automatically feel these concepts as central. The dramatic events are interpreted from a basically moralistic point of view, with its minute analysis of motivation, while the balance is tilted in a feministic way to Medea’s advantage, «she is the upholder of traditional morality» (65, emphasis in the original). «She accomplishes a major feat in making women us and men them» (192, emphasis in the original).

In so far as the present study is (meant to be) informed by modern (American) cultural concerns or intended for staging a reviewer should not offer any pronouncements about the interpretation. As a hermeneutic method I would prefer to study tragic drama as an expression of the age that brought forth these dramas, e.g. study the value of offspring to the (head of the) oikos, rather than «the innocence and vulnerability» of young children (104).

This prompts a basic methodological question. I am not convinced that these tragedies were staged in order to document (or for that matter, explore, criticize and comment on) the social world. This is implicitly the assumption of the present interpretation, as it is of most interpretations of Ancient tragedy, answering our modern (Christian, individualistic) cultural concerns. Aristotle’s theory of tragedy suggests that these tragedies violated basic social institutions and values, in order to revitalize them. But this question cannot be addressed within a short review.
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The editors of Zuntz’ *Griechische philosophische Hymnen*, H. Cancik and L. Käppel, are to be congratulated on making these fascinating papers by G. Zuntz, left among his *Nachlaß*, available to the public. It appears that Z began work on Kleanthes’ hymn to Zeus already in the fifties of last century and continued working on an intended publication *Von Empedokles zu Proklos. Studien zu griechischen philosophischen Hymnen* until the end. It has to be said that Z’ intended title suits the present publication better than that chosen by the editors. The book is by no means a monograph spanning the extant corpus of philosophical hymns, still less an annotated edition of these texts, but rather an intriguing journey through several centuries of literary-philosophical history.

---

2 I have argued for this view on several occasions, most extensively in the work cited.
3 Some 13 years after his death.
during which Z points out landmarks, defining features, fascinating byways like an expert guide in a literary museum. With immense erudition, compelling humanity and philological acumen Z picks his way through the thickets of neo-Platonic metaphysics, shedding light wherever he goes on chosen points in his chosen texts. Z shows at many points his affinity with his great teacher Wilamowitz but without the arrogance. The editors have done an excellent job in presenting these unfinished chapters in a coherent way. Sometimes this has meant adding footnotes (in double brackets) to Z’s lecture text and they have done some reordering. The speculative chapter on possible philosophical hymns of Empedokles is placed first (following chronology), although Z planned it for last. They omit a long section on Aion as it contains no philosophical hymns. Z himself placed Synesios after Proklos (despite chronology), probably because he favoured Synesios’ poetry and wanted to end on a high note. In fact he closes with the bare presentation of an anonymous hymn ὕπαττον ἐπεξείμα τα transm itted with those of Gregory of Nazianz. He admonishes the reader/listener to ‘take this hymn to heart’ as he admires it himself. As Cancik says in his preface, Z was clearly inspired in a personal sense by the aspirations of some philosophical hymns from antiquity (Kleanthes, Synesios, this anonymous); this passion combined with love of German classical poetry. Z, the exiled German of (presumably) Jewish extraction who spent most of his working life in Manchester, to return to Tübingen for his last decades, remained a ’Klassischer Philologe’ of the best sort despite personal loss as a result of the Nazi folly.

The chapters clearly show their origin as a series of lectures. Z repeatedly exhorts his audience to read for themselves a passage of Greek which he has not time to quote in its entirety. Some expressions (like the extraneous French on p. 110 or ’amusante Korruptel’ on p. 36) would probably have been revised before publication. The overall tone throughout of dialogue with an intended audience is somewhat unusual in a printed book, but allows one to feel the magnetism of Z’s original delivery and to feel personally addressed even as reader.

The first chapter argues, on flimsy evidence, that, among earlier philosophers, Empedokles may have initiated the genre of ’philosophical hymn’, first (apparently to us) brought to perfection by Kleanthes. Z combines Ammonios, De interpret. p. 249 Busse, who mentions a ’special treatment’ of Apollo among Empedokles’ works, with the mention in Aristotle, Peri Poieton fr. 72 Rose, of a lost prooimion to Apollo by Empedokles, but, as Z himself acknowledges, the evidence is tenuous. The second chapter turns to Kleanthes’ hymn itself, but it has to be said that the presentation of text, with commentary, is a little cursory. There is no apparatus criticus, which makes it difficult to see exactly what previous editors printed. Z discusses Pearson’s conjecture in line 4, for example, θεοῦ μὴμημα but it produces an unmetrical line if simply inserted in the place of transmitted ἤκου μὴμημα.¹ Nor does Z aim (in this lecture) to give a full com-

¹ Z partially adopts Pearson’s conjecture here and suggests as restoration of the whole line ἔκ οὐδὲ γενήσθαι, σέβετε μὴμημα λαχώντες. I see no compelling reason to change the paradigm ἔκ οὐδὲ γενήσθαι ηκοῦ μὴμημα λαχώντες / μὴμημα, ’we are descended from you [sc. Zeus] and we alone have received an imitation of your voice’. Kleanthes appears to mean that, alone of creatures, man has a voice which permits him to
mentary on the text: he takes his article in HSCP 63, 1958, as read, merely adding new points here or correcting earlier opinions. Since the Kleanthes hymn is the corner stone of Z’s book the editors might have done better to intervene more here: they might, for example, have combined the HSCP treatment with Z’s later chapter, and upgraded the text with an Apparat containing at least the readings mentioned by Z in his commentary. The concluding comments of Z on the hymn, however, in which he shows how Kleanthes combined the traditional hymn form with Stoic doctrine are masterly.

The next chapter attempts to bridge the chronological gap between Kleanthes and Proklos by hunting down a very few references to, and snippets of, philosophical hymns in the interim. Z’s method is to pick up a thread and pursue it like a tracker dog with meticulous examination of stages en route. His starting point in this chapter is a 1st c. AD funeral inscription (CIA III 772) to one Ophellius Laetus (called a θεολόγος) whose ‘heavenly hymn’ (μετάφρασις θεόν) seemed to ‘open the heavens’ for the author of the inscription and to make Laetus seem a second Plato (line 4). Although Laetus’ hymn is not preserved, Z is surely right to see in it a philosophical hymn expounding (perhaps) cosmological doctrine. In a long excursus he then traces the development of meaning of the word θεολόγος (assuming θεολόγον in the inscription is equivalent to this, with metrical lengthening) from an original sense of ‘speaker about the gods’ (such as Hesiod or Orpheus) to something closer to our ‘theologian’. The discussion takes in Varro’s theologia tripartita with its probable Greek antecedents, to show that Laetus’ hymn may have represented the first ‘physical’, that is philosophical, class (naturale genus) of theology whilst rhetorical hymns (e.g. by Aelius Aristides) are predominantly mythical (fabulare genus) and cult officials (the θεολόγοι mentioned in hieratic inscription form Asia Minor) represent the civile genus of theology.

The trail then takes Z to Tübingen itself where a late 16th c. ms. preserves a number of ‘oracular responses of Greek gods’ (χρησιμοὶ τῶν Ελληνικῶν θεῶν). In a fascinating piece of scholarly detective work Z traces the source to a hypothetical collection of ‘Klarische Orakelsprüche’ (that is, of Apollo Karios) which he dates to around 200 AD. The collection seems to have attempted a theoretical ordering of Greek polytheism, positing a supreme transcendent deity to whom the earlier named gods are subordinate daimones. The ‘Tübinger Theosophie’, as Z terms the extant collection of oracles, contains (#13) Apollo’s – distinctly physikos – answer to the question ‘Are you god or another?’ Sections 27 and 29 of Tüb. also contain a hymnic text, cited from Porphyry, which Z discusses with address the gods (cf. 3 oι γὰρ πάντες θάμναι θηματικὸς προσκυνηθῆναι). For detailed apparat see Johan C. Thom, Cleanthes’ hymn to Zeus, Tübingen 2005, 34-35.

1 To this should be added the papers Zum Hymnus des Kleanthes, RhM 94, 1951, 337–41; ‘Vers 4 des Kleanthes-Hymnus’, RhM 122, 1979, 97–98.

2 Signature Mb 27 in the Tübingen Universitätsbibliothek.

3 Unfortunately Z’ commentary on this text is lost, likewise the pages bearing his notes which he sent to another scholar. This is the loss regretted by the editors in the introductory pp. XXII.

4 From the ‘second book of Philosophy from Oracles’ (Περὶ τῆς ἐν λόγοις φιλοσοφίας), Z (78–79) concurs with scholars who ascribe the text to the Chaldaean Oracles.
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admirable care and erudition. The extant text of some twenty hexameters salutes the supreme, nameless deity who heads the cosmic order and causes generation (via 'Botengänge', ἀναγέλαιοι) with 'ancient wisdom' (ἀντεθέσθησεν νόος, lines 15–16).

The next two long chapters are devoted, respectively, to Proklos and Synesios. Z' method in each case is to discuss in detail one exemplary hymn of each author, hymn 4 of Proklos and 9 of Synesios.¹ The overall verdict is: Proklos, bad. Synesios, good. But the insights offered along the way into the mental worlds and œuvres of both authors are very rewarding.²

Z opens discussion of Proklos' hymn with some polemics, chiefly against H. Dörrie. Z disputes that Proklos believed the soul should aspire to heavenly wisdom by rational dialectic, arguing that his belief in theurgy, Iamblichos' higher form of magic ('Aberglaube' in Z' words) and inspired intuition outweighed pure reason. Z finds Proklos' poetic style in the hymns pompous and overblown, with redundant epithets thrown in to fill lines and a generally worn-out use of (post-) Homeric diction.³ Among Z' interesting positions in the commentary are: (1) Proklos' emphasis on fire and light imagery in the hymns probably derives from Persian (Sassanid) religion rather than Stoic cosmic fire. (2) In line 4 his preference for the reading θυμόν over vulgate θυμόν prompts a lengthy intermezzo on the textual transmission of the hymns.⁴ The section exemplifies Z' mastery of the inductive method. (3) As an overall interpretation of hymn IV I found his belief that the great task for which Proklos prays for divine inspiration in this hymn is, in fact, Homeric exegesis, convincing and valid.⁵ (4) In passing, Z remarks that Proklos' Hymns are more like prayers because the element of 'Bitten' takes precedence over 'Preisen'.⁶

I suspect that Z' preference for Synesios' hymns is influenced by the man as much as by the works. Something about Synesios' biography contrasting with the picture of Proklos lecturing to a dwindling circle of initiates in a 'villa on the

¹ On p. 189 he tells his audience that the discussion is meant as an incentive to 'selbständiges Studium des Dichters'.
² The circumstances of the book's publication leads to the somewhat ironical situation that R. M. Van den Berg's recent edition of Proklos' hymns (2000) could not be aware of his predecessor, nor could Z respond posthumously to a publication preceding his own.
³ E.g. p. 139 'die eher monotone und vage Diktion des Proklos' (sc. compared to Synesios). 149 n. 157 'die alt und ausdrucksschwach gewordene Sprache sucht durch Ausweitungen die fehlende Kraft zu beleben'. P. 150 'Den Eindruck des Mühsamen, Verschrobenen, wohl gar des geradezu Geschmacklosen...'
⁵ Z takes μήθον in line 15 (ὀργὴ καὶ τελετῆς ἱερῶν ἀναγέλαιοι μέθον) as referring to Homer's 'sacred myths'. The interpretation chimes well enough with van den Berg p. 215–16, who also believes the prayer is for inspired exegesis, but not only of Homer – the Chaldaean Oracles, Plato and Hesiod, too.
⁶ I'm not sure how this reflects on Käppel's polemics in his section of the introduction, in which he seeks to distinguish hymns from prayers absolutely according to the 'Sprechhaltung' of the worshipper. Proklos' texts are cast as hymns and do indeed involve worship but they contain a strong element of prayer ('Bitten') too. A problem with Käppel's definition of prayer as 'Dialog' with god, which hymns lack, is that hymns are collective, prayers (at least, personal ones) individual. The collective character of hymns accounts for precisely the reduction in scale of personal 'Bitten' that one would expect.
slopes of the Acropolis’ appealed to Z. Synesios’ recycling of earlier lyric diction and metre does not seem to my subjective judgement any fresher or more ‘authentic’ than Proklos’ use of the Homeric hexameter. The commentary combined with ‘Gesamtdeutung’ is exemplary.

Z, or rather his editors, leave us with an epilogue containing the text of an anonymous hymn Ω πάντων ἔπειξεν whose virtues Z recommends to his audience. He wished it to stand on its own, without exegesis. It is interesting to me that this hymn, so valued by Z, has moved as far as possible from the classical Greek hymn. It addresses a nameless abstraction so far removed from the sensory world that it defies description or human understanding. The classical Greek gods had names, provinces in sensory reality, biographies and sought communication with humans. In this anonymous hymn it is as if the classical tradition had been wiped clean of all features except metre to pave the way – as we know – for a new religion (with new myths, biographies, connection with the material world).

Heidelberg

William Furley


Ce livre rassemble et interprète la majeure partie des informations que Libanius nous donne sur le fonctionnement de son école dans ses discours et ses lettres. Il prolonge, complète et corrige, sur quelques points, les travaux de Peter Wolf, Vom Schulwesen der Spätantike/Studien zu Libanius, 1952; de Paul Petit, Les étudiants de Libanius, 1957; et de A. F. Festugière, Antioche païenne et chrétienne, 1959 (particulièrement le chap. 4). Loin des préjugés défavorables dont a été victime Libanios depuis Bentley et surtout Gibbon (p. 14), il permet d’entrevoir la personnalité complexe de Libanios, qui, au prix d’un travail acharné, devint une des figures les plus en vue de son temps. Cette réussite fut certes celle d’un orateur dont les œuvres suscitaient l’admiration, mais aussi celle d’un enseignant qui donna à son école un indiscutable rayonnement, malgré un environnement qui devenait de moins en moins favorable à la paideia hellénique. Il n’a pas cessé de défendre sa propre conception de la formation littéraire, qui reposait autant sur une connaissance approfondie des grands textes classiques, surtout ceux de Platon et de Démôsthène (p. 150–151), que sur la pratique de la rhétorique. Il jugeait aussi que cette formation devait seule permettre d’accéder aux postes de gouverneurs car elle était la meilleure garantie de la compétence et de l’honnêteté du personnel politique. Ce portrait de l’enseignant n’omet pas de signaler (p. 13–14, 22–24) les côtés sombres de son caractère dus à la fois aux souffrances physiques et aux entreprises hostiles que déclenchaient concurrents et adversaires, – il mentionne lui-même les phases de dépression qu’il a traversées, –

---

1 One senses this clearly in the glowing remarks on Synesios’ intellectual integrity in the introduction to this chapter. E.g. p. 158 ‘Die in allen Stürmen bewährte Redlichkeit und Tapferkeit diesens wahren Edelmanns...’

2 I do not claim deep familiarity with either author.