

Glenn W. Most

Klassische Philologie und Hermeneutik



Geboren 1952 in Miami (Florida). Studium der Klassischen Philologie, Vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft und Philosophie an den Universitäten Harvard, Oxford, Yale (Ph. D. 1980) und Tübingen (Dr. phil. 1980). Lehrtätigkeit an den Universitäten Tübingen, Yale, Heidelberg, Princeton, Siena und Michigan; seit 1987 Professor für Klassische Philologie und Altertumswissenschaft an der Universität Innsbruck. Buchveröffentlichungen: *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythias and Seventh Nemean Odes* (Göttingen 1985); *F. A. Wolf: Prolegomena to Homer* (mit A. T. Graf-ton und J. E. G. Zetzel, Princeton 1985); *The Poetics of Murder: Detective Fiction and Literary Theory* (mit W. W. Stowe, New York 1983); *Leibniz: Specimen Dynamicum* (mit H. G. Dosch und E. Rudolph, Hamburg 1982). Adresse: Institut für Klassische Philologie der Universität Innsbruck, Innrain 52, A-6020 Innsbruck.

My work at the Wissenschaftskolleg during this year was concentrated within two large fields of research, Classical Philology and the history of the classical tradition, in which I have been engaged for some years now and which I expect to occupy me for many years to come. My interest in them forms part of a larger research program which underlies, as a long-term substrate, all my smaller and more easily concludable particular projects, viz. the history of reading: the fact that, in some cases at least, the texts that both ancient and modern readers read are the same provides a control with which some of the disparities between ancient and modern readings can be measured; if most of the questions that bothered ancient readers of e. g. Homer are of little interest to us, while those that organize modern Homeric philology were scarcely (if at all) posed in antiquity, it may be possible to relate these differences to broader cultural divergences and ultimately to define concretely and interestingly some of the specific differences between the cultures of ancient Greece and Rome

on the one hand, and those of modern Western Europe and America on the other. I came to Berlin with the hope that I would make considerable progress here with two middle-range projects within this larger research program: ancient allegorical interpretation (an edition of Cornutus' *Epidrome*, a Greek school handbook explaining the names, attributes, and myths of the Greek gods in terms of Stoic physics) and the role of hermeneutics in German philology in the Nineteenth Century (one volume of a two-volume anthology of translations from the history of hermeneutics from the Fifteenth Century through Dilthey). As it turned out, while both projects did indeed progress, neither was completed during this year: partly because of older commitments which had first to be finished; partly because, as I learned more, I saw that preliminary work had to be done before the larger projects could be carried out successfully; and partly because of new problems which suggested themselves in the extraordinarily stimulating atmospheres of the Wissenschaftskolleg and of Berlin.

Of the older projects on which I have made considerable progress during this year, the most important concerns Theophrastus' so-called *Metaphysics*, a very rich but hitherto comparatively neglected document in ancient philosophy of natural science. For the past several years, I have been engaged, together with a small group of friends, in an edition, with translation, introduction, and commentary, of this text; during this year, we have almost finished the work — in part thanks to the generosity of the Kolleg in inviting to Berlin for a week one of my collaborators, André Laks — and we expect the edition to appear as part of the collection Budé in about a year. While in Berlin, I completed an article on the three medieval and Renaissance Latin translations of the text (here I was able to benefit from the helpfulness of Prof. Dr. Harlfinger of the Institut für Griechische and Lateinische Philologie of the Freie Universität and to take advantage of the resources of the Aristoteles-Archiv which he directs) and prepared a lecture, delivered in Paris, on the title and date of the treatise. The other philological projects which I completed during this year included a lengthy article on Cornutus, in which I tried to suggest fruitful areas of research on his allegorical methodology, pedagogy, political ideology, and relations to Latin poets; a study of Odysseus' tales in the *Odyssey*, arguing that they function as a negative definition of the duties of a good host, motivated by the hero's concern about the Phaeacians' hospitality; an examination of the theme of the dismemberment of the human body in the Latin poetry of the Neronian period, which I delivered as a colloquium at Pisa, the Wissenschaftskolleg, and the Freie Universität; and a paper on the epic hero's confrontation with the past in the Underworld as the locus within the genre of epic poetry for the con-

frontation of the epic poet with his literary past, and hence for his reflection upon the genre of epic.

Such philological studies were made certainly more pleasurable and, I hope, rather better, by the opportunity to discuss them with various philological colleagues at the Wissenschaftskolleg (in part within the context of an extremely enjoyable "Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium" which met here a number of times and comprised, among others, T. Engelhardt, M. Hengel, S. C. Humphreys, E. Lledó, G. Motzkin, W. Nippel, E. von Savigny, and D. Timpe) and at the Freie Universität. But it was even more for the study of the history of the classical tradition that I found Berlin to be a particularly stimulating environment. My work on Cornutus here was one of a number of projects on the history of the classical tradition within antiquity itself: articles on Plato's discussion of a poem by Simonides in the *Protagoras* (delivered as a seminar paper here, in America and in France) and on the general outlines of the process of literary canonization in Greek culture from Homer through the Alexandrian period (delivered as a lecture in Paris) are further examples. Berlin was a central locus for the scholarly reception of antiquity in the Nineteenth Century and beyond, and it was above all in this field that I learned much during this year. In the fall I held a compact seminar at Innsbruck on Greek myths in German literature from Goethe to Christa Wolf and finished a paper on Wordsworth's ambiguous relation to the pastoral tradition. Thereafter I concentrated on two projects within the history of German philology. The first concerned the history of the (empirically hardly selfevident) claim that the study of antiquity has a morally improving effect; as my colloquium for the Wissenschaftskolleg I delivered a lecture entitled "Vom Nutzen und Nachteil des Lebens für die Historie", in which I examined this issue partly in terms of the development of nineteenth-century philology from Humboldt and Boeckh through Nietzsche and Wilamowitz, partly in terms of the study of philology and history in classical antiquity. This is in essence a story about Berlin's role in the development of modern philology, and I was fortunate to be able to work on it here: the "Nachlass" of August Boeckh, preserved in the archive of the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR and made available to me with great helpfulness, proved of enormous interest in this connection; and I was able to benefit as well from discussions with a number of friends and colleagues from various departments of the Freie Universität. The second, "Zur Archäologie der Archaik", addressed the invention, in German studies towards the end of the nineteenth century, of the concept of an archaic stage in the development of Greek art and culture: here I attempted to illustrate the complicated interrelations of scholarly archaeology, philology, and art history, with the larger and more diffuse

forces of "Kulturgeschichte" and "Kulturpessimismus". This story is focused upon Munich, and was delivered as a lecture in Bavaria; but I benefited not only from Berlin's unique library resources and from discussions with people in a number of different fields, but also from the opportunity to present a first version as a lecture at the Freie Universität. In connection with both projects I worked intensively on Friedrich Nietzsche, a figure whose importance for the history of classical scholarship goes far beyond his actual concrete philological contributions, interesting though these are; I hope to continue to occupy myself with him in the coming years.

Finally, stimulated no doubt by the Wissenschaftskolleg's orientation this year towards the history and philosophy of science, expressed not least in the lively discussions of the weekly meetings of the Comparative Epistemology group, I became more interested in these aspects of such earlier projects of mine as Theophrastus and Cornutus, emphasized them in my work this year on the history of philology, and began several projects which I hope to complete in the near future: in particular, a substantial review essay on the work of G. E. R. Lloyd and a study on the relation between science and pseudo-science among the Neoplatonists.

The most difficult aspect of life at the Wissenschaftskolleg, I found, involved trying to balance the stimuli from three quite different sources: the work I hoped (or had) to do here; the Wissenschaftskolleg itself, with its lively Fellows and helpful, ingenious, and dedicated staff; and Berlin, with its extraordinary cultural and intellectual excitement, by no means limited to the university. It would have been impossible to do justice to any one of these, let alone to all three. This was quite frustrating: and a token to the joy of working, and living, here.