

Besprechungen

LUCIA FLORIDI

Edilo, „Epigrammi“. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento

Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter. 2020. VIII, 249 S. Gr.-8°

(*Texte und Kommentare*, 64.)

In the first modern commentary on the poets of the *Greek Anthology*, that of Brunck, from 1782, the epigrams of Hedylus were seven, and two pages were dedicated to them; in the most recent one, that of Gow and Page (GP), from 1968, the epigrams are 12 and they occupy 10 pages of commentary. Floridi (F.) comments on 14 epigrams and her book has 250 pages, so, in perspective, our poet has doubled the number of texts attributed and the attention awarded to him has gone from two to 250 pages in little over 250 years of modern study of Greek epigram. This growth *ratio* is much greater than in other poets of the *Anthology*, and to follow the commentaries chronologically is a very interesting experience. Some of the problems debated by Brunck are still present in Floridi's commentary; others have been completely overcome and, in their place, new queries have arisen.

The book by F. opens with a 53-page introduction which reviews the life and work of the poet, transmission of the text, and literary, prosodic and metrical characteristics of the epigrams commented. F. points out that the only date that can be extracted from the texts with some certainty (epigram 4) is the construction of the temple of Arsinoe-Aphrodite circa 268, therefore Hedylus must have been born towards the end of the fourth century or beginning of the third, which would make him a contemporary of Asclepiades and Posidippus. Nothing can be said for certain of a supposed publication of a joint work by the three

of them (an old theory by Reitzenstein) nor of the rest of his life, albeit everything points to him being a countryman of Asclepiades, i.e., a Samian. F. also gathers with ease all the information available about his (presumed) controversial relationship with Callimachus, which does not allow for any assured conclusions either, although the growing tendency is to challenge this notion.

The 20 pages dedicated to the transmission of the text are very valuable, since F. does not limit herself to repeating what is already known, but rather adds interesting observations about the history of the manuscripts of the *Greek Anthology* and Athenaeus. It is possible that this part might interest only those of us that coexist daily with these manuscripts, but if someone was to approach this complex history for the first time, F. would be an excellent starting point. The same can be said of the metrical and prosodic studies.

Of the 12 epigrams edited by Gow and Page, four are preserved in the *Greek Anthology* and eight in Athenaeus. Floridi's edition has the following coincidences and differences with Gow-Page regarding the text.

- 1 HE (AP 6.292). The text of F. is the same as GP, with the *cruces philologorum* in the same place (v. 3). The critical apparatus, however, at least quadruples that of Gow-Page, with thorough readings of the Suda and manuscripts of the Planudean and Palatine traditions not previously considered. Regarding the *locus desperatus* of v. 3, F. debates with mastery the conjectures (Dübner, Stadtmüller, Hecker and Ellis) and decides to leave it as is, until a better proposal arises.
- 2 HE (AP 5.199). Same text as GP, which is expected of an epigram without any serious problems of transmission; the apparatus of F.'s edition is enriched by the different readings of the Suda and conjectures or corrections of Jacobs, Reiske, Meineke which GP considered settled.
- 3 HE (Athen. 11.486a–b). F.'s text has notable differences with regard to GP's. In v. 1, a different punctuation that changes the sense (ή διαπινομένη Καλλίστιον ἀνδράσι, θαῦμα / κοῦ ψευδές, κτλ. GP : ή διαπινομένη Καλλίστιον, ἀνδράσι θαῦμα, / κοῦ ψευδές, κτλ. F); in v. 3, F. removes GP's *cruces* and prints Schweighäuser's correction (†ζωραεζμτρησι† GP : ζωραῖς μίτρησι F), which GP did not gather in the apparatus nor the commentary and which was later observed by Giangrande and Galli Calderini; in v. 5,

- she removes GP's *cruces* and prints a conjecture by Kaibel followed by another one by Musurus (ὥς καὶ †πάντων ἐπ' ἐκείνης† GP : ὥς καὶ πάλι τῶν ἀπ' ἐκείνης F), which had been discarded by GP.
- 4 HE (Athen. 11.497d–e). In v. 2 F. prints *cruces* where GP had printed a correction by Jacobs (τὸ ῥυτὸν αἰδοίης δεῦτ' ἴδετ' Ἀρσινόης GP : τὸ ῥυτὸν †εἰδείης† δεῦτ' ἴδετ' Ἀρσινόης F) and hypothetically proposes in the critical apparatus a new conjecture: εὐδοίης, which would be the “earthly” equivalent of the epithet εὐπλοία, well-attested for Arsinoe-Aphrodite. The hypothesis is very interesting, and I think the author should have dared to print it in the text.
 - 5 HE (Athen. 11.472f–473a). Without changes with regard to GP, except for an enriched apparatus.
 - 6 HE (Athen. 11.473a–b). Same text as GP, with the same *locus desperatus* in v. 5.
 - 7 HE (Athen. 8.344f) and 8 HE (Athen. 8.344f–345a). Same text as GP, with a clearer and more complete apparatus.
 - 9 HE (Athen. 8.345a–b). F. eliminates the *cruces* in vv. 4 and 5. In v. 4, she prints a correction by Jacobs followed by a correction by GP (proposed in their commentary, but not printed in their text) instead of the corrupt passage of Athenaeus (†τὸ δ' ὄρα̅ν μὴ μόνον οὐ λέγομεν† GP : τὸ δ' ὄρα̅ν, ναὶ μὰ τόν, οὐκ ἔχομεν F), and in v. 5 she prints Kaibel's instead of the corrupt text of Athenaeus (λιθούμεθα †πάντα πάλαι που† GP : λιθούμεθα πάντες ἀπλάτου F)
 - 10 HE (Athen. 4.176c–d), 11 HE (AP 11.123) and 12 HE (AP 11.414). Same text as GP.
 - *13 F. = Asclep. 40 HE (AP 5.161). Same text as GP.
 - *14 F. = SH 459 (Strab. 14. 6. 3.). Same text as SH.

F.'s commentary is much more complete in many aspects than GP's, which is to be expected, since the latter is a commentary on the whole Hellenistic epigram known up until that moment. GP barely had space to address proper literary aspects, in which F. is indeed able to deepen the research, particularly regarding the relationship of Hedylus with other epigrammatists and the position of the author within the development of the genre. Of particular interest is the commentary on epigram 11, which situates the epigram in the skoptic

tradition to which it belongs, and 13, whose authorship has been debated between Asclepiades and Hedylus since Antiquity. This debate has materialized in four extensive commentaries in recent years (my own, from 2004, Nastos in 2006, Sens in 2011, and now F.). The fact that, after devoting more than 40 pages to the discussion of the epigram, all four authors have different opinions about its attribution, as well as specific aspects of interpretation, underscores the complexity of these texts and the necessity of their continuous study, for which purpose the book by F. is, from now on, the mandatory reference.

Universidad de Salamanca

Luis Arturo Guichard
lguich@usal.es