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# Thursday, 20th December

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.30 | **Registration** |
| 9.10 | **Welcome Addresses and Opening Remarks (Sala I)**Prof. Antonio Felice Uricchio, Magnifico Rettore dell’Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”Prof.ssa Rosa Otranto, Vice-Direttrice del Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”Roberta Berardi (University of Oxford), Martina Filosa (Universität zu Köln) |

# 10.00-11.30 Session 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **Greek epigrams - Lost and Found** | **Papyri and New Discoveries** |
| Chair: Roberta Berardi (University of Oxford) | Chair: Martina Filosa (Universität zu Köln) |
| 10.00 | - Alessandra Grimaldi (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”): Callimachus’ *Epigrams*: Tradition and Reception between the *Greek Anthology* and Grammatical Works | - Élodie Mazy (Université libre de Bruxelles): Lost Books from Unknown Libraries: What do Papyri Tell Us About Book Collections in Late Antique Egypt? |
| 10.30 | - Davide Massimo (University of Oxford): Looking for the Ivy: The *Epigrams* of Leonidas Between Anthologies, Papyri, and Southern Italy | - Alberto Buonfino (Università degli Studi del Salento – Universität Wien): Storia dei rinvenimenti di papiri a Soknopaiou Nesos: dagli “scavi di papiri” allo scavo archeologico scientifico |
| 11.00 | - Marta Marucci (Università degli Studi della Basilicata): Teodorida di Siracusa: un poeta dimenticato? | - Marzia D’Angelo (Università di Pisa): Sul *PHerc.* 89/1383: problemi di ricostruzione e lettura in un nuovo papiro teologico di Filodemo |

#  11.30-12.00 Coffee Break

#  12.00-13.30 Session 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **Learning How (Not) to Forget Remembrances, Memorization and Transmission in Epicureanism** | **Achilles Between War and Love: Memory of Euripides’ *Skyrioi* in Antiquity** |
| Chair: Nicoletta Bruno (*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, BAW – München) | Chair: Jacopo Khalil (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”) |
| 12.00 | - Solmeng-Jonas Hirschi (University of Oxford): Epicurean Time, Memory and Oblivion | - Francesco Moles (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): Eroismo arcaico negli *Sciri* di Euripide |
| 12.30 | - Vincenzo Damiani (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg): Memory as a Means of Therapy and Salvation: Didactic and Psychagogic Devices in Epicurus’ *Compendia* | - Elly Polignano (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): Un esempio di eroismo erotico: la controversa questione dell'*Epitalamio di Achille e Deidamia* |
| 13.00 | - Jonathan Griffiths (University College London): Selection and Loss: Reconstructing One Part of Epicurean Cosmology | - Enrica Aglaia Milella (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): Il mito di Achille a Sciro in Ovidio fra tradizione e innovazione |

#  13.30-14.30 Lunch Break

#  14.30-15.00 1st Poster Session

- Silvia Onori (Università degli Studi di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale): Un poeta 'gorgiano': ossimori e paradossi nei frammenti gnomici di Agatone

- Sara López-Maroto Quiñones (Universidad Complutense de Madrid): The *Tractatus de Sphaera* of Sacrobosco in the Beinecke MS 556

- Filippo Trotta (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): Lost and Rediscovered Texts: Some Notes About a Medieval Epigraph of Castellaneta (TA)

- Cristiana Roffi (Universität zu Köln – Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna): The Circulation of National Identity between Tradition and Innovation: The Barbarian Stereotype in Tacitus' *Germania*

#  15.00-16.30 Session 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **Selection and Authorship in Greek Historiography** | **Lost Books in Late Antiquity** |
| Chair: Sergio Brillante (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”) | Chair: Solmeng-Jonas Hirschi (University of Oxford) |
| 15.00 | - Gastón Javier Basile (Universidad de Buenos Aires): *Historia*: The Fragments of Early Greek Prose-writing Tradition | - Marco Cristini (Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa): *Oblivio non natura nobis venit*: Cassiodoro e la perduta *Gothorum historia* |
| 15.30 | - Stefano Gioacchino (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): Le *Ἀλεξάνδρου Πράξεις* di Callistene di Olinto: contraddizioni e problemi di attribuzione | - Collin Miles Hilton (Bryn Mawr College): Porphyry Lost between Greek and Latin Neoplatonism: Macrobius and Olympiodorus on the Distinction of Poetic and Philosophical Myth |
| 16.00 | - Gabriella Rubulotta (Université de Strasbourg): Callisseno. Fortuna di un uomo maledetto | - Silvia Santomauro (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): Storie di libri e di eresie: il perduto *Commento alla Genesi* di Origene ed il *P.Giss*. II 17 |

#  16.30-17.00 Coffee Break

#  17.00-19.00 Session 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **The Transmission of Greek Poetry** | **How *scholia* Saved Ancient Literature** |
| Chair: Lucia Maddalena Tissi (LabEx HASTEC) | Chair: Federica Benuzzi (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia) |
| 17.00 | - Jacopo Khalil (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”): Recovering the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* | - Chiara Gennari Santori (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”): Citazioni esiodee negli scolî a Omero: varianti testuali e tracce di esegesi antica |
| 17.30 | - Leonardo Arpino (Università degli Studi di Trento): *Lost in transmission*: Th. III 104 e le varianti “rapsodiche” dell'*Inno omerico ad Apollo* | - Enrico Santachiara (University of Exeter): *Schol.* 30 al *Timone* di Luciano: nuovo indizio della corruzione di Cleone dal decimo libro dei *Philippika* di Teopompo? |
| 18.00 | - Anna Lucia Furlan (King’s College London): In Search of Orpheus: Selection and Loss in the Fragmentary Orphic *Corpus* | - Marco Pelucchi (Università degli Studi di Milano): Pessimi poeti: tradizione antica e criteri di selezione |
| 18.30 | - Francesco Boccasile (Università degli Studi Roma Tre): Teognide rivoluzionario e Teognide moderato. Per un’interpretazione della tradizione (socratica) di Teognide tra lotta, amnistia e amnesia | - Georgia Kolovou (Université Paris-Nanterre): The Criteria of Eustathios for the Selection and the Compilation of the Poetic Quotations in his *Commentary* on the *Book* VI of the *Iliad* |

#  20.00 Conference Dinner (La Locanda di Federico, P.zza Mercantile, 63)

# Friday, 21st December

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.00 | **Plenary Session with Keynote Speech (Sala I)**Luisa Fizzarotti (Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna) introduces:Tiziano Dorandi (Centre Jean Pépin CNRS – Paris)**Pratiche di redazione e di produzione libraria nella biblioteca di Filodemo a Ercolano** |

#  10.00-11.30 Session 5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **Lost Literary Texts *in papyris reperta*** | **Selection and Loss in Athenaeus’ Work** |
| Chair: Andrea Beghini (Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici, Napoli – Università di Pisa) | Chair: Davide Massimo (University of Oxford) |
| 10.00 | - Daniela Cagnazzo (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): Testimonianze tragiche da frammenti papiracei. Il caso di *P.Oxy*. XX 2257 | - Benjamin Cartlidge (University of Liverpool): Remembering Loss, Dismembering Gain: Books and Individuals in Athenaeus |
| 10.30 | - Lorenzo Sardone (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”): *P.Ryl.* I 58: uno strano testimone del *De Corona* di Demostene. | - Ottavia Mazzon (Università degli Studi di Padova): Donne dimenticate e donne ricordate. Per una riflessione sulla versione epitomata del *Libro* XIII di Ateneo. |
| 11.00 | - Duccio Guasti (University of Cincinnati): Il *P. Heid.* 310 e l'*horror vacui* dell'anonimato | - Federica Consonni (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia): Athenaeus and the *Epitome*: History of a ‘Restoration’ |

#  11.30-12.00 Coffee Break

#  12.00-13.30 Session 6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **Omissions and Quotations Beyond Antiquity** | **Roman Republic: Cicero and His Reception** |
| Chair: Giulia Marolla (Università degli Studi di San Marino) | Chair: Giuliano Caracciolo (Universität zu Köln – Università di Roma “La Sapienza”) |
| 12.00 | - Emanuele Zimbardi (Università di Roma “La Sapienza” – Freie Universität Berlin): Omissioni tra lacune meccaniche e intenzionali in una traduzione tardoantica | - Giulia Marinelli (Universität zu Köln – Università di Roma “La Sapienza”): Tra memoria e oblio: il controverso caso dell'*Orazione* di Cicerone in difesa di M. Fonteio |
| 12.30 | - Simon Smets (University College London): The Omission of the Recipient’s Words in Letter Collections | - Eugenio Mattioni (Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna): Parole, temi e stile dei *populares*: quanto e cosa possiamo ricostruire? |
| 13.00 | - Marco Forforelli (Independent Scholar): Una lunga scia di polemiche: il terzo assedio di Nisibis e le tracce di un confronto storiografico parzialmente perduto | - Georgios Taxidis (Universität Hamburg): *Successit laurea sertis*: Quoting Cicero in Claudian’s *De Consulatu Stilichonis I* |

#  13.30-14.30 Lunch Break

#  14.30-15.00 2nd Poster Session

- Francesco Condone (Università degli Studi di Napoli “Federico II”): Animal Anthropomorphism in Dionysius’ Lost *Ixeutica*

- Anna Trento (Università degli Studi di Padova): A Forgotten Author from Sinai: Monk Nilus and His Works

- Anna Busetto (Independent Scholar): A Forgotten Fund? The ‘Discovery’ of Greek Manuscripts in the Biblioteca Bertoliana of Vicenza

#  15.00-16.30 Session 7

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **Reconstructing Texts: The Case of Greek Tragedy** | **Memory and Oblivion of Hellenistic Kingdoms and Roman Empire** |
| Chair: Marco Donato (Università di Pisa) | Chair: Alberto Corrado (University of Oxford) |
| 15.00 | - Sabrina Mancuso (Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen – Università di Pisa): Un'ipotesi di ricostruzione del contenuto mitografico del *Tereo* tramite confronto intertestuale con le fonti | - Sergio Brillante (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): *Otia imperialia*. L'opera paradossografica di Tolomeo Dioniso |
| 15.30 | - Elena Iakovou (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen): Reconstructing the Innovator Euripides in His Fragmentary Tragedies *Oedipus* and *Antigone* | - Alessandra Tafaro (University of Warwick): Obliterating Domitian’s Memory: from Inscriptions to Martial’s Second Edition of Epigrams Book 10 |
| 16.00 | - Giulia Dovico (Universität zu Köln): Between Selection and Loss: Examples of Survival from *Scholia* to Euripides | - Mariana Bodnaruk (Central European University): *Damnatio Memoriae* of the High-ranking Senatorial Office-holders in the Later Roman Empire |

#  16.30-17.00 Coffee Break

#  17.00-18.30 Session 8

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sala I** | **Sala “Carlo De Trizio”** |
| **How Greek Comedy Survived Through Time** | **Death and Survival of Poetic Texts**  |
| Chair: Anna Lucia Furlan (King’s College London) | Chair: Georgios Taxidis (Universität Hamburg) |
| 17.00 | - Federica Benuzzi (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia): Lost Hypotexts. Lucian’s *Lexiphanes* and Alexandrian Exegesis to Comedy | - Ivan Nikolsky (Institute of World History, RAS – Russian Presidental Academy, Moscow): Dracontius and the *Dominus Ignotus* in the *Satisfactio*: Why Did the Vandals Imprison the Carthaginian Poet and Refuse to Release him? |
| 17.30 | - Virginia Mastellari (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg): Il genere trascurato. Trasmissione e forme della Commedia di mezzo | - Alberto Corrado (University of Oxford): Lucretius in the *praefatio* Epigram of Prosper of Aquitaine’s *Liber epigrammatum* |
| 18.00 | - Lara Unuk (Univerza v Ljubljani): Mythological Characters in Selected Fragments of Old Greek Comedy | - Pierluigi Gatti (Università degli Studi di Napoli L'Orientale): Stolen Manuscripts and Discovered Texts: Angelo Decembrio and the *Carmen De Bello Actiaco* (*PHerc.* 817) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.30 | **Closing Remarks (Sala I)**Nicoletta Bruno (*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften – München) |

#  18.45-20.00 Wine Reception

Contact:

prolepsis.associazione@gmail.com

prolepsisblog.wordpress.com
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**Keynote Speech**

Tiziano Dorandi (Centre Jean Pépin CNRS – Paris)

*Pratiche di redazione e di produzione libraria nella biblioteca di Filodemo a Ercolano*

La collezione di libri conosciuta come Biblioteca di Filodemo, scoperta a Ercolano sepolta dall’eruzione del Vesuvio dell’anno 79 d.C., è una miniera di informazioni eccezionali sulle pratiche di redazione di opere letterarie e sulla produzione libraria nell’antichità. Essa è costituita da diverse centinaia di rotoli di papiro di argomento filosofico databili dal III sec. a.C. al I sec. d.C. Il fondo più antico della raccolta fu probabilmente riunito dall’Epicureo del I secolo a.C. Filodemo di Gadara e dal medesimo incrementato con le copie delle sue numerose opere. Al momento dell’eruzione, la biblioteca era collocata in una sontuosa villa suburbana di Ercolano, proprietà della *gens Calpurnia*, il cui membro più illustre fu il senatore Lucio Calpurnio Pisone Cesonino, console nel 51 a.C., suocero di Giulio Cesare e *patronus* di Filodemo.

Il fondo librario di Ercolano costituisce l’unico esempio concreto e tangibile di una biblioteca “privata” nella quale opere della letteratura greca e latina erano conservate insieme ai trattati composti dalla persona che l’aveva organizzata – il filosofo Filodemo. Di questi ultimi, si conservano non solo numerosi esemplari delle redazioni definitive o “edizioni” (che fossero destinate o meno a una più ampia diffusione), ma anche versioni intermediarie, redazioni provvisorie e finanche brogliacci. Siamo dunque di fronte a un tipo singolare di “biblioteca” che è nello stesso tempo deposito di libri, ma anche atelier nel quale molti di quei libri erano prodotti. Lo studio di tutti questi documenti consente di avere un’idea assai larga dei metodi di redazione dei testi di Filodemo e più in generale di certe pratiche di produzione libraria durante il I sec. a.C.

*Practices of Book Editing and Production in the Library of Philodemus in Herculaneum*

The book collection known as Library of Philodemus, found in Herculaneum and buried by the Vesuvius’ eruption in 79 AD, is a source of exceptional information on the practices literary work editing and ancient book production. It is composed of hundreds of papyrus scrolls containing philosophical material to be dated back between the 3rdcentury BC and the 1st AD. The most ancient section probably belonged to the 1st century BC Epicurean philosopher Philodemus of Gadara, who made it richer by his continuous process of copying his own works. During the eruption, the library was located in a luxury suburban villa in Hercolaneum, belonging to the gens Calpurnia, whose most famous member was the senator Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, consul in 51 BC., father in law of Julius Caesar and patronus of Philodemus.

The books in Herculaneum constitute the only concrete and tangible example of a ‘private’ library where literary works in Latin and Greek were preserved along with the treatises written by the person who organised the library itself – namely Philodemus. Among these treatises, we not only find final redactions or ‘editions’ (whether destined to a larger circulation or not), but also intermediate versions, temporary redactions, and even drafts. This is therefore a very peculiar “library”, which is at the same time a book storage, and an atelier, where those books were produced. The study of these documents allows us to have a large idea of the redaction methods of Philodemus’ texts, and more broadly of book production techniques in the 1st century BC.

**Thursday, 20th December:**

**Session 1: 10.00-11.30**

**Session 1a) Greek epigrams - Lost and Found (Sala I)**

Greek epigram is a genre which lends itself to fruitful discussion regarding loss and selection criteria. For a long time, our knowledge of Greek epigrams depended on the remnants of ancient anthologies (mainly the *Greek Anthology*). However, significant papyrological (e.g. the Milan Posidippus) and epigraphic finds have allowed the recovery of significant literary texts, enriching our knowledge of the epigrammatic panorama, stimulating discussion on the transmission and fortune of such texts, and inducing reassessments on various individual poets.

Alessandra Grimaldi (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

*Callimachus’ Epigrams: Tradition and Reception between the Greek Anthology and Grammatical Works*

Callimachus’ poetic works are mostly preserved by papyri, and only the Hymns and the epigrams seem to escape this fate. Luckily, more than 60 of his epigrams are included in six books of the *Greek Anthology*, thus enabling us to take a glimpse at the fortune of Callimachus. However, these epigrams do not represent the whole corpus: if we look closer at grammatical works of the 2nd century AD, both Greek and Latin, we can find that a small number of heterogeneous fragments and testimonies, as well as a couple of complete epigrams, survive. The presence of some fragments of Callimachus’ epigrams (those written in non-elegiac meters) in the works of Hephaestio and Caesius Bassus suggests that in the 2nd century AD the interest of the scholars was focused on the metrical technique and variety; on the other hand, their inclusion in Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophists* and in philosophical works (such as those by Sextus Empiricus and Diogenes Laertius) gives us a hint of their widespread diffusion and of their fortune throughout the Imperial Age.

Davide Massimo (University of Oxford)

*Looking for the Ivy: the Epigrams of Leonidas between Anthologies, Papyri, and Southern Italy*

Leonidas of Tarentum is one the Greek epigrammatist whose work is best preserved for us: around 100 of his epigrams survive, which amount to 600 lines, mainly thanks to their inclusion in the *Greek Anthology*. This fact alone accounts for a great fortune of Leonidas in the early stages of reception. However, if one looks closer to external evidence, the overall picture is wider and more varied. The presence of Leonidas in a papyrus probably of Augustan age (*P.Oxy.* 662, containing miscellaneous epigrams), suggests that the interest for this poet was still alive at that time. In addition to this, one can note that Propertius in one of his elegies (3.13) directly translates one of Leonidas’ epigrams, a rather unique case in his poetry. This interest even enters the material culture: an epigram of Leonidas was found in the so-called “House of the Epigrams” in Pompei and traces of another epigram have been identified on a fragment of wall-painting from Suasa (central Italy). All these elements may be the result of chance, but they can also tell us something about the selection criteria and the fortune of an author who was clearly read and appreciated in different contexts and ages, and despite that has been undervalued by scholars for great part of the 20th century. We could then try to recover the "abundant ivy of Leonidas” (as Meleager calls it), which might have been more wide-spread than it seems now.

Marta Marucci (Università degli Studi della Basilicata)

*Teodorida di Siracusa: un poeta dimenticato?*

[*The Case of Theodoridas of Syracuse: A Forgotten Poet?*]

Theodoridas of Syracuse is a poet who lived during the second half of 3rd century BC and was an imitator of Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum. Theodoridas’ poetic works are almost completely lost, except for 18 epigrams which have survived thanks to their inclusion in the Greek Anthology and a small number of lost poetic works preserved through grammatical works and Athenaeus. During the last century, two papyri were discovered containing epigrams and references to Theodoridas, both dated to the 1st century BC: *P. Freib.* I 4 contains miscellaneous epigrams, one of which is attributed to Theodoridas; *P. Louvre* 7733v, on the other hand, contains an anonymous epigram for a shell and a commentary on the same epigram which mentions Theodoridas (even if no scholar has found an explanation for this mention yet). Finally, the epigraphist Peek attributed to Theodoridas a votive anonymous epigram found on a stone in the Phthiotis region. Despite these new discoveries and attributions, this poet has not yet received the proper attention from scholars. The presence of Theodoridas in the Greek Anthology, in papyri and in epigraphs raises an important question: do we still have to consider Theodoridas a minor poet and an imitator, or should we rather revalue him and call him a forgotten poet?

**Session 1b) Papyri and New Discoveries (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Élodie Mazy (Université libre de Bruxelles)

*Lost Books from Unknown Libraries: What do Papyri Tell Us About Book Collections in Late Antique Egypt?*

Late Antique literature in Egypt is primarily studied through ancient manuscripts. Aside from manuscripts, documentary papyri also provide a large number of book titles, in private letters, short notes establishing lists of books being sent, canonical lists, property inventories and library catalogues. A complete survey of these documents, Greek and Coptic, allows us to know 446 titles of books. Hence papyri are a unique, though hardly used, source for studying Late Antique books, their content and their management. All of the books mentioned in documentary papyri must be considered lost: indeed, none can be identified for sure with a manuscript, and some are even unknown in manuscript tradition. Furthermore, the books mentioned in papyri belonged to collections and libraries that are unknown, either because of the fragmentary nature of most of the documents, their vagueness or the lack of archaeological context. First, I will compare the title, genre and subject, language and material of books as they are described in documentary papyri with the preserved manuscripts from Late Antique Egypt, in order to point out possible discrepancies between these two kinds of sources. A preliminary study shows that, while papyri and manuscripts seem to concur in the distribution of book genres, they differ, at first glance, on language and material of books. Secondly, I will examine the books unknown in manuscript tradition, focusing especially on their genre and subject. This could give an idea of how much of Late Antique literature from Egypt got lost, while, of course, expanding our knowledge of this literature. Finally, I will try to reconstruct the management of the libraries, namely thanks to catalogues that provide information about book location, categorization and method of cataloguing.

Alberto Buonfino (Università degli Studi del Salento – Universität Wien)

*Storia dei rinvenimenti di papiri a Soknopaiou Nesos: dagli “scavi di papiri” allo scavo archeologico scientifico*

[*Soknopaiou Nesos and its Papyri: History of Discoveries and Current Dislocation*]

The papyri produced in Egypt during the Greek-Roman period are several tens of thousands. Many of them, recovered in the ancient Egyptian settlements between the XIX century and the second half of the XX century, are nowadays kept in the most important museums and institutions in the world. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to go back to the origin of these texts, because of the unscientific methods through which they were recovered and because of the ways they were sold on the antiques market and bought by private and public collections.

One of the sites where a lot of literary and documentary texts written on papyrus come from is Soknopaiou Nesos/Dime es-Seba (Fayyum, Egypt): all the papyri found during the numerous archaeological and non-archaeological explorations (official and clandestine) from the second half of the XIX century, are now stored in museums and collections around the world.

This Research aims to catalogue all the published and non-published papyri found in Soknopaiou Nesos, also through the use of new digital resources. Furthermore, an extensive survey will also be necessary, in order to find and study the papyri that are still not published and that are stored into the coffers of the museum storerooms and papyrological institutions. During this research it will be important to define the ways in which the papyri found in Soknopaiou Nesos have been acquired by the institutions and museums.

Selected bibliography:

* A.E.R. Boak, *Soknopaiou Nesos. The University of Michigan Excavations at Dimê in 1931-32*,Ann Arbor 1935.
* E. Breccia, *Dove e come si trovano i papiri in Egitto*, «Aegyptus» 16 (1936), pp. 296-305.
* A. Calderini-S. Daris, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell’Egitto greco- romano*, Cairo 1935-1996, III, p. 349; IV, pp. 296-301; *Suppl*. 1, p. 236; *Suppl*. 2, p. 195; *Suppl*. 3, pp. 139 s.; *Suppl*. 4, pp. 120 s.; *Suppl*. 5, pp. 90 s.
* M. Capasso-P. Davoli, *Soknopaiou Nesos Project I*, Pisa-Roma 2012.
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Marzia D’Angelo (Università di Pisa)

*Sul PHerc. 89/1383: problemi di ricostruzione e lettura in un nuovo papiro teologico di Filodemo*

[*A New Theological Text by Philodemus in PHerc. 89/1383*]

The library of the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum, the only ancient library which has survived into the modern era, preserves a unique heritage of philosophical texts not transmitted by the medieval tradition. It contains more than 1800 papyri carbonized by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in 79 AD and brought to light during the Bourbon excavations in the 18th century. During the eruption, many rolls were seriously damaged or broken in several pieces: each part of the same roll has been stored – and in some cases opened – separately from the others. This is the reason why in the Officina dei Papiri in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Naples it is possible to find fragments stored with a different inventory number which belong to the same original roll.

*PHerc.* 89/1383 is a case of this kind: as Gianluca Del Mastro has recently discovered, these two papyri are respectively the upper and the lower part of the same roll, broken roughly in the middle. A systematic study of both papyri – that remain so far unpublished due to their poor state of conservation – is required to determine the correct order of the fragments in the roll and to examine the content of the work. Actually, due to its carbonized state, during the unrolling different layers of papyrus remained attached to each other: this makes it necessary to distinguish *sovrapposti* and *sottoposti* (pieces layered above or below) from the main layer in order to virtually place them in their original position in the roll.

This speech aims to show some preliminary results of the work in progress on this new text, in which a new reading of the final *subscriptio* confirms that the author is the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus of Gadara. Thanks to an accurate stratigraphical analysis of the fragments, some textual sequences are now readable, and they will be able to clarify the theological argument of the treatise, by revealing important points of contact with the other religious works by Philodemus.
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**Session 2: 12.00-13.30**

**Session 2a) Learning How (Not) to Forget Remembrances, Memorization and Transmission in Epicureanism (Sala I)**

*Non memini quid fuerim* said Tiberius (Sen., *De benef.* 5.25.2), worrying that he would be liable for his past if he admitted to remembering it. There might be more than mere cowardice and fearful self-interest at stake in such a position. Ancient philosophers, and in particular the Epicureans, had given thought to the problems of memory, identity and time *vs*. happiness long before Tiberius' reign. Interestingly, such problems influenced not only their theories but also their teaching and the propagation and reception of their writings. Our panel proposes to examine and restore that nexus of memory, didactic and transmission.

The first presentation [I] will focus on the very understanding of time, memory and oblivion in Epicurus and Lucretius. The second presentation [II] will explore the mnemotechnics and didactics of the Garden, with a particular focus on Epicurus' *epitomai*. The last presentation [III] will offer a case-study on the transmission and reconstruction of Epicurean texts based on the fragments of Epicurus' *On Nature.*

Solmeng-Jonas HIRSCHI (University of Oxford)

*Epicurean Time, Memory and Oblivion*

The Epicurean conception of time is an obscure and vexed topic – somewhat surprisingly so, considering the comparatively rich source material available. The core of the problem lies in our (modern) difficulty to assess, or indeed unite, the external, objective and absolute time implied by Epicurean ontology (atomic motions, regularity, causation) and the internal, subjective and relative time as defined by Epicurus in the *Letter to Herodotus* 72–3. From an Epicurean perspective, however, what is at stake when dealing with time is the impact that past and future harms can have on our present well-being. It is thus not so much an epistemological challenge concerned with the very possibility to ascertain the truth-value of past or future propositions as it is the result of an ethical agenda concerned with recollecting past pleasures and avoiding, or even forgetting, past harms so as to maintain *ataraxia*. In focusing on the Epicureans’ understanding of past time and its management, the first talk of our panel will investigate the ontological and ethical background of selection and loss of memories in Epicureanism. The presentation will effectively tackle two questions: [1] What are memories in Epicureanism? [2] How can we store, affect and select them? To answer both these points, I shall offer close readings of key passages in Epicurus (*Ep. Hdt.* 72–3; *PHerc.* 1416/1413 [= Arr.2 37]), Lucretius (1.459–482) and, tangentially, Cicero (*De fato*). A re-evaluation of the famous Symmetry Argument will shed new light on the articulation between memory and time in the Garden by supporting a type of ethical presentism. My presentation will put the emphasis on both the practice-oriented, 'medicinal', nature of Epicurean advice and the perspective of the agent in implementing the doctrine, thereby paving the way for the following panelists.
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Vincenzo Damiani (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg)

*Memory as a Means of Therapy and Salvation: Didactic and Psychagogic Devices in Epicurus’ Compendia*

Epicurus’ *Kompendienliteratur*, whose extant instances are the three doctrinal letters and the collection of sentences (Κύριαι δόξαι) cited at the very end of the 10th book of Diogenes’ *Vitae*, marks the transformation of a pre-existing ‘auxiliary’ text-format into a new, powerful pedagogic and psychagogic tool. Those texts clearly show that the operation of abridgement was subject to an internal diversification in terms of style and rhetorical choices in order to effectively reach the different learning needs of its readership. Although it is a feature common to all of them, the fact of being intentionally conceived as susceptible of complete, or selective, memorization has a different implementation in each case. The second contribution of the panel will focus on the techniques deployed by Epicurus in each of his compendia not only to provide the reader’s μνήμη with a written support, but also to steer their disposition, as I shall show. The *Letter to Menoeceus*, partly because of its length, seems to be made to be learned by heart and it aims to present the basics of ethical discourse by leveraging typically literary devices such as prosodic composition, symmetry, and poetic quotations. In contrast, the *Letter to Hero*dotus is a text designed to be consulted whenever needed rather than to be fully memorised. Accordingly, Epicurus insists on the correct relationship between λέξεις and πράγματα in order to support the effort of learning. The *Letter to Pythocles* offers a somewhat different structure which is reminiscent both of collections of definitions (ὅροι) and of erotapocritic literature. Here, the complete memorization seems to be subject to the comprehension of a single principle (that of multiple causation) underlying the list of alternative explanations given by Epicurus. Finally, the *Maxims* exhibit a specific internal order and can be assimilated to the *Letter to Menoeceus* as to the need of being memorised *verbatim*.
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Jonathan Griffiths (University College London)

*Selection and Loss: Reconstructing One Part of Epicurean Cosmology*

I wish to take one fragmentary text – from Book 2 of Epicurus’ *On Nature* (cols. 1–7 Leone) – and consider two questions connected with it: [1] what we have lost, and what stands behind it (especially in relation to the early doxographical tradition); and [2] what is selected from it in Lucretius’ rendering in Book 2 of his poem *DRN*. My focus will thus serve as a case-study that harnesses the themes and questions explored in the first two papers.

The opening papyrological fragments of *On Nature* Book 2 (cols. 1–7) contain a discussion of Epicurus’ introduction of worlds (*kosmoi*). In particular, they seem to outline some points of difference between the worlds. However, we cannot clearly grasp what these points of difference were, and the epitomization of this part of *On Nature* Book 2 in Epicurus *Ep. Hdt.* 45 does not take us substantially further.

We are thus confronted with a problem that stems squarely from issues of selection and loss in the transmission of our Epicurean sources. To exemplify these themes, I wish to advance a new reconstruction of the cosmological section of *On Nature* Book 2. A later scholion (*Ep*. *Hdt.* 73) says that Epicurus discussed the different shapes of the worlds in Book 12 of *On Nature.* This is a tantalising datum that we cannot corroborate with any primary evidence. Indeed, I wish to argue that Epicurus’ main discussion of other worlds probably belonged in Book 2, not Book 12. I will present this case using not only the fragmentary evidence of *On Nature*, but also supplementary evidence from Lucretius (2.1023–1089), Cicero (*ND* 1.23–24), and the arrangement of subjects in doxography (Aetius 2.1–5).
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**Session 2b) Achilles Between War and Love: Memory of Euripides’ *Skyrioi* in Antiquity (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Francesco Moles (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”)

*Eroismo arcaico negli Sciri di Euripide*

[*Archaic Heroism in The Lost Skyrioi by Euripides*]

The mythical episode of Achilles on Skyros gained a noteworthy diffusion in the Hellenistic and imperial age, as attested by various sources largely depending on a lost euripidean play, the *Skyrioi*, of which we only have a few fragments left belonging to indirect tradition. These records let us recognise in the story a path of initiation to heroism based on the ‹‹Withdrawal and Return›› epic pattern, also traceable in similar episodes. Symptomatic are frr. 683a Kn. (belonging to the *Skyrioi*) and 880 Kn. (among the *incertarum fabularum fragmenta*, but likely to be attributed to the *Skyrioi*), ascribable to the end of the play and still recalling epic values. This paper aims to demonstrate how Euripides proposed in Achilles an archaic model of heroism by means of a comparison with the Helen of 412, where we can trace a variation on the same epic pattern revealing the historical and cultural gap between the two plays. In the Helen, the tragedian outlines in the lead a new heroic model, based on *sophia* and *logos*, as well as on the refusal of weapons. However, the utopian nature of this model clearly surfaces in the debated ending of the play, when Helen, finally reunited with Menelaus, causes a new war and returns to the archaic values with a language similar to the two mentioned fragments, implicitly stating the impossible realisation of such a modern heroic paradigm. It will also be argued if and how this could be considered an ideological proof supporting the dating of the play in a period at least preceding to the Peloponnesian War.

Elly Polignano (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”)

*Un esempio di eroismo erotico: la controversa questione dell'Epitalamio di Achille e Deidamia*

[*Achilles as a Hero of Love: The Controversial Case of the Epithalamium of Achilles and Deidameia by Bion of Smyrna*]

This fragmentary poem raises many questions in relation to its attribution, its genre, its plot and, above all, its critical interpretation. Nevertheless, it brings with it an important and original contribution to the traditional image of Achilles on Skyros, as it occurs in Euripides’ *Skyrioi*: the Trojan hero is here presented as a real man of love, who chooses his life next to Deidameia instead of fighting as he is supposed to do. In a perfect bucolic frame, Bion puts Sapphic words in Achilles’ mouth, shows us a new parodic image of Paris as one of Theocritus’ shepherds, brings out the conflicting τόπος of war and peace, courage and love, death and life. Due to its allusions to Theocritus, Sappho and Bion himself, the work has been ascribed to Bion or one of his pupils, but the question is still pressing and open. For instance, many scholars argue that, since the Theocritean *Epithalamium of Helen and Menelaus* (*Id*. 18) also contained mythological characters, this work must be considered Theocritean as well. Another issue is caused by the attribution of this poem to a specific genre because it has none of the features of the archaic lyric ἐπιθαλάμιον, even though the Bucolic sylloge in two manuscripts of the Laurentian family suggests the title ̓Επιθαλάμιος Αχιλλέως καὶ Δηιδαμείας for it. Thus, there are many unsolved questions about this poem that can irreparably change our point of view on this matter, especially considering that most of the “epithalamium” is lost.

Enrica Aglaia Milella (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”)

*Il mito di Achille a Sciro in Ovidio fra tradizione e innovazione*

[*Reception of Achilles on Skyros’ Myth in Ovid*]

The myth of Achilles on Skyros had a limited circulation in the archaic and classical period of the Greek history. However, it surely had a wide dissemination afterwards, probably in the version of this mythological episode that Euripides portrayed in his lost *Skyrioi.* Most likely, Ovid knew this tragedy and used it as a pattern in some sections of two of his major works, i.e. *Ars Amatoria* and *Metamorphoses*, in the description of Achilles during the time spent on Skyros, before attending the Trojan War*.* In *Ars* I 679-702 Achilles stands out as an erotic model for the audience. He is dressed up as a woman and he is busy spinning (the very same activity Achilles is doing in fr. 683a Kn. attributed to Euripides’ play) while he’s on Skyros, but the moment Deidamia enters Achilles’ bed, he finds his virility again and forces the princess to lie down with him. And shortly after, she falls in love with the hero, captured by his beauty prior to any heroic strength. Whilst, in *Met.* XIII 162-176, Odysseus refers to the episode while he is delivering a speech aimed at winning in the dispute over Achilles’ armour. Odysseus claims that Achilles dropped the distaff and abandoned women’s clothing, Skyros and Deidamia thanks to Odysseus’ cleverness. Therefore, he believes the Greeks won the war, primarily, thanks to him, taking into his own hands all of Achilles’ credit. Ultimately, one of the most meaningful characteristics of Ovid as a poet is to be a relentless innovator in the approach to the mythological tradition and hence, he bends Achilles’ character to his own purposes in both of the cited works.

**1st Poster Session: 14.30–15.00**

Silvia Onori (Università degli Studi di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale)

*Un poeta 'gorgiano': ossimori e paradossi nei frammenti gnomici di Agatone*

[*A ‘Gorgiastic*[[1]](#footnote-1)*’Poet: Oxymorons and Paradoxes in Agathon’s Gnomic Fragments*]

In *Rhet.* 2.21 Aristotle notes that a γνώμη, to be defined as such, must respond to two main contents criteria: forms of generalization and references to convenient or inconvenient human behavior. In this regard Most underlines that many examples of γνῶμαι quoted by Aristotle belong to the tragedy, particularly to Euripidean drama. However, it is not proposed here to reflect on the maxims disseminated in the Euripidean tragedies but on the γνῶμαι transmitted from the fragments of a poet only partly known: Agathon. Agathon’s aphorisms have sometimes been judged inconsistent and considered mere rhetorical virtuosities, when indeed, as Wright[[2]](#footnote-2) rightly says, the poet really had something to say. I would like to focus on fr. 12 Snell that reads as follows: ‘If I tell the truth, I will not make you happy;/but if I make you happy at all, I will not tell the truth’. Here the motto ‘the truth hurts’ is synthesized in chiastic and epigrammatic form: the purity of truth is in antithesis to the pleasure of its content and remains deliberately ambiguous whether it is good to tell the truth while injuring the addressee or secret it and invent a lie. It is impossible to determine to which drama or character the fragment belongs, but it is worth noting that the paradox portrayed in fr. 12 is peculiar to ἄγγελος (see particularly: Aesch. *Ag.*620-5; Soph. *Trach.*369-74; *Ant.*1192-5) and μάντις characters (see Eur. *Phoen.*954-9), often and unwillingly ambassadors of bad truths. So, I propose to reconsider what simply seems like a typical pun of Agathon and to hypothesize - not being able to contextualize the text more specifically because of its fragmentary form - that it might refer to the distinctive speaking of messengers and seers in Greek tragedy.
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Sara López-Maroto Quiñones (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

*The Tractatus de Sphaera of Sacrobosco in the Beinecke MS 556*

The *Tractatus de Sphaera*, composed in the 1230s in four books by the great professor of the University of Paris, Johannes de Sacrobosco, was the textbook every student used for basic astronomy concepts. For this reason, it is not surprising that there is a high number of manuscripts all over the world, most of them with commentaries, glosses and scholars’ notes. In fact, I have found more than 130 manuscripts between the XIII-XV centuries; besides, in Thorndike’s edition (1949) 18 more manuscripts are included, to which more than 200 printed editions (Gingerich 2015: 101-102) and translations (Crowter *et alii* 2015) should be added. Thus, the most recent Latin edition of the *Sphaera* was made by Thorndike. In this book (Thorndike 1949: 73-74) a beautiful manuscript is described, which is named T, owned by Henry C. Taylor of New York. It is dated in 1281, so the importance of the codex is unquestionable since it was written only fifty years after the original and it is a substantial part in the textual transmission. Moreover, Thorndike remarks he could not see this manuscript until his edition was already finished. Pitifully, while I was searching it for my own edition of the book IV of the *Tractatus*, I found that Sylla and McVaugh (1997: 61) said this codex was in an unknown location nowadays. However, when I found out that Taylor donated a great number of his manuscripts to the Yale University, I started looking for the codex in their catalogues. Finally, I can ensure I have found the manuscript: the Beinecke MS 556, which contains mathematical, computistical, astronomical and astrological treatises; among them, the three most known Sacrobosco’s works: Sphaera, *Compotus* and *Algorismus*. In the manuscript, books of Johannes Campanus of Novara, Gerardus Sablonetanus and Alfraganus are also included.
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Filippo Trotta (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”)

*Lost and rediscovered texts: some notes about a medieval epigraph of Castellaneta (TA)*

This presentation concerns the analysis and interpretation of the text of a dedicatory epigraph, walled inside the church of Santa Maria Assunta in Castellaneta (Taranto) and dated between the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century. The text has been transmitted to us indirectly by the chronicles of the Dominican friar Serafino Montorio at the beginning of the 18th century, however in the course of time every traces of it was lost, until it was recovered among the materials of reuse of the church itself, during the restoration works conducted by architect Corrado Bucci Morichi in the early seventies of the last century. A first analysis carried out by Bucci Morichi and prof. Roberto Caprara revealed how the inscription referred to the decoration of the building, which originates in the year 1300. The deciphering of the text turned out to be obscure, so much so as to force Caprara to affirm «unclear text, which needs linguistic and palaeographic explanations». A recent study conducted by the autor of the present abstract, in addition to providing an unprecedented palaeographic and linguistic analysis, has tried to suggest an alternative reading of the dedication, in an attempt to add new elements to the understanding of an epigraph still full of interesting – though unread – clues.
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Maggiore 1910 = F. P. Maggiore, *Memorie storiche di Castellaneta*, Taranto 1910.

Mastrobuono 1943 = E. Mastrobuono, *Castellaneta e il suo territorio dalla preistoria al Medioevo*, Città di Castello-Bari 1943.

Montorio 1715 = S. Montorio, *Zodiaco di Maria. Ovvero le dodici province del regno di Napoli*, Napoli 1715.

Cristiana Roffi (Universität zu Köln – Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna)

*The Circulation of National Identity Between Tradition and Innovation: The Barbarian Stereotype in Tacitus’ Germania*

The aim of this poster is an attempt to analyze the re-appropriation of Tacitus’ Germania, a short monograph on German ethnography written in 98 A.D., and to look at the ways in which traditions of studying the text have undergone transformation in later periods. The book has a long legacy: rediscovered in the 15th century, it was read widely by German humanists in the 16th. In the following centuries, the *aureus libellus* — or “golden booklet”— continued to fascinate readers who considered Tacitus the authoritative word on Germanic culture. In order to examine how Tacitus’ writing provided fodder for future conceptions of the “ideal” German people, the analysis of the Latin texts, compared to the Nazi misinterpretation, will highlight the following specificities:

- the theme of racial purity and the virtues (honor, fidelity) used by Tacitus to describe the Germans, in contrast to the corrupted Roman imperial society (the integrity of the Germans as portrayed by Tacitus had immense appeal to the National Socialist hierarchy in the 1920s and 1930s). A special attention will be given to the depiction of the tribes, described as descending from an ‘earth-born god’ and thus deeply rooted to the territory;

- diplomatic exchanges between Rome and communities from the North, which could have been utilized by Tacitus for his book (Roman commanders produced unpublished memoirs of their campaigns along the lines of Caesar’s *Commentaries*, which circulated in Roman literary circles).

Finally, the suggested relationships between tradition and transformation of Tacitus’ *Germania* aim at confirming that the text was popular among nationalists in the 19th century and became particularly dear in the 20th to Nazi leaders who adopted Tacitus’ themes to further their political and racial agendas.

**Session 3: 15.00-16.30**

**Session 3a) Selection and Authorship in Greek Historiography (Sala I)**

Gastón Javier Basile (Universidad de Buenos Aires)

*Historia: the fragments of early Greek prose-writing tradition*

The Greek prose-writing tradition prior to or contemporary with the circulation of Herodotus’ *logoi* has been for the most part lost or preserved in a fragmentary state. However, despite the lack of extant material, *historia* –understood in a broad sense– seems to have been a very popular form of collecting, recording and disseminating knowledge on a variety of topics in early Greece. Though scholars have grouped these prose writers by different criteria and given them assorted names (*polymaths*, *logographoi*, *histores*, etc.), these writers can all be said to have produced some form of *historia*, ranging from natural philosophy, medical treatises, geographies, accounts of foreign travel and people often involving the record of wonders (*thomasia*) to the kind of discourse about the human past we now narrowly count as “histories”.

Drawing on Herodotus’ allusions to the incompetence of his Ionian predecessors (Hdt. 2.143; 5. 36, 125; 6. 137; also, Thuc. 1.97), a well-known passage in Thucydides’ Archaeology (1.21.1) and Dionysius of Hallicarnassus’ standard discussion of some of these early prose writer (loosely referred to as *archaioi sungrapheis*) in his treatise on Thucydides (Thuc. 5. 13–15), it is the aim of this paper to account for the general neglect and disparagement of these early prose writers in classical Greece. Aside from the hazards of textual transmission and the political weight attached to certain traditions over others, I wish two address three factors that may have brought about the gradual demise of the early prose writing tradition among the learned. Indeed, the extant commentaries describe the logographers as defective or undeveloped on three levels: a) their truth claims; b) their style; c) and their methodology. Dionysius’ commentary, though far removed from the sources and belonging to a different cultural milieu, may shed light on a number of intellectual traditions that flourished throughout the fifth century BC which may be seen as detrimental to the circulation and preservation of these early prose texts.
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Stefano Gioacchino (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”)

*Le Ἀλεξάνδρου Πράξεις di Callistene di Olinto: contraddizioni e problemi di attribuzione*

[*Callisthenes’ Deeds of Alexander, a Problem of Authenticity*]

Callisthenes of Olynthus, the official historian of Alexander’s expedition into Asia, was one of the main opponents of the Macedonian king’s orientalizing policies and behaviour. Despite that, his work *The Deeds of Alexander*, only known through fragments, presents a flattering character that contrasts with the author’s reputation as opponent of Alexander. This apparent contradiction in Callisthenes has sparked debate since antiquity. One of the first who noticed it was the philsopher Philodemus who in the first century AD wrote ‘If on the one hand in his historical writings he deified Alexander, on the other he opposed to prostrate forward him’. Modern scholars have also generally failed to provide a credible explanation for this contradiction; for example, in the latest commentary on the works of Callisthenes, Rzepka (*BNJ*, 2016, comm. F.31) uses very similar words, writing that the historian “authored works showing Alexander as a superhero adored by forces of nature and animals but in real life opposed similar honors being paid to Alexander by Greeks and Macedonians”. More recently, the more distinctively flattering features in Callisthenes’ corpus have been considered unauthentic and explained as the result of textual interventions by later authors and a *damnatio memoriae* possibly planned and developed by scholars at Alexandria during the Lagid Kingdom, immediately after Alexander’s death (Howe, 2013). It was in fact useful for the Ptolemaic Dinasty to justify its power in Egypt- where sovereigns had always been considered gods- through a connection with a deity (Badian, 1968, pp.256-58). And it is not a case that the fragments suspected of subsequent interventions- that I will consider during my presentation- are those in which the intention to deify Alexander is more evident: *FGrHist* 124, F.31 and *FGrHist*

124, F14a.
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Gabriella Rubulotta (Université de Strasbourg)

*Callisseno. Fortuna di un uomo maledetto*

[*Callixenus. Shadows of a Damned Man*]

During the notorious trial in the wake of the battle of Arginusae, Callixenus was responsible for the death sentence of the generals who failed to rescue shipwreck victims[[3]](#footnote-3).

The people of Athens soon repented of the too severe punishment and Callixenus, hated by everyone, was left to die of starvation. The literature of the Imperial age appears to be particularly fascinated by this story and this miserable character. The “Arginusae” theme seems to have been a popular school subject[[4]](#footnote-4). Unfortunately, only very few texts have survived. A lost declamation of Ælius Aristides was dedicated to Callixenus and Apsines quoted a speech on the “burial of the ten generals”[[5]](#footnote-5). *P.* *Yale* II 105 delivered an excerpt of a speech about a trial of a general who could not bring home the dead after a naval battle[[6]](#footnote-6). A very similar subject is repeated in a sketch for a declamation whose author is Sopatros[[7]](#footnote-7). Some allusions witness the double paradigmatic tenor of this episode: on one side, the Arginusae trial is often mentioned as an exemplary circumstance where Socrates showed his rectitude; on the other side, Callixenus, punished afterwards, became a symbol of wickedness. Yet, the figure of Callixenus knew an independent reception of that of Socrates. Starting from the 1st century BC, a very negative tradition on the accuser of the Arginusae generals arises. Characterized as a sycophant, his name is sometimes associated with those, more popular, of Anytus and Meletus. Through Aristides’ and Hermogenes’ scholiasts and other evidences, a portrait of Callixenus has risen to the surface. My paper aims to reconstruct this literary theme, the classical sources employed and his multiple variations in the Imperial age.

**Session 3b) Lost Books in Late Antiquity (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Marco Cristini (Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa)

*Oblivio non natura nobis venit: Cassiodoro e la perduta Gothorum historia*

[*Oblivio non natura nobis venit: Cassiodorus and the Lost Gothic History*]

Cassiodorus wrote a *Gothic History* in twelve books, dealing with kings who had been long hidden in oblivion, in the words of a famous letter of the *Variae*. Ironically, Cassiodorus’ *Gothic History* suffered the same fate as its protagonists, since it was lost shortly after the middle of the sixth century. It is known only thanks to an epitome written by Jordanes (the so-called *Getica*). The reasons of this loss have never been fully investigated, because it is generally believed that there would have been little interest in preserving the history of the Goths after the end of their kingdom. Cassiodorus’ *Variae*, however, survived and the same is true for his *Chronica*, an historical work written on behalf of the Gothic court, and for Jordanes’ *Getica*. My paper aims to show that the loss of the *Gothic History* was by no means accidental: it was decided by Cassiodorus himself, who did not want to circulate a book written mainly to please the Gothic kings and who, above all, was not interested any more, after his conversion, in a work serving specific political purposes. He preserved the *Variae* because they were a source of epistolary formulas and his chronicle because it helped to understand Biblical chronologies, but he hoped that his *Gothic History* would fall into oblivion, since it bore witness to a period when he was involved in secular politics, sometimes acting like a mere client of Gothic patrons. Oblivion is not sent by nature, but it is a consequence of the Original Sin: Cassiodorus, when writing this sentence in his *Explanation of the Psalms*, was not thinking only of the Bible, but perhaps also of his *Gothic History*, which was soon to be hidden by a merciful oblivion.

Collin Miles Hilton (Bryn Mawr College)

*Porphyry Lost between Greek and Latin Neoplatonism: Macrobius and Olympiodorus on the Distinction of Poetic and Philosophical Myth*

The interpretation of myth was central to Neoplatonic exegesis, whether to discern metaphysical insight from the scandalous episodes in Homer, such as the deception of Zeus, or to explain Plato’s own imagistic narratives, such as the myth of Er. The 6th CE century Neoplatonist Olympiodorus clearly explicates the distinction between two sorts of myth, and how they must be read: poetic myth has the potential of harming readers who dwells on the surface, but revulsion can drive them to seek the higher truth; philosophical myth cannot pose harm, but might not propel them beneath the surface (*In Gorg.* §46.4-6). Jackson’s authoritative work on Olympiodorus’ interpretation of myth claims that this distinction is unique in the extant evidence, baring “disappointing” parallels from Proclus a century earlier, among others (1998:291n878; 1995:279n8-10). I argue, however, that this distinction was already formulated by Porphyry, Plotinus’ student; but his role in the history of this idea has been forgotten, due to the categorization of Macrobius, the 5th century CE Latin Neoplatonist, as a part of the early medieval canon. His commentary on Cicero’s *Somnium Scipionis* includes the same distinction between poetic and philosophical myth, as a part of defense against the Epicurean Colotes’ criticism that the myth of Er uses fictions like poetry (I.2.6-12). Porphyry is widely considered a principal source in the Macrobian scholarship—e.g. Stahl (1952:24-39), Flamant (1977:170), Armisen-Marchetti (2001:LVIII-LVIX)—and Proclus explicitly attributes his, in many ways similar, exposition and refutation of Colotes to Porphyry (*In Remp.* II.105.23ff. = frg. 182 Smith)—see Gersh (1986:520-521). The distinction between philosophical and poetic myth does not occur in Proclus’ testimony, but the parallels makes it likely that Porphyry originally formulated it in the context of defending the myth of Er, perhaps in the work entitled περὶ τοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν, on which see Wilberding (2011:123-124). Olympiodorus’ innovation seems, characteristically, to be further drawing out the ethical ramifications of Porphyry’s idea. Yet apparently because of this division in the corpora, Porphyry’s role in this part of the development of Neoplatonic hermeneutics has been forgotten from the standard account.
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Silvia Santomauro (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”): *Storie di libri e di eresie: il perduto Commento alla Genesi di Origene ed il P.Giss. II 17* [*Tales of books and heresies: Origen’s lost*Commentary on Genesis*and*P.Giss. *II 17*]

This paper aims to investigate and deepen Origen's *Commentary on Genesis* and its cultural environment. This lost exegetical work was, probably, focused on *Genesis* 1,1-4,24 and it is preserved only in a few fragments. This commentary, that Origen started to write in Alexandria, along with the luckiest *De Principiis*, is focused on the issue of the *origin of Man*, a problem which was then debated by Christians, Jews and pagans; in particular, his exegesis of the biblical text is based on the doctrine (that was influenced by the Platonic philosophy) of the pre-existence of souls, that the apostolic Church contrasted. The paper will particularly focus on *P.Giss*. II 17, a fragment from a papyrus codex that comes from *Hermopolis Magna* and is dated to the late third or early fourth century A.D.: it is the oldest papyrus that scholars connect to Origen’s exegetical work on *Genesis*, whose authorship is currently widely debated.

**Session 4: 17.00-19.00**

**Session 4a) The Transmission of Greek Poetry (Sala I)**

Jacopo Khalil (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

*Recovering the first Homeric hymn to Dionysus*

The first Homeric hymn to Dionysus (as edited by West 2003) is not a classic case of lost text later re-discovered, but it rather resembles an original patchwork of material coming from different sources and different times.

Fr. D is the only fragment which derives for sure from the collection of Homeric hymns as we know it, and it was brought to light only with the discovery of a manuscript in 18th century.

Fr. A, on the other hand, comes from three quotations of Diodorus (who attributes these lines to ‘the poet’ or explicitly to Homer) and from sch. A. R. 2. 1211. In 1992 Hurst published a papyrus fragment (*P. Genav.* inv. 432) who contained the text corresponding to fr. A 2-10, plus some extra-lines. West then recognized in lines 11-4 the same verses as Orph. *A.* 1199-1202.

Fr. B is a single hexameter line found in Athenaeus, who is quoting from Crates (fr. 109). The grammarian introduced the quotation with the statement that it comes from ‘the archaic hymns’, and Allen proposed to ascribe this line to our Homeric hymn. Another hemistich, quoted and ascribed to Homer in the *Suda*, has been tentatively connected with our hymn by Allen on the basis of its Dionysiac content.

Finally, fr. C (*P. Oxy.* 670) is the most puzzling of all. It consists of 26 piecemeal lines that were published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1904, and then re-edited several times. The fragments, unfortunately, got lost by 1973. From its publication to West’s edition the lines of fr. C have been variously ascribed either to the Hellenistic period or to a Homeric hymn (the one in the M codex or another one completely lost).

The ascription of fr. C to the first Homeric hymn is crucial in establishing the hymnic narrative. In my talk I will first analyze what are the criteria upon which these fragments have been edited together; secondly, I will investigate the possibilities that the attribution of fr. C to our hymn opens up.
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Leonardo Arpino (Università degli Studi di Trento)

*Lost in transmission: Th. III 104 e le varianti “rapsodiche” dell'Inno omerico ad Apollo*

[*The Homeric Hymn to Apollo: Lost Transcripts and Variant Readings*]

The commonly held view, notably expressed by Allen (1936) and Càssola (1975), that the *Homeric Hymns* were relatively little known in antiquity, has recently been challenged in a volume byVergados, Faulkner and Schwab (2016) on their reception*.* It was, in fact, a long-standingcontradiction that a supposedly unimportant *corpus* was nonetheless quoted and imitated byauthorities like Thucydides and Callimachus. But this opinion was held on solid ground: the text ofthe *Hymns* is a markedly unpolished one, with inconsistencies and repetitions attributed to the earlyrhapsodic phase of its transmission: that they were never emended was deemed impossible for acommonly read text.

In this paper, I wish to assess the evidence for the existence, down to the 5th century BCE, of concurrent transcripts of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo.* The word "transcript" is to be understood in the technical sense of a written record generated in connection with an oral performance, as in Nagy (1996). Such lost transcripts left traces in the subsequent tradition; they are clearly detectable for the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* via the comparison of the manuscript tradition with the extensive quotations in Thucydides' third book, and within the manuscript tradition itself in the *marginalia* of

the ***x*** family. In so doing, I reject the view that the text of the *Hymn* transmitted by our medieval tradition is a reflection of an actual performance, and I propose that doublets and variant readings found both in the manuscript tradition and in ancient quotations are best understood as traces of lost transcripts rather than "rhapsodic" modifications of an already authoritative text.
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Anna Lucia Furlan (King’s College London)

*In Search of Orpheus: Selection and Loss in the Fragmentary Orphic corpus*

The Orphic literary *corpus* stands out for its extremely complex fragmentary state, with the name of Orpheus being one of the only consistent unifying elements. Starting from the Classical period it is possible to distinguish, among the literature ascribed or linked to Orpheus, between cosmogonic, theogonic and cosmological poems, several *Hieroi Logoi* containing doctrinal elements whose features we partly ignore, and magical texts containing rites and *formulae* inspired by popular formulations and characterised by a propitiatory purpose. The aim of this paper is to examine how the fragmentary state of the Orphic literary *corpus* influences the study of the Orphic religious stream, focusing on one specific theme – that is a possible Orphic henotheistic phenomenon. Some of the various and different sources ascribable or linked to Orphism present a divine figure which acquires the status of a ‘one’ god – separate and complete, with features of oneness and (to some extent) uniqueness as in henotheistic formulations. In this paper I will take into consideration some of these sources, namely a few specific Orphic fragments: the best-known Orphic *Hymn to Zeus* as well as frr. 416 (298 K.) belonging to the lost Orphic work ‘Μικρότερος Κρατήρ’ (*Shorter Krater*), 543 F (239 K.) attributed to a lost Dionysian Orphic Poem, 620 F (299 K.) from the lost Orphic ‘Ὅρκοι’ (*Oaths*) and 691 F (248 K.) included in the ‘Διαθηκαί’ (*Orphic Testaments*). After having analysed their main literary features, I will examine how and why these fragments survived through time and were selected by later authors such as the compilers of the *De monarchia* and *Cohortatio ad Graecos,* Cyril, Clement, Theodoret, Eusebius and the *Theosophia Tubigensis.* Indeed, I will show how in Late Antiquity apologists selected, handed down and filtered these texts belonging to the fragmentary Orphic literary tradition through specific apologetic strategies.

Francesco Boccasile (Università degli Studi Roma Tre)

*Teognide rivoluzionario e Teognide moderato. Per un’interpretazione della tradizione (socratica) di Teognide tra lotta, amnistia e amnesia*

[*Revolutionary Theognis and Moderate Theognis. For an Interpretation of the (Socratic) Tradition of Theognidea between Struggle, Amnesty and Amnesia*]

«In the difference of minds is grounded the diversity of actions» (Th. III 10, 1, trans. by Th. Hobbes). Between mind and action there are words, that is the mind in action and therefore the most appreciable political fact. Through a semantic analysis of the political language, above all in relation to some catch-words and slogans, we will ll be able to see how a fracture in the Athenian aristocracy produced an inner-aristocratic struggle, culminated in the revolutionary events of the 411 and 404 BCE. Theognis was indifferently the poet of democratic aristocrats and oligarchic aristocrats, so his verses and those one sealed by his name were mutually used by the opponents to attack or justify each position and proposition, according to the dialogic structure of some conspicuous part of Theognis’ collection. The uncompromising Theognis was advocated – in a sense, *embodied* – by Socrates and his fellows. But after the fall of the Thirty, since when Athenian democracy would be no more openly challenged, circumstances advised caution, and the anti-democratic Theognis started to rarefy: the civic conciliation and the defense of the «master of tyrants» finally required moderation.

**Session 4b) How scholia Saved Ancient Literature (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Chiara Gennari Santori (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

*Citazioni esiodee negli scolî a Omero: varianti testuali e tracce di esegesi antica*

[*Hesiodic Quotations in the Scholia to Homer: Textual Variants and Traces of Ancient Exegesis*]

The scholiographic *corpora* contain frequent quotations of authors different from the one commented. Although the transmission process has caused heavy data loss, through the analysis of form and function of the citations it is possible to obtain useful information concerning both the author involved and the ancient scholarship. Among the numerous quotations from Hesiod in the scholia to Homer, I propose to examine two exegetical notes in which the text shows interesting variants and receives particular explanations. Sch. T ad *Il*. 12. 5 b1 (*ex*.) discusses the location of the ditch with respect to the Achaean wall. To illustrate the possible value of ἀμφί as an indication of spatial extension, it is quoted without further specification *Th*. 127, the famous and discussed line which narrates the generation of Uranus by Gaia: the text of the scholium has ἵνα μιν περὶ πᾶσαν ἐέργοι (“so that he might enclose her totally”), while other sources have πάντα καλύπτοι (“cover, hide”). If the scholium does not allow to formulate hypotheses on the genesis and transmission of the variant, it is neverthless possible to reflect on the exemplary function of the quotation and its relevance to the context. Sch. T ad *Il*. 22. 349c1[*ex*. (*Hrd*. + *ex.*?)]provides a more articulate exegesis of the quotation. With reference to the words with which Achilles refuses any ransom for Hector’s body, the scholium analyzes the ἀνάγνωσις and the meaning of εἰκοσινήριτα (“twenty-time countless” or “twentyfold” [ransom]). Among the examples supporting the etymology from ἐρίζω (with the probable meaning of “to be equal”), we find the quotation of *Th*. 240, in which the Nereids are defined μεγήριτα: the epithet is also glossed as θεαῖς ἐρίζοντα. Other ancient sources provide a similar explanation, with reference to a beauty contest, but they also attest the variant μεγήρατα (“lovable”). The scholium preserves therefore a trace of the ancient discussion on this difficult word.
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Enrico Santachiara (University of Exeter)

*Schol. 30 al Timone di Luciano: nuovo indizio della corruzione di Cleone dal decimo libro dei Philippika di Teopompo?*

[*Scholium on Lucian’s Timon 30 Rabe: New Evidence of Cleon’s Bribery from Theopompus’ Philippika X?*]

Several fragments of Theopompus’ work are preserved in the scholiastic *corpora* dating back to the Byzantine Era, especially those on Aristophanes and Lucian. For instance, the *scolium* on Lucian’s *Timon*30, which the focus of my paper will be placed on, is the source of three fragments from *Philippika* X, the book concerning the Athenian demagogues (*FGrH*115 F92, F 95, F 96a). In particular, after reporting an episode that shows the annoying arrogance of Cleon towards the Assembly(*FGrH*115 F 92), the *scholium* tells that a letter Cleon wrote to the citizens of Mytilen proves his extreme corruption. This letter would reveal the Lesbians bribed him with ten talents to convince the Athenian people to repeal the decree sanctioning the death penalty and slavery for the Mytileans themselves after their insurrection(427 BC).Thucydides–briefly cited at the end of this report (οὕτω Θουκυδίδης) – cannot be considered as the source of this epistolary document, for he does not treat similar episodes concerning Cleon, but just the assembly discussion about the destiny of Mytilene (Thuc. 3. 36ff.). I aim, therefore, to thoroughly analyse this apparently anonymous historical account –not studied by modern scholars yet –and, by means of specific lexical elements here present, advance the X book of Theopompus’ *Philippika* as its possible origin. Moreover, the result of such analysis would match the little of Theopompus that remains about Cleon. Indeed, one of the other two fragments concerning that politician (F 94) treats the prosecution brought against him by the Athenian Knights: it is stated that he received money from the islanders to convince the Assembly to relieve them of their war contributions. Consequently, the report of Cleon’s letter could therefore aid us in reconstructing his critical profile provided by Theopompus.
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Marco Pelucchi (Università degli Studi di Milano)

*Pessimi poeti: tradizione antica e criteri di selezione*

[*Pessimi poetae: Ancient Tradition and Selection Criteria*]

Authors, whose works are available to us just in a fragmentary form, raise a most central issue: why are they preserved only in fragments? With respect to some poets it is possible to find an answer in their reputation as *pessimi poetae*, already attested in antiquity. I intend to approach this topic by considering a revealing passage in Philodemus’ *De Poematis* (*Tractatus A*, col. XXV Sbordone, from book 2 in Janko’s reconstruction, from 3 in Dorandi’s), which has been curiously neglected by the critics. There, models of good poetry are opposed to examples of bad poetry: for instance, Euripides in opposed to Carcinus and Cleaenetus for what concern tragedy, and Homer to Choerilus and Anaximenes with respect to epic poetry. It is not hard to recognise in their bad reputation the reason why their works have not been transmitted to us. Carcinus, Cleaenetus, Choerilus and Anaximenes represent in fact a blatant case of literature preserved only in fragments.

In this paper, I aim therefore to consider the tradition related to the *pessimi poetae*, starting from Philodemus’ passage. I shall have this achieved by elaborating on their bad reputation, which would be impossible to reconstruct without Philodemus’ testimony. For Cleaenetus (*TrGF* 84), I will reconsider a fragment by Alexis (fr. 268 K.-A.). I will then focus on the tradition about Carcinus: in this case, it is necessary to establish if the author cited by Philodemus is Carcinus I (*TrGF* 21) or rather Carcinus II (70). Lastly, I will dwell on Choerilus (from Iasus: *SH* 333) and Anaximenes (from Lampsacus: *SH* 31). Both are to be identified with the homonymous poets that accompanied Alexander the Great on his Asiatic expedition. Even if Horace corroborates Choerilus’ bad reputation, details are to be added to his depiction; also for Anaximenes new evidences need to be taken into account.

Thanks to such a reconstruction of the tradition concerned with the *pessimi poetae*, it is possible to focus on an extremely early selection in the transmission of ancient literature, otherwise ignored. Thanks to Philodemus’ passage we can understand how the neglect concerning a number of poets, far from being casual, reflects the standpoint adopted by ancient critics.
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*The criteria of Eustathios for the selection and the compilation of the poetic quotations in his commentary on the book VI of the Iliad*

The particular method of Eustathios in his philological work on Homer is demonstrated by the title itself of his compilatory and technical commentary: *Parekbolai*. He selects and compiles different extracts, remarks and notes on Homer such as: ancient scholia, poetic quotations, historical, geographical, rhetorical and philosophical passages, but also grammatical, lexicographical, morphological and etymological remarks in order to explain the Homeric text in the 12th century. The selection and the compilation of all of these different extracts compose an autonomous, personal, continuous, and independent commentary on the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad.*

The objective of our paper is to present Eustathios’ criteria for the selection of the poetic quotations in his commentary on the book VI of the *Iliad.* We attempt to isolate all the poetic quotations attested in his text, we classify the poets (archaic, lyric, tragic poetry etc.), we devise the quotations in four categories: exact and inexact quotations, adapted quotations and allusions and we make a detailed comparison between the poetic quotations and their byzantine version in the text of Eustathios. Then we attempt to define their function in his byzantine commentary and his personal criteria for the selection and the compilation of all these different poetic sources, such as the grammatical and the linguistic elements of the poetic quotations. Finally, we explain the criteria of his selection by integrating his method in the pedagogical and didactic frame of the education of the 12th century.

**Friday, 21st December:**
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**Session 5a) Lost Literary Texts *in papyris reperta* (Sala I)**

Daniela Cagnazzo (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”)

*Testimonianze tragiche da frammenti papiracei. Il caso di P.Oxy. XX 2257*

[*Tragic Testimonies from Fragmentary Papyri. The Case of P.Oxy. XX 2257*]

Although no aeschylean *hypomnemata* have been preserved, the papyri have returned evidences of ancient scholarship: papyri with *marginalia* and *hypotheseis* of several lost tragedies (cfr. *P.Oxy.* 2252, 2255, 2256); so, it is difficult to make a comparison with the tradition of *scholia*, but it provides particular value for these ancient annotations. If the misery of papyrus notes could testify a lower fortune of Aeschylus compared to other dramatists, like Euripides, the discovery of scholar materials linked with lost tragedies denotes that his productions was still available during the first few centuries of Imperial Age, and the high quality of culture. The tracks of aeschylean scholarship, emerged from papyri (dated from I-III century AC), reflect the interest of the great work made by scholars in the Hellenistic Age; we can have an evidence thanks to *P.Oxy*. XX 2257 (II cent. A.C.), that shows a precious scholar product, based on different materials.

Lorenzo Sardone (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

*P.Ryl. I 58: uno strano testimone del De Corona di Demostene*

[*P.Ryl. I 58: A Strange Specimen of Demosthenes’ De Corona*]

*P.Ryl.* I 58 was published in 1911 by A.S. HUNT, in the first volume of *Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the John Rylands library*. This item is a quire of papyrus, that could be referred, on the paleographic evidence, to the late V century AD. It contains §§ 267-268, 274-275, 280-281, 286-287, 292-294, 297-298, 302-303, 308-309, 313-315, 320-321, 324, that is the final section of Demosthenes’ *De Corona*. As we can note from this prospectus, the oration text is not continuous, but it breaks off at the end of each page, not caring for periods, sentences and words division. These interruptions are not due to material damages suffered from the quire. Further, each page shows an unusual pagination, that goes from 1, to 11. At the end, on the last written page, we can read the subscription, with the double title of the oration (Ὑπὲρ Κτηϲιφῶντοϲ Περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου) and a closing *formula* (εὐτυχῶϲ τῶι γράψαντι μοι καὶ λαμβάνοντι καὶ ἀναγιγνώϲκοντι). The fact that the first page remains unwritten confirms that this quire would never have been part of a complete codex, containing all the oration text. So, the question is: what is this curious *specimen*? What is its function? *Editor princeps* thought it was a rhetorical exercise. Perhaps is possible a different reconstruction. In my opinion, *P.Ryl.* I 58 has been copied from a very damaged *antigraphus*, probably from single sheets of an old *codex disligatus*. So, it seems very notable that someone in Oxyrhynchus has copied a text with a such quantity of textual *lacunae*. This scribe, that could be identified with a scholar, found this old codex, read the final *subscription* with the name of Demosthenes and, understanding the importance of this text, prepared a copy, with a philological taste, that hides the unceasing regression of Greek culture in the Egypt of V century AD.
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Duccio Guasti (University of Cincinnati)

*Il P. Heid. 310 e l'horror vacui dell'anonimato*

[*‘The First Greek Anthologist’, ‘Cercidae, ut videtur, iambi’: The Horror Vacui of Anonymity*]

In the Hellenistic age there was a big revival of moral poetry in a (modernized) style and meter inspired to that of Hipponax: Phoenix as the first practitioner was followed by Callimachus, Herondas, Cercidas and others. To this poetic type belong also three fragmentary poems: two in the *P. Heid.* 310 G (together with a poem of Phoenix), and one partially attested in two other papyri, the *P. Lond.*155 verso and the *P. Bodl. ms. gr. class* f 1. The three fragments were first published by Gerhard in 1909. For a philologist it can be frustrating that good poetry remains anonymous. Consequently Knox (*The First Greek Anthologist*, 1923) conjectures (following impressions rather than proves) that it was part of a much larger anthology compiled by Cercidas himself, while Powell in the *Collectanea Alexandrina* (1925) identify Cercidas as the probable author, without further explanation. Knox himself will classify these verse as ‘Cercidea’ (poems in Cercidas’ alleged anthology, which in late antiquity were believed to have been written by Cercidas himself), publishing them as a continuum in his *Greek Choliambic Poets* (1929). All following editions of Cercidas (Diehl [1925, 1936, 1950], Livrea [1986], Lomiento [1993]) just ignore these poems without discussion. As far as I know, the question of the attribution has never been considered, except for Knox’ theory, which I think is based more on assumptions and suggestions than on observation of the facts. It is certain only that Cercidas used choliambic verse, as testified by the only line of the fr. 65 Lom. In my contribution I will discuss all the pros and contras of attributing these fragments to a known author vs. presenting them as anonymous.

**Session 5b) Selection and Loss in Athenaeus’ Work (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Benjamin Cartlidge (University of Liverpool)

*Remembering Loss, Dismembering Gain: Books and Individuals in Athenaeus*

Athenaeus is a difficult and contradictory author: both atomising and encyclopaedic, both scholarly and unreliable, he has stimulated different responses from readers throughout the ages. Modern dismissals of his work as encyclopaedic and compilatory have been increasingly challenged by work that sees the *Deipnosophists* from a literary perspective. This paper uses concepts drawn from cognitive theories of memory to explore the bookish world of the *Deipnosophists*.

Memory is a central motif of the *Deipnosophists* at a number of levels of the complex narrative, from the frame of the work, to the speeches of the sophists, and back again to the construction of the authorial voice. The paper begins by sketching a map of memory’s roles in Athenaeus’ narrative, seeking both to define its different functions and to explore places in which these functions are deliberately blurred. The interplay between memory and personal identity is key here: Athenaeus’ narrator’s identity, it is shown, works along different parameters to that of the individual sophists, yet the narrator’s memory is as fallible as theirs. Memory is dramatized as much by loss as by retention.

Furthermore, memory, in the form of recollection, is a vital link between epistemology and metaphysics for Plato, in turn an essential intertext for Athenaeus. While the presence of the *Symposium* requires less explanation, Athenaeus’ use of the *Phaedo* is less explored. But by exploring the interrelationship between death and memory in the figure of Ulpian – the deipnosophist by far the most concerned with the limits and the boundlessness of memory, yet whose knowledge, unlike Socrates’, will not grant him immortality - Athenaeus deepens the Platonic texture and the intellectual texture of his work.

The paper thus presents a central paradox in Athenaeus’ work, allying him with ludic elements of the Second Sophistic.

Ottavia Mazzon (Università degli Studi di Padova)

*Donne dimenticate e donne ricordate. Per una riflessione sulla versione epitomata del libro XIII di Ateneo*

[*«Forget you! And forget her too!». Choosing to Forget in the Epitome of Athenaeus’ Book 13*]

Byzantine culture has often been described as a «culture of the συλλογή». Throughout the whole millennial history of the Byzantine Empire, scholars prepared anthologies of both ancient poetry and prose, produced collections of excerpts, and composed several *epitomai* of classical works. In doing so, Byzantine scholars constantly toyed with the fine line between remembrance and forgetfulness, and many of their choices had a lasting impact on what has or has not survived of the classical literary heritage. More often than not, when they *opted* to consign a literary piece to *oblivio*n, it is known to us only through indirect tradition. Sometimes, however, we can still enjoy both versions of an ancient literary work, the complete one and the one in epitomized form. When this happens, we are in the position of evaluating the literary interests of the classical scholars of the Byzantine Empire and to try and understand their selection criteria for what was worth knowing in full and what was to be read as a compendium because it was too long or other reasons.

The *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus are one of these fortunate cases: the (almost) complete work has survived in Ms. *Marc. gr.* Z 447 (= 820), along with an epitome probably dated to the 11th century. Given the magnitude and the wide variety of topics in the *Deipnosophistae*, the epitome represents an exceptionally rich terrain for enquiring on the selection choices made by Byzantine scholars on what to keep and what to forget of classical literature. In particular, the analysis of Book 13, which is dedicated to women, can shed light on the kind of image of ancient women Byzantines were interested in preserving or *not* preserving. By comparing the complete and the epitomized version of Book 13 of the *Deipnosophistae*, my paper will aim to show the attitude of some Byzantine scholars towards ancient portraits of women, focusing on the information they chose to omit.
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*Athenaeus and the Epitome: History of a ‘Restoration’*

The *codex unicus* of Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistai*, the so-called *Marcianus* ‘A’ (IX saec. ex.), is heavily mutilated in the beginning and has some lacunas both in its middle and final part. Modern editions fill these material gaps thanks to a byzantine epitome of the work, perhaps based on the *Marcianus* before it was damaged. This is nevertheless the result of a work of ‘restoration’ of Athenaeus’ text which started already in the *Renaissance* and ended in early XVII century with Casaubon’s edition. This paper aims to discuss critically, from both a philological and an historical point of view, the different moments and ways in which the Epitome was used to recover the lost text of Athenaeus. Therefore, it focuses in particular on the restoring of two main material losses of the *Marcianus*: that of the beginning (*Ath*. 1-3.73a), and that of one entire quire of the 11th book (*Ath*. 11.781a-11.784d). The first issue concerns directly the discovery of the Epitome, that is of its primary manuscript source: the so-called ‘Vaticanus x’, now considered lost. Who found it and when had it been used for the first time to complete the main text? The answer lies in the bound between two *codices*, both of the end of the XV century, which show the restoring of the initial lacuna long before the printed edition of Mousouros: the *Laurentianus* Pl. 60.1, in hand of Demetrios Damilas, and the *Parisinus* 3056, mainly in hand of venetian humanist Ermolao Barbaro. The lacuna of the 11th book, although, hasn’t been restored until Isaac Casaubon’s (1559-1614) well-known edition, who edited the text gleaning it from the epitome. Apparently, it seems that this loss had been unnoticed by XV and XVI century scholars. Some considerations on the *Renaissance* manuscript tradition of Athenaeus allow to formulate a new hypothesis able to explain the late recovery of this section.
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Emanuele Zimbardi (Università di Roma “La Sapienza” – Freie Universität Berlin)

*Omissioni tra lacune meccaniche e intenzionali in una traduzione tardoantica*

[*Omissions between Mechanical Loss and Intentional Forgetfulness in a Late Antique Translation*]

In the textual tradition of a literary work, the omission of some portions of original text is often due to mechanical lacunae. This is also what we would be tempted to think for the case of the metrical homily on Jonah and the Ninivites, a Late Antique Greek text known under the name of Ephrem (IV century). This is a translation of a very long original Syriac work (2142 verses). Not only perturbations of the metrical scheme, but also the comparison with the Syriac original version lead us us to think that the transmitted text in the only one Greek manuscript presents omissions. In fact, out of the Syriac 2142 verses, about 500 do not have any correspondence in the Greek translation. But the nature of such omissions is not merely philological. Some of them can be ascribed to the translator’s will to change the original text with various aims. Sometimes he wants to reduce a long and repetitive section of the original text, thus adapting the rhetorical style of Syriac poetry to a more sober one. Secondly, the translator aims at simplifying some complicated expressions in the original language, and he omits the entire portion of the text which presents them. Finally, some omissions seem to delete an ideological or cultural reference which a Greek audience could not easily understand. In this sense, some omissions in the Greek homily on Jonah by Ephrem must be ascribed to a precise translation technique, according to which the “loss” of part of the source text (the Syriac one) transposed into the target text (the Greek one) must be interpreted as an intentional “forgetfulness” of the original message.

Simon Smets (University College London)

*The Omission of the Recipient’s Words in Letter Collections*

My paper discusses the literary opportunities of omitting received letters from an authorial letter collection. These comprise specific forms of inter- and intratextuality, engagement with the reader and creating order out of several constituents. It fits into recent studies on authorial letter collections, which have argued that the genre is often characterized by principles of deliberate ordering. To discern these principles and to interpret their meaning, it is essential to take into account the idea of ‘omission’: the majority of epistolary collections consist of letters written by a single author, who leaves out the letters that provoked a certain answer or responded to a text received. As the original letters have often been lost outside manuscripts or prints *of the collection*, the other half of the epistolary dialogue cannot be read anymore.

My paper focuses on Marsilio Ficino’s *epistolarium*, with reference to the ancient and medieval models whose writing strategies he adopted. Central are the first four books, which offer an occasion to explore most of the literary artifices mentioned. With regards to intertextuality, we see that humanists could incorporate in their letter collection the response to a letter that features in another humanist’s collection. In this way, they created a broader dialogue between the two letter *collections*, and in addition they undid the attempt by the first compiler to silence their voice by omitting their response from his (largely) single-author collection.

The analysis further demonstrates how the omission of addressees’ responses creates an emptiness at the other side of the presented dialogue, which has to be filled up by the reader of the whole collection. It appears that consecutive letters change from answering an original letter in a specific context to interacting with the reader’s response towards previous letters. My paper will show that in any case the scattered parts of Ficino’s epistolary exchanges with many parts left out, were ordered to such a degree that they turned into one strong dialogue with the reader of his collection.

Marco Forforelli (Independent Scholar)

*Una lunga scia di polemiche: il terzo assedio di Nisibis e le tracce di un confronto storiografico parzialmente perduto*

[*The Controversial History of the Third Siege of Nisibis*]

Why do the references to the third siege of Nisibis in the two works of Theodoret – *Historia religiosa* (I, 11-13), *Historia ecclesiastica* (II, 31) – contradict each other? How can Zonaras'version be remarkably similar to the account in Theodoret’s *Historia ecclesiastica* withoutdepending on any Christian source? How many versions of this story began to circulate after thefailure of the siege in 350 AD? Many questions remain unanswered. In this context, the abudance ofdocuments is not helpful. Some scholars (P. Peeters 1920, A. Colonna 1950, M. DiMaio 1977, C. S.Lightfoot 1988) emphasize the temporal gap between texts closer to the facts and later sources asthe reason for questioning the credibility of the text; on the other hand, they often recognize twodistinct traditions: pagan historiography and ecclesiastical histories.In this research, I will identify the lost sources of both Theodoret’ and Zonaras’ accounts of thesiege. I will start from the most recent of these texts, the twelfth-century History of the ByzantineZonaras, examining the absence of references to St. Jacob and any miraculous evidence in theaccount of the monk. The great convergence between the main source of Theodoret’s *Historia ecclesiastica* (II, 31) and Zonaras’ *Epitome* (XIII, 7, 1-14) may be due to two different paganversions, that seems to be indipendent from Julian's account (*or*. II, 62B-66D). Therefore, it will beimportant to stress that, when the Christian apologists celebrated the divine protection against thePersian attacks, alternative accounts circulated in the West as well as in the East and were availableto later historiographers. A full analysis of *Quellenforschung* will reveal important features of thediversified approaches towards these different traditions, from mutual influence on substantialalteration of the sources. We are dealing with surviving sources, which may echo now-lost works orhistorical portions: the *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus *senior* and the *Historia* of Eunapius ofSardis.
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**Session 6b) Roman Republic: Cicero and His Reception (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Giulia Marinelli (Universität zu Köln – Università di Roma “La Sapienza”)

*Tra memoria e oblio: il controverso caso dell'orazione di Cicerone in difesa di M. Fonteio*

[*Between Memory and Oblivion: The Controversial Case of Cicero’s Speech on behalf of Marcus Fonteius*]

The great orators of the past didn’t leave written records of their eloquence. Differently, Cicero decided not to condemn his oratory activity to oblivion, publishing the speeches he gave. The published speeches are the result of a selection process operated by Cicero himself: he employed specific selection criteria in choosing some speeches for publication while suppressing others. In addition to the unpublished ones (*orationes ineditae*), there are fragmentary speeches, which were only in part published or preserved. Finally, the *orationes deperditae*, speeches which circulated in

antiquity but which have since been lost.

This paper will investigate the much-discussed case of Cicero’s speech *pro M. Fonteio*, which represents, for more than one reason, an emblematic example of selection/loss of an ancient text: in the extant text of the oration, Cicero refers to the first *actio* of the trial. However, this part of the pleading has not been handed down. The extant part of the text (the *actio secunda*) is extremely fragmentary and has been handed down through different ways (the palimpsest manuscript Pal. Lat. 24, the mutilated manuscript Arch. S. Petr. H 25 and finally, parts of the text are known only through

quotations by later authors).

This paper purposes to examine the patterns and the reasons (with focus on the political implications) behind the loss/nonpublication of the first *actio* and other sections of this text. Through an analysis of the clues provided by Cicero himself and by later authors, together with a reconstruction of the complex transmission of this speech, this paper will clarify the issue, distinguishing two different levels: firstly, material which has been lost in the manuscript tradition; secondly, the selection operated by Cicero himself (particular attention will be paid to the presence of *tituli* and *rubricae* in the text).
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Eugenio Mattioni (Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna)

*Parole, temi e stile dei populares: quanto e cosa possiamo ricostruire?*

[*Words, Themes and Style of Popularis Speeches: How Much Can We Reconstruct and How Much is Lost?*]

The oral presentation intends to tackle some of the main critical issues related to fragmentary literature, starting from two case studies offered by Latin republican orators related to the *popularis* wing. In a first section an attempt will be made to define *ex novo* a *corpus* of fragments (2) and testimonies (7) attributed to Lucius Ap(p)uleius Saturninus, questioning, deductively, on the following themes: possible reasons for the exclusion of this author from the *ORF* by Enrica Malcovati and from previous similar collections; criteria for the selection of a coherent and meaningful series of texts; usefulness of a rhetorical analysis of the texts thus identified, results expected from it, its value for historical reconstruction.

A more detailed discussion, from the historical, historiographical and stylistic point of view, about a quotation in Plutarch’s *Life of Lucullus* (34,4-35), which could constitute a ‘new’ fragment of a speech delivered by Publius Clodius Pulcher, will instead be the starting point for dealing with: reliability of witnesses; distinction between fragment and testimony; fragment boundaries; distinction between quotation, *fragmentum sine verbis*, re-elaboration, rewriting and invention by the source; relationship between direct and indirect speech; distinction between *verba* and *res*; features of Greek translations of original Latin words and legitimacy of a backward version; editorial choices in doubtful cases. This will imply a reference to the specific *loci paralleli* and to some examples of similar mechanisms used in the *Bioi Paralleloi* (i.e other *verbatim* citations that can be useful to illustrate the aims and the *modus operandi* of the biographer in outlining his characters.

Starting from the aforesaid concrete examples, we will try to extend our conclusions to all the material relating to fragmentary oratory, by facing specific problems such as nature, characteristics and political orientation of the sources, functions of quotation and testimony and their consequences, prevailing mechanisms of transmission; losses occurred and their representativeness, legitimacy and limits of an expansion of the text basis to be taken into account.
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Georgios Taxidis (Universität Hamburg)

*Successit laurea sertis: Quoting Cicero in Claudian’s De Consulatu Stilichonis I*

In the opening lines of his major work *De Consulatu Stilichonis* Claudian, “the last great pagan poet” (Christiansen 2009 *et al*.) raises the topic of the succession of military action and accomplishments to that of political life (v. 5 *et calidis thalami successit laurea sertis*). The marriage of the young emperor Honorius, which was followed shortly after its completion by the military triumph over the rebel Gildo, is used here as an illustrating example of this topic of “succession”.

Neither the topic nor the expression is new since Cicero writes in his fragmentary extant *De Consulatu suo*: *cedant arma togae* (fr. 16 Traglia). This verse arose negative criticism among Cicero’s contemporaries. That is why the writer defends himself by quoting the verse in some of his latter works and by explaining its meaning and his own intentions (e. g. Cic. *Pis*. 73-74).The “*cedant arma togae*” -*topos* survived through quotation among the post-classic period (Quint. *inst*. 11, 1, 24; Plin. *nat*. 7, 117) up to Servius’ (and Claudian’s) time (Serv. *ad Aen.* 1, 1).

This paper focuses on Claudian’s *successit laurea sertis* and proposes to elucidate the ways in which Claudian makes use of Cicero’s quotation in the proem of the first book of his “*On the Consulship of Stilicho*”.

For that purpose the quotations mentioned (especially Cicero’s own explanation in *Pis*. 73-74) will be discussed and critically assessed semantically and stylistically in correlation to linguistic elements of Claudian’s proem surrounding the (paraphrased) quotation.

Through this approach the paper hopes to highlight the decisive role of classical quotation in a late antique “*πανηγυρικός λόγος*”. Especially by analyzing Claudian’s quotation of Cicero’s verse we gain valuable insights into the poet’s intercourse with classic Latin literature- a favored but not exhausted subject of analysis by scholars- to which the present approach hopes to contribute. Finally, the quotation analysis will also suggest an overall interpretation of the poem’s opening lines.
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**2nd Poster Session: 14.30–15.00**

Francesco Condone (Università degli Studi di Napoli “Federico II”)

*Animal Anthropomorphism in Dionysius’ Lost Ixeutica*

Fourteen manuscripts, among which the famous *codex Vind. med. gr.* 1 (512-513 AD), transmit to us the late antique prose paraphrase of a lost didactic poem on bird-catching, the *Ixeutica*, ascribed to a certain Dionysius (maybe the Periegetes). The paraphrase text was edited first by GARZYA (1963) and then by PAPATHOMOPOULOS (1976); it was also recently translated in French by SUDAN, SCHUWEY and PERNET (2009).

Through a careful reading of this peculiar text it is possible not only to enjoy the paraphrast’s noticeable literary efforts, but also to reconstruct the structure of the lost hypotext*,* as well as its contents and main poetic motives.

In the present study, I will focus on one of the most striking themes of the *Ixeutica*: animal anthropomorphism. The tendency to explain animal habits in a human perspective is typical of ancient Greek zoological poems, as pointed out by TOOHEY (1996 : 199-203) and REBUFFAT (2001 : 37-38). But this tendency has its roots deep in the post-theophrastean zoological tradition, which conferred to animals rational abilities not inferior to human ones (LI CAUSI 2018).

More precisely, animal anthropomorphism is accomplished by Dionysius in three different ways:

- comparisons and similes between birds and men. Cf. *e.g.* I 23: the wryneck’s frenetic movements resemble the Corybants’ ecstatic dance.

- endowing birds with human emotions and moral principles. Cf. *e.g.* I 3: eagles are worried about the legitimacy of their babies, so expel from the nest the ones suspected to be illegitimate.

- mythological excursus regarding metamorphoses from birds to men. Such excursus have usually a clear aetiological function. Cf. *e.g.* II 5: seagulls were once the men who invented the practice of fishing: that is the reason why they always follow fishing boats.
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Anna Trento (Università degli Studi di Padova)

*A Forgotten Author from Sinai: Monk Nilus and His Works*

The corpus of Nilus of Ancyra, a monk who lived in Galatia between the IV and the V century, rises several authorship issues. Since the author was ignored by contemporary historical sources, different writings circulated under his name together with his genuine ascetic works, due to deliberate re-attributions (a work by Evagrius Ponticus: GUILLAUMONT 2009) or reworkings (homilies: TRENTO 2016; epistolary: BOSSINA 2011, 2013; CAMERON 1976; GRIBOMONT 1969). Several writings (even the very first Christian novel, the so-called *Narratio*: CONCA 1983a, CANER 2010) have thus been collected in *PG* 79 and, whether right or wrong, ascribed to the evanescent figure of Nilus Ancyranus. After Heussi’s pioneering essay (HEUSSI 1917), many scholars questioned their authenticity.

Surely to be regarded as spurious and later is the epistolary (*PG* 79, 57-582). This collection offers a starting point for a *pars construens* leading to the rediscovery of a *new* Nilus, mistaken for the Ancyranus because of homonymy. Indeed, letter IV 1 is tellingly independently transmitted from the rest of Ancyranus’ epistolary and preserved in sinaitic patristic collections. Based on a linguistic analysis, on significant quotations and on other iconographic and literary sources (ACCONCIA LONGO 1965; SOTIRIOU G., M. 1958), I argue that letter IV 1 must be subtracted from Ancyranus’ corpus and ascribed to another Nilus, who can be placed in Sinai around the VI-VII century.

The manuscripts containing *ep*. IV 1 (*Karakallou* 251, *Hieros. S.S*. 113 and *Vat. gr*. 731) include other ascetic texts attributed to Nilus of Sinai, such as *quaestiones et responsiones*, letters and sayings, which are still unpublished. They convey an image of Nilus as a spiritual father taking care of the spiritual education of his disciples and reflecting on monastic virtues and vices, female asceticism and liturgical issues. In my presentation, after giving account of the authorship problems, I shall focus on selected relevant passages from Nilus of Sinai’s corpus in order to shed new light on this neglected author through his writings.
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Anna Busetto (Independent Scholar)

*A Forgotten Fund? The ‘Discovery’ of Greek Manuscripts in the Biblioteca Bertoliana of Vicenza*

The manuscript fund of the Biblioteca Bertoliana (the oldest and most important public library in Vicenza) consists of 3556 *codices* and it is divided into three sections, the most ancient of which includes about 600 manuscripts dating between the 12th and 16th century. Among these – which are mainly Latin mss. – there are also three Greek manuscripts of literary subject (ms. 209, containing three Euripides’s tragedies; ms. 508, containing a commentary on to Gregory of Nazianzus’s *Orations*; ms. 598bis, consisting of a poetic anthology of texts ranging from the 6th century BC to the 16th century), dating from the 14th century (the oldest one) to the 17th-18th century (the most recent one), in good state of preservation and valuable as for paleographic and codicological interest. In this regard, the most surprising fact is that nobody seems to have been so far aware of the exact size of such Greek fund: the most important catalogues of manuscripts (e.g. those authored by Giuseppe Mazzatinti, Elpidio Mioni, Marcel Richard) cite only two of the three *codices*, and even the very recent (and still in progress) database of the project "Nuova Biblioteca Manoscritta" registers only ms. 508 and ms. 598bis. Only *Pinakes* database mentions all the three mss., probably just mixing information from the other catalogues, but provides scanty information. Actually, none of these three manuscripts has ever been the subject of a specific paleographic, codicological or philological study. Therefore, the aim of my paper is to provide the very first overall description – with a possible sketch of the history – of this neglected small fund, shedding light on a *not* so desirable oblivion.

**Session 7: 15.00-16.30**

**Session 7a) Reconstructing Texts: The Case of Greek Tragedy (Sala I)**

Sabrina Mancuso (Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen – Università di Pisa)

*Un'ipotesi di ricostruzione del contenuto mitografico del Tereo tramite confronto intertestuale con le fonti*

[*A Hypothesis of Reconstruction of Tereus’ Mythographic Content through an Intertextual Comparison with the Sources*]

Sophocles’ *Tereus* is a fragmentary drama, which presents a version of the myth of Procne very different from the one proposed by Homer, Pherecydes and Aeschylus. This paper aims to provide an analysis of *Tereus*’ surviving fragments, which is carried out through a systematic intertextual comparison with the earliest sources of myth, with the allusions to the myth contained in Sophocles’ other dramas and with Ovid, who draws his own version of myth from Sophocles’. The purpose of this analysis is the delineation of Sophocles’ version of the myth of Procne, evincible both from *Tereus*’ fragments and from the mentions to the myth, which are observable in *Ajax*, *Women of Trachis*, *Electra* and *Oedipus at Colonus* and have a paradigmatic function. The result will be a delineation of the innovations carried out by Sophocles both at the mythographic level – the introduction of the names of Procne and Philomela, as well as the glossectomy undergone by Philomela and Tereus’ metamorphosis into a hoopoe – and thematically – the focus on the concepts of barbarism, metamorphosis and song. This paper will show how Sophocles’ *Tereus* can be read as a criticism against Thrace: The Thracian Tereus, after having cut Philomela’s tongue, which is a symbol of ἰσηγορία – how this paper aims to show – is destroyed by the Athenian women through an act of writing. Sophocles introduces Tereus’ metamorphosis into a foreign and threatening bird, to represent the belligerent Thracian, while the song of the nightingale Procne, which is the most melodious animal sound and expresses at the same time the greatest pain imaginable, is a metaphor of tragic poetry. From this paper will emerge the functionalization of Procne’s myth carried out by Sophocles, who uses it to achieve two goals: the reproach of every alliance with Thrace and the exaltation of tragic poetry.
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Elena Iakovou (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen)

*Reconstructing the Innovator Euripides in His Fragmentary Tragedies Oedipus and Antigone*

Two of the most popular figures of the Oedipus myth are Antigone and her father Oedipus, whose tragic story is the core of the homonymous fragmentary tragedies of Euripides. The dramatist deals thoroughly with these characters by not only relying on his predecessors (e.g. the other Greek tragedians, Aeschylus and Sophocles, epics and lyric poetry) but also by adding innovative elements to the existential form of the Theban myth.

In this framework I will firstly concentrate on Euripides’ *Oedipus* (probably produced after 415 BC), who appears to challenge the Sophoclean version of the myth regarding the encounter of Oedipus with the Sphinx (*TrGF* fr. 540 and 540a Kannicht) and Oedipus’ blinding by Laius’ servants, while he is still known at Thebes only as the son of Polybus of Corinth (*TrGF* fr. 541 Kannicht). The episode of the Sphinx, which presents a detailed account of the various effects of light on creature’s plumage and its riddle in Hexameter verses *verbatim*, as well as Oedipus’ forcible blinding demonstrate on the one hand the startling variants of the myth and on the other hand the innovative input of Euripides. Further on, I will set the focus on Euripides’ *Antigone* (probably written between 420 and 406 BC), whose plot is quite similar to the eponymous Sophoclean play, though with some striking differences: Haemon assists Antigone with the burial of Polynices, the young couple gets married (*TrGF* fr. 162a and 164 Kannicht) and Dionysus as *deus ex machina* saves them and prophesies the birth of their son Maeon (*TrGF* fr. 166, 167 and 168 Kannicht).

Although the plot of these tragedies is ultimately hardly reconstructable due to their fragmentary state, a close examination in consideration with our existing knowledge about the Oedipus myth in Sophocles, Aeschylus and other literary texts will illuminate other aspects of the myth unknown to us but not to the tragedians.

Giulia Dovico (Universität zu Köln)

*Between Selection and Loss: Examples of Survival from Scholia to Euripides*

Browning's assessment that “it was not an exception for a thirteenth or fourteenth century scholar to have access to early tradition, it was the rule”[[8]](#footnote-8) might seem too optimistic, since the boundary between their original contribution and their use of ancient material is frequently blurred. Far from providing an answer, the paper aims at inquiring the mechanisms of survival of earlier material in the peculiar field of scholia to Euripides, an author whose transmission depends on a selection (the ten tragedies commented on) and on an averted loss (the re-discovery of the “alphabetic plays”). The investigation on later witnesses carrying scholia to *Medea* shows that even later manuscripts, such as **Ne**, or later additions within ancient manuscripts can provide evidence of the survival of earlier material. With regard to this latter aspect, **V**, which is recognised as witness of *scholia* *vetera*, preserves also traces of Byzantine scholarship. It is among these notes, usually disregarded as *recentiores*, that it is possible to find close verbatim similarities to notes preserved in earlier witnesses (e.g. **O**) or to other old scholia. This allows an insight on Byzantine scholarly practices, in this particular case probably linked with the Planudean circle. Moreover, **gB**, an anonymous collection of *excerpta*, appears to preserve a scholium to *Bacchae*, a tragedy whose tradition is situated at the intersection between selection and loss: indeed, it followed the path of the selected plays, but lost its *corpus* of scholia. The linguistic comparison with other corpora of *scholia vetera* leads to the assumption that this material, even admittedly sporadic, may be considered old. Such examples are certainly scarce; however, they enable a glimpse on how streams of tradition can, even partially, survive in late or indirect witnesses within a contaminated tradition such as the Euripidean one, at the crossroad between selection, loss and survival.

Sigla

**Ne** *Neap.* ex *Vind. gr.* 17 (15th cent.)

**V** *Vat. gr.* 909 (13th cent.)

**O** *Laur.* 31.10 (12th cent)

**gB** *Barb. gr.* 4 (14th cent.)
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**Session 7b) Memory and Oblivion of Hellenistic Kingdoms and Roman Empire (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Sergio Brillante (Università degli Studi di Bari “Aldo Moro”)

*Otia imperialia. L'opera paradossografica di Tolomeo Dioniso*

[*Otia imperialia. Ptolemy Dionysos’ Paradoxographical Work*]

In a well-known passage of his *Historiae* (7,144,632-641), John Tzetzes makes a long list of authors of paradoxographical works, including the name of a certain Ptolemy. Until today, scholars could not suggest a persuasive identification of this writer, mostly because the scholia that the same Tzetzes composed for his own work have been ignored for a long time. One of these scholia, though, makes clear that the Ptolemy mentioned in the text is in fact Πτολεμαῖος Διονύσιος. In this paper, I will argue that this author could be identified with the king Ptolemy XII, in accord with the well-known relationship between the Ptolemaic court and the literary genre of paradoxography.

Alessandra Tafaro (University of Warwick)

*Obliterating Domitian’s Memory: from Inscriptions to Martial’s Second Edition of Epigrams Book 10*

In response to the regime change in AD 96/98 and the assassination of Domitian in AD 96 followed by his subsequent official *damantio memoriae*, Martial staged his own work’s death and afterlife within the second edition of Book 10. Whilst Domitian’s visual representations were effaced or refashioned in the shape of the new Emperor, Martial was defacing and erasing his poetic monumental inscriptions within the first edition of book 10 (AD 95) to republish it in a revised edition in AD 98. Playfully adopting the tropes of remembering and forgetting, monumentalisation and iconoclasm, Martial mingled new (*pars nova maior erit*: 10.2.4) and old poems (*nota leges quaedam*: 10.2.3) to create a great literary palimpsest. This paper aims to spotlight how Martial’s revised edition and the contemporary epigraphic and material culture equally performed Domitian’s obliteration, particularly focusing on Martial’s appropriation of epigraphic strategies and intermedial techniques. Erasure on monuments and erasure within Martial’s Book 10 second edition (*elapsum manibus nunc revocavit opus*: 10.2.2.) will be compared in an attempt to address and explore the common mechanisms of forgetting and remembering performed both in the Flavian epigraphic culture and within the spatial environment of an epigram-book, where epigrams act as both lasting monuments and ephemeral objects.

Mariana Bodnaruk (Central European University)

*Damnatio Memoriae of the High-ranking Senatorial Office-holders in the Later Roman Empire*

Unlike *damnatio memoriae* of the emperors/usurpers[[9]](#footnote-9), the memory sanctions against the senatorial elite in the later Roman Empire have received modest attention of historians. This paper seeks to reconstruct aristocratic involvement in the empire’s memory politics in the time of the administrative and cultural change accelerated by the Constantinian reforms. With *damnatio memoriae* defined as the act of publically erasing a person’s memory, I assess the late Roman practice through honorific sculpture and written sources as well as rarely studied impact on their audience. This paper intends to go beyond the specialized compartments of the disciplines (epigraphy, art history, philology) and to make connections among the seemingly disparate phenomena of social life mediated by honorific monuments and literature. Rather than a singular action, *damnatio memoriae* was a series of complex processes, which encompass a number of memory sanctions. A series of questions arises: How did different types of memory sanctions against the fourth- and early fifth-century senatorial elite manage to construct and re-create memory of the senatorial office-holders fallen from grace? How did the opposite process of rehabilitation and restoration of memory of the leading senators function in juxtaposition to imperial *damnatio memoriae*? This paper thus also seeks to trace damning aristocratic memory as a result of the *damnatio memoriae* of the usurpers while reinstated to the same historical context. I examine a group of processes starting from a denouncement as *hostis publicus* to sanctions against the memory of high-ranking officials posthumously accused of having plotted to overthrow the emperor. The memory sanctions are manifested, yet not restricted, through the disfigurement and destruction of physical monuments, in particular, statues and inscriptions, which were never total. The traces of erasures left visible were apparently meant to be seen in order to remind and warn contemporaries of the punishment of oblivion for disgraced officials. Examining the sanctions against memory of the late imperial senatorial aristocracy, I first explore the interdictory imperial legislation regarding the disgraced senatorial officials (I). Second, shifting from law to epigraphy, I look briefly at practice and patterns of *damnatio memoriae* in inscriptions set up for the senatorial office-holders (II). Third, I assess the elusive traces of the memory sanctions in the late antique literary texts (III). I conclude with an elaboration on what the different media genres, including literature, as the mediating structures by which the ruler and aristocracy articulated their interaction, reveal about the ways in which the memory of the members of the senatorial order was constructed and re-shaped (IV).
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**Session 8a) How Greek Comedy Survived Through Time (Sala I)**

Federica Benuzzi (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)

*Lost hypotexts. Lucian’s Lexiphanes and Alexandrian Exegesis to Comedy*

At present, Michael Weissenberger’s *Literaturtheorie bei Lukian: Untersuchungen zum Dialog Lexiphanes* (Stuttgart-Leipzig 1996) is the only monographic work that tackles the Lucianic dialogue *Lexiphanes* in detail and with a lemmatic approach. As stated in the title, the study aims at highlighting the core principles of Lucian’s stance on literary critic and achieves that by analysing the dialogue in itself, but also within the context of five other *literaturkritische Schriften* of the Lucianic *corpus*, namely, *How to write history*, *Against the Ignorant Book Collector*, *A Professor of Public Speaking*, *The Mistaken Critic* and *Soloecista*. Weissenberger’s mostly precise analysis of the textual parallels identifies not only the classical *auctoritates* from which the protagonist draws his outdated, hyper-Atticist vocabulary (mainly Aristophanes, the tragedians, Plato and the orators), but also the treatment of the same words in the lexicographic and scholiographic tradition. However, he fails to address the issue of the relationship between the dialogue and the huge body of Alexandrian exegesis that was still available at Lucian’s times.

I argue that taking a closer look at a few undervalued textual correspondences between the dialogue and the *scholia in Aristophanem* may allow to underline how relevant ancient scholarship (especially to comedy) was for Lucian. In my paper, this analysis will be followed by a broader discussion on how this approach may affect our modern perception not only of the *Lexiphanes*, but also of Alexandrian philology as referent for the dialogue and as object of its parody.

Virginia Mastellari (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)

*Il genere trascurato. Trasmissione e forme della Commedia di mezzo*

[*The Neglected Genre. The Transmission and the Features of Middle Comedy*]

Middle Comedy is a generic, and somewhat controversial, label applied to fourth-century BC comedy, the period of Greek drama between the last plays of Aristophanes and the time of Menander. No complete comedies have survived from this period, and what is worse, unlike Old and New Comedy, no Middle-Comedy play has been directly transmitted. Therefore, we can only rely on fragments quoted by later excerptors such as Athenaeus of Naucratis or Stobeaus, or by lexicographers interested in single words or expressions rather than the comedies themselves. As a consequence, the resulting picture is inevitably blurred and the risk of mis- or overinterpreting the evidence is tremendously high. Keeping in mind these challenges, this paper aims at investigating select fragments of fourth century

BC comic production with an eye to genre and the ways of transmission. On the one hand, I will show to what degree it is possible to outline the path which leads from Old to New Comedy; this involves taking into account the substantial difference in themes, production, and audience, all of which might be recovered thanks to attempts at reconstructing the lost plays dating from the fourth century. On the other hand, I will show how cautious a scholar should be in this attempt at reconstruction; the way fragments are transmitted may form a misleading picture, as the excerptors’ aim in quoting comic fragments was often to make gastronomic, moral, or lexicographical anthologies. A fresh look at a fundamental aspect such as transmission will allow us to definitively overturn some widespread assumptions, most notably the belief that Middle-Comedy plays were mainly about food and that they lacked any interest in socio-political issues.
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Lara Unuk (Univerza v Ljubljani)

*Mythological Characters in Selected Fragments of Old Greek Comedy*

From the period of Old Greek Comedy (6th – beginnings of 4th century BC) only eleven plays by Aristophanes survive today, while the works of his predecessors and contemporaries have been preserved as fragments, quotations, titles of lost dramas and through hypotheses. Aristophanes is thus our main source of knowledge about the structure, style and topics of Old Comedy which is generally believed to be firmly positioned in polis, in human world, as opposed to tragedies which are narratives about mythological events. Due to this scarcity of sources our conception of the themes of Old Comedy is quite incomplete. Some of the known titles and surviving fragments prove that mythological themes were possibly quite common in Old Comedy. Furthermore, while authors of comedies had a comparative freedom in creating their characters, scholia to *Peace* by Aristophanes, line 741, seem to imply some kind of standardization in their depiction of gods and heroes.

I attempt to examine the way in which the playwrights of Old Comedy employ mythological motifs and characters, focusing on the fragments from the plays Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτόμολοςby Epicharmus, Διονυσαλέξανδρος(together with its hypothesis, *P. Oxy. 663*) and Ὀδυσσῆςby Cratinus as well as Ταξίαρχοιby Eupolis. I compare those fragments to Aristophanes and place them into a wider context of Old Comedy fragments in order to discern the similarities in their approach to mythological motifs. Characteristc are carnivalesque motives as defined by Bakhtin as well as the motives of utopia, the descent to Hades and political satire. Gods and heroes are depicted as »lower characters« as understood by Aristotle (1448a). Some of them appear more often than the others.

While dealing with Old Comedy fragments we should not forget that any mythological reference could be simply political satire. However, some kind of mythological tradition can be recognized in Old Comedy.
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**Session 8b) Death and Survival of Poetic Texts (Sala “Carlo De Trizio”)**

Ivan Nikolsky (Institute of World History, RAS – Russian Presidental Academy, Moscow)

*Dracontius and the Dominus Ignotus in the Satisfactio: Why Did the Vandals Imprison the Carthaginian Poet and Refuse to Release him?*

This article deals with one of the crucial problems concerning the fate of the fifth century Carthaginian poet Blossius Aemilius Dracontius and his literary heritage: why was he arrested on the orders a Vandal king Gunthamund, and why was his release so long delayed, despite numerous pleas for a pardon, of which we know through the panegyric text referred to as the *Satisfactio*? The conventional opinion in literature is that an earlier panegyric (which has not survived), dedicated to an ‘unknown person’, a *dominus ignotus*, was the reason. Various theories exist regarding the identity of this *dominus ignotus*: it is said that it might have been some Roman emperor, for example, Zeno or Anastasius, a Gothic king Theodoric (Schetter, Bright, Obermeier, Edwards), or an earlier Vandal king Huneric (Merrills). In this paper I suggest that this *persona non grata* could not have been a ruler, but must have been a teacher of Dracontius, Felicianus Grammaticus, and that the text that caused Dracontius’s arrest may not be lost, but may be found in the *Carmina Profana* compilation. Several parallels between *Satisfactio* and this text, ‘*Praefatio Dracontii discipuli ad* *grammaticum Felicianum’*, especially images of animals, demonstrate that such interpretation is viable.

To sum up, the answers to the questions raised in the work, will be as follows:

1. Who was the *dominus ignotus*? It was Felicianus Grammaticus, Dracontius’s teacher;

2. Why was Dracontius arrested? Because of the text, known as the ‘Praefatio Dracontii discipuli ad grammaticum Felicianum’, from the Carmina Profana compendium (Carmina Profana 1), in which the Vandals are shown in an unflattering light and compared to wild beasts. It did not matter so much who the text was addressed to (i.e. Felicianus);

3. Why did the text of the Satisfactio, created as a plea for pardon, not work, and why

was Dracontius left in prison? Because this text itself contained references to the ‘seditious’

dedication, mentioned above.

Alberto Corrado (University of Oxford)

*Lucretius in the praefatio epigram of Prosper of Aquitaine’s Liber epigrammatum*

Prosper of Aquitaine’s *Liber sententiarum ex operibus Sancti Augustini* is the attempt to epitomise part of Augustine’s philosophy in *sententiae* during his later years in Rome, as Pope Leo’s advisor. It was an effort aimed at fitting Augustine’s doctrines – which, previously, Prosper had firmly and naïvely defended – to the cause of the primacy of Catholic Church, as a great, final homage to his master of the early years (Hwang, 2009: 198-202; 204-205). Shortly after, Prosper drew from his *sententiae* to create one of the oddest Fathers’ works of poetry: a book of epigrams in which each poem corresponds to a maxim (despite a few exceptions, see Horsting, 2016: 1-6). Remarkably, the collection is introduced by a poem which is completely separate from the rest of the epigrams, introducing Prosper’s poetic endeavour as *decerpere flores* (*Lucr*. 4.4) and presenting the *liber*. I maintain that this quotation from the proem to Lucretius’ book 4 holds a deeper meaning than just a stylistic *mimesis*. In fact, the two prooemial passages share more than just a quote, since the themes and the images of the epigram continuously echo Lucretius. We should not ignore, therefore, the programmatic relevance that quoting Lucretius eventually assumes in this case, which appears, at the same time, to suggest a deeper reference: as Lucretius turned the Epicurean philosophy into poetry, the old Prosper versified his own Augustinian epitome; as Lucretius honoured Epicurus, Prosper paid a tribute to his master Augustine.

In the oral presentation, I will try to outline the reasons why Prosper summons Lucretius in his *praefatio* epigram and attempt to go beyond the typical exploitation of the classical literature in early Christian poets in order to detect a bond between Prosper and Lucretius which may not only be exquisitely literary.
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Pierluigi Gatti (Università degli Studi di Napoli L'Orientale)

*Stolen Manuscripts and Discovered Texts: Angelo Decembrio and the Carmen De Bello Actiaco (PHerc. 817)*

After the death of Alfonso the Magnanimous (June 1st, 1458), the humanist Angelo Decembrio (about 1415-after 1467) left Naples and went to Spain where he attended to his studies and got hold of numerous manuscripts. In the spring of 1465, however, he decided to return to Italy, entrusting his luggage and books to a group of Italian merchants to convey them to Bologna. When he arrived in Italy, he heard that somewhere close to Rodez, in Provence, henchmen of the Comte d’Armagnac had robbed the merchants and demanded a ransom to return his stolen goods. Not being able to pay the sum, Angelo Decembrio tried to recover his personal effects through the intervention of Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan, to the Comte d’ Armagnac. The pleas of Decembrio in which he describes the event and his personal belongings are preserved in the State Archive of Milan. The list of his books is of particular interest for the conference topic. It contains some rarities for the time, including a complete manuscript of Plautus’ plays, and an otherwise unknown text:

*Donatus antiquissimus in Graeco et cum eo quoddam opusculum metricum quod dicebatur esse Virgilii de bello nautico Augusti cum Antonio et Cleopatra, quod incipit:*

*armatum cane, Musa, ducem belloque cruentam*

*Aegyptum*

The incipit of this epic poem was related by many scholars to the relics of PHerc. 817 which contain verses on the conquest of Egypt by Octavian in 30 BC. However, some critics (Hollis, Scappaticcio) consider the theft of books an invention of Decembrio to get money from its protectors and reject the fragment as a humanistic forgery.

Some unedited documents preserved at the Archives of Paris contribute to close the question. In them, Louis XIV grants pardon to the bandits accused by Angelo for various acts of robbery, including a theft of books. I also managed to identify some of Angelo's manuscripts kept in French libraries. Finally, a careful analysis of the piece of information and style shows that the testimony and the fragment are genuine, and that with the highest probability they belonged to the same poem preserved in PHerc. 817. This example would, on one hand, shed new light on the dynamics of loss and conservation of classical texts (for instance the role of school canon, the conservation in a peripheral area, etc.) and on the other hand, reflect on the humanistic forgeries.
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