

Antología Palatina. Libros XIII, XIV, XV (Epigramas variados). Introducción, edición y traducción de BEGOÑA ORTEGA VILLARO y MARÍA TERESA AMADO RODRÍGUEZ (Alma Mater). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas 2021. XCIII, 310 pp. (partly duplicate numbering: pp. 58–244) – ISBN 978-84-00-1088-5

• LUCIA FLORIDI, Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna  
FICLIT – Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica  
(lucia.floridi2@unibo.it)

Books 13, 14, and 15 of the *Greek Anthology* differ in several aspects, such as the number of poems they contain, their themes, meters, authors, origins, and date of composition. The very denomination of “book” is not appropriate for all of them: while books 13 (epigrams in various meters) and 14 (a collection of arithmetical problems, riddles, and oracles) are part of the anthology proper – as preserved by Palatinus graecus 23 (P), the 10<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript from which the *Palatine Anthology* derives its name – book 15 is the result of an editorial choice first made by FRIEDRICH JACOBS, *Anthologia Graeca ad fidem codicis olim Palatini, nunc Parisini ex apographo Gothano edita*, I–III. Lipsiae 1813–1817), and followed by the subsequent editors: with disregard for palaeographical and codicological data, it brings together a series of epigrams and short poems found at the end of the manuscript, and which were not originally conceived as a unitary whole – to put it in MARC LAUXTERMANN’s words, “[t]here is no Book AP XV” (*Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and Contexts*, vol. I. Vienna 2003, p. 118). LAUXTERMANN also expressed the hope that future editors will take this into account, and that scholars will stop referring to AP 15 as a separate book. ORTEGA VILLARO and AMADO RODRÍGUEZ are aware of this (see their introduction to AP 15, esp. p. CLXVII, n. 1), but they prefer to follow the editorial tradition. Such a choice might appear questionable from a philological point of view, but it is consistent with the main scope of this volume: to offer the first full Spanish translation of this section of the *Greek Anthology* (see p. XIX). Accordingly, in this review, AP 15 will still be referred to as “book” 15.

The varied nature of this last section of the *Anthology*, which makes the title of “Epigramas variados” adopted by the Spanish editors a suitable choice, together with the total number of poems which follows the assemblage, and

which is small enough to fit nicely into a single volume, has already resulted in a joint edition: the twelfth volume of Budé's *Greek Anthology* consists of these same three books (Anthologie grecque. Tome XII. Anthologie Palatine. Livre XIII–XV, texte établi et traduit par FÉLIX BUFFIÈRE. Paris 1970).<sup>1</sup> The very novelty of this edition, which makes it appealing for anyone interested in the *Anthology*, and not only for a Spanish-speaking readership, is that it also includes texts and translations of the Palatine scholia to books 14 and 15, which are often crucial to understand the poems themselves, especially when riddles and arithmetical problems are involved.

The book has a clear structure: it opens with a short introduction, which deals with the manuscript tradition of the *Anthology* and with its modern editions, and explains the criteria followed in the present edition; a bibliography follows. Each book is then given separate treatment: an introduction, dealing with its structure, origin, contents, etc., is followed by a text provided with a critical apparatus, a facing Spanish translation, and complementary notes. The final section consists of five appendixes: the text of the aforementioned scholia (Appendix 1), concordances (Appendix 2), meters (Appendix 3), an index of proper names (Appendix 4), and a list of authors, which offers basic information on their chronology, life, and work (Appendix 5).

The general introduction presents the main collections on which our knowledge of Greek epigram is based and their reciprocal relationships: the lost anthology assembled by Constantine Cephalas at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century (the editors here follow LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry*, pp. 86–87, against those who put it at the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century); the Palatine manuscript and Planudes's autograph, Marcianus graecus 481, both of which are based on Cephalas; and, finally, the minor sylloges, which mostly derive from Cephalas as well. Basic information on the *apographa* of P follow (pp. XIV–XVII), while the *apographa* of Pl are not considered (there is only a passing mention of Parisinus gr. 2744, the earliest surviving copy of the Planudean edition of the *Greek Anthology* in its unified form. Nothing is said about British Library Add. 16409, which is roughly contemporary with Pl and whose copying was supervised by Planudes himself).<sup>2</sup>

---

1. In other editions and/or translations, AP 13–15 are grouped together with AP 16 (e.g. W.R. PATON, *The Greek Anthology*, V. London – Cambridge, Mass. 1918) or with AP 12 and 16 (e.g. H. BECKBY, *Anthologia Graeca*, IV. Munich 19682; 1st ed. 1958).

2. On the importance of this apograph for the study of the Greek Anthology, see LUCIA FLORIDI, *Lucillio. Epigrammi*. Berlin – Boston 2014, pp. 67–68, with the relevant bibliography.

Reasonably, only the minor collections that are relevant to the present edition are considered here: the *Sylloge Parisina* or *Crameriana*, the *Sylloge Laurentiana*, Σ<sup>π</sup>, the *Sylloge Euphemiana*, and a collection of epigrams on Homer, recently published, independently, by FRANCESCA MALTOMINI (Una silloge di epigrammi su Omero [e alcuni inediti bizantini]. Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 75 [2015] pp. 151–175) and FRANCESCO VALERIO (Analecta Byzantina. Medioevo greco 16 [2016] pp. 255–302). Three *syllogae* of Planudean derivation are also included – K, H, and Ma. The editors are aware that they are not autonomous contributors to the *paradosis*, but they include their readings in the apparatus, in order to document the reception of the poems (p. XIV). The same principle must lie at the basis of the inclusion of the readings provided by the various testimonies from the minor *syllogae*, independently of their reciprocal relationships, although this is not clearly stated, so readers not acquainted with the complex tradition of the *Greek Anthology* might be misled. For the *Sylloge Parisina*, for instance, both the readings of the 13<sup>th</sup>-century Par. gr. 352 and of the 14<sup>th</sup>-century Par. gr. 1630 are included, but nowhere is it explained that the latter is essentially a rearranged excerpt from the former, as scholars have now unequivocally shown (LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry*, pp. 291–293; F. MALTOMINI, *Tradizione antologica dell'epigramma greco. Le sillogi minori di età bizantina e umanistica*. Rome 2008, pp. 38–41). The same holds true for the two manuscripts of the *Sylloge Laurentiana* used in this edition: nothing is said about the relationship between Laur. 32.16 – an important manuscript compiled by Planudes himself about 20 years before Pl, and consisting of two separate epigrammatic series, L<sup>1</sup> and L<sup>2</sup> – and Par. gr. 1409 (14<sup>th</sup> century), in which MALTOMINI has identified an excerpt from L2 (MALTOMINI, *Tradizione antologica*, p. 52). Nor much information is given about the *Sylloge Euphemiana* – whose very denomination looks shaky, after MALTOMINI (*Tradizione antologica*, pp. 80–94) has shown that the collection consists of two independent sections, and that the poems for a certain Euphemius composed by Leo the Philosopher, on which the denomination of *Sylloge Euphemiana* was based, are in the second section, which has nothing to do with the first, which is of Cephalan origin (this collection would have been better labelled as *Sylloge quae olim vocabatur Euphemiana*, as in some of the most recent works on epigrams).

Succinctness is in the very nature of this introduction, and readers interested in learning more on single collections are always referred to the relevant bibliography. The choice to record the readings provided by the

manuscripts of the minor collections independently of their reciprocal relationships, however, obviously concerns the very criteria on which the edition is based: clarity on this point would have been welcome. It is especially unfortunate that, because of this hasty treatment of the minor collections, some of the inaccuracies found in previous editions are repeated here as well. Among the testimonies of *AP* 14.1, 14.2, 14.7, 14.12, 14.13, and 14.51, for instance, the editors include App.S<sup>P</sup> (Par. gr. 1630). The poems do in fact appear in this miscellaneous manuscript, but at f. 195r; therefore, they are not part of the *Sylloge Parisina* proper, whose epigrams, which – as already mentioned – are derived from Par. gr. 352, only occupy f. 62v and ff. 135r–137v (see MALTOMINI, *Tradizione antologica*, pp. 38–39). The *siglum* App. S<sup>P</sup> is thus inappropriate here.

The introductions to the individual books are clear and informative. The editors offer an overview of the contents and structure of each book and provide a good summary of the scholarly debate concerning its origins. In the case of both book 13 and book 14, their original belonging to Cephala's anthology has been called into question. Book 13 collects 31 epigrams in unusual meters and is thus very different from the other Cephala books, both in terms of grouping (in Cephala's anthology, epigrams are usually arranged thematically or by genre, while here a formal criterion is followed) and length (with the exception of book 4 – which collects the proems to the *Garlands* by Meleager and Philip, and to Agathias's *Cycle*, thus functioning as a sort of introduction to the anthology proper – the number of poems in the other books of P is much higher: *AP* 5, for instance, has more than 300 epigrams, *AP* 6 more than 350, and *AP* 7 almost 750). Predictably, there has been much speculation as to the origin of this collection. The predominant view, to which the editors subscribe, is that the collection belonged to Cephala and found its way into his anthology through a metrical treatise of some kind.

Book 14 collects arithmetical problems, oracles, and riddles, in a rather haphazard combination. ALAN CAMERON has strongly argued for the Cephala origin of this book (A. CAMERON, *The Greek Anthology. From Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford 2003, pp. 135–137, 207–215 and 223–226), questioned by previous scholars. ORTEGA VILLARO and AMADO RODRÍGUEZ adopt a middle view, and follow Maltomini in positing a “mixed” origin for this book (*Tradizione antologica*, pp. 189–195): although it originally occurred in Cephala – they argue – its present form is the result of expansions on the part of the compilers of P (they think, in particular, that one of the mathematical collections on which the book is based, the collec-

tion by the somewhat elusive Metrodorus, might be “un añadido a Céfalas por parte de los compiladores de P”, p. LXXXIV). Also commendable is the way in which the editors explain the inner poetical nature of these apparently dry verses, whose overarching characteristic is their being an “ejercicio de reflexión y de inteligencia” (p. LXXXV), be they mathematical problems, riddles, or oracles. They clarify the prevailing didactic use especially of the arithmetical problems, and highlight the effort made in these short poems to avoid repetitiveness and to provide “pequeñas narraciones no exentas de encanto” (p. LXXXIX); they review the various forms taken by oracles, suggesting that the selection aims to offer “un panorama amplio de los distintos tipos atestiguados” (p. XC); finally, they clearly present the common techniques on which the metrical riddles of the book are based, from metonymy/analogy to puns and other linguistic strategies, mythical figures, etc. (pp. XCII–XCIII).

Book 15, which – as mentioned above – consists of miscellaneous materials that were not conceived as a unified collection, is discussed on pp. CLXVII–CLXXX. Once again, the editors summarise the structure of the book, its contents and authors, the scholarly debate on its origins and its relationship to Cephalas, and describe the varied content of the poems, paying particular attention to the fascinating figure poems known as *technopaegnia*. Since these poems are transmitted by both P and the bucolic manuscripts, the latter are given a brief description here (it must be noted that they are also relevant for the epigrams ascribed to Theocritus – one of which, *AP* 13.3, is included in this edition). The introduction to *AP* 15 ends with a paragraph on  $\Sigma^\pi$ , one of the minor collections already mentioned in the general introduction (by this *siglum*, scholars indicate the epigrams copied by a 12<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup>-century hand in the first and final folios of P, and in the blank spaces in the margins). ORTEGA VILLARO and AMADO RODRÍGUEZ focus on the poems on pp. 707–709 of P, i.e. *AP* 15.41–50. They remark (p. CLXXX) that since these poems are also in Pl, they should be edited as part of the so-called *Appendix Planudea* (i.e., the poems included in Pl, but not present in P, which are published in a fictional 16<sup>th</sup> book of the *Greek Anthology*), and not of *AP*. This observation is a further reminder of how editorial habits have imposed themselves in the case of the *Anthology*, despite strict philological reasons. It is to be hoped that future scholars will develop a critical reflection on this point and will consider the possibility of moving away from editorial practices that, although well-established and often convenient, might be misleading, as they do not always accurately account for the actual state of transmission.

The Greek text, provided with a critical apparatus, is accompanied by an indication of P's page number; the layout of the manuscript is also followed in the disposition of "títulos, lemas o escolios marginales que, en concreto en estos libros, tienen gran importancia" (p. XX). Only the most important scholarly conjectures are included in the apparatus, while those "que no han tenido recorrido o que son innecesarias por haberse generalizado otra en concreto más simple o más sensata" (p. XX) are reasonably omitted. Nevertheless, ORTEGA VILLARO and AMADO RODRÍGUEZ's apparatus is often more detailed in documenting scholarly interventions in the texts than those of their predecessors. Particular attention is paid to the corrections put forward by scholars in the *apographa* of P. The editors rightly note in which *apographum* the corrections are transmitted and do not attempt to attribute them to proper names – a methodologically correct choice, given that most of these manuscripts were successively owned by different scholars, which makes it impossible to attain any certainty in the ascription of conjectures. The work conducted on the *apographa* allows ORTEGA VILLARO and AMADO RODRÍGUEZ to avoid generic indications, such as "edd." (used, for instance, in the Budé series), to indicate easy and widespread normalisations and/or corrections, in favour of the indication of the apograph(s) in which these normalisations and/or corrections can be found (see e.g. *AP* 13.6.7). From a broader perspective, they are more detailed than previous editors in documenting the critical work done on these texts over the centuries (e.g. *AP* 13.7.2). This is an important step forward with respect to previous editions.

Translations – as far as this reviewer can judge – are accurate and reliable. They balance philological exactness with an effort to provide a smooth-running, natural-sounding, and clear translation.

The accompanying notes are inevitably brief, yet informative. They provide the basic information about historical, social, and geographic *Realien*, mythical characters, stylistic and metrical matters, the general interpretation of the poem, and textual problems. They also offer useful insights on general topics – consider, for instance, the observation that, in popular literature, it is quite common to find double versions of a same text, and it is usually difficult to determine whether the original version is the shorter one, which was then expanded, or vice versa (p. 290, n. 75, with reference to *AP* 14.29, a riddle on a clyster whose longer and more elaborate version is offered by *AP* 14.55).

I would like to conclude this review with some minor quibbles and bibliographical additions.

The editors have opted for a positive apparatus. Sometimes, however, the readings of the testimonies are recorded quite randomly. A single example should suffice to clarify my point (but other epigrams display the same problem): *AP* 13.3, ascribed to Theocritus, is transmitted by the bucolic manuscripts, P, Planudes, and the Planudean syll. Ma. At l. 1, it is reported that the bucolic manuscripts have Ἴππῶναξ, while P has ἰππῶναξ: the reading of Pl (and Ma) is not specified. In a similar vein, one learns that, at v. 2, Pl<sup>pc</sup> has ποτέρχεν against Pl<sup>ac</sup>'s and P's ποτ' ἔρχεν, and that AHRENS and GOW – PAGE print προσέρχεν, but no hint is given as to what the readings of the bucolic manuscripts (and Ma) might be; at the same line, the editors note that P has τύμβω, while Pl<sup>ac</sup> and Ma have τάφω: once again, the reading of the bucolic manuscripts is not recorded. At l. 4, P has καθίζεν, while the bucolic manuscripts have καθίζου: in this case, it is the reading of Pl (and Ma) that is missing.

*AP* 13.9.2: in the apparatus, BENTLEY is credited with both the (necessary) correction Λεσβίης and with aligning his reading with P's, Λεσβίην.

*AP* 13.11.3: πολλὰ ῥέξας for P's πολλ' ἔρξας (retained by the editors) is reported as the reading printed by JACOBS, DÜBNER, and PAGE, *FGE*, but JACOBS himself credits BRUNCK: see now DAVID SIDER, *Simonides. Epigrams and Elegies*. Oxford 2020, pp. 222–224 (who also provides a metrical interpretation of this poem as two lines of *rz<sup>d</sup> lec* followed by 4 *ia<sub>1</sub>*, which involves printing BRUNCK's emendation. More generally, this important new edition of the epigrams ascribed to Simonides is relevant for all the poems of *AP* 13 ascribed to him).

*AP* 13.13: the poem, alternatively known as IG I<sup>3</sup> 885 (Athens, Acropolis, ca. 440 BCE), can also be found, along with a full commentary, in SARA KACZKO, *Archaic and Classical Attic Dedicatory Epigrams. An Epigraphic, Literary, and Linguistic Commentary*. Berlin – Boston 2016, n. 98, pp. 377–382.

*AP* 14.7: at l. 2, the Par. gr. 1630 is credited with both the readings καὶ τὸ θέναρ and ἦ δὲ θέναρ.

*AP* 15.24 (Simias's *Wings*): on this text, as it appears in Laur. 32.52 (G), see also MASSIMO BERNABÒ – ENRICO MAGNELLI, *Il codice Laurenziano plut. 32.52 e l'iconografia bizantina dei carmina figurata*. *Bizantinistica* s. II, 13 (2011) pp. 189–232 (esp. pp. 202–213).

The siglum *cett.* in this edition is used not only for manuscripts, as is the norm in philological practice, but also for the editorial choices of modern

scholars. Apart from being odd in itself, this use might result in confusion: at *AP* 13.14.1, for instance, a poem transmitted by P only, an indication such as “Δάνδης P PAGE, *FGE* : Δάνδης cett.” makes one wonder where this correction comes from (from SIDER’s edition, p. 141, one learns that it was first proposed by BRUNCK; in complementary note 64, p. 280, ORTEGA VILLARO and AMADO RODRÍGUEZ generically refer to a “corrección ... habitual entre los editores”).

In the complementary notes, in a few cases succinctness might result in a lack of clarity. Philip *AP* 13.1, for instance, consists of five stichic pentameters progressively becoming more spondaic in both hemistichs, so that v. 1 is holodactylic, while v. 5 is holospondaic, as is well explained on p. 58, n. 1. The editors then go on to comment: “[e]stos pentámetros funcionan como asinartetos, y como tal admiten a fin de colon el hiato y la *brevis in longo*, por lo que no sería necesaria la reconstrucción de τιμῶσιν y πᾶσιν”. It might thus appear puzzling that, in the text, at v. 1, they retain P’s τιμῶσι, instead of BOISSONADE’s τιμῶσιν, against all previous editors, while at v. 5 they regularly print Jacobs’s correction πᾶσιν instead of P’s πᾶσι. They should have explained, with G. MORELLI, *Inni e iscrizioni metriche in pentametri elegiaci*. *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 113 (1985) pp. 55–60 (to whose contribution they indeed refer), that it is the very artifice used by Philip – i.e. the progressive increase of contractions – that imposes the correction, at least at v. 5.

p. 224: TANNERY (1985) is obviously a slip for TANNERY (1895).

p. 274: Palladas’ epigrams were not in the *Cycle of Agathias*, as the editors state. This 6th-century anthology only included poems composed by Agathias’ contemporaries – still unpublished or not particularly famous ones, as Agathias himself clarifies in the proem to his *Histories* (*Hist. praef.* 8)<sup>3</sup> – and Palladas was certainly not one of them. As for the date, the editors assign him to the 4<sup>th</sup> century. There is no mention of the scholarly debate on the author’s chronology, further prompted by the publication, in 2012, of P.CtYBR inv. 4000, whose new poems are ascribed by the *editor princeps*, KEVIN WILKINSON, to the Alexandrian poet. This important papyrological addition is only briefly, and generically, referred to in footnote 18 (“A la abundante producción epigramática presente en la *Antología*, se suman los nuevos descubrimientos papiráceos”). The only bibliographical

3. ἔδοξε δέ μοι πρότερον κάκεῖνο ἀξιέπαινόν τι εἶναι καὶ οὐκ ἄχαρι, εἴ γε τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων τὰ ἀρτιγενῆ καὶ νεώτερα, διαλανθάνοντα ἔτι καὶ χύδην οὕτως παρ’ ἐνίοις ὑποψηθυρίζόμενα, ἀγείραμι τε ὡς οἶόν τε εἰς ταῦτό καὶ ἀναγράψαιμι ἕκαστα ἐν κόσμῳ ἀποκεκριμένα.



item the editors mention is the (unpublished) 2014 doctoral dissertation by GINEVRA VEZZOSI. A new critical edition of Palladas is being prepared by LUIS ARTURO GUICHARD. In the meantime, readers can be referred to MARIA KANELLOU – CHRIS CAREY (eds), *Palladas and the Yale Papyrus Codex (P. CtYBR inv. 4000)*. Leiden 2022, with all the relevant bibliography.

All in all, ORTEGA VILLARO and AMADO RODRÍGUEZ have produced a useful edition of a fascinating and difficult section of the *Greek Anthology*, which is especially commendable for its inclusion of scholia to *AP* 14 and 15, and for the work conducted on the *apographa* of P. Recent years have seen a growing interest in riddles, wordplays, and visual poetry in antiquity, with important contributions by – among others – SIMONE BETA, CHRISTINE LUZ, and JAN KWAPISZ. VILLARO and RODRÍGUEZ's edition, which is consistent with this scholarly trend, will certainly prompt further research on these complex texts, whose technicalities have proven a challenge to scholars over the centuries.

#### **Keywords**

Anthologia Palatina; Maximos Planudes; Syllogae minores; epigrams in unusual metres; riddles; arithmetical problems; oracles; technopaegnia