CHAIRPERSON'S ADDRESS • VOORSITTERSREDE

DOING JUSTICE TO ZEUS: ON TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES

Johan C. Thom
University of Stellenbosch

ABSTRACT

The *Hymn to Zeus* by the Stoic philosopher Cleanthes is one of the most intriguing
texts to survive from the Hellenistic period, and of great significance for the history
of Hellenistic philosophy, the history of Hellenistic and Greco-Roman religions as
well as the history of Greek literature. A detailed study of all three these facets –
philosophical, religious and literary – is essential for understanding the poem. The
Hymn itself is remarkable precisely because it combines different philosophical,
religious and literary traditions and sources into a new expression of philosophical
religion. Scholars, however, often focus on one aspect of the text without giving due
recognition to the integration accomplished in it. To do justice to this text means to
understand the way the text itself interprets the traditions it draws upon; it also
means to take the *Hymn* seriously as a text that still has something to say to us.

Editing an ancient Greek text and commenting on it is surely one of the
most challenging and concrete ways of participating in the classical tradition.
It not only requires one to draw upon a wide range of philological disci-
plines, such as paleography, textual criticism, a detailed knowledge of the
Greek language and of Greek metre, an understanding of the relevant literary
forms and genres and their history, and insight into the historical back-
grounds and contexts in which the text originated, and to integrate all these
various disciplines in the eventual commentary; it also forces one to make
sense of the text and to account for its meaning and value not just in general,
but especially for us, today. Having spent the better part of a decade writing a
commentary on Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*,[1] I thought this the appropriate
opportunity to reflect on what the text means and how this is accomplished.

---

[1] Thom forthcoming. All references to my commentary refer to this publication. See
also this book for a text and translation of the *Hymn*.

1

Making sense of an ancient text is impossible without an understanding of how the ancient author is involved in the sense-making process. The text itself is an expression of the author's interpretation of reality, that is, his attempt to give meaning to his experience of the world. Interpreting such a text means not only to look at the text, to understand its logic and internal coherence, but also to look through the text at the world-experience of which the author tries to make sense.

A fascinating aspect of the *Hymn to Zeus* is that the author is very conscious of the way his text functions as a medium of making and communicating sense. In fact, making sense of the world may be said to be the very topic of the *Hymn*. Cleanthes furthermore makes deliberate use of the literary and religious traditions transmitted to him to convey his own interpretation of the world-order. He himself thus represents a link in the classical tradition.

The early Stoics were indeed well known for the way they appropriated and reinterpreted their cultural tradition in order to present Stoic philosophy as its culmination. The founder of the Stoa, Zeno of Citium, is said to have consulted the oracle of Delphi as a young man to know what he should do in order to succeed in life. The reply was that 'he should be in contact with the dead' (εἰ συγχρωτίζοιτο τοῖς νεκροῖς), which he interpreted to mean that he should study ancient authors (Diog. Laert. 7.2).[2] His engagement with earlier philosophers and poets is reflected in the titles of writings such as *Pythagorean Matters, Homeric Problems, On Listening to Poetry,* and *On Hesiod's Theogony.*[3] Zeno's respect for tradition also underlies his 'rewriting' (μετα-γράφειν) of the famous Hesiodic saying to read: 'He is best of all who follows good advice; good, too, is he who finds out all things for himself' (τούς θ᾽ Ἡσιόδου στίχους μεταγράφειν οὕτω· κεῖνος μὲν πανάριστος ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται, / ἐσθλὸς δ᾽ αὖ κἀκεῖνος ὃς αὐτὸς πάντα νοήσῃ; Diog. Laert. 7.25 = SVF 1.5).[4] Cleanthes' successor Chrysippus was even criticised in antiquity for the extent to which his own writings were bolstered by quotations and interpretations of poets and philosophers.[5]

---

[2] This oracle is discussed by Von Fritz 1972:85-86.

[3] For these writings, see Steinmetz 1994:521-24. For his interest in Heraclitus, cf. the suggestions by Long 1975-1976 (reprint 1996:35-57) and Schofield 1999:81.

[4] Trans. Hicks, LCL. See Steinmetz 1994:520. The original saying is Hes. *Op.* 293-95. Stoics were fond of 'rewriting', also called 'corrections' (παραδιορθώσεις); cf. *SVF* 1.219, 235; 3.167. We have an example from Cleanthes in *SVF* 1.562.

[5] See Diog. Laert. 7.180-81; 10.26-27.

Cleanthes himself was accused by a hostile Epicurean witness of attempting like Chrysippus to harmonise Orphic writings and those of Homer, Hesiod, Euripides and others with Stoic doctrines.[6] The evidence of the *Hymn to Zeus* indicates that there was some basis for this accusation, but as we shall see, Cleanthes' use of the earlier poets is much more subtle than this accusation would have us believe. He held as a general principle that poetry was the most effective medium to communicate the truth, both because the discipline imposed by poetry concentrates meaning and because the musical element of poetry makes a greater impact on the recipient than bare prose.[7] It is therefore likely that he thought the poets he used provided special insight into the world and the human condition. Within the philosophical tradition Cleanthes interacted most intensively with the work of the Presocratic philosopher Heraclitus. Cleanthes expounded the latter's philosophy in a four-volume commentary entitled *Interpretations of Heraclitus* ('Ηρακλείτου ἐξηγήσεις), which is unfortunately all lost, but traces of Heraclitus's influence is evident in almost every part of the *Hymn to Zeus*.[8]

Cleanthes and the *Hymn to Zeus*

Cleanthes was the second head of the Stoa, the philosophical school meeting in the painted colonnade on the Agora in Athens.[9] He was born in 331 BCE in Assos, a town in the southern Troad just across the sea from Lesbos. He took over the leadership of the school from Zeno in 262 BCE, when he was already sixty-nine, and remained head for thirty-two years until his death in 230. Most of what we know of his life is anecdotal.[10] He was a boxer before he came to Athens and maintained a strong physique throughout his life. He

---

[6] Cf. Phld. *Piet.* 13, p. 80 Gomperz (Diels, *Dox. Graec.*, 547.16-26; *SVF* 1.539): ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέ[ρῳ] (sc. περὶ θεῶν Χρύσιππος) τά τ[ε] εἰς 'Ορφέα [καὶ Μ]ουσαῖον ἀναφε[ρόμ]ε[ν]α καὶ [τ]ὰ παρ' ['Ο]μήρῳ καὶ 'Ησιόδ[ῳ] καὶ Εὐρι[π]ίδη καὶ ποιηταῖς ἄλλοις, [ὡ]ς κα[ὶ] Κλεάνθης, [π]ειρᾶτα[ι συν]οικειοῦ[ν] ταῖς δόξαις αὐτῶ[ν]: 'In the second book (sc. of *On the gods*, Chrysippus), just like Cleanthes, attempts to relate the works attributed to Orpheus and Musaeus and those of Homer, Hesiod, Euripi-des, and other poets, to their own ideas.'

[7] Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 108.10 = *SVF* 1.487; Phld. *Mus.* 4, XXVIII.1-22 ed. Neubecker = *SVF* 1.486 (part).

[8] The commentary is listed among Cleanthes' other works in Diog. Laert. 7.174 (*SVF* 1.481). For Heraclitus's influence on early Stoics, Cleanthes in particular, see Long 1975-1976:133-56 (reprint 1996:35-57) and Hahm 1977:80-81.

[9] For Cleanthes' life and chronology, see Thom forthcoming: Introduction, §1.

[10] Cf. esp. Diog. Laert. 7.168-74 (*SVF* 1.463), 176 (*SVF* 1.474). For a brief discussion see Guérard, Goulet & Queyrel 1994:2.408-10 and Steinmetz 1994:566-67.

supported himself as a student in Athens by doing manual labour, watering gardens by night (Diog. Laert. 7.168). He had a reputation as a slow learner, but the anecdotes illustrating this may also serve to demonstrate his fitness for preserving the tradition: his fellow-students, for example, called him a donkey, to which he replied that he alone was able to carry the burden of Zeno's teachings (170). Zeno himself reportedly compared Cleanthes to hard tablets, difficult to inscribe, but retaining what has been written on them.[11]

Cleanthes was considered the most religious of the early Stoics.[12] He had a special interest in theology and developed arguments for the existence of the gods.[13] He also taught a more austere ethics than either Zeno or his own successor, Chrysippus.[14] We know of fifty-seven writings attributed to Cleanthes, most of them on ethics.[15] In addition, there are several poetic fragments, including the *Hymn to Zeus*.

There is no evidence to help us determine at which stage of his life he wrote the *Hymn to Zeus*.[16] It is the only substantial text in his oeuvre to survive more or less intact, and indeed the only extant text of any of the early Stoics. This fact makes the *Hymn* a very precious historical document, but the lack of comparable material also makes it much more difficult to interpret the poem.

History of reception

We have no testimonies from antiquity to indicate how contemporary readers received the text. The only reason we know of the *Hymn to Zeus* is its inclusion in the fifth-century *Anthology* by Stobaeus (*Anth.* 1.1.12 ed. Wachsmuth). A good case has been made that Lucretius composed the introductory hymn to Venus in his poem *On the nature of things* as an Epicurean counterpart to Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*.[17] There are possible allusions to v. 4

---

[11] Diog. Laert. 7.37 (*SVF* 1.301); cf. Plut. *Rect. rat. aud.* 47e (*SVF* 1.464).

[12] Cf. e.g. Festugière 1954:111; Nilsson 1967-1974:2, 261; Long & Sedley 1987:1. 332; Annas 1996; Sedley 1998.

[13] See Algra 2003:151; Dragona-Monachou 1976:71-108.

[14] See Steinmetz 1994:575 and my commentary on vv. 27-29 of the *Hymn to Zeus* in Thom forthcoming.

[15] Most of these writings are listed by Diog. Laert. 7.174-75 (*SVF* 1.481). See further Steinmetz 1994:567-69 and Guérard *et al.* 1994:410-12.

[16] Wilamowitz (1895:197-98; 1912:203) argues for a date before 276, while Festa (1935:173-74) suggests a date after Cleanthes took over as head, but both proposals are mere speculation.

[17] See Wilamowitz 1925-1926:1.328; Neustadt 1931:393-95; and esp. Asmis 1982.

4

of the *Hymn* by Aratus, Arius Didymus, Cicero, Musonius Rufus and Paul in the Book of Acts, but in view of the textual problem in v. 4 these are uncertain at best.[18] Finally, the Stoic poet Manilius, who wrote his *Astronomica* at the end of Augustus's reign, appears to have been influenced by the *Hymn to Zeus* in several places in his poem.[19] But these are meagre pickings for a poem that modern commentators often describe in highly flattering terms.[20]

The *Hymn to Zeus* first enters modern scholarship in 1568 when its text was printed by Fulvius Ursinus together with a selection of other lyric, elegiac and pastoral poems. One assumes that its perceived literary value was the main reason for its inclusion. A few years later, in 1573, Henri Étienne, commonly known as Stephanus, again published the *Hymn*, but this time in the company of fragments of philosophical poetry.[21] It was thus recognised from an early stage that the *Hymn to Zeus* functions in both a literary and a philosophical context. Both these publications did little more than just present the reader with a text.[22] For these scholars the text appears to speak for itself.

This continues to be the trend for the next three and a half centuries. Scholars confined themselves to publishing, translating and emending the text. In the few instances where the text is accompanied by notes, these are mainly *ad hoc* comments of a textual critical or philological nature.[23] The first scholars who attempt to give an interpretation of the *Hymn to Zeus* as a text, instead of just commenting on individual lines, are James Adam in 1911 and Wilamowitz in 1925.[24] Adam rightly recognised that the *Hymn* should be interpreted as an integral text with due consideration to its literary, religious and philosophical qualities,[25] but he painted the poem against such a large

---

[18] Cf. Aratus, *Phaen.* 5; Arius Didymus ap. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 15.15.5; Cic. *Leg.* 1.25; Muson. fr. 17 p. 90.4-5 ed. Hense; Acts 17:28 (with the discussion in Thom 2001: 479-80, 497-99).

[19] Cf. *Astron.* 2.61-66, 80-81; 4.888-90, 895.

[20] For references, see Thom forthcoming: Introduction, n. 2.

[21] For a critical evaluation of this publication, see Most 1998:4-6.

[22] Joseph Scaliger added some notes to Étienne's edition, but as far as the *Hymn to Zeus* is concerned, these were only a few textual critical comments (Stephanus 1573:217).

[23] Cf. e.g. Cudworth 1678; Brunck 1784; Sturz 1785; Petersen 1829; Wachsmuth 1875:17-20; Pearson 1891:247-49; Wilamowitz 1924; Powell 1925:227-31.

[24] Adam 1911; Wilamowitz 1925-1926:1.306-32.

[25] 'Mr Pearson's commentary [sc. Pearson 1891] . . . is excellent so far as it goes, but it hardly professes to do much more than explain the text. The Hymn of Cleanthes

canvas that the specificity of Cleanthes' contribution tends to get lost. Wila-mowitz also emphasised that Cleanthes speaks as poet and as philosopher within a cultic context, but he identified the tension between the religious character of the poem and Stoic philosophy as the main problem confron-ting the interpreter.[26] This remains the most substantial problem in subse-quent scholarship.[27]

Religion and philosophy in the *Hymn to Zeus*

The problem signalled by Wilamowitz may be summarised as follows:[28] the *Hymn to Zeus* is almost a textbook example of the form of a traditional cult hymn. It is addressed to the supreme deity of the Olympian pantheon, and it contains many traditional epithets and other literary traditions associated with Zeus, as well as most of the other stylistic features normally found in cult hymns. It furthermore clearly displays the tripartite division commonly found in hymns: it starts with an *Invocation* (vv. 1-6), in which Zeus is identified as the addressee of the *Hymn*; this is followed by the *Argument* (vv. 7-31), which lays the foundation for the requests in the next section; and the *Hymn* finally climaxes in a *Prayer* (vv. 32-39), in which Zeus is asked to save human beings from their destructive ignorance and to grant them insight so that they may play their rightful role in the cosmic harmony. The *Hymn* as a whole, but particularly the prayer at the end, conveys a tone of sincere piety. On the face of it, it is difficult not to interpret this poem as a religious hymn,

demands the fullest possible treatment alike on its poetical, its religious and its philo-sophical side: it is in fact . . . a blend of poetry, religion, and philosophy, summing up most of the best and inspiring ideas of Stoicism, without any of the Stoic aridity and trivialities, but also much of the noblest Greek thought on God and man and nature from Heraclitus down to Aristotle' (Adam 1911:117-18).

[26] See esp. Wilamowitz 1925-1926:1.306-07, 317, 323-25.

[27] See esp. Festugière 1949:310-32; Zuntz 1958; Meijer 1983; Glei 1990; Sier 1990; Thom 1998; 2001:480-92. Some other noteworthy contributions on the *Hymn* as a whole since Wilamowitz are Neustadt 1931; Pohlenz 1940 (reprint 1965); Verbeke 1949:235-51; Meerwaldt 1951:58-69; 1952:1-12; Hopkinson 1988:131-36; Schwabl 2001:55-74. Many scholars, however, continue to focus on textual critical problems in the *Hymn to Zeus* or on matters of detail interpretation. For a full bibliography of recent scholarship on the *Hymn to Zeus*, see Thom forthcoming: Bibliography, §1.

[28] The next few paragraphs are a slightly revised version of my discussion in Thom forthcoming: Introduction, §2.

and it has therefore been suggested that the *Hymn* functioned within the context of the Stoics' communal worship.[29]

Within Stoicism, however, Zeus represents the active principle of order and rationality which permeates the whole of the cosmos. He is, in fact, often identified with aspects of the physical world, such as nature, reason, providence, fate or the law of nature, or even with the world itself.[30] Because human beings participate in this universal reason which permeates the world, it does not appear meaningful for them to petition Zeus as if he were a separate, transcendent deity. The insight requested of Zeus could indeed be found within ourselves; it is not necessary to look for it elsewhere. Furthermore, because Zeus is identified with fate, and because we are part of this causal sequence of events, whether we want to or not, it seems useless to try to change fate by praying.[31] Scholars have therefore questioned whether the prayer, and indeed the *Hymn* as such, ought to be taken at face value.

Wilamowitz, indeed, accepted the *Hymn* as a sincere prayer: it is an expression of the human need for religiosity, despite the fact that it is in conflict with the philosophical doctrines of the Stoic school.[32] More recent scholars, however, resolve the tension between religion and philosophy in favour of the latter and deny the *Hymn* any religious function whatsoever. Reinhold Glei, for example, sees the *Hymn to Zeus* as a sophisticated literary allegory by means of which the readers are persuaded to attain insight, that is, the Good, by using their own Logos.[33] Kurt Sier likewise argues that 'the prayer's petition (sc. for insight) is ... merely the religious projection of that which Zeus as immanent Logos in any case already realises in the world.'[34] Keimpe Algra suggests that the prayer is a direct self-address to the god within us, the rational self, 'a reminder that one should have one's own internal daimon in tune with the cosmic reason.' According to him the relation between God and human beings is therefore internalised in the *Hymn*.[35]

The question is, however, whether these interpretations do justice to the *Hymn* as a whole. In their concern to harmonise the *Hymn* with a generalised

---

[29] Wilamowitz (1895:197) considers it a cult song accompanying the third libation at a symposium, which was customarily offered to Zeus.
[30] See the excellent summary in Asmis 1982:459.
[31] See Algra (2003:174-75), who cites Sen. *Nat.* 2.35.
[32] Wilamowitz 1925-1926:1.323, 325; cf. also 1924:260-61. Elsewhere he calls it 'ein viel zu wenig gewürdigtes Kleinod wahrhaft religiöser Dichtung' (1912:203).
[33] Glei 1990.
[34] Sier 1990:106 (my translation).
[35] Algra 2003:174-76.

7

conception of Stoic philosophy they seem to lose focus of the way the composition builds up to climax in the prayer, and of the way Zeus is depicted in the poem. In order to make sense of the *Hymn*, we have to follow the pointers the author himself gives us.

The depiction of Zeus

A perusal of the Hymn makes it clear that Zeus is not treated as some abstract, philosophical principle; on the contrary, he is presented in rather personalist and theistic terms as the king and ruler of the world; a divine father from whom all human beings have their origin and to whom they can turn for help; a god who can correct our mistakes; someone with whom we can communicate, and to whom we have an obligation.[36] There is nothing particularly Stoic about this deity; in fact, the Zeus of Cleanthes' *Hymn* is recognisable as the culmination of a development stretching from Homer through Pindar and Aeschylus.

This impression of Zeus is strengthened by the traditional, non-technical character of the *Hymn*. Very little technical terminology is used that is demonstrably Stoic. There are only two Stoic terms, namely, the 'universal reason' (κοινὸν λόγον) in v. 12, and the 'universal law' (κοινὸν νόμον) in vv. 24 and 39 (the other occurrences of *logos* and *nomos* in vv. 2 and 21 need not be interpreted in a Stoic sense). In addition, there is only one phrase which is recognisably Stoic, namely, the qualification of the universal reason in vv. 12-13 as 'permeating everything' (διὰ πάντων φοιτᾷ). This does not mean, of course, that the *Hymn* is devoid of any other Stoic ideas, but it could be understood without specialised knowledge of Stoicism. Much in the poem may indeed be interpreted on two different levels, as traditional material, or as an expression of Stoic thought. Let us consider some of the most pertinent examples.

The epithets of Zeus in the Invocation and in the Prayer are based on Homeric usage, although Cleanthes gives a new application to some of them. 'Many-named' (πολυώνυμε, v. 1) is elsewhere used of chthonian deities like Hades rather than Zeus;[37] within a Stoic context it probably refers to Zeus'

---

[36] This section is based on my discussion in Thom forthcoming: Introduction, §4. For Cleanthes' personalist treatment of Zeus, see Isnardi Parente 1993:47 and Inwood 1996:258-59; cf. already Nilsson 1967-1974:2.296, 297. The most prominent Stoic representative of such a theistic and personalist approach to God is Epictetus, but he may well have followed Cleanthes; see Long 2002:147-52, esp. 147 n. 4.

[37] Cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 18, 32.

identification with the universe, reason, fire, fate, or providence.[38] In v. 2, ἀρχηγέ could be read in both its philosophical and its traditional meaning, that is, both 'first cause' and 'leader.' 'Governing everything with your law' in the same verse refers to the Stoic doctrine that the whole universe conforms to the universal law, but the idea that God or some divine principle 'governs' or 'steers' (κυβερνᾶν) the world is already found in Presocratic philosophers, as well as in poets like Pindar, and has thus become conventional.[39]

The close relationship between God and human beings to which v. 4 refers, is according to other Stoic texts based on the fact that humanity shares in the same rationality and virtues as God.[40] The notion of a kinship between gods and humans was, however, widely established in antiquity.[41] In his description of the relationship between God and mortals, Cleanthes combines traditional, mythological terms of genealogy and resemblance between father and child with the more technical philosophical terminology of participation in deity.

The first part of the Argument, vv. 7-17, describes Zeus' universal rule. It is not surprising that a Stoic poem would wax eloquent about the cosmic

---

[38] See Zeller 1921-1923:3.1.333-34; Neustadt 1931:389-90; Pohlenz 1940:117 (reprint 1965:87); and Steinmetz 1994:578. Cf. Diog. Laert. 7.135 (*SVF* 1.102, part = LS 46B1) (the abbreviation LS will henceforth be used for Long & Sedley's edition of fragments of Hellenistic philosophers). See further Thom forthcoming: Commentary, n. 20.

[39] Cf. esp. Pind. *Pyth.* 5.122-23; Parmenides 28 B 12.3 DK. For more early parallells see Diels & Kranz 1951-1952:3.248, s.v. κυβερνᾶν. See further my commentary *ad loc.*

[40] Cf. Muson. fr. 17, p. 90.4-6, 13-14 ed. Hense: καθόλου δὲ ἄνθρωπος μίμημα μὲν θεοῦ μόνον τῶν ἐπιγείων ἐστίν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ παραπλησίας ἔχει τὰς ἀρετάς·. . . οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐκείνου μίμημα τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἡγητέον, ὅταν ἔχῃ κατὰ φύσιν, ὁμοίως ἔχειν . . . : 'In general, of all creatures on earth man alone resembles God and has the same virtues that He has. . . . So man, as the image of Him (sc. God), when living in accord with nature, should be thought of as being like Him . . .' (trans. Lutz, slightly adapted). Cf. also Cic. *Leg.* 1.25: *iam uero uirtus eadem in homine ac deo est, neque alio ullo in gen<ere> praeterea. est autem uirtus nihil aliud, nisi perfecta et ad summum perducta natura: est igitur homini cum deo similitudo:* 'Moreover, virtue exists in man and God alike, but in no other creature besides; virtue, however, is nothing else than virtue perfected and developed to its highest point; there is therefore a likeness between man and God' (trans. Keyes in LCL); Arius Didymus ap. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 15.15.5 (*SVF* 2.528, part = LS 67L3): κοινωνίαν δ' ὑπάρχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους (sc. θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους) διὰ τὸ λόγου μετέχειν, ὅς ἐστι φύσει νόμος: '(Gods and men) are members of a community because of their participation in reason, which is natural law' (trans. Long & Sedley).

[41] See Des Places 1964 and Pépin 1971: esp. 5-51.

9

impact of the active principle, which infuses and permeates everything in the universe with its divine power, from the heavens down to the sea. As a materialistic philosophy, Stoicism taught that the active principle was physically present in all things to give them structure and cohesion, although its form varied depending on the ontological status of the object. In this passage the thunderbolt, a symbol the Stoics appropriated from the Presocratic philosopher Heraclitus, represents the material substratum which is elsewhere called fire, heat, or breath (*pneuma*). It functions as the vehicle for the universal reason, thus carrying the divine intelligence throughout matter.[42] What is remarkable, however, is the consistency with which Zeus' personalist character is maintained. He is not identified with the thunderbolt or the *logos*; he is rather depicted in terms of a traditional iconography in which Zeus is wielder of the thunderbolt, the weapon used to enforce his will. The thunderbolt and the accompanying *logos* remain separate entities acting as Zeus' servants or instruments, and enabling him to be the supreme ruler over all of nature (v. 14).

Within the dramatic context of the *Hymn*, nature itself assumes the character of an obedient subject who willingly submits to Zeus' rule (cf. esp. vv. 7-8, 15-16), thus acting as foil for the foolish bad people who disregard his order (v. 17). The refusal of the bad people to conform to Zeus' rule alludes to one of the main problems in Stoic ethics, namely, how it is possible for people to act independently in a world-order where everything is causally linked and determined.[43] Cleanthes does not, however, address the problem of determinism in the *Hymn*, but rather that of the disorder resulting from the bad people's actions. 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. The philosophical and literary background of these verses is complicated. Heraclitus' concept of the *logos* as the union of opposites is usually suggested as the context in which vv. 18-21 be understood.[44] According to his world-view, opposites such as even and uneven, order and disorder, loved and unloved, good and evil, are simply a matter of perspective; the *logos* as world-order combines both ends of the spectrum into one unity. Heraclitus compares the unity of the *logos* with the 'back-stretched

---

[42] See my commentary on vv. 12-13 in Thom forthcoming, esp. nn. 219 and 220.

[43] There is an extensive list of publications on this problem. For recent discussions, see e.g. Forschner 1995:98-113; Hankinson 1999:526-41; and Frede 2003.

[44] Cf. Neustadt 1931:396-97; Zuntz 1958:296-98; Ghidini Tortorelli 1973:337; Long 1975-1976:143-49 (reprint 1996:46-52). The most relevant Heraclitus fragments cited are 1, 23, 25, 26, 27, 91 Marcovich (22 B 1, 2, 10, 50, 51, 102 DK).

connection' (παλίντονος ἁρμονίη), of a bow or a lyre, for which the tension between the two arm-ends is essential for the efficacy of the instrument.[45] In this view good and evil are essential aspects of a higher, dynamic unity. If this is correct, evil would be an essential and necessary corollary of the good, which is in fact close to Chrysippus' position.[46] Such an interpretation, however, cannot be reconciled with the immediate context of these verses. 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). A strict Heraclitean interpretation is therefore

---

[45] Heraclitus, Fr. 27 Marcovich (22 B 51 DK = 209 KRS = 78 Kahn). There is about equally strong textual evidence for the alternative reading παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη, 'a connection turning back (on itself),' but either reading would suit the Heraclitean interpretation of vv. 18-21. For the text and interpretation of the Heraclitus fragment, see Marcovich 1967:119-29, esp. 126-28; and Kirk, Raven & Schofield 1983:192-93. For a different interpretation, cf. Kahn 1979:195-200. The strongest argument in support of Cleanthes' use of this fragment is made by Long, although he does not connect it directly with vv. 18-21 (1975-1976:149; reprint 1996:52-53). He is more explicit about such a connection in his recent study of Epictetus (2002: 154 n. 9).

[46] See Chrysippus ap. Gell. *NA* 7.1.2-6 (*SVF* 2.1169, part = LS 54Q1): '*nihil est prorsus istis' inquit 'insubidius, qui opinantur bona esse potuisse, si non essent ibidem mala. nam cum bona malis contraria sint, utraque necessum est opposita inter sese et quasi mutuo aduerso quaeque fulta nisu consistere; nullum adeo contrarium est sine contrario altero. quo enim pacto iustitiae sensus esse posset, nisi essent iniuriae? aut quid aliud iustitia est quam iniustitiae priuatio?* . . *proinde, inquit, homines stulti cur non hoc etiam desiderant, ut ueritas sit et non sit mendacium? namque itidem sunt bona et mala, felicitas et infortunitas, dolor et uoluptas. alterum enim ex altero, sicuti Plato ait, uerticibus inter se contrariis deligatum est; si tuleris unum, abstuleris utrumque*': "'There is absolutely nothing more foolish than those who think that there could have been goods without the coexistence of evils. For since goods are opposite to evils, the two must necessarily exist in opposition to each other and supported by a kind of opposed interdependence. And there is no such opposite without its matching opposite. For how could there be perception of justice if there were no injustices? What else *is* justice, if not the removal of injustice? . . . Why do the fools not similarly wish that there were truth without there being falsity? For goods and evils, fortune and misfortune, pain and pleasure, exist in just the same way: they are tied to each other in polar opposition, as Plato said. Remove one, and you remove the other"' (trans. Long & Sedley). Cf. also Epict. *Diss.* 1.12.16: διέταξε δὲ θέρος εἶναι καὶ χειμῶνα καὶ φορὰν καὶ ἀφορίαν καὶ ἀρετὴν καὶ κακίαν καὶ πάσας τὰς τοιαύτας ἐναντιότητας ὑπὲρ συμφωνίας τῶν ὅλων: '(God) has ordained that there be summer and winter, and abundance and dearth, and virtue and vice, and all such opposites, for the harmony of the whole' (trans. Oldfather in LCL).

11

forced to admit a tension between vv. 18-21 and the surrounding context.[47] Zeus' ability to level out differences is, however, an ancient motif already found in authors like Hesiod and Solon, where it is closely connected with the justice of Zeus.[48] Although Cleanthes may have been influenced by Heraclitus, he gives a different interpretation to the role of Zeus. His phraseology is also much closer to that of Hesiod and Solon than to that of Heraclitus.

In the last section of the Argument, vv. 22-31, Cleanthes again uses traditional material, namely, the topos of being blind to perceive what is good and the topos of mistaken life-goals, to illustrate the instability of a life not based on God's rational, normative order.[49] The pursuit of honour (v. 27), money (v. 28), and pleasure (v. 29) can clearly be identified with the conventional ways of life (βίοι) often criticised by ancient moralists.[50] Cleanthes argues that such life-goals lead to the complete opposite of that intended: instead of a good life, they lead to incoherence and disorder.

Finally, in the Prayer, we again find traditional epithets emphasising Zeus' benevolence and power over nature (v. 32), as well as an allusion to his cultic function as Saviour (v. 33), but the deliverance requested is from ignorance, and the gift asked for is insight. The phraseology in vv. 32-35 is again dependent on the poets Homer and Hesiod, as well as the philosopher Heraclitus.[51]

Cleanthes thus intertwines religious and moral traditions with Stoic ideas undergirded by phrases taken from Heraclitus, but without allowing philosophical concepts to predominate. By moulding traditional and philosophical views together Cleanthes forges a new conception of Zeus as a deity separate from both the world itself and from human beings, as a god who is able to influence and change things, and who can respond to prayer.

---

[47] See e.g. Zuntz 1958:296-98. Critical of the Heraclitean interpretation of vv. 18-21: Sier 1990:104-05; Thom 1998:54-56.

[48] Cf. Hes. *Op.* 5-9; Solon, Fr. 4.32-39 ed. West.

[49] Although the topos of moral blindness occurs widely, Cleanthes makes use of Orphic and Pythagorean sources in particular; cf. *Carm. aur.* 54-56; *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 256-57; Orph. Frr. 49.95-97, 233 Kern = 396.14-15, 337 Bernabé. See further my commentary on vv. 23-24 in Thom forthcoming.

[50] Wilamowitz (1913:188-91) was the first to point this out. See further my commentary on vv. 26-31 in Thom forthcoming.

[51] Cf. for the epithets Hom. *Il.* 2.412; 22.178; Bacchyl. 5.58; Orph. Fr. 21a.1 Kern = 31 Bernabé; and for vv. 32-35, Hom. *Il.* 17.645-46; Heraclitus, Fr. 85 Marcovich (22 B 41 DK); Hes. *Theog.* 506. See further my commentary *ad locc.*

The function of the Prayer

When we now consider the function of the Prayer in the *Hymn to Zeus*, we have to bear in mind that the ancient cult hymn was composed in such a way that the prayer constituted its climax; everything builds up towards the prayer.[52] Looking at the composition of the *Hymn* from this perspective, we see that the Invocation, vv. 1-6, underlines both Zeus' position as ruler and the privileged position of human beings in nature because of their special relationship with God. This is also the reason why they may and should praise him.

The Argument as a whole focuses on the problem the bad people present to Zeus' universal rule. The first part of the Argument, vv. 7-17, appears to continue the theme of praise with its description of the order Zeus creates throughout nature. At the end of this section, in v. 17, it becomes clear, however, that the positive, obedient response of nature to Zeus' rule is presented as a foil to the foolish people who act outside his plan.

The actions of the bad people are described in more detail in the last section of the Argument, vv. 22-31. Blind to the fact that the good life may be obtained by adhering to God's law, they chase after mistaken goals in the hope that they will attain happiness, only to end up in confusion and frustration. The first and last sections of the Argument are therefore carefully counterpoised: the first contains a positive and optimistic description of the order prevailing in nature in obedient response to Zeus' rule, while the latter gives a gloomy and negative depiction of the fragmented and disorderly lives as a consequence of rejecting God's normative order.

Acting as a hinge between these two sections, vv. 18-21 suggest a solution to the disorder created by the bad people: Zeus himself is able to restore order and to create unity in plurality. The pivotal role of this section is highlighted by its position at the exact centre of the *Hymn*, flanked by the opposing first and last sections of the Argument, which itself is framed by the Invocation and Prayer. Two factors relativise the solution offered in these verses, however. The first is that the solution is not presented as a *fait accompli*. Zeus knows how to change disorder into order, but it is not claimed that he has already accomplished this. The rational order that he has in mind is still 'coming to be' according to v. 21. Secondly, the solution is followed by the description of the dire consequences of the bad people's actions: the

---

[52] See Wünsch 1914:145; Furley & Bremer 2001:1.60. For a detailed analysis of the composition of the *Hymn to Zeus*, see Thom forthcoming: Introduction, §3.

Argument ends on the sombre note that people are able to reject God's solution.

When Cleanthes now turns to Zeus in the Prayer section (vv. 32-39), he appears to do so from a real sense of need. Zeus is requested to do something beyond the ability of the author or his audience. The *Hymn to Zeus* is therefore not merely Stoic doctrine presented in hymnic form.

But this again confronts us with the problem of what it means for a Stoic to pray.[53] In 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*. Through his reason he participates in the divine and has no need of something outside himself, a fact that contributes to the self-sufficiency of the Stoic sage. The fact that God is identified with fate furthermore appears to preclude prayer, for how can prayer change that which is predetermined by the very structure of the world? In practice, however, Stoic positions on prayer are much more diverse and even contradictory. In the words of Marcel Simon, 'Stoic prayer is a paradox but a reality'.[54] Seneca and Cleanthes are sometimes cited as representatives of a 'strict' and a 'more liberal' approach to prayer,[55] but even Seneca is at times quite positive about the value of prayer.[56]

The cause of the difficulty to understand Stoic prayer, and indeed Stoic religion in general, may be ascribed to the fact that Stoicism was, from the very beginning, not purely pantheistic, but in fact an amalgam of pantheism and theism.[57] Stoic theism derives from the view that God, as the ultimate

---

[53] For (brief) recent discussions of Stoic views on prayer, see Von Severus 1972: 1149-50, Simon 1980, and Algra 2003:174-76.

[54] Simon 1980:212.

[55] See Algra 2003:174. For Seneca, he quotes *Nat.* 2.35: *expiationes procuratio-nesque quo pertinent, si immutabilia sunt fata? permitte mihi illam rigidam sectam tueri eorum qui <risu> excipiunt ista et nihil esse aliud quam aegrae mentis solacia existimant. fata aliter ius suum peragunt nec ulla commouentur prece*: 'What use are expiations and precautions if the fates are immutable? Allow me to support that rigid sect of philosophers who accept such practices with a smile and consider them only a solace for a troubled mind. The fates perform their function in another way and they are not moved by any prayer' (trans. Algra). In the case of Cleanthes, he cites the *Prayer to Zeus and to Destiny* (ap. Epict. *Ench.* 53 = *SVF* 1.527) and the *Hymn to Zeus*. Mansfeld (1979:131) points out, however, that Seneca here 'refers to people who vainly ask for a change of fate'; this passage cannot be adduced as a general rejection of prayer.

[56] For a detailed discussion of the evidence of Seneca's views on prayer, see Richards 1964.

[57] For Stoic religion in general, see Nilsson 1967-1974:2.257-68 and Babut 1974:172-201. For the combination of pantheism and theism, see Long 2002:147-48 and Algra

14

form of rationality, in a sense transcends the world structured and ordered by him; he is thus immanent and transcendent at the same time. On the same view, God also transcends human rationality, but he may to some extent still be considered a "person" because his rationality is similar in kind to that of humans.[58] This theistic trend is more prominent in some Stoics than in others, which accounts for the fact that Cleanthes is considered the most religious of early Stoics. While it cannot be denied that the combination of theistic and pantheistic lines of thought made it very difficult for Stoics to remain logically consistent, it would be a mistake to try to make Stoics more consistent than they were.[59] The *Hymn to Zeus* should therefore be considered on its own terms, without forcing it into a pantheistic straitjacket.

2003:167-68. It would be wrong to view the relationship between pantheism and theism in terms of a historical development from the former to the latter, as Reale does 1985:247: 'The Stoic God, according to the logic of the system, since he is identical with nature, *cannot be personal*. Consequently it makes no sense to pray to God, if he is impersonal logos and nature: beyond that, as we will see, man, in order to fulfill his life, has no need of the assistance of God. However, in the history of the Stoa, God will tend to assume more and more spiritual and personal traits, religiousness will tend to permeate more and more strongly the system, and prayer will begin to acquire a precise meaning. Moreover, it is a fatal destiny of pantheism that it cannot keep the identification of God and Nature in a correct equilibrium so that it tends to resolve in the end, either into atheism or theism. The Stoa will turn, especially in the last stage, towards theism, but without arriving at it fully. In any case in the first Stoa, with Cleanthes, a vivid religious sense had already appeared. It found full expression in the well-known *Hymn to Zeus* . . .' (emphasis original).

[58] Cf. Algra 2003:167, 168: 'The Stoic system . . . does exhibit dualistic features in distinguishing god from matter and treating god as clearly the highest principle, as a principle with an altogether different status from that of matter. Moreover, god could be said to be present in various degrees in various parts of the physical world, but most strongly in the "governing part" (*hēgemonikon*) of the cosmos. . . . The latter perspective could give rise to what comes close to a form of astral religion, . . . as well as to the feeling that God, in his purest form, is somewhere 'high up there', and so in a way transcending the world of mortals.' 'Behind all this (sc. what looks like a theistic point of view in early Stoicism) lies the firm conviction that god's rationality – or, for that matter, the rationality of the cosmos – does not differ in kind from human rationality, so that to some extent god can be viewed as a 'person' with purposes and intentions.'

[59] Cf. Long 2002:148: 'The early Stoics, especially Chrysippus, offered exceedingly complex answers to resolve these difficulties over pantheism and theism, and over the relationship between cosmic and human nature, but in my judgement they left more problems than they resolved.'

According to Simon, the most natural form of Stoic prayer is thanksgiving for divine benefaction.[60] The second type of Stoic prayer is to affirm the wise person's submission to the divine will, which is also the law of nature, the universal reason, and providence.[61] Festugière calls this 'the mysticism of consent'.[62] Cleanthes' own *Prayer to Zeus and to Destiny* (ap. Epict. *Ench.* 53 = *SVF* 1.527) comes to mind. It is not too difficult to square these two types of prayer with the Stoic position.

However, the prayer contained in the *Hymn to Zeus* 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.[63] In this case, Cleanthes turns to a superior force, outside himself, for help.[64] 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.[65] 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.[66] God has created a rational world-order in which humans should participate in order to be happy, but their ignorance blinds them to it. Cleanthes therefore requests that Zeus save people from their ignorance and replace it with insight into the way God

---

[60] Simon 1980:213, citing Epict. *Diss.* 1.12.31, 1.16.15 and 19. Praise is often used in Greek hymns as a form of thanksgiving; see Bremer 1998.

[61] Simon 1980:213-14.

[62] Festugière 1954:110-12.

[63] Although the *Hymn* may seem to include an intercessionary prayer for others (v. 33), I argue in my commentary that the prayer includes all human beings. Cf. also Simon 1980:209 n. 12. Stoic petitionary prayers are limited to request of the gods only what is good and beneficial to their moral and intellectual well-being; see Simon 1980:212-13. This is in fact a topos of philosophical prayer; cf. the references in Thom forthcoming: Commentary, n. 474.

[64] Cf. De Vogel 1967-1973:3.83: 'The poet asks the help of God, and he feels that, without this help, we, on our side, are not able to honor God truly.' Kidd, in his commentary on Posidonius, Fr. 40, quotes M. Aur. *Med.* 9.40 for the notion that 'the gods co-operate with us even in what is in our power' (καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν οἱ θεοὶ συλλαμβάνουσιν); the fact that something is within our own ability should therefore not keep us from praying for assistance. Prayer seems to imply 'some form of co-operation between man and what is beyond him' (1988:184).

[65] See also Verbeke's view that the deity is for Cleanthes both immanent and transcendent (1949:193-94).

[66] Simon 1980:219. Cf. also his references to Epict. *Diss.* 1.25.13, 1.30.1, 2.5.22, esp. for God as 'Another' (ἄλλος).

administers the world. This would allow us to respond appropriately to the honour and privilege we have of participating in the divine rationality. Such participation is itself an act of worship; living in harmony with nature means to be part of the cosmic choir praising god. The *Hymn to Zeus* is thus not merely autoreferential, an allegory of Stoic philosophy, or a self-address to the rationality within; it rather reflects an awareness of a rationality transcending the limits of our own, something or someone that may help us live the rational life, and who therefore deserves our worship, a worship which indeed consists of the rational life. According to Cleanthes' *Hymn*, the philosophical life is a religious life, and vice versa.

The *Hymn* has thus come full circle: the praise promised in the Invocation is not just sung in the *Hymn*, but points beyond it; the praise of God's works is only fully realised when all people work with him. The *Hymn*, like many others, therefore functions on two different communication levels: internally, it is a communication between human beings and God, but there is also an external communication between the poet Cleanthes and his human audience.[67] On this level, the *Hymn to Zeus* serves to remind people of, and implicitly exhorts them to achieve, their true goal in life, namely, to live in accordance with the divine *logos* manifest in nature.

Doing justice to Zeus

Doing justice to Cleanthes' *Hymn* requires us to do justice to Zeus.[68] Cleanthes' Zeus is a complex figure who evokes an intricate network of associations: as the Zeus of literature he is the ruling father of gods and men; as the Zeus of religion he is the wielder of the thunderbolt and the guarantor of justice; as the Zeus of philosophy he is the origin and maintainer of the world-order, and the provider of the insight we need to live well. Doing justice to Zeus means that we should not reduce him to one strand of this network. It also means that we should allow the text and its composition to guide our understanding of the meaning of the *Hymn* instead of trying to make it consistent with Stoic doctrine in general. Doing justice to Zeus finally entails that we should take the *Hymn* seriously as a text that still has something to say to us. A commentary on Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* should therefore be more than just a learned set of philological comments on textual criticism, metre, literary phraseology, source material or philosophical

---

[67] For the communicative function of prayer, see Fenske 1997: esp. 79-127. Cf. also Danielewicz 1976:118-19 and Furley & Bremer 2001:1.59.

[68] Cleanthes himself ends the poem reminding his audience of their obligation to 'hymn' Zeus and his works 'in justice'.

17

concepts, valuable as these may be. Instead, a commentary should attempt to understand the human problems giving rise to the text and the way the text itself tries to make sense of them. Only then will the tradition it represents be of more than mere historical interest.

Bibliography

Adam, J. 1911. 'The Hymn of Cleanthes.' In A.M. Adam (ed.), *The Vitality of Platonism and Other Essays*, 104-189. Cambridge.

Algra, K. 2003. 'Stoic theology.' In B. Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion 0to the Stoics*, 153-178. Cambridge.

Annas, J. 1996. 'Cleanthes.' *OCD* 343.

Asmis, E. 1982. 'Lucretius' Venus and Stoic Zeus.' *Hermes* 110:458-470.

Babut, D. 1974. *La religion des philosophes grecs*. Paris.

Bremer, J.M. 1998. 'The reciprocity of giving and thanksgiving in Greek worship.' In C. Gill, N. Postlethwaithe & R. Seaford (edd.), *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, 127-137. Oxford.

Brunck, R.F.P. (ed.). 1784. *ΗΘΙΚΗ ΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ*. Editio nova 1817. Lipsiae.

Cudworth, R. 1678. *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*. Reprint 1964. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.

Danielewicz, J. 1976. *Morfologia hymnu antycznego*. Poznań.

De Vogel, C.J. 1967-73. *Greek Philosophy*. 3 vols. Leiden.

Des Places, É. 1964. *Syngeneia*. Paris.

Diels, H. 1951-52. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 6th ed. W. Kranz. Berlin.

Dragona-Monachou, M. 1976. *The Stoic Arguments for the Existence and Providence of the Gods*. Athens.

Fenske, W. 1997. *"Und wenn ihr betet..." (Mt. 6,5): Gebete in der zwischenmenschlichen Kommunikation der Antike als Ausdruck der Frömmigkeit*. Göttingen.

Festa, N. 1935. 'Ortodossia e propaganda nello stoicismo antico.' In *Mélanges offerts à M. Octave Navarre par ses élèves et ses amis*, 169-180. Toulouse.

Festugière, A.-J. 1949. *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*. Vol. 2: *Le dieu cosmique*. Reprint 1983. Paris.

Festugière, A.-J. 1954. *Personal Religion among the Greeks*. Berkeley & Los Angeles.

Forschner, M. 1995. *Die stoische Ethik*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt.

Frede, D. 2003. 'Stoic determinism.' In B. Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, 179-205. Cambridge.

Furley, W.D. & Bremer, J.M. 2001. *Greek Hymns*. 2 vols. Tübingen.

Ghidini Tortorelli, M. 1973. 'Morfologia cleantea di Zeus.' *AAP* n.s. 22:327-341.

Glei, R. 1990. 'Der Zeushymnus des Kleanthes: Ansätze zu einer philosophischen Theo-Logie.' In L. Hagemann & E. Pulsfort (edd.), *"Ihr alle aber seid Brüder": Festschrift für A. Th. Khoury zum 60. Geburtstag*, 577-597. Würzburg.

Guérard, C., Goulet, R. & Queyrel, F. 1994. 'Cléanthe d'Assos (C138).' *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 2:406-415.

Hahm, D.E. 1977. *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*. Columbus, Ohio.

Hankinson, R.J. 1999. 'Determinism and indeterminism.' In K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld & M. Schofield (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, 513-541. Cambridge.

Hopkinson, N., (ed.). 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.

Inwood, B. 1996. 'L'*oikeiosis* sociale chez Epictète.' In K. Algra, P.W. van der Horst & D.T. Runia (edd.), *Polyhistor*, 243-264. Leiden.

Isnardi Parente, M. 1993. *Introduzione a lo stoicismo ellenistico*. Rome & Bari.

Kahn, C.H. 1979. *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*. Cambridge.

Kidd, I. G. 1988. *Posidonius II: The Commentary*. Cambridge.

Kirk, G.S., Raven, J.E. & Schofield, M. 1983. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. 2nd ed. Cambridge.

Long, A.A. 1975-76. 'Heraclitus and Stoicism.' *Philosophia* 5-6:133-156.

Long, A.A. 1996. *Stoic Studies*. Cambridge.

Long, A.A. 2002. *Epictetus*. Oxford.

Long, A.A. & Sedley, D.N. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. 2 vols. Cambridge.

Lutz, C.E. 1947. 'Musonius Rufus "the Roman Socrates."' *YCIS* 10:1-147.

Mansfeld, J. 1979. 'Providence and the destruction of the universe in early Stoic thought. With some remarks on the "mysteries of philosophy."' In M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*, 129-188. Leiden.

Marcovich, M. 1967. *Heraclitus*. Merida, Venezuela.

Meerwaldt, J.D. 1951. 'Cleanthea I.' *Mnemosyne* 4:40-69.

Meerwaldt, J.D. 1952. 'Cleanthea II.' *Mnemosyne* 5:1-12.

Meijer, P.A. 1983. 'Kleanthes' Loflied op Zeus: Kunt ge noch zingen, zing dan mee!' *Lampas* 16:16-37.

Most, G. W. 1998. 'À la recherche du texte perdu: On collecting philosophical fragments.' In W. Burkert, L. Gemelli Marciano, E. Matelli & L. Orelli (edd.), *Fragmentsammlungen philosophischer Texte der Antike – Le raccolte dei frammenti di filosofi antichi*, 1-15. Göttingen.

Neustadt, E. 1931. 'Der Zeushymnos des Kleanthes.' *Hermes* 66:387-401.

Nilsson, M.P. 1967-74. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. Munich.

Pearson, A.C. 1891. *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes*. Reprint 1973. New York.

Pépin, J. 1971. *Idées grecques sur l'homme et sur dieu*. Paris.

Petersen, C. 1829. 'Cleanthis Stoicis hymnus in Jovem auctori suo vindicatus ad eiusque doctrinam enarratus.' In C.F. Hipp (ed.), *Index scholarum in Gymnasio Hamburgensium academico a Paschate 1829 usque ad Pascha 1830 habendarum*, 1-38. Hamburg.

Pohlenz, M. 1940. 'Kleanthes' Zeushymnus.' *Hermes* 75:117-123.

Pohlenz, M. 1965. 'Kleanthes' Zeushymnus.' In *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 1:87-92. Hildesheim.

Powell, I.U. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford.

Reale, G. 1985. *A History of Ancient Philosophy*. Vol. 3: *The Systems of the Hellenistic Age*. Ed. and trans. J.R. Catan. Albany.

Richards, W.J. 1964. *Gebed by Seneca, die Stoïsyn*. Diss. Utrecht.

Schofield, M. 1999. *The Stoic Idea of the City*. 2nd ed. Chicago & London.

Schwabl, H. 2001. 'Aus der Geschichte der hymnischen Prooimien: Homer, Hesiod, Arat, Lukrez – und ein Blick auf den Zeushymnus des Kleanthes.' *WHB* 43:39-105.

Sedley, D. 1998. 'Cleanthes (331-232 BC).' In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 2:382-83.

Sier, K. 1990. 'Zum Zeushymnos des Kleanthes.' In P. Steinmetz (ed.), *Beiträge zur hellenistischen Literatur und ihrer Rezeption in Rom*, 93-108. Stuttgart.

Simon, M. 1980. 'Prière du philosophe et prière chrétienne.' In H. Limet & J. Ries (edd.), *L'expérience de la prière dans les grandes religions*, 205-224. Louvain-la-Neuve.

Steinmetz, P. 1994. 'Die Stoa.' In H. Flashar (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*. Vol. 4.2: *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, 491-716. Basel.

Stephanus, H. 1573. *ΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΣ*. Paris.

Sturz, F.G. 1785. *Cleanthis hymnum in Iovem*. Lipsiae.

Thom, J.C. 1998. 'The problem of evil in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*.' *AClass* 41:45-57.

Thom, J.C. 2001. 'Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* and early Christian literature.' In A.Y. Collins & M.M. Mitchell (edd.), *Antiquity and Humanity*, 477-499. Tübingen.

Thom, J.C. forthcoming. *Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus*. Tübingen.

Ursinus, F. 1568. *Carmina novem illustrium feminarum ... Cleanthis, Moschionis, aliorumque fragmenta nunc primum edita*. Antverpiae.

Verbeke, G. 1949. *Kleanthes van Assos*. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 11/9. Brussels.

Von Fritz, K. 1972. 'Zeno von Kition.' *RE* 10A:83-121.

Von Severus, E. 1972. 'Gebet I.' *RAC* 8:1134-1258.

Wachsmuth, C. 1875. 'Commentatio II de Zenone Citiensi et Cleanthe Assio.' In *Index scholarum in Academia Georgia Augusta per semestre hibernum a mdccclxxv habendarum*, 3-20. Gottingae.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1895. 'Aratos von Kos.' In *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1894*, 182-199. Göttingen.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1912. 'Die griechische Literatur des Altertums.' In *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache*, 3-318. Leipzig & Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1924. 'Kleanthes Zeushymnus.' In *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, vol. 2:257-261, 324-325. Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1925-26. *Reden und Vorträge*. Berlin.

Wünsch, R. 1914. 'Hymnos.' *RE* 9.1:140-83.

Zeller, E. 1921-23. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Leipzig.

Zuntz, G. 1958. 'Zum Kleanthes-Hymnus.' *HSPh* 63:289-308.