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Callimachus' epitaph for the tomb of his father is notorious for how perplexingly little it says about the deceased. We are told neither his name nor profession, whereas the name that resounds loud and clear is that of the author of the epigram. This is a measure of how Callimachus outshone his father. The Greeks may have found delight in being defeated by their children (cf. Pl. Mx. 247a), yet we are less impressed. Even for the sake of Callimachus himself, would it not be rewarding to know who his father was?

The epigram illustrates the broader problem we have with the poet's closest literary ancestors. If we do our counting carefully, we see clearly enough that there is a two-generation gap between the beginning of what Droysen labelled as the Hellenistic period (Geschichte der Hellenismus, 1836, 19 - although he himself was not very clear about the chronological boundaries of his 'new' word) and the advent of 'Golden Age heroes' Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius of Rhodes. Whilst the latter were not treated altogether kindly by fate, the generations of their fathers and teachers have been almost completely obscured. Almost – because what we do know is enough to give us a taste of what we are missing.

Our conference is an unprecedentedly ambitious attempt to sketch a picture of the lost generations of the poets active during the last two decades of the fourth century and the first two decades of the third. We undertake to approach Philitas, Simias, Phoenix, Crates, and Timon and the whole gamut of their obscure contemporaries, genre by genre. We aim to discuss a number of thorny issues, among which the chronology and circulation of early Hellenistic poetry; the role these two generations played as forerunners of Hellenistic poetry and intermediaries between the tradition(s) of late Classical poetry and the new voices of Hellenistic poetry; and the larger implications for our (brittle) attempts of periodization. This pioneering venture into the origins of 'Hellenistic-ness' will help illuminate the shadowy and mysterious realms of Hellenistic poetry before Callimachus.
Venue
School of the Arts Library, 9 Abercromby Square, University of Liverpool campus, Liverpool, L69 7ZG.

Registration
All are welcome at the conference. There is no registration fee but please use this link to our online shop to register. You can also let the conference organisers know in advance if you wish to attend (see below).

Organisers
• Jan Kwapisz (Warsaw)
• Marco Perale (Liverpool)
• Guendalina Taietti (Liverpool)

Organised by the Department of Archaeology, Classics and Egyptology at the University of Liverpool and the Instytut Filologii Klasycznej of the University of Warsaw, the conference is made possible by the generous support of the Postgate Fund, the Warsaw Faculty of Polish Studies, and the Warsaw Institute of Classical Philology.
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PROGRAMME

Tuesday, 14 June 2016

9:00 - 9:30 Registration

9:30 - 9:35 Opening speech (Classics Coordinator, Bruce Gibson)

9:35 - 9:50 Presentation: Marco Perale, Jan Kwapisz

9:50 - 10:25 Keynote Lecture: Richard Hunter (Trinity College, Cambridge) - *Callimachus and the Language of Rhetorical Style*

Epic and mock-epic (chair: Marco Fantuzzi)

10:25 - 11:00 Thomas Nelson (Trinity College, Cambridge) - *Early Hellenistic Epic: A Reassessment*

11:00 - 11:20 COFFEE BREAK

11:20 - 11:55 Enrico Magnelli (Florence) - *Argonautic Epic Before Apollonius: Cleon of Kourion, and (Possibly) More*

11:55 - 12:30 Guendalina Taietti (Liverpool) - *The Poets at Alexander’s court: How Flat is Flattery?*

12:30 - 13:05 S. Douglas Olson (Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies / Heidelberger Academy / University of Minnesota) - *Mock-Epic and Mock-Didactic in the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Periods: Archestratus, Matro and Others*

13:05 - 14:00 BUFFET LUNCH

Comedy & Tragedy (chair: Richard Hunter)
14:00 - 14:35 **Benjamin Cartlidge** (St John’s College, Oxford) - *The Attic Challenge: Poetics at the End of the Long Fourth Century*

14:35 - 15:10 **Agnieszka Kotlinska-Toma** (Wroclaw) - *Early Hellenistic Tragedy and the Rise of a New Aesthetic*

15:10 - 15:45 **Marco Fantuzzi** (Macerata) – *The author of the "Rhesus" as poeta doctus and "critic" of the (tragic) tradition*

15:45 - 16:15 COFFEE BREAK

Lost voices (chair: Ewen Bowie)

16:15 - 16:50 **Annette Harder** (Groningen) - *Traces of a Lost Generation*

16:50 - 17:25 **Pauline LeVen** (Yale, via Skype) - *The Authorial Voice of Lost Authors in Early Hellenistic Hymns*

17:25 - 18:00 **Peter Parsons** (Oxford) - *Wandering Poems in Early Ptolemaic Egypt?*

19:00 CONFERENCE DINNER

---

**Wednesday, 15 June 2016**

Elegy and Epigram (chair: Annette Harder)

9:00 - 9:35 **Martine Cuypers** (Trinity College Dublin) - *Catalogue Elegy from Antimachus to Alexander Aetolus, Hermesianax, Phanocles and Others*

9:35 - 10:10 **Lucia Floridi** (Milan) - *Early Hellenistic Epigram: Themes, and ‘Genres’*

Philosophical Poetry (chair: Annette Harder)

10:10 - 10:45 **Maria Noussia-Fantuzzi** (Thessaloniki) - *A Cure for Love. Resisting Eros in Early Hellenistic Philosophy and Poetry*

10:45 - 11:20 **Rebecca Lämmle** (Basel / Cambridge) - *Cynulcus' Timon: Athenaeus and the Silloi*

11:20 - 11:35 COFFEE BREAK
Metrical extravagance (chair: Gregory Hutchinson)

11:35 - 12:10 Jan Kwapisz (Warsaw) - Taking Odd Measures

12:10 - 12:45 Marco Perale (Liverpool) - Simias of Rhodes, the Artsy Avant-guardist

12:45 - 13:20 Ewen Bowie (Corpus Christi, Oxford) - Philicus, 14 Months on

13:20 - 14:05 BUFFET LUNCH

Philitas of Cos (chair: S.Douglas Olson)

14:05 - 14:40 Konstantinos Spanoudakis (Rethymno) - Philitas of Cos, 14 Years Later

14:40 - 15:15 Gregory Hutchinson (Oxford) - Philetas among the Romans

15:15 - 15:30 Jan Kwapisz, Marco Perale - Closing remarks

The event has been made possible by the generous support of the Postgate Fund, the Warsaw Faculty of Polish Studies, and the Warsaw Institute of Classical Philology.
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ABSTRACTS

Ewen Bowie (Corpus Christi, Oxford) - Philicus, 14 Months on

The paper will revisit issues which were treated too briefly in my skirmish with Philicus in 2015: the implications of his apparently chiefly tragic output for the structure, location and dialect of his Demeter; the related issue of whether the poem is calculated to be equally adapted for reading and recitation; its exploitation, as by other near-contemporary poems, of meta-literary images of purity and remoteness; Philicus’ idiosyncratic choice of metre; and the perhaps consequential restriction of later ancient knowledge of the poem to metricians.

Benjamin Cartlidge (Faculy of Classics and St John’s College, Oxford) - The Attic challenge: Poetics at the end of the long fourth century

Alexandrian poetry and post-classical comedy are both ‘Hellenistic’ literatures, in the sense with which historical scholarship has usually invested the term (following Droysen and others). Yet they are rarely read together – or for that matter, against each other. The integration, or non-integration, of comedy into the story of Hellenistic literature has been an important area of scholarly dissent (e.g. Arnott 1979: xxxviii-xl vs. Hutchinson 1988: 10). By asking what is ‘Hellenistic’ about New Comedy, we raise a number of questions about the relationship between literature in Attica in the fourth and third centuries and the later developments in Alexandria.

Studies of Hellenistic literature often point to its self-reflexivity about poetic production and its literary predecessors. New Comedy, particularly Menander, is frequently brought into dialogue with tragedy, sometimes by scholars simply seeking to list parallels or tragic ‘models’. This approach obscures comedy’s rather richer relationship with fifth century literature; the generic enrichment of comedy by tragedy, epic, dithyramb, philosophical
texts, and epinician speaks to the wide-ranging literary interests of comic poets. Petrides (2014) has recently studied comedy’s awareness and exploitation of its mask; comedy knows itself – and famously exhorts others to do the same; the self-consciousness of literary production is reflected on different levels of the text. The pointed, neat, elegant plotting of Menander’s comedy – we should dearly love proper comparative material here! – also looks forward to the elegant constructions of Hellenistic poets. The premium on cleverness, on deceptively wrought simplicity, draws comedy and Hellenistic poetry together into a single nexus.

**Martine Cuypers** (Trinity College Dublin) - *Catalogue Elegy from Antimachus to Alexander Aetolus, Hermesianax, Phanocles and Others*

Apart from epigram, most of the remains of early Hellenistic elegy are catalogue poetry, with as most substantial specimens a 98-line catalogue of ‘loves of the poets’ from Hermesianax’s *Leontion* (CA 96–106), a 28-line catalogue of pederastic love affairs by Phanocles (*Loves or Beautiful Boys, CA* 106-9) and the fragmentarily preserved *Tattoo Elegy*, which list cautionary myths that the speaker threatens to tattoo upon his enemy’s skin (SH/SSH 970). Further practitioners include, among others, Alexander Aetolus (*Apollo, Muses*) and Philitas (*Bittis*). Key models appear to have been the Hesiodic *Catalogue* and Mimnermus’ *Nanno*, but Antimachus’ *Lyde* also hang as a spectre over these poems and all subjective catalogue elegies of the Hellenistic period, including Callimachus’ *Aetia* (as is clear, for example, from Call. fr. 398 Pf., Posidip. *AP* 12.168 and Asclep. *AP* 9.63). Focusing on Hermesianax, Phanocles and the Tattoo Elegy, this paper will explore not only the extant evidence per se but also whether anything can be gained for its appreciation by revisiting the remains of Antimachus’ *Lyde*, twenty years after the appearance of Victor Matthews’ monumental edition.

**Marco Fantuzzi** (Macerata) - *The author of the ”Rhesus” as poeta doctus and ”critic” of the (tragic) tradition*

My paper presupposes the results of my previous contributions of 2005 (‘Euripides (?) , Rhesus 56–58 and Homer, Iliad 8.498–501: Other Possible Clues to Zenodotus’ Reliability’, *CPH* 100, 2005, 268-73) and 2010 (‘Scholarly Panic: panikos phobos, Homeric Philology and the Beginning of the Rhesus’, in S. Matthaios, F. Montanari, and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter 2010, 41-54). These works had been case studies demonstrating how the author of the Rhesus loves to opt and implicitly argues for specific variants or interpretations that appear to be more or less hotly debated by later scholars, and may have been also debated some decades before the beginning of professionally ”philological” research in the modern sense of the term. My paper will consist of discussions of some more cases in *Rhesus* where allusive practice and scholarly choice are closely connected, and presuppose the taste for philological discussion that is usually connected to Hellenistic poets (the *Rhesus* dates from second half of the 4th cent., according to a now widely accepted chronology). An example follows, *exempli gratia*.

**Rh. 356 διφρεύων βαλιαίς πώλοις**
βαλιός, down to the 4th cent., is a Homeric-Euripidean word (Βαλίος is the name of one of the two horses of Achilles at Il. 16.149 and 19.400; Eur. Alc. 578, Hipp. 218, Hec. 90, IA 222 - all of them lyric passages as in Rh.). It is usually assumed to mean "dappled" in Hom. and Eur., but "fast" in, at least, Call. F. 110.53 Harder; Triphiod. 84; Synes. H. 1.77; always in Nonnus, Dion. (12x) and Par. Io. 10.70 – a series of passages where βαλιός often modifies nouns like πτερά, ἄνεμοι, ὀυραῖ, ἀήται, γούνατα, etc., unequivocally connected to "speed" and not to "dapple". But Σ to the βαλιός passages of Hom. and Eur. (and Oppian) frequently interpret it as "fast" or suggest both alternative interpretations "dappled" or "fast": Σ T Hom. II. 16.149 Ξάνθου καὶ Βαλίον· ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς χροιῶς, ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ηπάδων; Σ Eur. Hec. 90 βαλίαν τὴν λίαν ἐνεργή τῶι βήματι and βαλίαν· γράφεται καὶ βαλία καὶ βαλία. διαφέρει δὲ· βαλία μὲν γάρ λέγεται ἡ ταχεία παρά τὸ λίαν βαίνειν, βαλία δὲ ἢ κατάστικτος, Hipp. 218 βαλίας· ταῖς ποικίλαις τὴν δοράν καὶ καταστίκτους, ἢ ταχειάς, παρά τὸ βαίνειν ἄλλης; Opp. Hal. 2.4.34 βαλιήσαν· καταστίκτους, ἢ ταχειάς· βαλία ἢ κατάστικτος ἐλάφος ἢ ταχεία, [Cyn.] 2.314 βαλιῶν· ταχυτάτων. The wavering between the two semantic fields of colour and speed may have been ancient with βαλιός as it was with ἄργος (cf. Frisk (1954/1972) I.214), and not necessarily had to begin with Callimachus (pace Schmitt (1970) 53-4 n. 6). And Σ to our passage may be correct in reminding the contradiction with the whiteness of Rhesus’ horses at 304 (and 618) and assuming: δύναται δὲ ἄντι τοῦ ταχειάς. Modern interpreters, from Hermann (1828) 293 to Feickert 198-9, Liapis 162, and Fries 251, charge 356 of contradiction, and try to explain it as a misunderstanding or bad memory of Eur. IA 220-2 πώλους ... λευκοστίκτωι τριχὶ βαλιῶς. But they may be wrong. Before Callimachus, the Rh. author made perhaps his own scholarly choice about the alternative meanings between which βαλιός was already fluctuating.

Lucia Floridi (Milan) - Early Hellenistic Epigram: Themes and ‘Genres’

This paper offers an investigation into the themes and epigrammatic subgenres practiced by late 4th to early 3rd century epigrammatists. It will focus in particular on ‘minor’ figures, such as Hedylyos of Samos, who have been neglected in the secondary literature. They will be compared to the most important epigrammatists of the same period, such as Posidippus and Asclepiades, in order to detect differences and similarities in their interpretation of the genre, in a crucial time of its development. The study aims to to shed new light on the thematic features of epigram of the early Hellenistic age – that is, a couple of centuries before Meleager made his selection, which strongly conditioned any future perception of Hellenic epigram. In order to pursue such a survey, attention will be paid not only to the poems transmitted through the Byzantine sources (namely AP, API, and the so-called ‘minor collections’), but also to epigrams preserved via papyri (in particular, the recently published ‘Vienna Epigrams Papyrus’ – CPR XXXIII) and the indirect tradition (e.g. Athenaeus). The picture that will be drawn is likely to reflect a wider and more nuanced variety of themes and typologies, from the part of early Hellenistic epigrammatists, than the subsequent development of the genre in the 3rd to 2nd centuries BC, and then Meleager’s selection, would suggest.

Annette Harder (Groningen) - Traces of a Lost Generation

In this paper an attempt will be made to form a picture of the generation of poets which preceded Callimachus and his contemporaries in the course of the IVth century BC on the basis of their – rather scanty – remains and to discuss some issues concerning their reception. The starting point for this tentative reconstruction of what may be considered as
a lost generation of poets are the collections of fragments in Powell’s *Collectanea Alexandrina* and the *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. The main questions that will be addressed are: does a careful and systematic analysis of the remains of even the obscurest poets help us to form a picture of the poetic background of Hellenistic poetry in the generations just before Callimachus? If so, what does this picture amount to? Does this analysis help to sketch a larger framework in which we can look at specific poets about whom we know a little more, such as Archestratus or Timon of Philius, and is it helpful for a more precise evaluation of the innovative character of Callimachus’ poetry?

**Richard Hunter** (Faculty of Classics and Trinity College, Cambridge) - *Callimachus and the language of rhetorical style*

This paper considers the relationship between so-called programmatic imagery and language in Callimachus and the language of ancient rhetorical criticism. I will consider in particular the relationship between Aitia fr. 1 and the classification of styles and types in Demetrius, *On Style* and in the rhetorical and cultural critics (such as Dio Chrysostom) of the imperial age. Ideas of ‘Atticism’ will also play an important role, and I will consider to what extent ideas both about ‘Attic’ style and culture and about rhetorical Atticism may shed light both on the origins of Callimachean poetics and on the meaning of Aitia fr. 1.

**Gregory Hutchinson** (Faculty of Classics and Christ Church, Oxford) - *Philetas among the Romans*

The renown of Philetas for Romans is apparent; the accessibility of his texts is another matter. There is not the same papyrus background as demonstrates the ubiquity of Callimachus in the Greek world. But texts could readily have been brought to Rome, if Roman poets saw it as their job to study as it were the previous bibliography in a genre. Close and verbal connections appear in a poem near the start of Catullus’ polymeric book; it forms part of a net of connections in 3-4 with Hellenistic poetry and archaic lyric. Broader connections at least are apparent as Ovid spreads his range: Demeter near the end of the *Amores* and bridging *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*; Bittis in the poems of exile—and perhaps there a closer link too with Demeter’s grief. In between, Propertius; entries too in the didactic poems of Ovid. The Roman reception might point us to a wider vision of Philetas than is sometimes entertained: emotion and wisdom as well as learning and refinement.

**Agnieszka Kotlińska-Toma** (Wroclaw) - *Early Hellenistic Tragedy and the Rise of a New Aesthetic*

In the final decades of the fourth century we may note a significant shift in theatrical productions. There are changes in both dramatic theme and production. This specific revolution has a cultural basis but was also caused by significant political changes. Drama as a form of mass entertainment had huge potential as a propagandist influence, so it was the perfect medium for the broader distribution of new ideas. Changes in production, which were partly as a result of the new political situation, were introduced to Athens by Demetrius of Phaleron, who later played a considerable role in the creation of the intellectual
circle at Alexandria. Our knowledge of tragedy and satyr drama in this period is, however, very limited. Only a small number of authors, testimonies and titles, and a few fragments, are extant. Python, author of the play *Agen*, belongs without doubt to the precursors in the field of satyr drama. Sosiphanes and Moschion may, with great caution, be counted with the next generation, which was somewhat older than Callimachus, but which was active when the Cyrenian was developing his intellectual identity. Since it is impossible to establish an exact chronology of earlier Hellenistic poetry – among these authors Callimachus himself – it is also worthwhile to take a look at the authors who were active at the same time as the Cyrenian (we assume that many of their works originated in the earlier period of that poet's own activity). Theaetetus, Sositheos, Lycophron, Alexander Aetolus and Timon of Phlius without doubt belong to this grouping. The transformations that took place in dramatic genres, including their 'visual' element or stage decorations, bore a significant influence on the shaping of a new aesthetic in art and methods of thought and imagery, and hence in poetry as well. The emergence of short performances of tragedies, comedies, mimes, Homerists and the restaging of old dramas had a great influence not only on the development of new poetic genres, but also on the poetic imagination itself, and was able in a significant manner to change the code of understanding between the producer and the audience.

**Jan Kwapisz (Warsaw) - Taking Odd Measures**

The reinvention of various Archaic lyric metres for stichic use is a phenomenon known to have enjoyed a certain vogue among Hellenistic 'bookish' poets. My paper sets out to investigate the origins of this short-lived tradition between the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the third century BC. The known repertoire of these experimental metrical patterns has been recently widened by the publication of the third-century 'Vienna epigrams papyrus' (*P. Vind. G 40611*), which contains a palette of polymetric incipits; this adds to the extant bunch of polymetric fragments and epigrams attributable to the third-century poets of varying prominence, such as Simias of Rhodes, Asclepiades of Samos, Phalaecus, Archebulus, Sotades, Theodoridas, Callimachus and Theocritus. Among these, three poets stand out due to the likelihood of their belonging to the first generation(s) of Hellenistic poets, namely Simias, Asclepiades (whose at least one incipit seems to be included among the 'Vienna epigrams') and Phalaecus (who used his eponymous hendecasyllable for an epitaph for the famous fourth-century actor Lycon of Scarphe). In my paper, after discussing the evidence for the early Hellenistic chronology of these three poets, I will focus on answering the question of what it means that such experimentation with lyric metres emerged at the dawn of the Hellenistic age. I will suggest that the re-use of lyric metrical patterns in composing the emphatically literary poetry of the new era, namely literary epigrams and pattern poems, was a novel means of contributing to create a productive tension between the bookish medium and the archaizing tradition of symptotic song – the tension detectable in and crucial for defining of so much of Hellenistic poetry.
Rebecca Lämmle (Basel / Cambridge) - Cynulcus' Timon: Athenaeus and the Silloi

This paper explores the testimony for Timon of Phleius and the fragments of his Silloi in Athenaeus' Deipnosophistai, and asks what we can learn about the Silloi from this important source.

Pauline LeVen (Yale) - The Authorial Voice of Lost Authors in Early Hellenistic Hymns

In the archaic and early-classical period, the dominant (but not the single) mode of transmission of melic poetry was oral: songs were shared, learnt and passed down through choral practice, school or private instruction, and participation in symposia, and until the fourth century BCE, most cult songs were not inscribed by temple authorities.

A few cult hymns dating from the late fourth and early third centuries BCE, however, have survived in inscriptions (Aristonous’ Hymn to Apollo, Philodamus of Scarphaea’s Paean to Dionysus and Isyllus’ Paean to Asclepius, all collected in Powell’ Collectanea Alexandrina). These texts offer us fascinating insights not only into missing generations of lyricist, but also into the mechanisms of transmission and diffusion of poetry before the advent of bookish poetry. The goal of my paper is to explore the consequence that this shift in transmission and recording practices has for the notion of poetic authorship and authorial voice.

As opposed to earlier cult hymns which are, for the most part for us, anonymous, these fourth-century BC paeans are attached to the name of an author, either in the song itself, by a poet cautiously staging the genesis and inscription of his composition in the narrative (Isyllus), or in the material surrounding the inscribed text, the subscriptio that describes the privileges accorded to the poet by the community who had the hymn inscribed (Aristonous and Philodamus). My paper first describes some of the poetic strategies used by a poet to legitimize the source of his authority within the song, and to connect it, or not, to his name. Second, I examine how the written medium, and the external superimposition of a poet’s name to an otherwise anonymous song, affect the reception of an oral form. Finally, I discuss the phase of “second anonymity,” the detachment of the song from the figure of the “inscribed” author, as readers of the inscription travel away from the stone and the conditions of (re)performance of the hymn change.

Enrico Magnelli (Florence) - Argonautic epic before Apollonius: Cleon of Kourion, and (possibly) more

The aim of this paper is to discuss the scanty remains of Greek hexameter poetry on the Argonautic saga that can be dated, either surely or tentatively, to the early Hellenistic period. Predictably enough, it is Cleon of Kourion who gets the lion’s share. Much light has been shed on him some fifteen years ago in a brilliant paper by Giovan Battista D’Alessio (in R. Pretagostini [ed.], La letteratura ellenistica. Problemi e prospettive di ricerca, Rome 2000, 91-112): while acknowledging that my arguments will be mere slices from Giovan Battista’s rich banquet, I hope that a re-thinking of the well known PMich. inv. 1316v (SH 339A), a fragment of a treatise of literary criticism comparing Apollonius and Cleon, may help to better understand the literary features of the latter’s work. Three brief scholia on
Apollonius Rhodius (on 1.77-8, 587, 623-6a = pp. 13, 51, 55 Wendel: SH 339) will also be discussed with reference to the use of myth in Cleon’s lost poem. Other papyrus fragments of uncertain authorship will receive attention as well. The tantalizing POxy 4712 (ed. D’Alessio, The Ox. Pap. LXIX, 2005, 54-83: cf. my remarks in ZPE 158, 2006, 11-12, C. De Stefani, ibid. 8, and especially F. Pontani, Phasis 10, 2007, 133-149), come it from Cleon’s poem or not, preserves a passage on Medea’s dreams usefully compared with Apollonius’ treatment of the same subject; the tiny scraps of POxy 5190 (ed. D’Alessio, The Ox. Pap. LXXIX, 2014, 41-50; on the contrary, POxy 3698 appears not to belong here, since its verses have been plausibly ascribed to Eumelus, see A. Debiasi, Eumelo. Un poeta per Corinto, Rome 2015, 15-22) will also be taken into account, though very little can be said about either their content or their age. My hope is that a careful reading of the evidence may tell us something about this interesting sub-chapter in the history of Hellenistic epic, and even about Apollonius’ relationship to his (close) forbears and possible models.

**Thomas Nelson** (Trinity College Cambridge) - *Early Hellenistic Epic: A Reassessment*

Perhaps more than any other genre, the fragmentary scraps and testimonia of early Hellenistic epic provide ample opportunity for conflicting interpretation and debate. Once considered widespread and the direct target of Callimachus’ disdain in the Aetia prologue (Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos*, 1966, Leipzig), the genre’s very existence was called into question twenty years ago by Alan Cameron, who famously argued that “relatively little large scale epic was in fact written during the Hellenistic age” and “little or none in the century or so before Callimachus published Aetia I-II” (Callimachus and his Critics, 1995, Princeton: 266). The extremes of Cameron’s polemic, however, conceal the fact that we do have evidence for the existence of a number of early Hellenistic epics, even if their scope and scale are ultimately an issue of pure conjecture.

In this paper, I propose to reassess this evidence, outlining discernible developments in the epic genre and highlighting potential precursors of the famous Hellenistic aesthetic. I shall begin with Antimachus of Colophon and Choerilus of Samos, late classical proponents of mythological and historical epic respectively, whose fragments already display many similarities with ‘Callimachean’ poetry. I shall then turn to early Hellenistic encomiastic epic, reassessing what we know of the ‘Alexander poets’ beyond the scathing verdict of literary history, while also comparing other early hexameter encomia by Aratus and (potentially) Hermodotus. The bulk of the paper, however, will focus on early Hellenistic historical and mythological epic, including the works of Hegemon of Alexandria Troas, Diotimus, Antagoras and Moero, exploring how these poets both follow on from Antimachus and Choerilus, and foreshadow what we later find in Apollonius Rhodius and Rhianus. Despite the scarcity of our evidence, early Hellenistic epic, I argue, appears to have been an important stage of transition in the development of the epic genre, and many of its proponents already display archetypally ‘Callimachean’ interests in aetiology, paradoxography and Homeric scholarship.

**Maria Noussia-Fantuzzi** (Thessaloniki) - *A Cure for Love. Resisting Eros in Early Hellenistic Philosophy and Poetry*
Between the fourth and second centuries B.C. all the Hellenistic philosophical schools contributed to the reflection about the nature of erôs standardly considering love as a sort of irrational passion. Poets as well showed a sort of shyness for the fact that the intellectual could fall prey to the passion of love, which was again viewed as a disease of the reason (e.g. Callimachus, AP 12.150, Theocritus’ Id. 11.1-3). In this paper I investigate how the early Cynics intervene in this long debate on the issue of resistance to love and how the frames of reference offered by poetry, philosophy and medicine can help us understand the ‘solutions’ they add to it.

**S. Douglas Olson** (Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies / Heidelberger Academy / University of Minnesota) - *Mock-Epic and Mock-Didactic in the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Periods: Archestratus, Matro and Others*

This paper considers what is known of mock-epic and mock-didactic dactylic hexameter poetry in the late 5th and early 4th centuries, beginning with Athenian Old Comedy, the parodies of Hegemon of Thasos, Plato Comicus’ "Philozenus", and the *Hedupatheia* of Archestratos of Gela. I then turn to the late classical authors Euboeus of Paros and Matro of Pitane, and to what appears to be their considerably more engaged and sophisticated involvement with their Homeric exemplars. Most or all of this material was likely preserved in the Library at Alexandria, and I argue that this new literary style, along with a marked tendency toward an aesthetic of pathos in Matro in particular, can be read as an important predecessor of certain aspects of Hellenistic dactylic hexameter poetry.

**Peter Parsons** (Faculty of Classics, Oxford University; Oxyrhynchus Papyri Project) - *Wandering Poems in early Ptolemaic Egypt?*

This paper sets out to consider, from the evidence of papyri and ostraca, what kinds of poems were being read in early Ptolemaic Egypt, not in Alexandria but in the *chora*; how such texts might have been created, imported and circulated; which genres dominated and what that says about the market for verse; and how far the market might have influenced the preferences and prejudices of Callimachus & co.

**Marco Perale** (Liverpool) - *Simias of Rhodes, the Artsy Avant-guardist*

Impregnated with experimentalism and rooted in glossography and dialectology, Simias’ corpus remains one of the most diverse of the early Hellenistic times, including epigrams, hymns, didactic and hexameter narrative poetry. Often referred to as the inventor of the *technopaignia* ‘figure poems’, Simias paved the way for a new generation of Hellenistic ‘kainographers’ (cf. *SH* 677). He was awarded a place in the prologue of Meleager’s *Garland* (4.1.30), where his poetry is compared to a ‘wild pear ready to be eaten’. A Rhodian celebrity at the time of Strabo (14.2.13), Simias is placed by Hephaestio before Philicus, a poet active at Alexandria under the Philadelphos, which suggests that he was contemporary with Philitas of Cos or earlier (cf. Maas 1927, 156). He was known to Philicus, who
borrowed one of his metrical inventions, and imitated by Callimachus, who may have alluded to him in his epigram on the school-boy Simos (ep. 48 Pf. = 26 G.-P.; Fantuzzi 2007, 76-8). Unlike the epigrams and the figure poems, which travelled as far as Rome (we find echoes in both Catullus 3.11: Robinson Ellis 1876, and Laevius: Kwapisz 2013, 30-3), Simias’ more arduous and ambitious poetic heritage disappeared gradually but inexorably at the beginning of the Imperial age. In my talk, I will give an overview of Simias’ corpus, discussing content, genre and style of the fragments from these lost poems, i.e. the ethnographic poem Apollo, the epic Gorgo, the didactic Months, and his lyric hymns. I will also investigate the reception and circulation of Simias’ fragments and epigrams in the Hellenistic age, and his influence on later generations of poets. Finally, I will try to inscribe Simias in the cultural and literary milieu of the early Hellenistic times, and put forward the idea that his poems and collection of glossai were conceived and produced either within a royal court context (Alexandria or Pella) or at his native city Rhodes (vd. frr. 8 and 11 P.).

**Konstantinos Spanoudakis** (Rethymno) - *Philitas of Cos: 14 Years Later*

My edition of Philitas of Cos (originally a St Andrews PhD) was published by Brill in 2002. The initial part of the paper will revisit the principles of that edition and will present and evaluate the progress on Philitan scholarship since then. The second part will summarize the possible content of the works of Philitas from a critical perspective and will re-examine (a) anonymous entries in Hesychius tentatively ascribed to Philitas and (b) the nature of his controversial grammatical work *Ataktai Glossai* ‘Unruly Words’.

**Guendalina Taietti** (Liverpool) - *The poets at Alexander’s court. How fat is flattery?*

My paper focuses on the accusations against the epic poets at Alexander’s court and aims at reassessing their status as valuable writers within the Macedonian’s artistic court production. The extant information on Aeschrion, Agis, Anaximenes and Chroerilus is undoubtedly scant, but in my opinion the blame that the ancients cast upon them has too often been taken for granted. I think that there is room for a reassessment of their works and for some historical speculation: how could they all be such bad poetasters if Anaximenes was also a famous rhetorician and a prolific historian, if a meter was named after Aeschrion, and if Chroerilus apparently made a craft translation of Sardanapalus’ verses? What kind of poets did Alexander choose for the glorification of his campaign? The king knew well how to hire excellent artists (Lysippus, Apelles, Pyrgoteles), but most of the writers at his court (among them, the historian Callisthenes) were charged with flattery. Is it a mere accusation, or is it showing us something about Alexander’s taste and agenda?