesion contributes to the content these verses display. While verses 18 and 19 focus on disharmonious opposites, verses 20 and 21 focus on Zeus’ ability to create unity in plurality. This unity is present in λόγος (21), which is presented as the result of Zeus’ activities to restore balance: the λόγος combines both ends of a spectrum into a unity. The harmony in the universe Zeus is able to maintain seems to be moving constantly. It is remarkable that even though the λόγος is eternal, it needs to be realized in the universe constantly.

In this way, the centre of the Hymn explains that Zeus works continuously to accomplish harmony in the cosmos, which is encapsulated in the meaning of the universal and everlasting λόγος.

Three. Human recalcitrance.

Human beings, striving to achieve good things (ἀγαθά 23) in life accomplish the exact opposite (πάμπαν ἐναντία τῶνδε 31) because, in their ignorance, they disregard λόγος and thereby Zeus’ guide. In this section the poet presents the outcome of living in foolishness (ἀνοία 17): if mankind conducts its life disregarding Zeus’ λόγος, it will only achieve the opposite of the things they long for. To clarify this idea Cleanthes uses two topos of traditional material in this section of the argument: (i) mankind is blind to perceive its own goodness144 and (ii) mankind follows false life-goals.145 These topos are the punishments the κακοί suffer for being separated from λόγος and thus from Zeus himself.

---

143 Thom (1995, 108): ‘The good and the bad are not equal partners, but they are blended in such a way that the end product is a restored rational order.’
144 Heraclit. in S.E. M. 7.133. Pl. Lg. 4.716a-b.
145 The goals Cleanthes mentions can be identified with the conventional ways of life often criticized by ancient philosophers. E.g. Arist. En. 1095a20-24.
So, in disobeying Zeus’ law, the ἄστικοι punish themselves. Firstly, the irony of verse 23, specifically the pursuit of ἀγαθά (23) by the ἄστικοι, shows that the ἄστικοι are unable to perceive and understand what truly leads to a good life. They will not only never acquire good things, which becomes explicit in the phrase ἀντίδι β’ αὐθ’ ὀρμῶσιν ἄνευ καλοῦ (26), but they also have an incorrect definition of these good things, exactly as the described τόποι imply. They pursue δόξη (27), κερδοσύνας τετραμμένοι οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ (28) and ἄνεσι καὶ σώματος ἡδέα ἔργα (29), matters that do not contribute to their moral well-being, and are accordingly not considered to be ‘good.’ The separation of λόγος and thereby of Zeus leads human beings to a misconception of and an inability to reach true ἀγαθά.

Secondly, the punishment the poet portrays in the participium φεύγοντες (22), which should be regarded as a metaphor for rushing through life without control, and the personal negative, emotional reaction out of ignorance of what divine order truly entails.

It thus follows that a life separated from Zeus equals a miserable life for human beings. The phrase μάλα πάμπαν ἐναντία (31) at the very end of this section serves as a reminder that Zeus is capable to change unsatisfactory situations into their opposites (18-19) and that he arranges matters into an harmonious state (20-21). This reminder prepares the ground for the prayer, in which Zeus is asked to resolve the problem of the ἄστικοι.

146 Cleanthes himself composed a poem in which the good, according to him, is described with twenty-nine epithets. The poet proposes a view of the good as only things that benefit mankind morally. See for the poem and further information on the poem Thom 1995, 122.
147 A close Stoic parallel is found in Cic. Rep. 3.33. See also Thom 1995, 113-114.
3.3 Prayer: deliverance and insight leading to praise

One. Plea for deliverance and insight

Cleansethas prepared the ground for the prayer very well. Zeus has been depicted as the mighty ruler of the world-order, which offers the impression that he will be able to answer the plea of the poet. As in the invocation, Zeus is surrounded by powerful epithets to illustrate his character.

The direct address of Zeus (Zeũ 32) distinctly marks the transition from argument into prayer. It also recalls the invocation, where Zeus is addressed with the same vocative. The poet continues by assigning Zeus the epithet πάνδωρε (32), more commonly used of Earth and of Destiny than of Zeus. In these last both cases the epithet is used to reflect that Earth and Destiny dispense both good and bad fortune. This content seems to be a very strong reminder of the centre of the hymn, especially ὑδε γὰρ εἰς ἐν πάντα συσήματικας ἑσθλὰ κακοῖς (20). Cleanthes seems to use πάνδωρε as a reminder of the most evident characterization of Zeus in the hymn: the capability to level out differences.

This unfamiliar epithet for Zeus is followed by a very common epic epithet for Zeus: κελαινεφές (32). Remarkably, this is the only epithet in the whole Hymn to Zeus that apparently does not have another possible Stoic connotation besides the obvious traditional meaning already mentioned. In Homer κελαινεφές serves mainly to express the might of Zeus. This traditional, ornamental epithet might therefore be chosen to convey Zeus’ power. However, in conjunction with ἀργικέραυνε (32), which immediately follows the previous epithet, κελαινεφές can nonetheless be regarded as a a Stoic notion. Earlier in the Hymn Cleanthes has stated that Zeus uses his κεραυνός (10) as an assistant, to enforce his rule over nature. Together, κελαινεφές ἀργικέραυνε could refer to the Stoic Zeus’ power over the natural world. Adhering to this conclusion, the prayer then starts addressing Zeus as the God who reconciles differences in and holds power over the natural world.

---

148 For a further comparison of the prayer with the invocation, see Thom 1997, 142.
149 The phrase ἀλλὰ Zeũ (32) has a precedent in Hom. Il. 8.242 in a similar context.
150 E.g. Earth, see Ps.-Plu. Vit. Hom. 18. E.g. Destiny, see Opp. C. 1.12.
151 Hom. Il. 2.412, 11.78, 21.520; Od. 9.552 and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 316.
152 Hopkinson (1988, 135-136); ‘a traditional Homeric epithet of Zeus, with no particular Stoic application.’ Thom (1995, 145); ‘all the other epithets in v.v. 1-2 and 32 except this one can easily be given a Stoic interpretation in addition to their normal meanings in epic verse.’
153 E.g. Hom.II. 2.412 and 22.178.
154 Perhaps Cleanthes composed the epithet ἀργικέραυνε himself. For further information, see Thom 1995, 146-147.
The plea to liberate human beings of ignorance in verse 33 is therefore not surprising. The poet prays to Zeus to act in accordance with the characteristic this Hymn marks as being Zeus’ most important feature: to restore order and create harmony out of conflict and thus, to liberate mankind of ignorance. Cleanthes repeats this plea in verses 34-35 in different words. Here the request is addressed at Zeus πάτερ (34). The use of the vocative in a context of supplication makes a claim on the special relationship between human beings and Zeus, already explored in the invocation (3-5). The repetition of the same plea marks the significance of its content to the poet. It is conspicuous that the argument only speaks of the κακοί who act separated from Zeus’ law and thus needs to be liberated from ignorance, while the prayer speaks of ἄνθρωποι. The κακοί in need of Zeus’ help seem to represent the majority of human beings.\footnote{Zeus is ‘father of men and gods’ and therefore frequently addressed as πάτερ. See Hom. Il. 1.503, 2.371, 3.276; Od. 1.45, 4.341 and 7.311.}

Two. Goal of the prayer.

The second and last section of the prayer indicates the goal of the previous section and ultimately of the Hymn itself: the praise of Zeus and his works. There is a clear motif of mutual exchange: Zeus deserves gratitude as acknowledgement for the gifts bestowed by him (36).\footnote{The view that mankind is mostly evil agrees with statements found elsewhere in Stoic literature. E.g. S.E. M. 9.133; Plu. De stoic. 1048e and Cic. N.D. 2.39.} The gift of γνώμη (35) in Zeus’ guidance can only be answered by praise, and is also a precondition for being able to praise Zeus. Zeus himself therefore provides the necessary understanding without which it is not possible to reciprocate him.\footnote{The motif of reciprocity, also known as the do-ut-des principle, is presented in many technical terms usually associated with: τιμᾶω, τιμή, ἀμειβόμεθα (36); ὑμνέω (37, 39); γέρας (38). For further information, see Furley and Bremer 2001, 31-61.} The relationship between mankind and Zeus - in the invocation marked as special because of our origin from him, in the first part of the prayer marked as special because of a ‘father-child’ relationship - is therefore grounded in Zeus’ endowment of γνώμη.

Cleanthes has expanded the people who are in need of γνώμη in the first section of the prayer from the κακοί to a more general ἄνθρωποι. He now seems to identify himself and his companions with the human population who are separated from Zeus by using the first person plural in ἀμειβόμεται:

\begin{quote}
δόρρ' ἂν τιμηθέντες ἄμειβόμεθα σε τιμῇ, ὑμνοῦσκες τα σα ἐργα δυναμένας, ὡς ἤπειροι
θυτον ἐοντ', ἐπει οὖσθε βροτοῖς γέρας ἀλλο τι μείζον ὧσε θεοῖς, ἡ κακοιον ἅει νόμον ἐν δίκῃ ὑμνεῖν.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
So that we, having been honoured, may answer you in honour, singing continuously of your works in a hymn, as is fitting for one who is mortal, for there is no greater gift to mortals, nor gods, than to always praise the universal law in justice.
\end{quote}
they also are in need of God’s gift of understanding. Once honoured with this special gift of γνώμη, mankind is able to praise the κοινὸς νόμος (39), and more specifically the one responsible for it: Zeus. After all, Zeus is the one who governs this νόμος (2), a force that causes the celestial bodies to follow him voluntarily (7-8). As a result these celestial bodies exist in perfect harmony. This is what the poet wants mankind to have as well. When considered from a Stoic perspective, it seems likely that Cleanthes refers to these celestial bodies when he states the Homeric formula οὖτε βροτοῖς [...] οὖτε θεοῖς. The poet lists mortals and gods in the same sentence, hence creating a parallel between them. This raises the suggestion that mankind is capable, as celestial bodies are, to live in perfect harmony. Cleanthes seems to want to remind his audience of exactly this result of Zeus’s law: perfect harmony. Another result of the Homeric formula is a reminder of the fact that Zeus is ruler of both mortals and gods: he is the culmination of deity and consequently both should grant him praise.

The greatest gift for mankind is to praise the universal law of Zeus (38-39). The poets’ Hymn to Zeus is a excellent example as he strikingly ends this Hymn with a verb indicating praise by means of a hymn: ὑμνεῖν (39).

3.3.4 Preliminary conclusion

The Hymn to Zeus by Cleanthes must be surveyed as a hymn with a Stoic content. Every mythological aspect and epithet, except for one, can and should be read in a Stoic context.

The obvious Stoic content of the Hymn to Zeus makes it evident that the philosopher Cleanthes represents Zeus as the first active principle in the Stoic world system. Zeus, depicted by the ancient sources as the god of gods, is equated with that which governs all, the first active principle. Zeus is represented as a near abstract god, with absolute power, embracing all things and uniting good and evil.

---

159 Although it is a Stoic thought that mankind is mostly evil (see note 140), it is not attested that all of mankind is evil. Meijer (1981, 231) provides another possible solution: ‘Kleanthes sluit zichzelf met zijn stoische medezangers in het koor der mensheid in. Wij hebben er ontvangst, laten wij iets terugdoen,’

160 Reale (1985, 246): ‘This pantheistic and materialistic conception of God does not exclude polytheism... God is the logos-fire, he is the highest active principle, or seen from another perspective, he is the totality of the cosmos. The many Gods are the stars, that is, privileged parts of the cosmos, and are conceived to be living and intelligent beings.’ Thorn (1995, 161): ‘It is not inconceivable that θεοῖς here refers to the celestial bodies who willingly conform to the order Zeus laid down in nature.’ For corresponding Homeric formulae, see Hom. Il. 15.98, 24.433 and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo 351.

161 The epithet κελαινεφής (32).

162 To present Zeus as the active principle in the Stoic world system, Cleanthes (i) makes only use of epithets (except one, see previous note) that can be considered Stoic (ii) refers regularly to Heraclitus and (iii) displays many Stoic notions and doctrines.

163 See chapter 1 of this thesis.

164 Remember δαίμον (15).
Conclusion

The goal of this thesis was to assess how Zeus, king of gods, is depicted in two Hellenistic hymns: the *Hymn to Zeus* by Callimachus and the *Hymn to Zeus* by Cleanthes. After a short introduction on the origin and nature of Zeus, based on various ancient sources, the structure and the linguistics of the hymns have been analysed.

Based on the analysis of the *Hymn to Zeus* written by Callimachus, the conclusion can be drawn that as the hymn progresses (i) Zeus is praised in his function of king and (ii) the distinction between Zeus and an earthly king is minimized. This evidence leads to the conclusion that Callimachus composed the *Hymn to Zeus* to praise the Ptolemaic king, Callimachus' patron. However, this is shrewdly done. Callimachus adopts traditional characteristics of Zeus, traditional epithets and a traditional outline for a hymn.

The analysis of the *Hymn to Zeus* by the philosopher Cleanthes shows that his hymn belongs to the genre of the philosophical hymns. These hymns are addressed at personifications of impersonal principles, or at traditional deities allegorized as principles of nature. From the start until the end of the hymn it is evident that Cleanthes addresses Zeus not merely in his function as the chief Olympian deity, but in his function as the active principle in the Stoic belief system as well. Every mythological aspect and every epithet can and most likely should be read in a Stoic context. Nevertheless, Cleanthes, just like Callimachus, stays true to conventional vocabulary, epithets and outline to display this Stoic notion of Zeus.

In conclusion: after careful analysis of the structure and linguistics of the *Hymn to Zeus* by Callimachus and the *Hymn to Zeus* by Cleanthes with the objective to assess the image of Zeus as displayed in these *Hymns*, the following can be said:

(i) Callimachus presents Zeus most prominently as the king of gods. The poet uses familiar vocabulary and epithets to depict the image of Zeus. The equation of Zeus with Ptolemy II Philadelphus I demonstrates that the traditional image of Zeus in his function of king of gods is used to illustrate that the king of kings, Ptolemy, is similar to Zeus.

165 Arifron fr. 813 in Ath. 15.702.
166 All, but the epithet *κελαινεφής* (32). It is the one epithet that, on its own, cannot easily be read in a Stoic manner. This 'problem' is solved by interpreting it as part of the following epithet *ἀργικέραυνε* (32), and might then refer to the Stoic Zeus' power over the natural world. See p. 33 of this thesis.
(ii) The poet Cleanthes introduces Zeus foremost as the active principle in a world system based on Stoic beliefs. Just like Callimachus, Cleanthes uses common vocabulary and epithets to display this Stoic notion of Zeus.

These results lead to a third, joint, conclusion:

(iii) Both poets present a two-folded image of Zeus: by using the traditional\(^{167}\) image of Zeus as king of gods, as a symbol of the most powerful force in the universe, a second underlying objective receives more substantial meaning. For Callimachus this objective is the status of his patron, for Cleanthes, it is the Stoic active principle.

\(^{167}\) As depicted in ancient sources. See chapter 1 of this thesis.
Hymn to Zeus

For suddenly the works of the Panacrian bee arose
the she sleep in a golden cradle,
embrace, the Meliae of mount Dikte, and Adrasteia put you to
God, your navel fell off; hence the
When the nymph left Thena, carrying you towards Knosos,
do the grandsons of the Bear, daughters of Lykaon, drink.

And held in distress queen Rhea said:
'Beloved Gaia, you too, give birth; your labours are light.'
So the goddess spoke and after lifting her great aloft
she struck the mountain with her staff; yes, it split open a long
way for her, and poured down a mighty flood; there she wrapped
your body, oh lord, after cleansing it, and gave you to Neda to
carry into the Cretan shelter, to be raised secretly,
for you; and you did not die, for you are always.
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Appendix I

Callimachus: Hymn to Zeus

Whom should be sung at libations to Zeus, Rather than the god himself, always great, always king, Charioteer of the Pelogonians, judge of the sons of Ouranos? Just how shall we sing to him, as lord of Dikte or Lycacon? My soul is highly in doubt, since debated is his birth. Zeus, some say you are born in the mountains of Ida, Zeus, others [say] in Arcadia; which of the two father, lied? 'Cretans always lie,' yes, for Cretans erected a tomb, oh lord, for you; and you did not die, for you are always. And in Parrhasia Rhea gave birth to you, where was a hill sheltered with thickets brush; there the ground is holy, and there approaches not some creature low to land, in need of Eileithyia, nor a woman, but the Apidianas call it the primeval child of Rhea. There, when your mother laid you down from her mighty lap she at once sought a stream of water, whereby she might wash off the soil of birth, and to wash your body therein. But mighty Ladon flowed not yet, nor Erymanthos, Clearest of rivers, waterless was still all Arcadia, to be called highly well-watered was anon. For at that time, when Rhea loosed her girdle, watery laon took many a hollow oak above, and Melan held on to many a main, and many angry beasts above Carnion, wet though it may be, created dens, and a man traveled by foot over Crathis and many-pebbled Metope, thirsty; with much water lying beneath his feet. And held in distress queen Rhea said: 'Beloved Gaia, you too, give birth; your labours are light.'
χαίρε οὐ ἐθειότερον Ἀ 
ἀἀἐπήλασθαι φάντο ἀοτεύχεα οὖλα Ἰδαίοις ἱ

ἡμίκυς ὑμετέρ

δύνατο θαυμάτων ἀλήθειας ήραν άνθιο,

φάντο πάλον Κρόνιδρον διάρτημα δώματα γειμο-

τις δε κ’ ἐπ’ Όσλύμπω τε καὶ Λιδί κλήρων ἐρύσσοι,

ὡς μᾶλα μηνιφρός; ἐπ’ ἵσαι γαρ ἕουσε 

πληθαυσία τα δε τούσον ὄσον δια πλείστων ἔχουσιν. 

ψευδώμην άιόντων ἃ κεν πεπόθεν ακούν. 

οὐ σε θεών έσπερα πάλο θεάν, ἕρα γε κείρων, 

η τη βί το τε κάρτος, ὁ και πέλας εἴασα διώρο. 

θρασο δ οἰοναν μεν’ υπεροχον ἀγγελισίν 

σον τράνων ο τ ἔρμοι φίλος ενδέξεια φαίνειν.

εἰλεο δ’ αἰξηρον δ τι φερτσταν ου σο γε νηρ 

ἐμπράζομεν, ουκ ἄνδρα σακεπαλοῦ, ου μεν αοιδο-

ἀλλα τα μεν μακαρεσον ὀλίζουν αὕτω παρηκάς 

ἀλλα μελεν ἔτεροι, ου δ’ ἔξελον πολιάρχου 

αὕτως, ὅν υπὸ χειρο γεμομορο, ὅν ιδρει αἰχμή,

ὁ ἐρέτη, ὁν πάντα τι δ ου κρατέοτος ὑπ’ ιοχυν[75]

αὐτικα ἀλληκα μὲν ἴδεομεν Ἰανυιοντο,

τευχροτα δ’ Ἀρρω, ἐπακτήρας δε Χιτονής 

Ἀρτέμιδος, Φοῖβον δε λυρῆς εν εἰδότας οἰμο-

εκ δ’ ἄλως μαυλολησης, ἐπει δ’ αἰωνὸν 

ἀρετήν έσται τοι κεν ἔτοιμοι, οὐτε το αὐτικο 

λαον ὑπο σκληροι οι τ’ εμπαλιν ιδησιονον 

ἐν δε μυρηνεν έβαλες φωικόν, εν’ δ’ άλλας ὀλβα 

πασο μεν, ου καλά δ’ ιοσον, ἐοικε δ τεκμηριαθα 

ημετερο μεδεσιλαν’ πεπηρο γαρ εύρο βεβηκεν 

ἐσπέροις κενος γε τελει τα κεν πρι νοση 

ἐσπέρας τα μεγαστα, τα μειονα δ, εὔσε νοση,

οι δε τα μεν πλειστα, τα δ’ ουχ ειν, τον δ’ άπο 

πας αὑτοσ άνην έκολονονς, ένεκλοσας δε μενοιν 

χαιρε μεγα, Κρονιθη παντεπερατε, δωτορ έδω 

δωτορ απημονις, τεα δ’ εργατα τις κεν αειδο 

ου γενε, ους τις κεν Διως εργαμετ’ αειοσ.

χαιρε πατερ, χαιρ αὐθι διδον δ αρετην τη αφεσος 

τε, ουτ αρετης άτερ ωλας επιστατα ανδρας αειειν 

ουτ αρετη αφενου διδον δ ἀρετην τε και ὀλβον.

on the mountains of the Ida, which men call Panakrta. And loudly the Curetes danced around in armour, banging their weaponry, so that Cronos might hear with his ears the sound of their thunder, and not your infant cries. And you grew well, and you were well nurtured, heavenly Zeus and quickly you came to manhood, and quickly the down blossomed for you. But, while you were still a child, you demonstrated all perfect deeds; therefore your siblings, although earlier born, did not begrudge you to have heaven as your assigned domain. Well, the singers of old were not completely right; they said Fate divided the three folded gifts to the sons of Cronos; but who would draw Lot over Olympus and Hades, who but someone extremely naive? For it makes sense to draw for equal shares. But these are as much in pieces as is possible. Let me tell lies that convince hearers’ ear! No lots made you king of the gods, no, but the deeds of your hands, your strength as well as your power, that you indeed stationed near your throne. And as your messenger you drafted the most magnificent of birds for your omens — may the things you show be favorable to my friends. And of the powerful men you chose him, who is bravest; not those skilled in the use of ships, not a shield-wielding man, nor a singer; no, these you dismissed at once to lesser divinities, other wards for other gods to care for, but you reserved rulers of cities themselves, beneath whose hand is the landowner, the skilled warrior, the oarsman, everything; yes, what exists that is not under the rulers’ might? Thus, we say, smiths belong to Hephaistos, warriors to Ares, huntsmen to Artemis of the tunic, and those who knows the strains of the lyre well to Phoibus. But kings belong to Zeus, for nothing is more divine than the rulers of Zeus. That is why you selected them as your lot, and gave them citadels to guard. You yourself resides in the high places of the cities, keeping an eye on those who lead their men with crooked judgment, and those who rule justly. Upon them you casted riches, and prosperity abundantly. Upon all of them, but not at all in equal measure, if we may pass judgment by our ruler; for he is preeminent by far. In the evening he accomplishes what he’d thought of in the morning; yes, in the evening the greatest things, and the lesser, soon as he’d thought of them. While others complete some things in less than a year, other things not in one year, and others you yourself don’t allow to finish completely, after diminishing their eager desire. A great salute, son of Kronos last in a line, provider of good things, provider of well-being. Who can sing of your deeds? He never lived, nor ever will; who shall sing of the deeds of Zeus? Salute, father, salute again; and grant us goodness and prosperity. Without goodness happiness cannot bless men, nor goodness without prosperity. Give us goodness and happiness.
Appendix II

Cleanthes: Hymn to Zeus

κύδιστ' ἀθανάτων, πολυώνυμε, παγκρατὲς αἰεί,
Σεῦ, φυσεως ἀρχηγάς, νόμων μέτα πάντα κυβερνῶν,
χαῖρε· σε γὰρ πάντεσσι θέμις θνητοὶ προσαυδᾶν.
ἐκ σοι γὰρ γενόμεσθα θεοῦ μίμημα λαχόντες
μονοῖ, ὅσα ξείει τε καὶ ἔρρει θυντ' ἐπί γαῖαν-
τῶ σε καθυμνήσω, καὶ σὸν κράτος αἰεῖν ἀλείων.
οὐ δὴ πας ὅδε κόσμος, ἔλισσόμενος περὶ γαίαν,
πείθεται, ἥ κεν ἀγῆς, καὶ ἐκὼν ὑπὸ σεοι κρατεῖται-
τοιον ἔχεις ὑποεργὸν ἀνικήτοις ἐνὶ χερσὶν
ἄμφαθε πυρόεν' ἀειζώοντα κεραυνόν·
τοῦ γὰρ ὑπὸ πληγῆς φύσεως πάντ' ἔργα <τελεῖται>·
ᾧ σὺ κατευθύνει κοινὸν λόγον, ὃς διὰ πάντων
φοιτᾷ, μιγνύμενος μεγάλῳ μικροῖς τε φάεσσι·
yῴῳ σὺ τόσος y ὕπατος βασιλεὺς διὰ παντός.
oὐδέ τι γίγνεται ἔργον ἐπὶ χθονὶ σοῦ
δίχα, δαίμον,
οὔτε κατ' αἰθέριον θεῖον πόλον, οὔτ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ,
πλὴν ὁπόσα ῥέζουσι κακοὶ σφετέραις ἀνοίαις.
ὃν φεύγοντες ἐῶσιν ὅσοι θνητῶν κακοί εἰσιν,
δύσμοροι, οἵ τ' ἀγαθῶν μὲν ἀεὶ κτῆσιν ποθέοντες
οὔτ' ἐσορῶσι θεοῦ κοινὸν νόμον οὔτε κλύουσι,
ὡς κεν πειθόμενοι σὺν νῷ βίον ἐσθλὸειεν·
αὐτοὶ δ' αὖθ' ὁρμῶσιν ἄνευ καλοῦ ἄλλο ἐπ' ἄλλα·
οἳ μὲν ὑπὲρ δόξης σπουδὴν δυσέριστον ἔχοντες,
οἳ δ' ἐπὶ κερδοσύνας τετραμμένοι οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ,
ἄλλοι δ' εἰς ἄνεσιν καὶ σώματος ἡδέα ἔργα.
ἀλλὰ κακοῖς ἐπέκυρσαν ἐπ' ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλα φέρονται,
σπεύδοντε μάλα πάμπαν ἐναντίον τῶνδε γενέσθαι.
καὶ Ζεῦ πάνδωρε, κελαινεφὲς, ἀργικέραυνε,
Appendix III

Introduction to the Hellenistic Era

The Macedonian Alexander the Great extended the empire of his father, Philip ‘the one-eyed’ II, with an extraordinary military campaign. After a period of heavy drinking, he died suddenly, leaving an enormous empire with no successor or any form of political power or administrative structures. It is not surprising that a struggle for power followed in the next years. At the end of the first quarter of the third century, three of Alexanders’ commanders all claimed the title of basileus, settling for a division of Alexanders’ empire instead of controlling it as a whole. By that time they had established their kingdoms with permanent geographical centers and stable administrations: the Antigonids in Macedonia and parts of Greece, the Seleucids in Asia, and the Ptolemies in Egypt. In the third and earlier part of the second century the prosperity of all three kingdoms peaked. With the rise of the Roman empire these kingdoms slowly declined, until Rome eventually led to their downfall.

‘The name of Alexander marks the end of one age of the world, the beginning of another,’ Droysen stated. The expansion of an empire, on a scale this grand, had enormous consequences on a geographical, political, social, cultural and economic level. Already under the reign of Alexander a new lingua franca, koinè, became the common speech. After the decomposition of Alexanders’ realm into three separate kingdoms, the capital cities bloomed as centres of culture, following the example classical Athens had set them. The Hellenistic monarchs presented themselves as benefactors of the arts, building facilities for scientific research, schools and musea. Naturally these capitals attracted many artists and learned men. The exchange of ideas that followed led to a more unified culture in the Greek world.

What is now called the ‘Hellenistic era’ is generally defined as the period after the death of Alexander the Great (323 BC) until the battle of Actium (31 BV), when Octavian defeated Mark Anthony and queen Cleopatra. The term ‘Hellenistic’ was coined by the German scholar Droysen, in his history of the period from the time Alexander the Great till the coming of Christianity. This work he named Geschichte des Hellenismus. For Droysen, ‘Hellenismus’ was the mix of Eastern and Greek cultures that provided the soil from which Christianity arose. A translation to ‘Hellenism’ was not possible (which means something else), which is why this period is since called by its adjective form: ‘Hellenistic,’ Greek-like.

---

168 Droysen 1977, 1.
169 Droysen 1931.
The Classical era, ‘the Golden Age’, has always been considered to be the zenith of classical Greek culture. Compared to this era, much of the literature produced after the death of Alexander the Great has been dismissed as derivative, decadent and inferior.\textsuperscript{170}

In this new Hellenistic world there was one centre, founded by Alexander himself, that on a cultural level dwarfed all others: Alexandria. Hellenistic authors can by and large be seen as a synonym for Alexandrian authors. The court of Alexandria was ablaze with the enlightenment of learned men, who centred their learning and often living at the heart of this enlightened world: the Mouseion.

The conception of Classical literature changed in this era. Literature was not just to be read (which is a change on its own): it must be examined, discussed and criticized. Genres with old traditions were not self-evident any more. Old genres, long forgotten, were picked up and given new life. New subjects made their way into poems. A different style of writing erupted: obscure and learned was the new mode. Callimachus, a forerunner in this process, signifies the right way for a poet:\textsuperscript{171}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{δὴρον ἐλλάγει μηδ’ σίμων ἀνὰ πλατῦν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους ἀτρίπτονς, εἰ καὶ στειπτέρην ἐλάσεις.} ‘
\item \textit{τῷ πιθόμην· ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ ἀείδομεν οἱ λιγὺς ἦχον τέττιγος, ὦμορθόν δ’ όπικ ἐριληραν ὄνοι.} ‘
\item \textit{don’t drive your chariot down public highways, but keep to the back roads though the going is narrow.}
\item \textit{I obeyed; for we are the poets for those who love the cricket’s high chirping, not the noise of the jackass}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{170} Bug 2006, 1.
\textsuperscript{171} Call. \textit{Aet. fr.} 1.26-29 ed. Harder 2012.
Appendix IV: the Homeric Hymn to Zeus

The title ‘Homeric Hymns’ is a collective term for 33 hymns attributed to the Greek gods. They are ‘Homeric’ because they are composed in the same epic meter, dialect and style as Homer’s Odyssey and Iliad. They are ‘hymns’ because each poem is addressed to a deity, celebrating their attributes or epiphany. Some hymns are very short, containing only three lines, while another extends to 580 lines.

When and how the hymns were recited has been much disputed and is still without certain results. Based upon evidence of the language of the poems, Allen, Halliday and Sikes suggest that the longer hymns date back to the last stage of the epic period. The smaller hymns, including the Homeric Hymn to Zeus, appear to belong to the classical period.

Pindar is the first to refer to the hymns as προοιμίοι, followed by Thucydides. This word seems to indicate that the hymns were used as ‘preludes,’ introductions to the traditional oral epic poetry. This assumption is strengthened by the Homeric Hymn to Helios and the Homeric Hymn to Selene. They specifically state that the bard will turn to recitation of epic poetry. It is, however, difficult to believe that a hymn of almost 600 lines preluded another epic poem, not necessarily longer than the hymn. Thucydides might have called the Apollo Hymn a prooemium as a technical term, like a ‘Prélude.’ The length of the smaller poems on the other hand suggest that they were not used independently. It seems reasonable to assume that the minor and major hymns belong to the same genre, yet are a distinct group based on their length and therefore their purpose. The minor poems seem to have functioned as preludes, the major hymns as free-standing poems.

---

172 The Homeric Hymns have been transmitted through time in name of Homer. Already in ancient times this authorship was debated.
173 Rayor 2004, 1.
174 For more details, see Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1963, 96–109.
175 Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 1963, 109: ‘The longer hymns then upon the evidence of their language appear to belong to the last stage of the epic period; the figures for the smaller hymns, though less cogent, since they assume the homogeneity of the poems, are a guarantee of their age on the whole, and compared with the ratios of the later epics give them a place in the classical period; a conclusion agreeing with their style and the imitations in tragedy and comedy collected by Adami l.c.’
176 Pi. N. 2.1-5.
177 Th. 3.104.4-5.
178 Homeric Hymn to Helios 18-20 and the Homeric Hymn to Selene 19-20.
179 Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1963, 95.
The Homeric *Hymn to Zeus* contains only four lines. It is one of the shortest hymns of all Homeric *Hymns*:

Schematically the structure of the poem can be rendered as follows:

1. **Invocation of Zeus**
   - *Zeus is addressed with his characteristics*  
   - ll 1-2

2. **Argument**
   - *Themis is mentioned as a goddess close to Zeus*  
   - ll 2-3

3. **Prayer**
   - *Request for mercy*  
   - l 4

The outline of the composition faithfully follows the traditional outline of hymns devoted to a deity. The hymn can be discerned into firstly an invocation, secondly an argument and thirdly a prayer including a farewell to the addressed deity. The invocation and prayer are much alike, for they both consist by and large of epithets used to emphasize the greatness of Zeus. These epithets present an image of Zeus that completely concurs with his hierarchical position in the Greek pantheon. The only true outstanding feature in this hymn is Themis.

The Greek goddess Themis is the personification of law and justice, and holds in this verse a very close relationship to Zeus. This relationship is expressed by the ambiguous Greek verb ὀαρίζω:  

180 it can mean (i) to have a personal relationship and (ii) to have sexual contacts. Mythology supports the idea of a sexual relationship between Zeus and Themis: she was one of the first wives of Zeus.  

181 The intimate relationship between Themis and Zeus emphasizes Zeus in his function of keeper of the law. The appearance of Themis is thus the keynote for a full understanding of his hymn: the poet prays to Zeus in his function of god of law and justice.

---

180 The verb is found in Hom. *Il.* 6.151 and 22.127. The latter has an erotic connotation: it is used to describe the manner of dialogue between a boy and a girl sitting beneath an oak.
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