

ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΕΚΤΑΚΤΗ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΑ ΤΗΣ 19^{ΗΣ} ΜΑΡΤΙΟΥ 2002

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΟΥ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΟΥ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ (ΖΗΖΙΟΥΛΑ)

ΕΠΙΣΗΜΗ ΥΠΟΔΟΧΗ
ΤΟΥ ΑΝΤΕΠΙΣΤΕΛΛΟΝΤΟΣ ΜΕΛΟΥΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ
RICHARD HUNTER

ΧΑΙΡΕΤΙΣΜΟΣ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΤΙΠΡΟΕΔΡΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ

κ. ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟ ΣΚΑΛΚΕΑ

Ἡ Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν μὲ τιμὴ ὑποδέχεται σήμερα καὶ περιλαμβάνει στοὺς κόλπους της, ὡς ἀντεπιστέλλον μέλος αὐτῆς, τὸν διακεκριμένο Καθηγητὴ κ. Richard Lawrence Hunter, ἀτόχο τῆς περίβλεπτης Βασιλικῆς ἑδρας τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς στοῦ Πανεπιστήμιου τοῦ Cambridge.

Ὁ Καθηγητὴς κ. Hunter γεννήθηκε στὴν Αὐστραλία, ὅπου περάτωσε τὶς ἐγκύκλιες καὶ τὶς Πανεπιστημιακὲς σπουδὲς του στοῦ Πανεπιστήμιου τοῦ Sydney.

Ἀκολούθως ἐργάστηκε κυρίως στοῦ Πανεπιστήμιου τοῦ Cambridge καὶ σὲ πολλὰ ἀξιόλογα Πανεπιστήμια τῶν Η.Π.Α. ὡς ἐπισκέπτῃς Καθηγητῆς.

Τὸ ἐρευνητικὸ καὶ συγγραφικὸ του ἔργο εἶναι πολὺπλευρο, ἐκτεινόμενο ἀπὸ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴ καὶ Ρωμαϊκὴ κωμῳδία, στοῦ Ἑλληνικὸ μυθιστόρημα καὶ στὴν ποίηση τῆς Ἑλληνιστικῆς περιόδου.

Ὁ κ. Hunter, μὲ τὸ ἐπιστημονικὸ ἔργο του, ἀνοίξε νέους ὀρίζοντες καὶ συνέβαλε στὴν πρόοδο τῶν κλασσικῶν γραμμάτων. Γι' αὐτὸ δικαίως συμπεριλαμβάνεται μεταξὺ τῶν κορυφαίων μορφῶν τῆς εἰδικότητός του.

Ἐκ μέρους τῆς Ὀλομελείας τοῦ Ἀνωτάτου Πνευματικοῦ Ἰδρύματος τῆς χώρας, καλωσορίζω τὸν νέον συνάδελφο καὶ τοῦ εὐχομαι μακροήμερευση, γιὰ νὰ συνεχίσει τὸ παγκοσμίου φήμης ἔργο του.

Dear Professor Hunter,

On behalf of the Academy of Athens I welcome and congratulate you as a new member of our Academy and I wish you a healthy long life to continue your distinguished scientific work.

Παρακαλώ τὸν συνάδελφο κ. Κονομῆ νὰ ἀνέλθει στὸ βῆμα γιὰ νὰ παρουσιάσει τὸ ἐπιστημονικὸ ἔργο τοῦ νέου συναδέλφου κατόπιν ἀποφάσεως τῆς Συγκλήτου.

ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΗΣΗ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΝ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΑΪΚΟ κ. ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟ ΚΟΝΟΜΗ

Ὁ καθηγητὴς Richard Hunter ἐκλέχτηκε πρόσφατα Regius Professor of Greek, δηλαδή Βασιλικὸς Καθηγητὴς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς στὸ Πανεπιστήμιο τοῦ Καίμπριτζ, θέση πού μὲ τὴν ἀνάλογη τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου τῆς Ὁξφόρδης ἀποτελεῖ παγκόσμια τὴν πιὸ περίβλεπτη θέση γιὰ τὸ θέμα τῆς στὴν ἀκαδημαϊκὴ κοινότητα.

Ὁ καθηγητὴς Hunter γεννήθηκε στὴν Αὐστραλία ὅπου ἀποφοίτησε ἀπὸ τὸ ἐκπαιδευτήριό Cranbrook τοῦ Σίδνεϋ. Ἐφοίτησε στὸ Πανεπιστήμιο τῆς ἴδιας πόλης ἀπὸ ὅπου ἀποφοίτησε μὲ ἄριστα καὶ πῆρε τὸ πανεπιστημιακὸ βραβεῖο γιὰ τὰ Ἑλληνικά. Τὸ 1975-79 ἐφοίτησε στὸ Πανεπιστήμιο τοῦ Καίμπριτζ (Pembroke College), ὅπου μὲ ἐπιτηρητὴ σπουδῶν τὸν καθηγητὴ C.F.L. Austin συνέγραψε τὴ διδακτορικὴ του διατριβὴ μὲ θέμα: A Commentary of Eubulus (ἓνα σχολιαστικὸ ὑπόμνημα στὸν Εὐβουλο).

Ἡ Ἀκαδημαϊκὴ του σταδιοδρομία ἐξελίχτηκε κυρίως στὸ Κολλέγιό του, ὅπου ἀπὸ τὸ 1977 ἔγινε ἐταῖρος του, τὸ 1981-87 ἐχρημάτισε λέκτορας στὰ κλασσικὰ γράμματα, τὸ 1985-87 βοηθὸς καθηγητὴς μελέτης (tutor), τὸ 1987-1993 καθηγητὴς γιὰ τὴν εἰσαγωγὴ σπουδαστῶν στὸ Κολλέγιό του, τὸ 1987-97 Πανεπιστημιακὸς λέκτορας στὰ κλασσικὰ γράμματα, τὸ 1997-2001 προήχθη σὲ Reader τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Φιλολογίας, καὶ τὸ 2001 ἐκλέχτηκε ὡς ὁ νέος Βασιλικὸς καθηγητὴς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσας καὶ φιλολογίας.

Στὸ χρονικὸ διάστημα ἀπὸ τὸ 1975-1999 ὑπῆρξε ἐπισκέπτης καθηγητὴς σὲ ἄρκετὰ ὀνομαστὰ Πανεπιστήμια τῶν Η.Π.Α. (Στάνφορντ, Γουίσκόνσιν, Πρίνστον, Πανεπιστήμιο τῆς Virginia, Πανεπιστήμιο τῆς Καλιφόρνιας κ.ἄ.). Ταυτόχρονα ὁ καθηγητὴς Hunter πρόσφερε τίς ὑπηρεσίες πού τοῦ ἀνατέθηκαν ἀπὸ τὸ Πανεπιστήμιο καὶ τίς ἄλλες πανεπιστημιακὲς ὀργανώσεις. Ἀνάλογες ἦταν οἱ ὑπηρεσίες του καὶ σὲ ἄλλες ἀκαδημαϊκὲς ὀργανώσεις. Ἔτσι διετέλεσε ἐκδότης τῆς σειρᾶς Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, τοῦ περιοδικοῦ Journal of Hellenic Studies (1995-2000), τοῦ περιοδικοῦ Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society

(1985-93), διατελεί μέλος τῆς συμβουλευτικῆς ἐπιτροπῆς γιὰ τὴν ἔκδοση τοῦ Ἑνδιάμεσου Ἑλληνικοῦ Λεξικοῦ ποὺ θὰ ἐξυπηρετήσῃ κυρίως τοὺς φοιτητὲς ποὺ σπουδάζουν ἐλληνικὴ φιλολογία κ.ἄ.

Τὰ δημοσιεύματά του ἀριθμοῦν ἀρκετοὺς αὐτοτελεῖς τόμους ἀπὸ τοὺς ὁποίους οἱ πρῶτοι ἀναφέρονταν στὸ πεδίο τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Ρωμαϊκῆς κωμωδίας, ἀλλὰ ἀργότερα ἀνέπτυξε ἐνδιαφέρον καὶ γιὰ τὸ ἐλληνικὸ μυθιστόρημα. Στὴ συνέχεια τὰ ἐνδιαφέροντά του ἐπεξετάθηκαν στὴν ἐλληνικὴ ποίηση καὶ πιὸ συγκεκριμένα στοὺς ποιητὲς Ἀπολλώνιο τὸ Ρόδιο καὶ τὸν Θεόκριτο. Τὰ ἐνδιαφέροντά του αὐτὰ γενικεύθηκαν μὲ τὴν προσεχῆ ἔκδοση τοῦ ἔργου *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica de Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* μὲ τὴ συνεργασία τοῦ Ἰταλοῦ καθηγητῆ Marco Fantuzzi καὶ θὰ ἀκολουθήσῃ μιὰ μονογραφία γιὰ τὸ ἐλληνικὸ ἐγκώμιο.

Στὴ διδακτορικὴ του διατριβὴ γιὰ τὸν Εὐβουλο ἀντίθετα ἀπ' ὅ,τι ἔκανε ὁ Kock, τὸ κείμενο ἀντιμετωπίζεται μὲ πολλὴ σύνεση. Ἡ εἰσαγωγὴ καὶ τὸ σχολιαστικὸ ὑπόμνημα διαφωτίζουν λεπτομερῶς τμήματα τοῦ ἔργου ποὺ ἀποτελεῖ συμβολὴ στὴν ἱστορία τῆς Μέσης Κωμωδίας. Πρόκειται γιὰ ἐντυπωσιακὸ ἐπίτευγμα ἀφοῦ πρόκειται γιὰ ἔργο νεαροῦ ἐπιστήμονα. Τὸ τελικὸ τμῆμα τῆς Εἰσαγωγῆς πραγματεύεται τὴν παράδοση τοῦ κειμένου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου, τῆς κύριας πηγῆς τῶν ἀποσπασμάτων τοῦ Εὐβουλου καὶ ὁ συγγραφέας ὀρθὰ ἀποφαίνεται ὅτι ἡ Ἐπιτομὴ τοῦ Ἀθηναίου δὲν προέρχεται ἀπὸ τὸ κείμενο τοῦ Μαρκιανοῦ κώδικα (A).

Τὸ δεύτερο ἔργο του τιτλοφορεῖται *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (1983). Πρόκειται γιὰ τὸ μυθιστόρημα ποὺ μαζί μὲ τὰ Αἰγυπτιακὰ τοῦ Ἡλιοδώρου διαβάστηκε περισσότερο ἀπὸ ὅλα τὰ ἐλληνιστικὰ μυθιστορήματα. Ὁ Hunter ὑποδεικνύει τίς βουκολικὲς προδιαγραφές του, τίς πιθανὲς διασυνδέσεις του καὶ τὴν πιθανὴ σχέση του μὲ τοὺς σύγχρονους θεωρητικὸς τῆς λογοτεχνίας, ὅπως ὁ Ἑρμογένης. Ὑπογραμμίζεται ἀκόμη ἡ ἐκζήτηση στὸ βουκολικὸ αὐτὸ ρομάντζο ποὺ εἶναι ἐνδιαφέρον καὶ γιὰ τὰ ρητορικὰ καὶ μυθιστορηματικὰ εὐρήματά του καὶ γιὰ τὴ μεταγενέστερη εὐρεία ἐπίδρασή του στὴν Ἀναγέννηση. Τὸ μυθιστόρημα αὐτὸ ποὺ ὁ Γκαῖτε χαρακτήρισε κόσμημα διαβάζεται εὐχάριστα καὶ εἶναι γεμᾶτο μὲ ἀναφορὲς σὲ κλασσικὰ κείμενα καὶ στὸ σύγχρονό του μυθιστόρημα. Τὸ ἔργο τοῦ καθηγητῆ Hunter ἐπαινέθηκε γιὰ τὴν εὐαισθησία τῆς παρουσίας τῆς ὕλης καὶ γιὰ τὴν ἀποφυγὴ κάθε σχολαστικισμοῦ ἢ ἐπιπόλαιης κρίσης.

Τὸ ἐπόμενο ἔργο του, ἡ Νέα Κωμωδία τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῆς Ρώμης (1985), μεταφράστηκε καὶ στὰ Ἑλληνικά (1994) καὶ εἶναι ὁ καρπὸς διαλέξεων του στοὺς φοιτητὲς. Μὲ αὐτὸ δίνεται μιὰ καλὴ ἰδέα γιὰ τὰ ἔργα τῆς ἐλληνικῆς καὶ λατινικῆς

Κωμωδίας, αρχίζοντας από το δημιουργό του είδους κωμικό Μένανδρο έως τις ρωμαϊκές προσαρμογές του Πλάτου και Τερέντιου. Το βιβλίο που είναι γεμάτο με λεπτές παρατηρήσεις στις θεματικές πλευρές της Νέας Κωμωδίας, διαβάζεται ευχάριστα γιατί, εκτός του ότι πληροῖ ἕνα βιβλιογραφικό κενό, ἔχει θαυμάσια κεφάλαια, ὅπως π.χ. γιὰ τὴ δόμηση τῆς κωμωδίας σὲ πέντε πράξεις καὶ τὴ μελέτη γιὰ τὸ μέτρο.

Ὁ τόμος πὺ ἐπιγράφεται «Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ρόδιος: Ἀργοναυτικά III» (1989) εἶναι σαφῆς ἔκθεση τῆς σύγχρονης κριτικῆς γιὰ τὸν ποιητὴ Ἀπολλώνιο καὶ τὸ βιβλίο τῶν Ἀργοναυτικῶν του. Ἔχει πλούσια καὶ ἰσορροπημένη εἰσαγωγή, ἐνῶ τὸ ἴδιο τὸ σχολιαστικὸ ὑπόμνημα διακρίνεται γιὰ τὴ φινέτσα τῆς λογοτεχνικῆς του ἀνάλυσης.

Στὸ δεύτερο ἔργο του γιὰ τὸν Ἀπολλώνιο: *The Argonautica of Apollonius: literary studies* (1993), ἐκεῖνο πὺ χαρακτηρίζει τὴν προσέγγιση τοῦ θέματος ἀπὸ τὸν Hunter, εἶναι ἡ προβολὴ τοῦ ἔπους στὴν κοινωνικὴ καὶ πνευματικὴ διάσταση ὅπως καὶ τὰ συχνὰ ὁμηρικὰ παράλληλα πὺ σχολιάζονται μὲ ἐπιστημολογικὴ καὶ κριτικὴ νηφαλιότητα. Ὑποδεικνύεται ἐπίσης καὶ ἡ χρῆση πὺ γίνεται τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου ἀπὸ τὸν Βιργίλιο στὴν Αἰνειάδα του. Μὲ τὸν τρόπο αὐτὸ τὸ ἔπος τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου ἀναδεικνύεται σὲ ἕνα συναρπαστικὸ καὶ καινοτόμο λογοτέχνημα.

Τὸ βιβλίο του *Jason and the Golden Fleece (The Argonautica)* 1993, πὺ τὸ 1995 ἐκδόθηκε καὶ στὴ γνωστὴ σειρά τοῦ Clarendon Press τῆς Ὁξφόρδης *World's Classics*, εἶναι μιὰ ἀκριβῆς πεζὴ μετάφραση τῶν Ἀργοναυτικῶν στὴν ὁποία εἶναι ἐμφανεῖς οἱ μεγάλες πρόοδοι πὺ ἔγιναν στὴν λογοτεχνικὴ κριτικὴ γιὰ τὸν Ἀπολλώνιο καὶ γενικὰ γιὰ τὴν Ἑλληνιστικὴ ποίηση. Πρόκειται γιὰ τὴν καλύτερη μετάφραση τῶν Ἀργοναυτικῶν, ἕνα ἐπίτευγμα πὺ δὲν εἶναι εὐκαταφρόνητο ἐξ αἰτίας τοῦ ποικίλου χρωματισμοῦ τοῦ ὕφους τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου.

Στὸ ἔργο του *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (1996) ὁ καθ. Hunter ἐξετάζει τὰ συμφραζόμενα μέσα στὰ ὁποία τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ Θεόκριτου ἀναπτύχθηκαν καί, ἰδιαίτερα, τὸν τρόπο μὲ τὸν ὁποῖο αὐτὰ ἀναπλάθουν τὶς ποιητικὲς φόρμες τῆς ἀρχαϊκῆς ἐποχῆς. Οἱ φόρμες αὐτὲς δὲν ἀναφέρονται τόσο στὰ βουκολικὰ ποιήματα ὅσο στοὺς ὕμνους, μίμους καὶ τὰ ἐρωτικὰ ποιήματα τοῦ δευτέρου μέρους τοῦ θεοκρίτειου συντάγματος. Πρόσφατοι πάπυροι ἔχουν ἐπαυξήσει τὴν ἀντίληψή μας πὺς ὁ Θεόκριτος «διάβαζε» τὴν ἀρχαϊκὴ ποίηση, καὶ ὅλα αὐτὰ χρησιμοποιοῦνται κατὰ ἕνα τρόπο πὺ θὰ μεταβάλλει τὸν τρόπο πὺ ἐξετάζουμε τὴν Ἑλληνιστικὴ ποίηση.

Τὸ τελευταῖο βιβλίο πὺ ἔχω ὑπόψη μου, *Theocritus. A Selection* (1999), εἶναι

τὸ πρῶτο ἔργο πὸ ἐκμεταλλεύεται τὴν πρόσφατη «ἐπανάσταση» στὴ σπουδὴ τῆς Ἑλληνιστικῆς καὶ Ρωμαϊκῆς ποίησης. Τὰ ποιήματα πὸ συμπεριλήφθησαν στὴ συλλογὴ εἶναι κυρίως τὰ βουκολικά τὰ ὁποῖα, μέσω τῆς ἐπίδρασής τους στὸν Βιργίλιο, δημιούργησαν τὴ δυτικὴ βουκολικὴ παράδοση. Στὸ σχολιαστικὸ ὑπόμνημα μελετᾶται πῶς ὁ Θεόκριτος ἐκμεταλλεύτηκε τὴν κλασσικὴ κληρονομιά γιὰ νὰ δημιουργήσει ἕνα νέο εἶδος ποίησης καὶ τί σήμαινε ἡ ποίηση αὐτὴ τὸν 3ον π.Χ. αἰώνα. Στὴν εἰσαγωγὴ διερευνᾶται ἡ σημασία τοῦ ἐπιθέτου «βουκολικός», ἡ παρουσίαση ἑνὸς στυλιζαρισμένου τοπίου στὴν ἐξοχὴ, ἡ σημασία τοῦ ἔρωτα στὸ βουκολικὸ κόσμο καὶ τὸ λεκτικὸ καὶ μετρικὸ ὕφος τοῦ Θεόκριτου.

Τὰ μικρότερα μελετήματα τοῦ καθηγητῆ Hunter πὸ ἀναφέρονται σὲ ἑλληνικά καὶ λατινικά θέματα ὑπερβαίνουν τὰ 40 καὶ οἱ βιβλιοκρισίες, κυρίως σὲ ἑλληνικά θέματα, φτάνουν τίς 50.

Dear Professor Hunter,

For your important contributions to Greek literature the Academy of Athens has elected you as its correspondent member. On my behalf I wish you every success in your new post, the fulfilment of your scientific expectations and many happy events in your private life.

THEOCRITUS AND THE EVOLUTION OF GREEK CULTURE

RICHARD HUNTER

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE ACADEMY OF ATHENS

It is an enormous pleasure and honour to be among you this evening, and I would like to express my thanks to Professor Conomis and the whole Academy for the honour which you have done me. In these circumstances, I hope that a little personal history will not be an inappropriate place to start.

I grew up in Sydney, home of course to a very large Greek community, and it is one of the great regrets of my life that, as you have just learned to your cost, I did not seize the opportunity to learn Greek properly. When I was twelve, however, I was fortunate enough to be offered the chance to learn *ancient* Greek by a school which had not otherwise taught that language for fifty years, but where it still now hangs on (though not, I fear, every year, and by threads of varying degrees of precariousness). Since then learning, reading, and eventually teaching Greek have been and continue to be for me the sources of what (most of the time) seems like a pleasure far surpassing the mere Epicurean absence of pain. It is, however, perhaps that distance from the classical world which geography imposed, together with the fact that the last few decades have not been the easiest for Classics, at least in England and Australia, and I dare say here in Greece too, which contributed to the fact that the majority of my scholarly life has been devoted to literature which is conventionally categorised as 'post-classical', whether 'Hellenistic', 'Alexandrian', or even 'imperial' (and hence very late indeed, though still of course very early when examined in the wider context of Greek literature through the ages). It is in these ages that the 'reception' of the classical world, understood narrowly as (roughly speaking) the Greek world to the death of Alexander, began, and for modern classicists 'reception' inevitably involves reflection upon our own sense of ourselves and

Parts of this lecture, delivered at the Academy of Athens on 19 March 2002, have appeared or are due to appear elsewhere: cf. 'On Coming After' (Inaugural lecture, University of Cambridge, <http://www.classics.cam.ac.uk/Faculty/staff-Lit.html>); 'Theocritus and the style of cultural change' in H. Yunis (ed.), *Written Text and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, forthcoming); 'Hellenistic literature and its contexts' in A. Erskine (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, forthcoming).

what we do. The classical world is, of course, a construction of many post-classical worlds.

When I first began graduate work (on comedy – and even that was already ‘Middle’) at Cambridge, it was on the whole Latinists who then read, perhaps I should say ‘took seriously’, Hellenistic poetry, admittedly for their own, sometimes parochial, purposes; then as now, Hellenistic poetry needed rescuing from Latinists. I joke, of course. Nevertheless, it is I think broadly true that, with great and honourable exceptions, Greek scholars then – in that primeval age when I was young – were not much interested in the interpretation of ‘Hellenistic’ literature, except insofar as torn papyri offered opportunities for conjectural supplement and conjecture; I used to joke in lectures that this lack of interest was because ‘Hellenistic’ bore the same relation to ‘Hellenic’ as ‘realistic’ to ‘real’ – there were similarities, but one was always supposed to recognise the inferior imitation – but perhaps that was not merely a joke. The inevitable happened – and I soon became the person who lectured on all those ‘late’ texts which no one else wanted. To make matters worse, and put me quite beyond the pale, my second book was on Longus’ *Daphnis & Chloe*, a novel of (probably) the late second century AD, and one which was conventionally seen by serious men (except notoriously for Goethe) as the height of sophistic decadence and tastelessness, not so much ‘Hellenistic’ any more as ‘narcissistic’. How things have changed! Though the increased interest in the ancient novel (and in conferences on the ancient novel) may be traced already to the mid 1970s, in the last 25 years it has become a major multi-national industry, and must now account for a decent percentage of Dutch export turnover. As for Alexandrian/Hellenistic poetry, I think it fair to say that the same period has seen a virtual revolution in its study (and one in which scholars from Greece have played a significant role); in part this goes along with a surge of interest in the political and social history of the later classical world, but in part too it is a reflection of changing attitudes among literary scholars of all fields. Broadly speaking, the growth of an interest in literary theory has been good for the study of Hellenistic poetry, not because any particular theoretical trend has unlocked interpretative keys in the literature of Alexandria and related states, but because a general theoretical awareness has called time-honoured literary assumptions and prejudices into question: poetry which is very aware of its past is now no longer necessarily the worse for that. How symbolic is the fact that the current holders of the two Regius Chairs of Greek in England are both ‘Hellenistic

people' I do not know; in the case of Professor Parsons, of course, this is merely one of the very many strings to his bow.

I have no intention, you will be pleased to hear, of tracing once more in this lecture the origins of the idea of 'the Hellenistic' in modern scholarship; Droysen's *Hellenismus* has had its roots mapped often enough. It would be more tempting to look at another old subject, namely the origins and cultural power of the ideas of 'the classic' and 'the classics', which both have very interesting histories in Greek and Roman antiquity, let alone later, but let me stay for the moment with the narrower question of how antiquity regarded what we call 'the Hellenistic', an investigation which must be placed within the general context of how the past was organised and categorised.

The division of history, and particularly literary history, into periods and the assigning of stereotyped characteristics to those periods is always with us, perhaps indeed is necessary for the very practice of history of all kinds. In antiquity, fairly rigid models of development within literature, even over fairly brief spans of time, may be traced. Dio Chrysostom's laudatory account of the *Philoctetes* plays of the three 'classical' tragedians is a familiar example: according to this simple schema, which has obvious roots in rhetorical education, Aeschylus is characterised by the 'archaic spirit of great-mindedness' (μεγαλοφροσύνη καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον) which is well suited to tragedy and the old-style characters (παλαιὰ ἦθη) of the heroes' (chap. 4) – even the craftiness of his Odysseus is an archaic form of guile, unlike modern pseudo-straightforwardness (chap. 5). Euripides, on the other hand, is the complete opposite (ἀντίστροφος) of Aeschylus (11), whereas Sophocles, 'seems to come in the middle...' (chap. 15), rather as Hellenistic rhetorical theory devised three kinds of prose style, the high, the plain, and one in the middle which draws from both the other two; three was ever a magic number.

Much of our evidence for ancient discussion of cultural periods comes in fact from the writers of Roman classicism, from the Atticists of the Augustan age through to Quintilian, together with those who parody them, such as Petronius. Here, for example, is the famous opening of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' essay *On the ancient orators*: 'In the epoch preceding our own, the old philosophic Rhetoric was so grossly abused and maltreated that it fell into a decline. From the death of Alexander of Macedon it began to lose its spirit and gradually wither away, and in our generation had reached a state of almost total extinction. Another Rhetoric stole in, intolerably shameless and histrionic, ill-

bred and without a vestige either of philosophy or of any other aspect of liberal education. Deceiving the mob and exploiting its ignorance, it not only came to enjoy greater wealth, luxury and splendour than the other, but actually made itself the key to civic honours and high office, a power which ought to have been reserved for the philosophic art. It was altogether vulgar and disgusting, and finally made the Greek world resemble the houses of the profligate and the abandoned: just as in such households there sits the lawful wife, freeborn and chaste, but with no authority over her domain, while a reckless harlot, bent on destroying her livelihood, claims control of the whole estate, treating the other like dirt and keeping her in a state of terror; so in every city, and in the highly civilised ones as much as any (which was the final indignity), the ancient and indigenous Attic Muse, deprived of her possessions, had lost her civic rank, while her antagonist, an upstart that had arrived only yesterday or the day before from some Asiatic sewer, a Mysian or Phrygian or Carian creature, claimed the right to rule over Greek cities, expelling her rival from public life. Thus was wisdom driven out by ignorance, and sanity by madness' (trans. S. Usher, adapted). I will not be concerned in this lecture with the substance and course of the debate between 'Atticism' and 'Asianism', though I can hardly imagine more appropriate surroundings than these for the pursuit of such a subject; nevertheless, it is worth bearing in mind that just as in antiquity 'Asianism' seems always to have been a purely negative construct, created the better to parade the virtues of its 'opposite', so 'Hellenistic' has in the more recent past been another such negative construct (and it is of course no accident that the ancient period of 'Asianism' roughly overlaps with the modern construct of 'the Hellenistic'). There are, however, two aspects of Dionysius' marvellous tirade to which I would draw your attention.

The first is the very continuity of critical language. What Dionysius has to say about 'Asiatic rhetoric' mirrors almost exactly the treatment by Attic Comedy of 'the new music' of Timotheus and Philoxenus nearly four centuries before. What came before was solid and genuine, 'men' were really 'men' then, but the new is characterised by the empty fashionableness of the performance, which is made possible by the ignorance of the audience; 'playing to the crowd' is now the name of the game (cf. Quintilian 10.1.43). Secondly, there is the link between literature on the one hand and political and socio-economic ideas on the other. States which are decadent politically produce a decadent culture; such ideas were to become very powerful tools in the Greek literature of the Roman

empire. Thus, for example, Longinus' *On the Sublime*, a work to which I shall return, is one of our witnesses to a cultural narrative, which flourished in the first century CE, according to which political quiescence, i.e. an absence of democracy, is responsible for the dearth of literary grandeur (*On the Sublime* 44.2-5); in such a narrative, freedom of expression and greatness of thought go hand-in-hand with political freedom. To what extent the reception of Hellenistic poetry has similarly been affected by a kind of spillage over from a general distaste for the increasingly non-democratic politics of the Hellenistic states is a subject at least worth pondering.

It is however not just Hellenistic orators who felt the lash of Dionysius' pen. Here, for example, are some further observations: 'What makes the difference between one poet or orator and another is the dexterity with which they arranged their words. Almost all the ancient (*archaioi*) writers made a special study of it, with the result that their metres, their lyrics and their prose are works of beauty. But among their successors, with few exceptions, this was no longer so. Then, in later times, it was totally neglected, and no one regarded it as essential, or even thought that it contributed anything to the beauty of discourse. Consequently they have left behind them compilations such as no one can bear to read to the final flourish of the pen: I refer to such men as Phylarchus, Duris, Polybius, Psaon, Demetrius of Callatis, Hieronymus... and countless others [all Hellenistic historians]. The space of a whole day will not be sufficient for me to recite the names of all of them, if I should wish to do so. But why should we be surprised at these, when even those who claim to be philosophers and publish handbooks on logic are so inept in the arrangement of their words that I shrink from mentioning their names? It is sufficient to point to Chrysippus the Stoic as proof of my statement... Of writers who have been judged worthy of renown or distinction, none has written treatises on logic with more precision, and none has published discourses which are worse specimens of composition' (*On Literary Composition* p. 42 Usher). We need not dwell on what Chrysippus might have made of this criticism...

For the writers and scholars of the Augustan age *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι* –and their virtues– were what we would classify as 'the ancients' down to (roughly) the end of the fourth century BC, though of course divisions could be made within such a long period, and the critical language of periodisation was never meant to map smoothly on to a chronological table, in part because (of course) much more than mere chronology is at stake. It is less easy to establish where the poets and

scholars of the third century themselves drew boundary lines, or rather what any such boundaries might have meant for them, in the way that we can see that ἀρχαῖον and παλαιόν are already highly charged words for Thucydides and for certain self-consciously fashionable characters in Aristophanes. It will mean something that Eratosthenes did not carry his chronographical work on the Olympian victors beyond the death of Alexander, though we should be wary of leaping to the most obvious conclusions that one might draw from this apparent watershed. So too, Quintilian's famous report that, in the late third and second century BC, Aristarchus and Aristophanes (of Byzantium) did not receive anyone 'of their own time' (*suum tempus*) into the lists of approved authors (10.1.54) begs as many questions as it answers. The practice of the grammarians perhaps tells us more about the history of generic classification as a scholarly activity than it does about any sense of what divides the present from the past. Moreover, there is evidence on the other side. There is, for example, no sign that the several quotations of Callimachus and the at least one each of Euphorion and Simias of Rhodes in the great first-century catalogue of dreadful things said by poets in Philodemus' treatise *On Piety* were 'ghettoised' off from the quotations of archaic and classical poetry, and some at least of these quotations of what we call Hellenistic poetry presumably go back as far as Apollodorus in the mid-second century. Two further points are worth noting. First, there is in fact just enough evidence to show that the poetry of the high Alexandrian period was indeed the subject of scholarly interest long before the Augustan age, so that the break between 'classical' and 'non-classical' poetry is not as sharp as the story about Aristarchus and Aristophanes of Byzantium might suggest. Secondly, it is too often assumed (implicitly or explicitly) that the modern appreciation of or (often) impatience with Hellenistic poetry as a kind of salad bar alternative for the self-conscious, not part of the main menu of Classics, a fat –and taste– free zone, somehow echoes the ancient critical reception. In fact, however, it is only with the classicising critics of the Empire, such as the author of *On the Sublime*, that we find scholars taking Callimachus' weight-watching Muse at face value. Too little attention has been paid to the considerable difference in the critical reception of rhetoric and that of poetry after Alexander.

The study of Hellenistic literature is of course fragmented and skewed by the chances of survival. The high poetry of the third century, particularly that associated with the court of the Ptolemies at Alexandria, holds centre-stage, but (for example) Hellenistic oratory and tragedy are all but completely lost, and we

must reconstruct most of the literary scholarship of the period from scattered fragments and the scholia to the texts of earlier ages, which were now properly 'edited' for the first time. The natural concentration upon Alexandria can obscure the flowering of a brilliant Doric literary culture in the West: Theocritus allows us a glimpse of this, but one would give much to have one of Rhinthon's tragic parodies from the same period and area. The literature of the second and first centuries has, in particular, fared badly: epigrams (including those of Meleager of Gadara, whose 'Garland', an anthology of poems by himself and others, may still be glimpsed within the surviving *Palatine Anthology*), the *Europa* of Moschus, some bucolic poems which probably survived because of their association with Theocritus, Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis*, and the anonymous *Epitaph for Bion* are practically all the poetry which survives intact from this crucial transitional period. Nevertheless, it is also important to remember that a major part of 'literary experience' in this period was constructed through the great texts of the past, most notably perhaps Homer and Euripides, and it is through the constant re-interpretation and appropriation of these texts, an appropriation that took place in thousands of elementary school-rooms as well as in theatres and in the books of learned men, that they may be considered as much 'Hellenistic' as 'archaic' or 'classical'. The Hellenistic age is indeed one of the more remarkable and important periods of Homeric reception, and in the world after Alexander, the *alter Achilles* himself, a world of powerful 'kings' (*basileis*) of many different shades of legitimacy, the *Iliad* became again a strongly didactic text about (*inter alia*) power and conflict, as the *Odyssey* became an obvious pre-echo of the apparently ever-expanding geographical horizons of Greek culture.

If readings of Homer represent large-scale reactions to a shifting social geography, the new possibilities of movement, dislocation, and loss are perhaps reflected at a micro-level in the hundreds of 'literary' funeral epigrams of the Hellenistic period. The epigram offers the evermoving 'passer-by' a brief moment of stillness, while the deceased's often bitterly brief moment of *kleos* asserts the value of life in the face of the hopelessness of human mortality. Thus the following poem of Callimachus unites his own community of Cyrene in grief,

*At dawn we buried Melanippos, and while the sun
Was setting the maiden Basilo died*

*By her own hand, unable to live once she had placed
Her brother on the pyre. The house of their father
Aristippos looked upon evil doubled, and all Cyrene plunged
In grief, seeing that home of noble children orphaned.*

Epigram 20 Pf., trans. Nisetich

whereas in another poem the separation and loss of death is cruelly actualised in geographical distance :

*If you come to Kyzikos, it's small trouble to find Hippakos
and Didyme, for in no way obscure is the family.
And you must say to them a painful word, but say it
All the same: I hold their son, Kritias, here.*

Epigram 12 Pf., trans. Nisetich

If these poems seem easy enough to map on to what we know of the social world of the Hellenistic Mediterranean, the content of much Hellenistic literature has in fact often provoked at best disappointment. In one of the most suggestive modern discussions of 'the Hellenistic', almost now a 'classic' text, Sir Kenneth Dover addressed the question of naivety or pseudo-naivety as a poetic mode, and observed that one of the problems (for him) with Hellenistic poetry was that the poets 'treated poetry as if its province had been defined at some date in the past and it had been forbidden to advance in certain directions or to penetrate below a certain phenomenological level... If we can put ourselves into the place of educated Athenians at the end of the fifth century BC, a period in which philosophical, political, religious, scientific and historical thinking were developing at an almost explosive pace, we may, I think, be able to recapture the surprise we should have felt if someone had asserted that a century and a half later one distinguished poet would be writing, "And if you do this for me, Pan, may the boys of Arkadia not flog your sides and shoulders with squills when meat is short" (Theokr. VII.106 ff)... One can imagine, too, the despair of Thucydides if he had foreseen the drivel which Timaios (*FGrHist* 566) was to write about the mutilation of the herms (fr. 102, criticised by Plu. *Nic.* 1), a good example of the backwash of poetic convention into historiography' (*Theocritus* p. lxix). These are serious charges, and they stand within an honourable tradition: in 1955 Rudolf Pfeiffer, whose services to the study of Hellenistic poetry can hardly be exaggerated, said of Hellenistic poetry that 'it showed no original

magnitude of subject or gravity of ethical and religious ideas'. Whereas Dover expresses wonder at an apparent lack of development, a retrogression even, Pfeiffer calmly asserts a hollowness at the poetry's heart. The assertion has, of course, a history, and we may trace in back to Aristotle's *Poetics* and then to Longinus' *On the Sublime*, one of the most remarkable and influential texts to survive from antiquity, but also one which has a very great deal to answer for: Here is one of the most famous chapters of that work:

All human affairs are, in the nature of things, better known on their worse side; the memory of mistakes is inefaceable, that of goodness is soon gone. I have myself cited not a few mistakes in Homer and other great writers, not because I take pleasure in their slips, but because I consider them not so much voluntary mistakes as oversights let fall at random through inattention and with the negligence of genius. I do, however, think that the greater good qualities, even if not consistently maintained, are always more likely to win the prize – if for no other reason, because of the greatness of spirit they reveal. Apollonius is an error-free poet in the *Argonautica*; Theocritus is very felicitous in the *Idylls*... but would you rather be Homer or Apollonius? Is the Eratosthenes of that flawless little poem *Erigone* a greater poet than Archilochus, with his abundant, surging flood, that bursting forth of the divine spirit which is so hard to bring under the rule of law. Take lyric poetry: would you rather be Bacchylides or Pindar? Take tragedy: would you rather be Ion of Chios or Sophocles? Ion and Bacchylides are impeccable, uniformly beautiful writers in the polished manner; but it is Pindar and Sophocles who sometimes set the world on fire with their vehemence, for all that their flame often goes out without reason and they fall down dismally. Indeed, no one in his senses would reckon all Ion's works put together as the equivalent of the one play *Oedipus the King* (trans. Russell, adapted).

The influence of what Donald Russell has called this “manifesto directed against what we may call the Callimachean ideal” on modern attitudes to Hellenistic poetry would itself make for a whole series of lectures, but for now just note how style and subject-matter are treated together: gravity and greatness of one go hand-in-hand with the other, and vice versa.

I want now to look briefly at Kenneth Dover's two examples to see what they can in fact tell us about the Hellenistic literary response to the sense of the past, and in particular to the ancients' own views of the evolution of culture.

Timaios of Sicilian Tauromenion, whose long life extended from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the third century BC, was the great historian of the Greek west – and the first Greek writer to concern himself seriously with the history of Rome; his history of Sicily and the West in 38 books was probably written during half a century of political exile in Athens. Timaios is one of antiquity's great missing figures, but that has not stopped him acquiring a critical reputation all his own. The label which has been stuck on Timaios is that of 'pedant', itself a notion hardly conceivable without the same mindset which gave us 'Hellenistic'. Even Momigliano, one of Timaios' more sympathetic modern students, calls him 'a pedant with imagination' (*Terzo contributo* I 48) – almost a *real* scholar, then, almost 'one of us'. Indeed, a climactic section of Felix Jacoby's introductory essay in *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* on Timaios is concerned with the question of whether the title 'ein gelehrter' is appropriately bestowed upon Timaios. Part of Jacoby's self-confessedly 'psychological' answer is that Timaios' blindness to his own faults and his constant polemic against, not just other historians, but figures such as Aristotle, his constant nit-picking (if you like), which brought the name 'Epitimaïos' (the 'blamer'), *may* (Jacoby does not commit himself to the analysis) have been the result of a deep consciousness that he himself was nothing more than a dilettante without 'wissenschaftliche Ausbildung' who was not really up to the job of serious historiography (*FgrHist* IIB pp. 537-8). 'Dilettante' is, of course, another wounding word: no grave charge can be brought against any 'scholar', and Timaios was, according to modern scholars, both 'pedant' and 'dilettante'. Polybius famously criticises him for doing all his research in libraries, without any practical experience of military affairs, topography, or the interviewing of witnesses: 'Inquiries from books', sneers Polybius, 'may be made without any danger or hardship, provided only that one take care to have access to a town (*polis*) containing a wealth of written accounts (ὑπομνήματα) or to have a library near at hand' (12.27.4). (How different from the life of scholarship as *we* know it!). The sub-text seems to be that Athens, the *polis* where Timaios worked, like Alexandria, the site of the ancient world's most famous library, is now merely 'a university', i.e. not part of the real world, a place of theory, not practical knowledge; power, and the writing of that power, has moved elsewhere. Polybius' polemic, with its implicit exaltation of a Thucydidean ideal – Thucydides, after all, was exiled from the very *polis* in which Timaios worked and, at the very least, his account of this exile (5.26.5) implies extensive travel in pursuit of his enquiries, unlike the smug

Timaios – is thus an early witness to the periodisation, and the stereotyping which accompanies it, which was to take such hold in critical circles in Rome a century and more later.

One of the most persistent and virulent strains in Polybius' attack upon Timaios' history, and particularly the speeches within it, is the charge that it is infected by the frigid practices of the rhetorical schools. The terminology of this critical abuse – 'scholastic', 'sophistic', 'childish' (παιδαριώδης, μειρακιώδης) – passed into the canon of standard judgements, for we find it (and some of the very same examples used to illustrate it) repeated in Plutarch (*Nicias* 1.1-4) and 'Longinus' (4.1-3). 'Longinus' also cites the example which so upset Plutarch and Kenneth Dover: Timaios linked the Athenian disaster in his homeland of Sicily, in which the Syracusan leader Hermocrates, son of Hermon, played a central rôle, with the mutilation of the Athenian Herms shortly before the expedition's departure. So too, it was not a good omen that the Athenian general Nicias, whose name means 'victory', had in fact at first declined to take part. We may of course argue about the level of 'drivel' involved here – we live in a world where strange things happen, particularly in times of real or alleged war, and rationalism is at least not obviously triumphant today – and it is, moreover, not entirely certain that these reflections were in the voice of the historian himself rather than one of his characters. Nevertheless, Thucydides had already noted that the Athenians had taken the mutilation to be a bad omen for the expedition (6.27.3), and it is hard to believe that the oracle-mongers and seers, against whom, as Thucydides reports (8.1), the Athenians turned when disaster struck, had not already seen what lay in Nicias' name, though apparently they drew a different conclusion from it. Thucydides' Nicias had after all already sensed divine jealousy (*phthonos*) at work in the Athenian disaster (7.77.3), and events had proved that Nicias and those who took the mutilation of the Herms seriously were right all along. In writing from Athens the 'Sicilian version' of Athenian disaster, Timaios takes the Thucydidean account as his starting-point and expands upon it, particularly in the gaps which Thucydides' apparently rigidly austere selectivity sought to occlude, but in fact openly advertised. Specifically, we may speculate that Timaios took up and sharpened the tragic shaping of the Syracusan narrative in Thucydides: the rôle of the faceless divine, the *daimonion*, the ominous significance of names (cf. 'Helen', 'Aias' etc.), the fact that Timaios has the Athenian generals commit suicide, rather than (as in Thucydides and others) being put to death, and has their bodies (in time-honoured fashion)

exposed to public viewing (*theama*, fr. 102) all gesture towards familiar features of Athenian tragedy. This is not a matter of the familiar importance of dramatised pathos in hellenistic historiography, but of a specifically appropriate literary shape to a real 'Athenian tragedy'. The obvious parallel for the 'Sicilian version' of the Athenian catastrophe would be an Athenian version of the Persian catastrophe of the early fifth century, and Timaeus may, as perhaps also Thucydides before him, have specifically had in mind just such a text, the *Persians* of Aeschylus, another dramatisation of a disaster of which the gods had given forewarning (vv. 739-41) and of which the lesson was that no one should 'scorn their present lot and by desiring the property of others waste great prosperity' (vv. 824-6, cf. Thucyd. 6.13.1, 6.24.3). The turning of such a text against the Athenians would have carried a brilliant textual power.

Let me now turn to Dover's other exhibit. The meeting and song-exchange of Lycidas, the unmistakable goatherd (or is he?), met by chance (or is it?) on a Coan country road, and Simichidas in Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*, the *Thalysia*, has a fair claim to be among, not only the most discussed, but also the most powerful and strangely compelling scenes of all Greek poetry; in part its hold over us lies not merely in the familiar attractiveness of the mysterious and riddling, but also in our pervasive sense of witnessing a confrontation across time, a dramatisation of historical development. Both Lycidas and Simichidas are poets and they agree to an exchange of 'bucolic song' as they travel together.

Here is the opening part of Simichidas' poem in A.S.F. Gow's translation; 'For Simichidas the Loves sneezed, for he, poor soul, loves Myrto as dearly as goats love the spring. But Aratus, dearest friend in all to me, guards deep at heart desire of a boy. Aratus knows, a man of worth, the best of men, whom Phoebus himself would not grudge to stand and sing, lyre in hand, by his own tripods – knows how to the very marrow Aratus is aflame with love of a boy. Ah, Pan, to whom has fallen the lovely plain of Homole, lay him unsummoned in my friend's dear arms, whether it be the pampered Philinus or another. And if you do this, dear Pan, then never may Arcadian lads flog you with squills about the flanks and shoulders when they find scanty meat. But if you consent otherwise, then may you be bitten and with your nails scratch yourself from top to toe; may you sleep in nettles, and in midwinter find yourself on the mountains of the Edonians, turned towards the river Hebrus, hard by the pole. And in summer may you herd your flock among the furthest Ethiopians beneath the rock of the Blemyes from where the Nile is no more seen. But do you leave the sweet stream

of Hyetis and Byblis, and Oecus, that steep seat of golden-haired Dione, you Loves as rosy as apples, and wound for me with your bows the lovely Philinus, wound him, for the wretch has no pity on my friend.'

The (to us at least) obscure proper names, the sense that the poem is full of in-jokes, the joking prayer to Pan, and the persistent detached irony are all suggestive again of an entirely modern, iambic mode. The very lowness of such poetry, its claim to a 'popular voice', made it a paradoxically perfect vehicle for the exploitation of the new possibilities of written poetry and new types of audience. Thus, for example, whereas Lycidas speaks in a prophetic, incantatory, semi-mystical manner which hints at a magical control of the world (the halcyons etc.) and recalls the originary link between poet and seer, Simichidas includes the description (which so offended Dover) of a distant, but allegedly contemporary, rustic magical rite, with which he himself has nothing to do and about which he has learned, so we are to understand, from a book.

Lycidas' telling – or rather the telling which he puts in Tityrus' mouth – of the stories of Daphnis and Komatas, as he imagines the party he will hold to celebrate the safe arrival in Mytilene of his beloved Ageanax, is very different: 'Close by Tityrus shall sing how once Daphnis the oxherd loved Xenea, and how the hill grieved for him and the oaks which grow upon the river Himeras' banks sang his dirge, when he was wasting like any snow under high Haemus or Athos or Rhodope or remotest Caucasus. And he shall sing how once a wide coffin received the goat alive by the impious presumption of a king; and how the blunt-faced bees came from the meadows to the fragrant chest of cedar and fed him on tender flowers because the Muse had poured sweet nectar on his lips. Ah, blessed Comatas, yours is this sweet lot: you too were closed within the coffin; you too, on honeycomb fed, did endure with labour the springtime of the year. Would that you had been numbered with the living in my day, that I might have herded your fair goats upon the hills and listened to your voice, while you, divine Comatas, did lie and make sweet music under the oaks or pines.' Lycidas, unlike Simichidas, finds personal, exemplary comfort in the bucolic heroes of his own world - Daphnis and Komatas - and what is important, as it had traditionally been in the poetic representation of myth, is how their stories, their *πᾶθη*, act as paradigms for his own experience. Moreover, this highly allusive text seems to assume an audience, whether that be just Lycidas himself or some wider group, to which those stories are known and significant. This allusive narrative mode suggests 'tradition', as it also constructs for itself an interpretative community;

here, literary allusiveness, intertextuality if you like, and mythic allusiveness function in similar ways. The different gods who question the fast-fading Daphnis in *Idyll* 1 embody different levels of knowledge and curiosity, thus dramatising the text's construction of its audience, but this device also foregrounds that allusiveness which implies familiarity, while conjuring up the generic world of myth and constructing a community to whom that myth is significant, who need constantly to (re-)interpret it.

Simichidas' pursuit of novelty leaves a world marked out by (often arcane) cult and ritual names, rather than by narratives of personal or collective significance. The modern study of fiction has taught us that detailed names and places are the 'effects of the real' which create the fictional illusion; this is an irony which Thucydides would presumably not have appreciated. Such detail goes hand-in-hand with the telling of stories as coherent, self-contained wholes in which temporal and spatial sequence are of primary importance. With hindsight we can see that the vast sea of Greek myth was fertile ground for the development of fictionalising instincts and the instinct for fiction: Walter Burkert once noted that what is distinctive and 'utterly confusing for non-specialists and often for specialists' about Greek myth is its extraordinarily profuse detail of names, genealogies and inter-relationships, with, in other words (though Burkert certainly did not say this), 'effects of the real' waiting to happen. If we are forced to name a crucial moment in this process, the classicist may think of Aristophanes' Euripides, whose prologising gods told 'the whole story' (*Frogs* 946-7), i.e. organized disparate strands (and disparate names) into a coherent, connected narrative.

As for Lycidas' stories of Daphnis and Komatas, it is tempting to suggest that the allusive mode of telling, related forms of which are of course familiar enough from the choral lyric of the archaic and classical periods, is a direct response to developments in 'systematic mythography' and to what I have called the 'fictionalising' impulses which go with that systematisation. In the *Bucolics*, Theocritus thus imaginatively recreates or invents an oral style of 'traditional tale' beyond systematisation (and certainly beyond Simichidas) and only preserved in the folk memories of shepherds and goatherds. No more powerful dramatisation of what the sense of the past means and of an evolution within Greek culture survives from the extraordinary intellectual currents of the third century.

In using the classical past to try to make sense of the present we remain the heirs of the Hellenistic poets and scholars; in this period the idea, the con-

structive imagining of, a continuity of Greek culture was very powerful and it is a power which, I am pleased to say, is very obviously still with us. Its novelty must not of course be exaggerated. One could, for example, argue that when Athenians of the fifth century watched tragedies depicting characters of the Bronze Age, the imaginative construction of cultural continuity was just as strong (and the real continuity far less) than that which tied Theocritus and his contemporaries to the golden period of lyric poetry which their verse so vividly recreates. Thus Euripides highlights the disjunction by placing the language and intellectual sentiments of the late fifth century in the mouth of his Mycenaean characters. What however perhaps distinguishes the post-classical intellectual project, aspects of which I have been tracing, is precisely its self-conscious reflectiveness, what I might term its academic quality, and this seems – in this place – a quality worth celebrating.