J. C. Thom, *Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus. Text, Translation, and Commentary.* (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 33), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005, 207 pp., ISBN 3-16-148660-9.

In the Introduction of his edition of *Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus*, J.C. Thom states his intention to present a detailed analysis of the philosophical, religious and literary aspects of the poem. Thom succeeds admirably in welding these different aspects into a coherent interpretation of the poem. It is surprising that no major monograph on the *Hymn* has appeared since the first decades of the twentieth century. One must look back to the essay of J. Adam ("Hymn to Zeus", in *The Vitality of Platonism and Other Essays*, Cambridge 1911, 104-89) to find a comparable analysis of the entire *Hymn to Zeus*. Thus Thom's edition is most welcome and will serve as a standard reference work for future readers of Cleanthes.

The work falls into three parts: (I) Introduction; (II) Text and Translation; (III) Commentary. The Introduction consists of (1) Author and Date; (2) Genre, Style, Function, and Setting; (3) Composition; (4) Religion and Philosophy in *the Hymn to Zeus*; (5) Transmission of the Text. Thom presents his general interpretation of the *Hymn* in sections 3 and 4. More will be said about this later.

Part II offers very clear plates of the two pages of the *Neapolitanus Farnesinus* (hereafter *F*), which contain the *Hymn*. The text of the *Hymn* follows with one apparatus for parallels and a critical apparatus. A list of variant readings is attached at the end of this review. Thom concludes this section with his translation of the *Hymn.*

The Commentary furnishes detailed line-by-line analyses in support of the general interpretation presented in the Introduction. Thom provides English translations of the Greek and Latin parallels in the Commentary and throughout the rest of the work.

The Bibliography consists of three sections: (1) Cleanthes: Editions,

translations, and studies of the *Hymn to Zeus*; (2) Other ancient texts; (3) Other scholarly publications.

Three indices of (1) ancient texts, (2) subjects and names, and (3) Greek terms conclude the book.

Let us now turn to Thom's interpretation of the *Hymn*. One of the major virtues of Thom's interpretation is that throughout the work he is sensitive to the way in which the different parts of the *Hymn* relate to each other; so it becomes difficult to discuss his interpretation of part of the *Hymn* without bringing in considerations from other parts of the *Hymn*. For this review, however, I shall concentrate on the analysis of vv. 18-21 and to a lesser extent on the final prayer (vv. 32-9), as Thom is most innovative in his approach to these passages.

As I shall be referring frequently to vv. 18-21, it may be useful to cite the text and Thom's translation. Just before these verses Cleanthes states that no deed occurs without Zeus except for what evil people do in their folly. Cleanthes then continues:

> ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ τὰ περισσὰ ἐπίστασαι ἄρτια θεῖναι
> καὶ κοσμεῖν τἄκοσμα, καὶ οὐ φίλα σοὶ φίλα ἐστίν·
> ὧδε γὰρ εἰς ἓν πάντα συνήρμοκας, ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν,
> ὥσθ' ἕνα γίγνεσθαι πάντων λόγον αἰὲν ἐόντα.

'But you know how to make the uneven even
and to put into order the disorderly; even the unloved is dear to you.
For you have thus joined everything into one, the good with the bad,
that there comes to be one ever-existing rational order for everything.'

Thom argues against the commonly held interpretation of this passage as a "theodicy in the narrow sense of the term" (i.e. "a defense of God's goodness and justice in view of the existence of evil" (97); this theodicy usually takes the form of a Heraclitean *coniunctio oppositorum* in which one opposite entails the other. Thom cites various scholars as proponents of this position on p. 22, n. 96; the most recent is A.A. Long, "Heraclitus and Stoicism", *Philosophia* 5/6, 1975-76, 133-56 (= *Stoic Studies*, Cambridge 1996, 35-57). Thom summarizes this view as follows: "opposites . . . are simply a matter of perspective; the *logos* as world-order combines both ends of the spectrum into one unity. . . . In this

view good and evil are essential aspects of a higher, dynamic unity." (22-3) Thom, however, argues that the surrounding context does not endorse this interpretation: "If the *logos* (in Heraclitean fashion) encompasses both good *and* evil, it would not be possible for the bad people to act 'without' it (v. 17), nor would they be able to shun it (v. 22)." (23) In place of this view Thom proposes that Cleanthes is maintaining that Zeus has the ability to change disorder into order: "His answer in vv. 18-21, short and simple, is that God can fix it: Zeus knows how to restore order; he has in fact arranged things in such a way that the end result will be a universal rational order." (22)

Thom believes that the final prayer also supports his reading of vv. 18-21. In this prayer "Cleanthes asks that human beings be delivered from their destructive ignorance and that they obtain the same insight (γνώμη) on which Zeus himself relies to rule the universe, that is, insight into the universal law and reason." (16) If, however, on the Heraclitean view, evil is "an essential and necessary corollary of the good" (23), what would be the point of praying for insight? Thom goes further in raising questions about the nature of prayer for a Stoic. He downplays the pantheistic aspect of the *Hymn*, because "[i]n terms of the logic of a strict pantheistic system, a Stoic should have no need to pray: he has direct access to God within himself, since his reason shares in the divine *logos*." (24-5) Furthermore the Stoic concept of fate precludes prayer.

Thus the question arises as to what role prayer plays among the Stoics. Thom acknowledges two types of prayer consistent with the Stoic system: (1) a thanksgiving for divine benefaction, and (2) a prayer "to affirm the wise person's submission to the divine will," as found in Cleanthes' own *Prayer to Zeus and to Destiny* (*SVF* 1.527). (26) Thom, however, claims that the final prayer of the *Hymn* represents a third type, which emphasizes the theistic over the pantheistic aspects of the *Hymn*: "the prayer . . . belongs to a third type, namely, a petitionary prayer with a request to God to assist human beings in overcoming their lack of insight and the concomitant failure to make the correct moral choices. In this case, Cleanthes turns to a superior force, outside himself, for help. There is a sense that the god immanent in,

and identical with the cosmos, in a way transcends the rational
element within human beings, and he is thus able to come to their
assistance. We therefore find a 'dissociation of the human and
the divine'; something or someone *other* than the sage himself is
needed to help him become good." (26-7)

Thus Thom, as noted earlier, sensitively integrates the
different parts of the *Hymn* into a coherent interpretation. This
is accomplished by rejecting the Heraclitean interpretation of vv.
18-21 and positing a theistic interpretation of the final prayer.
The latter is particularly interesting insofar as it introduces
a transcendent deity. In doing this Thom is following recent
trends which see a tension between pantheism and theism in Stoic
religion (e.g. A.A. Long, *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide
to Life*, Oxford 2002, 147-8). While some have argued that there
is a development from pantheism in the early Stoa to theism in
the late Stoa, I think that Long and Thom are correct in seeing
this tension also in the early Stoa. What makes Cleanthes the
most religious of the early Stoics is precisely this theism.

Thom, however, in stressing the theistic aspect, minimizes
other Stoic aspects of the *Hymn*. In his interpretation, the *Hymn*
reads much more like a hymn of traditional Greek religion:
"There is nothing particularly Stoic about this deity; in fact,
the Zeus of Cleanthes' *Hymn* is recognizable as the culmination
of a development stretching from Homer through Pindar and
Aeschylus." (20) For some, including this reader, Thom's emphasis
on theism may be somewhat extreme.

This leads to a consideration of vv. 18-21. I agree with Thom
that there are difficulties in reconciling a Heraclitean interpretation
with other parts of the *Hymn*; such considerations led some
scholars to question whether Cleanthes had properly reconciled
the Stoic *logos* with the Heraclitean *logos*. Yet I wonder whether
Long is correct in arguing that this may be a difficulty inherent
in the Stoic system: "We may well feel that this attempt to
reconcile bad in the part with good and harmony in the whole
is unsatisfactory, and that it raises substantial difficulties for
Stoic ethics. But it is certain that the Stoics incorporated the co-
existence of moral opposites in their concept of cosmic order and
saw the good and harmony of cosmic *logos* as compatible with the

existence of bad in individual people. If then we find difficulty in reconciling the harmony of good and bad with the imperative, 'be good', that is not due to Cleanthes' lack of sensitivity to different *logos* concepts." (Long, "*Heraclitus and Stoicism*", 147) While Thom warns us not to make the Stoics more consistent than they were by applying a "pantheistic straitjacket" to the *Hymn* (26), he himself may be trying to bring consistency, where in fact Cleanthes and the Stoics have a difficulty.

We may also look more closely at vv. 18-21 to see how well the Greek supports Thom's thesis. In vv. 18-9 Cleanthes tells us that Zeus knows how to make the uneven even and to order the disorderly; furthermore that which is not dear to him is dear to him. In all these oppositions Thom argues that one opposite takes priority over the other. This is most clear with the first two pairs of opposites. The last pair, however, is more problematic for Thom's thesis. Literally the text reads that that which is not dear (οὐ φίλα) to you is dear (φίλα) to you. The proponents of the *coniunctio oppositorum* thesis would emphasize this pair in interpreting the passage. Thom, however, interprets this passage as meaning that the unloved, that which does not follow Zeus' order, can also become loved, that is orderly. The key to Thom's interpretation is to take ἐστίν in the pregnant meaning "become," following Festugière.

V. 20 also poses problems for Thom. Here Cleanthes states that Zeus has harmonized (συνήρμοκας) everything into one, the good with the bad. Again the passage seems to support the proponents of the *coniunctio oppositorum* thesis. The perfect sense of συνήρμοκας would appear to present a state of affairs in which Zeus has harmonized good and evil. For Thom the perfect must be taken in a futuristic or anticipatory sense such that it "refers to a harmony that is still being achieved." (109)

However the next verse (v. 21) fits very nicely into Thom's scheme. Cleanthes here states that one ever-existing rational order (λόγος) arises (γίγνεσθαι) from Zeus' harmonization in the previous line. The infinitive supports the idea that the harmonization is a process. Thom takes this to mean that Zeus turns the disorderly into the orderly. It is in emphasizing this verse that he argues against the perfective sense of συνήρμοκας as indicating a harmonious state of affairs in the previous line.

Thus in a close analysis of vs. 18-21 we see that Thom finds support for his thesis with some difficulties, in particular the last pair of opposites (οὐ φίλα and φίλα) and the interpretation of συνήρμοκας. From this analysis it becomes clear that very different interpretations of the passage will arise depending upon which pair of opposites is emphasized and upon how one understands συνήρμοκας and γίγνεσθαι. Thom is to be congratulated on proposing an innovative interpretation of the passage. Even for those who would continue with the *coniunctio oppositorum* interpretation, he has provided the basis for further discussion. Thom has brought out the opposing tendencies to read the passage as indicating a harmonized state of affairs or as a process in which Zeus brings the disorderly into order.

Now we may turn to the text. I present a comparison of the variant readings of Thom's text alongside those of G. Zuntz ("Zum Kleanthes-Hymnus", *HSCP* 63, 1958, 300-3), who was the last to make a thorough examination of the manuscript.

	F	Thom	Zunz
6.	ἀίδω	ἀείδω *Wachsmuth*	ἀείσω *Ursinus*
7.	δέ	δή *Scaliger*	γάρ *Zuntz*
9.	ὑπὸ χερσίν	ὑπὸ χερσίν	μετὰ χερσίν *Meineke*
11.	πληγῆς	πληγῆς	πληγῆις *Brunck*
26.	ἄνευ κακοῦ	ἄνευ καλοῦ *Ursinus*	ἄνευ νόου *Wilamowitz*
	ἄλλα	ἄλλα	ἄλλο *Sauppe*
33.	[missing short syllable]	σύ γ'	[missing short syllable]

As can be seen, Thom's edition of the text of the *Hymn* is conservative; he does not offer any new conjectures of his own and

for the most part defends the readings of *F*. In the commentary to the text Thom offers many insights and interesting parallels, of which I give the following examples:

4. ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμὲν † ἤχου μίμημα λαχόντες. Thom lists 27 conjectures for this celebrated crux. What is of interest here is that Thom cites Pearson's conjecture ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γενόμεσθα, θεοῦ μίμημα λαχόντες from A.B. Cook, *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*, Cambridge 1925, II.1, 855, n.1 instead of J. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford 1925, 228. Cook correctly reports Pearson's palaeographical explanation of how θεοῦ became ἤχου: "I (sc. Pearson) should account for the mysterious ἤχου as a supra-linear gloss i.e. ἢ Χου = ἢ Χριστοῦ." Powell incorrectly gives the gloss as IC XY, i.e. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

9. ὑπὸ χερσίν] μετὰ χερσίν *Meineke* : ἐνὶ χερσίν *Brunck*. Thom finds the conjectures problematic palaeographically. Following Meerwaldt and other scholars he links ὑπό with the ὑπό of ὑποεργόν, which appears earlier in the line, indicating the subordinate position of the thunderbolt. Parallels for this use of the preposition include Homer, *Il.* 9.156 (ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳ) and *Od.* 7.68 (ὑπ' ἀνδράσιν). Cf. *LSJ*, s.v. ὑπό B.II.2.

11. τοῦ γὰρ ὑπὸ πληγῆς] πληγῆις *Brunck*. Thom cites various parallels for the genitive, among which the most relevant is *Il.* 14.414: ὡς δ' ὅθ' ὑπὸ πληγῆς πατρὸς Διὸς ἐξερίπη δρῦς. He makes a convincing argument to retain the text. On the end of this line see below.

26. ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλα] ἄλλο *Sauppe*. Thom defends the ms. reading by citing a handful of parallels for singular ἄλλος followed by ἄλλα after ἐπί. Most notably he cites Quintus of Smyrna 1.464-6:

> πᾶσι δ' ἄρ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὁμὸν γένος, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ ἔργα
> στρωφῶντ' ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλα· πέλει δ' ἄρα κεῖνο φέριστον
> ἔργον, ὅ τι φρεσὶν ἧισιν ἐπιστάμενος πονέηται.

Thom argues that "the sentiment is similar enough to the *Hymn to Zeus* that the latter's influence cannot be ruled out." He furthermore points out: "the meaning is thus not only that different people have different goals, but that the same persons have varying goals. . . . The problem with the κακοί is not only that they chase after the wrong objectives, but also that they lack a constant, unifying goal that would give meaning to their lives. In addition to being impetuous (ὁρμῶσιν) they are also fickle." (130) This is indeed an intriguing parallel, which makes the retention of ἄλλα much more plausible.

30. For the missing first half of the line Thom finds Pohlenz's τἀγαθὰ μὲν ποθέουσιν most satisfactory, although he does not publish it in his text. He summarizes his reasons as follows: "The virtues of this conjecture include the fact that it picks up the phraseology of v. 23 (ἀγαθῶν μὲν . . . κτῆσιν ποθέοντες), thus rounding this section off with an *inclusio*; and that it provides the contrast presupposed by the δέ in the second half of v. 30. Unlike Pohlenz himself and others who accept his conjecture, however, I do not take τἀγαθά as the antecedent of τῶνδε; the antecedent instead refers to the negative experiences they suffer as reflected in v. 30b, ἐπ' ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλα φέρονται." (139) Although it may be difficult to see from such a short quote, Thom here shows a fine sensitivity to what is required by the context.

Other choices and lines of argument seem less probable to me, of which I cite the following:

6. ἀίδω] ἀείδω *Wachsmuth* : ἀείσω *Ursinus*. Thom opts for the present, where most editors emend to the future, since καθυμνήσω appears earlier in the line. Thom's reasons are as follows: "the present tense is used emphatically to contrast the hymn that the poet will now sing to his continual laudatory attitude towards Zeus. The awkwardness of conjoining the future καθυμνήσω paratactically with the present tense ἀείδω, makes it preferable to view the καί not as a conjunction, but as an emphatic adverb." (68). He translates: "Therefore I shall praise you constantly; indeed I always sing of your rule." (40) This,

however, remains awkward. One should not have to go to such
lengths to retain the present. Ursinus' future is preferable in light
of the parallelism with καθυμνήσω.

11. The last three syllables of this line are missing and have
spawned a variety of conjectures. Thom sees two major trends in
the supplements. The first links the thunderbolt with Cleanthes'
concept of tension (*SVF* 1.563: πληγὴ πυρὸς ὁ τόνος ἐστί);
e.g. φύσεως πάντ' ἔργα <τελεῖται> *von Arnim*. He rejects these
conjectures on the ground that "Cleanthes does not explicitly
identify the *tonos* with the thunderbolt." (81) The second trend
links the thunderbolt to Heraclitus 79 and 80 Marcovich (B 64
and 11 DK respectively). Of these conjectures he favors Sier's
νέμονται, although he does not publish it in his text and admits
that other possibilities are also plausible. While I do not wish to
argue against this second trend, I am not sure that it is so easy to
separate *tonos* from the thunderbolt. Thom argues that the blow
of the thunderbolt here is related to *SVF* 1.502, where Cleanthes
compares the sun to a plectrum (πλῆκτρον), striking (πλῆσσων)
the cosmos with its rays and leading it on its harmonious course:
"In the *Hymn* the thunderbolt is therefore functionally equivalent
to the rays of the sun." (79) It seems rather arbitrary to link the
blow of the thunderbolt to the blow of the sun's rays on the
cosmos, but not to make the connection with *tonos* as the blow
of fire.

One final textual note. On p. 133 Thom cites Cleanthes' verse
dialogue between reason and desire (Galen, *PHP* 5.6.35 = *SVF*
1.570) in relation to the life-goals of vv. 26-31 of the *Hymn*.
Although this text has no connection to the text of the *Hymn*, the
correct reading of the first syllable of the third line has received so
little recognition that I discuss it here. Thom, following A.A. Long
and D.N. Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, Cambridge 1987, II,
408, prints the text with Powell's conjecture: <ἦ> βασιλικόν γε·
πλὴν ὅμως εἶπον πάλιν. Besides Galen the poem is found in
the *Prosopopoiie* of Michael Choniates (formerly attributed to
Gregorius Palamas). P. Kotzia-Panteli, "Das Fragment 570 des
Stoikers Kleanthes und die *Prosopopoiie* des Michael Choniates

im Codex Marc. Gr. XI, 22", *EEThess* 20, 1981, 173-84, reports that this ms. reads νὴ βασιλικόν γε, κτλ., whereas *Par. gr. 2465* of the same text gives ναί, confirming Meineke's conjecture. Kotzia-Panteli (182) argues, I think correctly, that νή should be read.

Albert Watanabe
Louisiana State University
awatan@lsu.edu