

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

31.2013

ADOLF M. HAKKERT EDITORE

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

SOMMARIO

ARTICOLI

Riccardo Di Donato, <i>Saluto a Belfagor</i>	1
Carlo Franco, <i>Il contributo di Emilio Gabba</i>	6
Enrico Medda, <i>Ricordo di Vincenzo Di Benedetto</i>	11
Nicholas Horsfall, <i>Un ricordo di Giovanni Franco</i> , con appendice di Carlo Franco	14
Claude Calame, <i>De la pratique culturelle dominante à la philologie classique: le rôle du chœur dans la tragédie attique</i>	16
Lucia Marrucci, <i>Zeus 'Nemtor' nei 'Sette contro Tebe' (Aesch. 'Sept.' 485)</i>	29
Francesco Mambrini, <i>Les Dons de Clytemnestre et la tombe d'Agamemnon. Sur Soph. 'El.' 431-63</i>	40
Enrico Medda, <i>Statue per Menelao? Un'interpretazione di Aesch. 'Ag.' 416-9</i>	60
Daria Francobandiera, « <i>Comment faut-il le nommer?</i> » <i>Note sur l'histoire des interprétations d'Aesch. 'Ch.' 997-1000</i>	76
Pietro Totaro, <i>Venticinque anni di studi greci su "Lexis". Nota a Eschilo 'Supplici' 859 s. e 894</i> .	105
Matteo Taufer, <i>Due parziali apografi eschilei nel Laur. 32.21 (Ca) per 'Sept.' 35-68 e 'PV' 789-1093</i>	113
Matteo Taufer, <i>Aesch. 'PV' 550 ἀλαδὸν 'φέρεται' γένος: una lezione inedita nel Vallicell. B 70 (Nb)</i> .	119
Reina Marisol Troca Pereira, <i>Ifigénia em Áulide – duas afirmações: blasfémia (vs. deuses) ou realismo (vs. profetas)?</i>	122
Nadia Rosso, <i>L'ekphrasis' corale del primo stasimo dell' 'Elettra' di Euripide</i>	138
Giuseppina Basta Donzelli, <i>Nota su Euripide 'Elettra' 699</i>	156
Giacomo Mancuso, <i>Congetture inedite di Peter Elmsley all' 'Andromaca' di Euripide</i>	160
Gian Franco Nieddu, <i>Note alla 'Pace' di Aristofane</i>	170
Silvia Pagni, <i>Il coro del 'Pluto' di Aristofane: giochi paratragici</i>	189
Pierluigi Perrone, <i>Intersezioni tra lessico medico e comico: il caso di βουβών e βουβωνιάω (Aristoph. 'Vesp.' 275a-7a; Men. 'Georg.' 48.50-2)</i>	201
Francesca Guadalupe Masi, <i>Indeterminismo e autodeterminazione. Aristotele ed Epicuro</i>	213
Christos Tsagalis, <i>The Rock of Ajax: Posidippus 19.9 A-B</i>	238
Nicola Piacenza, <i>Amanti o distruttori di frutti: Leonida di Taranto ('AP' 9.563) alla luce di un epigramma adespota dell' 'Anthologia Palatina' (9.373)</i>	248
Vera Grossi, <i>Tradizioni locali attiche negli scoli a Tucidide. Note su alcuni scoli all' 'Archeologia'</i>	254
Ewa Garasińska – Wiesław Suder, <i>'Tentipellium' – An Ancient Facelift without a Scalpel?</i>	272
Lucia Pasetti, <i>L'io come personaggio: permanenza di un modulo linguistico nella ricezione dell' 'Amphitruo'</i>	284
Amedeo Alessandro Raschieri, <i>Traduzione e apprendimento retorico (Cic. 'inv.' 1.51 s.)</i>	311
Francesca Romana Berno, <i>Il compromesso impossibile. Marco Celio tra vizi e virtù</i>	321
Stefano Costa, <i>Il dovere della guerra civile tra Lucano e Gellio</i>	336
Giuseppina Magnaldi, <i>La parola-segnale nel cod. Laur. plut. 76.36 (L) di Apuleio filosofo</i>	347
Francesco Citti, <i>Un figlio o un figlio solo? Nota a Paul. 'dig.' 5.1.28.5</i>	358
Alberto Canobbio, <i>Una supplica tra serio e faceto: Marziale nel carme 13 di Sidonio Apollinare</i>	366
Alessia Fassina, <i>Sulla datazione del 'De Verbi incarnatione' ('AL' 719 R²)</i>	391
Pau Gilabert Barberà, <i>'Brideshead Revisited' (1945) by Evelyn Waugh (1903-1966): The Benefit of an Arcadian Experience in Confronting the Human Tragedy</i>	398

RECENSIONI

Arnaldo Momigliano, <i>Decimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico</i> (C. Franco)	419
Anton Bierl – Wolfgang Braungart (hrsgg.), <i>Gewalt und Opfer. Im Dialog mit Walter Burkert</i> (A. Taddei)	423
Luigi Lehnus, <i>Incontri con la filologia del passato</i> (C. Franco)	429
Piero Treves, “ <i>Le piace Tacito?</i> ”. <i>Ritratti di storici antichi</i> , a c. di Carlo Franco (V. Citti)	432
Valentina Garulli, <i>Byblos Laine: Epigrafia, Letteratura, Epitafio</i> (C. Tsagalis)	435
Jonas Grethlein, <i>Das Geschichtsbild der ‘Ilias’. Eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive</i> (C. Lucci)	438
Giulio Colesanti, <i>Questioni Teognidee. La genesi simposiale di un ‘corpus’ di elegie</i> (S. Pagni)	447
Livio Rossetti, <i>Le dialogue socratique</i> (S. Jedrkiewicz)	450
Richard Stoneman – Tristano Gargiulo (a c. di), <i>Il Romanzo di Alessandro</i> (C. Franco)	455
James H. Richardson, <i>The Fabii and the Gauls. Studies in Historical Thought and Historiography in Republican Rome</i> (A. Pistellato)	457
Alberto Cavarzere, <i>Gli arcani dell’oratore. Alcuni appunti sull’‘actio’ dei Romani</i> (A. Pistellato)	464
Bruna Pieri, ‘ <i>Intacti saltus</i> ’. <i>Studi sul III libro delle ‘Georgiche’</i> (M. Fucecchi)	468
Luca Canali – Francesca Romana Nocchi (a c. di), <i>Epigrammata Bobiensia</i> (S. Mattiacci)	473
Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, <i>L’arte del tradurre</i> (G. Ugolini)	477
<i>Leucothoe Iohannis Pascoli</i> , edidit Vincenzo Fera (S. Zivec)	479
Alfonso Traina, <i>Il singhiozzo della tacchina e altri saggi pascoliani</i> (V. Citti)	482
Giovanni Barberi Squarotti (a c. di), <i>Le ‘Odi’ di Quinto Orazio Flacco tradotte da Cesare Pavese</i> (C. Franco)	483

Direzione

VITTORIO CITTI
PAOLO MASTANDREA

Redazione

STEFANO AMENDOLA, GUIDO AVEZZÙ, FEDERICO BOSCHETTI, CLAUDIA CASALI, LIA DE FINIS, CARLO FRANCO, ALESSANDRO FRANZOI, MASSIMO MANCA, STEFANO MASO, ENRICO MEDDA, LUCA MONDIN, GABRIELLA MORETTI, MARIA ANTONIETTA NENCINI, PIETRO NOVELLI, STEFANO NOVELLI, GIOVANNA PACE, ANTONIO PISTELLATO, RENATA RACCANELLI, ANDREA RODIGHIERO, GIANCARLO SCARPA, PAOLO SCATTOLIN, LINDA SPINAZZÈ, MATTEO TAUFER

Comitato scientifico

MARIA GRAZIA BONANNO, ANGELO CASANOVA, ALBERTO CAVARZERE, GENNARO D'IPPOLITO, LOWELL EDMUNDS, PAOLO FEDELI, ENRICO FLORES, PAOLO GATTI, MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO, GIAN FRANCO GIANOTTI, PIERRE JUDET DE LA COMBE, MARIE MADELEINE MACTOUX, GIUSEPPE MASTROMARCO, GIANCARLO MAZZOLI, CARLES MIRALLES, GIAN FRANCO NIEDDU, CARLO ODO PAVESE, WOLFGANG RÖSLER, PAOLO VALESIO, MARIO VEGETTI, BERNHARD ZIMMERMANN

LEXIS – Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

<http://www.lexisonline.eu/>
info@lexisonline.eu, infolexisonline@gmail.com

Direzione e Redazione:

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Palazzo Malcanton Marcorà – Dorsoduro 3484/D
I-30123 Venezia

Vittorio Citti vittorio.citti@gmail.it

Paolo Mastandrea mast@unive.it

Pubblicato con il contributo del
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Copyright by Vittorio Citti
ISSN 2210-8823
ISBN 978-90-256-1287-0

Lexis, in accordo ai principi internazionali di trasparenza in sede di pubblicazioni di carattere scientifico, sottopone tutti i testi che giungono in redazione a un processo di doppia lettura anonima (*double-blind peer review*, ovvero *refereeing*) affidato a specialisti di Università o altri Enti italiani ed esteri. Circa l'80% dei revisori è esterno alla redazione della rivista. Ogni due anni la lista dei revisori che hanno collaborato con la rivista è pubblicata sia online sia in calce a questa pagina.

Lexis figura tra le riviste di carattere scientifico a cui è riconosciuta la classe A nella lista di valutazione pubblicata dall'**ANVUR** (*Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca*). È inoltre censita dalla banca dati internazionale **Scopus-Elsevier**, mentre è in corso la procedura di valutazione da parte della banca dati internazionale **Web of Science-ISI**.

Informazioni per i contributori: gli articoli e le recensioni proposti alla rivista vanno inviati all'indirizzo di posta elettronica **infolexisonline@gmail.com**. Essi debbono rispettare scrupolosamente le norme editoriali della rivista, scaricabili dal sito **www.lexisonline.eu**. Qualsiasi contributo che non rispetti tali norme non sarà preso in considerazione da parte della redazione.

Revisori anni 2011-2012:

Antonio Aloni
Guido Avezzù
Giuseppina Basta Donzelli
Luigi Battezzato
Federico Boschetti
Pierangelo Buongiorno
Claude Calame
Alberto Camerotto
Alberto Cavarzere
Walter Cavini
Ettore Cingano
Paolo Cipolla
Vittorio Citti
Donatella Coppini
Lucio Cristante
Richard Dawe
Fabiana Di Brazzà
Riccardo Di Donato
Marco Fernandelli
Alessandro Franzoi
Marco Fucecchi
Carles Garriga
Alexander Garvie
Gianfranco Gianotti
Francesca Lamberti
Diego Lanza
Walter Lapini
Liana Lomiento
Giuseppina Magnaldi

Enrico Magnelli
Stefano Maso
Paolo Mastandrea
Enrico Medda
Carles Miralles
Luca Mondin
Patrizia Mureddu
Simonetta Nannini
Renato Oniga
Piergiorgio Parroni
Maria Pia Pattoni
Bruna Pieri
Renata Raccanelli
Wolfgang Rösler
Antonio Stramaglia

partire dalla storia dei problemi, procedimento che tuttavia si sofferma a lungo non tanto sulla pubblicistica più recente quanto su angoli lontani nel tempo e situati in province meno illuminate dall'attenzione della critica. Questo modo di procedere a me pare un po' squilibrato, ma ha pur una sua ragione

Questi saggi sono stati raccolti e messi insieme con grande *pietas* da Carlo Franco, che premette a essi una lucida introduzione, in cui mette in luce anche le discussioni di metodo con cui Treves si confrontò con altri storici del suo tempo, in particolare Arnaldo Momigliano: ammirevole l'attenzione che egli dedica a illustrare le ragioni dell'uno e dell'altro. Questa introduzione ha qualche importanza per la comprensione della storiografia italiana del Novecento, e dovrebbe essere oggetto di riflessione.

Vittorio Citti
vittorio.citti@gmail.com

Valentina Garulli, *'Byblos Lainee': Epigrafia, Letteratura, Epitafio* (Eikasmos, Studi 20), Bologna, Pàtron, 2012, pp. 468; ISBN: 978-88-5553-207-5; € 43,00.

Valentina Garulli's monograph is a detailed and systematic study of Greek inscribed epitaphs. It is a welcome contribution to the quick growing sub-field of literary interpretation of inscribed epigram and will be of use to all those interested in Greek poetry and genre theory at large.

Garulli's work is centered on the examination of the relation between literary and inscribed epitaphs, in the light of previous studies that have shown that the dividing line between literary and inscribed epigram is rather thin and often misleading in terms of interpretation. The author studies three 'modalities' or types of literary and inscribed epitaphs: (a) those attested by a double transmission (i.e. in both literature and epigraphy), (b) those sharing a structural affinity pointing to imitation of one epitaph by the other, and (c) those sharing a common motif.

In the Introduction (Chapter 1, pp. 5-36), Garulli offers an overview of the *status quaestionis* with respect to various topics pertaining to the Greek epigrammatic tradition, such as the epigram as genre, its evolution in the course of time and in reference to other poetic genres, the epigram as a written text, its reception, the question of authorship, the terminology employed in antiquity for it, the contribution of the Hellenistic period in its evolution, and last the particular case of the inscribed sepulchral inscriptions that is the focus of her book.

Given the size and wealth of information included in Chapter 2 (pp. 37-219), I will examine three pairs of literary and inscribed epitaphs studied by Garulli, one from each of the three-abovementioned 'modalities'.

(a) The Chaeronea epitaph (pp. 39-56) is a well-known example of the problems and challenges inherent in the relationship between the literary and epigraphical epigrammatic traditions. Garulli systematically studies the three branches of the information available to us with respect to epigrams commemorating the Athenian deceased at the battle of Chaeronea (338 BC): (a) the four-verse epitaph attested in both the *Palatine* (7.245) and *Planudean* anthologies (III^a 5, 16, f. 31^v) under the name of Gaetulicus, which is also partly attested by means of a fourth-century inscribed epitaph found in the Olympieion in Athens (now preserved in the Epigraphical Museum, n. 8829); (b) the 'Demosthenes' epitaph in *De corona* (Dem. 18.289 ff.); and (c) a fragment of a marble stele found in 1959 at Athens that Bradeen has associated with a series of stelae containing the list of the names of the Athenian dead at the battle of Chaeronea organized by tribe. By examining in considerable

detail the various dictional,² stylistic, and thematic features of the material available, Garulli reconfirms an earlier interpretation, according to which the ‘Demosthenes’ epitaph is not genuine with the exception of verse 9 (*mêden hamartein esti theôn kai panta katorthoun*), since it is repeated in the actual text of Demosthenes’ speech. Garulli concurs with a long-held view that there were at least two epitaphs inscribed on the public monument at Athens dedicated to the citizens who had fallen at Chaeronea. Of these two epitaphs, one may have been exactly the same as that attributed to Gaetulicus in the *Palatine* and *Planudean* anthologies (partly attested in the *Olympieion*), while the other must have contained what is now v. 9 of the ‘Demosthenes’ epigram, which must have been composed by some grammarian of a later age who inserted it into the original text of Demosthenes perhaps intending to fill the void left by the orator’s testimony (pp. 53 f.). With respect to the epigram attested in the *Palatine* (7.245) and *Planudean* anthologies (III^a 5, 16, f. 31^r) Garulli’s final assessment rightly leaves open two scenarios depending on whether the epigram attributed to Gaetulicus is identical to that of the inscribed epitaph (*CEG* 467) or not. If the former is the case, then what is attributed to Gaetulicus may have been part of some larger epigram originally inscribed on a public monument at Athens for the Chaeronea dead. If on the other hand the inscribed epitaph is not identical to the one transmitted under the name of Gaetulicus in the *Palatine* and *Planudean* anthologies, then the latter may have been some sort of literary exercise on the well-known topic of commemorating the fallen in some illustrious battle of the past. The strengths of Garulli’s analysis within the framework of a time-old debate is the clarity of the presentation of the various views held so far and the stress she rightly puts on the fact that the epigram at hand does not designate clearly the battle of Chaeronea, as it is the case with the other sepulchral epigrams belonging to its context in this particular section of book VII of the *Palatine Anthology* (242-59).

(b) The next modality of sepulchral epigrams studied by Garulli pertains to epitaphs displaying a certain structural coincidence (pp. 110-58). A typical example of this category is the grave epigram attributed to Simonides for Cimon’s victory against the Persians at Eurymedon in 468 BC (*AP* 7.258 and *API* III^a 5,27 f. 31^r) and an inscribed epitaph (*CEG* 6) commemorating the Athenians who died either immediately after the battle at Chersonesos (447-446 BC) or after the Samian revolt (440-439 BC).³ After stating that both epigrams were inscribed on Athenian official monuments and shared similar contexts, Garulli departs on a detailed dictional, structural, stylistic, and metrical analysis of the two epigrams in question. She rightly concludes that the Simonidean epigram is more natural with respect to the flow of ideas, the effective use of enjambment, the *ordo verborum*, and the choice of diction than its inscribed counterpart. In this light, the fact that both epigrams share a similar beginning makes Garulli argue, contra Keil 1882⁴, that the inscribed epigram represents an attempt to imitate its famous Simonidean predecessor, given of course that the information concerning its authorship in the *AP* and *API* is accurate. Seen from this vantage point, we are faced with two initially inscribed epitaphs belonging to the fifth-century, the earlier of which has come down to us through literature that has somehow made it seem more ‘sublime’. This convincing analysis is rounded by Garulli’s exploration of another interesting hypothesis. Since another inscribed epitaph referring to the battle of Marathon

² What Garulli says about πανεπίσημος (pp. 44 f.) is certainly true, but it is its combination with *Khronos* (verse 1 of the ‘Gaetulicus’ epigram) that matters, and it is exactly this combination that is attested as early as the fifth century BC (see Aesch. *Suppl.* 139 f.; fr. 192.5-8 *Prometheus Solutus*; Soph. *OT* 1213; fr. 301 *Hipponous*).

³ The lack of an explicit reference to Samos makes it less likely that the Samian revolt is meant here; see R. Meiggs, *The Crisis of Athenian Imperialism*, HSCPh 67, 1963, 1-36, esp. 17.

⁴ B. Keil, *Zu den Simonideischen Eurymedon-Epigrammen*, *Hermes* 20, 1882, 341-8, esp. 342.

and found in the Athenian agora contains an almost identical line with Simonides' epitaph for the battle at Eurymedon, there must have existed a direct association between the two texts. In this light, it is not unthinkable, Garulli suggests, that Simonides may have imitated the Marathon epigram celebrating the first great victory of Athens against Persia. This is a tempting suggestion that may have gained more weight, if Garulli had emphasized the key role in both Athenian victories of a father and his son, Miltiades and Cimon respectively. Another feature pointing to the same direction is the following: *Mêdôn toksophorôn* and *promakhois* in Simonides' 'Eurymedon epigram' recall *khrysophorôn Mêdôn* and *promakhountes* of another famous [Simonidean] epigram for the Marathon battle, which despite all its interpretive problems (see mainly *FGE*) may have been discussed by the author.

(c) The third category involves epitaphs sharing a common motif (pp. 158-212). To this extent, Garulli presents 7 case studies, of which I will comment on the first one dealing with the epitaphs for Euippos (*AP* 8.500; *API* III^a 19, 31 f. 37^r) and Aristodamos (*GVI* 1345). There are two important questions pertaining to this epitaph's interpretation: (i) are the two epigrams linked through imitation?, and (ii) is this a real epitaph or not? With respect to the first issue and since both epigrams begin with the nearly identical line *ô par' emon steikhôn tout' / kenon êrion, eipon, hodita* a fair number of scholars have argued that the anonymous composer of the inscribed epitaph (2nd c. BC) used this particular epigram by Asclepiades (4th-3rd c. BC) as his model, the opposite being impossible on chronological grounds. Garulli puts this argument to the test, by suggesting that the almost verbatim repetition of the epigram's initial line may be simply representative of the use of an epigrammatic *topos* that is quite often employed as an *incipit*. This is a legitimate argument but I would like to have seen the author involve herself in the question referring to the *almost verbatim repetition* of the initial line of the epigram. Can this be the result of something else than imitation? And if so, did both Asclepiades and the anonymous composer of the inscribed epitaph draw from some stock of ready-made epigrammatic openings? On the other hand, Garulli is to be commended for stressing the fact that direct imitation of an epigram's initial line and its transfer to a *different context and type of epigram with respect to content and situation* (p. 160) undermines the imitation scenario. The second thorny issue pertains to the question of whether Asclepiades' epigram is sepulchral (Wilamowitz, Guichard) or epideictic (Reitzenstein, Bruss) or satirical (Tarán, Sens). Garulli argues that this is a grave epigram for a fictive individual who died at sea and for whom a cenotaph was built somewhere (by whom?) and a passer-by is asked to deliver the news of his loss to his parents at Chios. In this light, the author diverges from Sens' recent interpretation of this epigram as the parody of a *nauagikon*⁵.

The last part of Garulli's monograph consists in an exploration of the multiple literary aspects of inscribed epitaphs in the wake of their relationship to earlier literary texts. The advantage of her approach is that she adopts an effective and methodological sound principle of analysis, namely she carefully distinguishes between literary reminiscences, strong and weak allusion, simple verbal coincidence, and mere citations of the source. In this way, she is able to offer to the reader a rich panorama of the multiplicity of associations between inscribed epitaphs and the entire literary tradition. The composers of inscribed epitaphs should be thus treated as a special category of poets who engage in intertextual games with other texts, sometimes even epigraphical poetic texts, depending on their point of view, subject matter, situation they describe, literary taste and knowledge, individual talent, and synthetic ability. Epic, lyric, tragedy, Hellenistic poetry, and even literary epigram, both Greek and Latin, are often used by the composers of inscribed grave epigrams

⁵ A. Sens, *Asclepiades of Samos. Epigrams and Fragments*, Oxford 2010, 206 s.

as sources of material that they reshape and employ in their epigrammatic compositions.

All in all, Garulli is to be congratulated for writing an accurate, well-informed, and thoughtful book on Greek inscribed epitaphs. I think that she has made, together with other recent studies on this topic, a strong case that inscribed epigram (especially sepulchral epigram) must be interpreted henceforth as a form of poetry and that the sharp dichotomy with its literary counterpart must be treated with great caution.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Department of Philology

Christos Tsagalis
christos.tsagalis@gmail.com

Jonas Grethlein, *Das Geschichtsbild der 'Ilias'. Eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive* (Hypomnemata. Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben. Band 163), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006, pp. 381; ISBN 978-3-525-25262-8; € 64,90.

1. Questo volume monografico, dedicato al tempo epico, è il secondo dei quattro pubblicati da Jonas Grethlein dall'inizio della sua carriera universitaria¹. Nato nel 1978 a Monaco, Grethlein ha intrapreso studi di filologia classica e storia a Göttingen (1997-99) e a Oxford in Inghilterra (1999-2000). Presso la facoltà di Filosofia di Freiburg ha discusso, nel 2002, una tesi di dottorato sul tema del diritto d'asilo nel dramma ateniese. In concomitanza con la pubblicazione del lavoro, nel quadro del gruppo di ricerca friburghese *Identitäten/Alteritäten*² (2003), è stato cooptato entro un progetto di ricerca dell'Emmy-Noether-Programm DFG (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*) che gli ha permesso di trascorrere un soggiorno di due anni a Cambridge (Massachusetts), presso la *Harvard University*. Nel semestre estivo del 2004, ha presentato la monografia, da cui è tratto questo libro, come esame di abilitazione al titolo di *Privatdozent* presso le Facoltà di Filologia e Filosofia di Freiburg. Il libro vero e proprio, pubblicato nel 2006, ha segnato una tappa non solo per l'incardinamento universitario di Grethlein, ma anche per l'avvio di un percorso di ricerca molto caratterizzato. Ottenuto, dal 2005 al 2009, il ruolo di responsabile di un Emmy-Noether-Programm sul tema delle rappresentazioni della storia nella letteratura greca dell'epoca arcaica e classica, ha esteso l'indagine, avviata con l'epica, fino al quinto secolo. Il suo ultimo volume monografico³, pubblicato in lingua inglese dopo la promozione al titolo di Professore di Filologia Classica dell'Università di Heidelberg (2008), riguarda appunto *The Greeks and their Past. Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*. In parallelo ha continuato a sviluppare il tema del tempo epico nella direzione di una particolare categoria, quella del *plupast*, da intendere come un passato di secondo grado, un vero e proprio indice memoriale: questa linea di riflessione trova riscontro nel volume appena pubblicato con C. Krebs sul *plupast* nella storiografia, da Erodoto a Appiano⁴.

¹ J. Grethlein, *Asyl und Athen. Die Konstruktion kollektiver Identität in der griechischen Tragödie*, Stuttgart-Weimar 2003; *Das Geschichtsbild der 'Ilias'. Eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive*, Göttingen 2006; *Littels Orestie. Mythos, Macht und Moral in 'Les Bienveillantes'*, Freiburg 2009; *The Greeks and their Past. Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*, Cambridge 2010. Considererei comunque a parte Grethlein, *op. cit. (Littels Orestie)*: si tratta di un breve volume (ca. 80 pp.) sulla ricezione di Eschilo in epoca contemporanea (*Les Bienveillantes* di Jonathan Littell, prix Goncourt 2006).

² Grethlein, *op. cit. (Asyl und Athen)*.

³ Grethlein *op. cit. (The Greeks and their Past)*.

⁴ J. Grethlein – C. Krebs, *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography. The "Plupast" from Herodotus to Appian*, Cambridge 2012.