Lucia Floridi, *Edilo, Epigrammi. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Texte und Kommentare 64, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020, viii+250 pp., €109.95, ISBN 978-3-11-062962-0.

To students of Hellenistic epigrams, Hedylus has always been an important if not seminal figure in the development of the genre. Since, however, only twelve epigrams can be ascribed to him with any certainty, it should come as no surprise that Lucia Floridi's text and commentary is the first ever to appear as a separate publication;[1] nor that Floridi, who has earlier give us texts and commentaries on the later epigrammatists Strato (Alessandria 2007) and Lucillius (Berlin 2014) now has produced the go-to volume for all matters Hedylean. Floridi has always been thorough (492 pages for 105 epigrams of Strato; 662 for 142 of Lucillius); her current book ups the ratio with 250 pages for 14 epigrams. As is always proper for a book dedicated to one epigrammatist, commentaries are provided for all epigrams ascribed to him in antiquity,[2] even for those the editor considers spurious. Thus, in addition to epigrams 1-12, where Floridi sensibly adopts the numbers found in Gow-Page, she now has *13-*14, where the former is printed elsewhere as Asclepiades 40 Gow-Page/Sens/Guichard = Hedylus 11 Page, *EG* and even = Simonides *elegy* [115] Sider, although the attribution to the last is not all likely. Epigram *14 is quoted as an ἐλεγεῖον by Strabo 14.6.3, who quotes most of three distichs in order to demonstrate the geographic carelessness of the author, "whether Hedylus or someone else" (εἴθ' Ἡδύλος ἐστὶν εἴθ' ὁστισοῦν).[3] Although Floridi herself reserves judgement, her careful comparison of it with the indisputably genuine poems has convinced me that this is indeed a poem of Hedylus; it is essential to have it included here. That it is hard to fit into Meleager's various categories means nothing; as I show elsewhere, our ideas of what makes for a good Hellenistic epigram have colored our appreciation of poems that did not meet Meleager's personal standards. The discovery of an epigram book of Posidippus shows us that Meleager omitted varieties of epigrams not to his liking, which entails that

[1] A text and commentary appeared earlier in a journal: I. G. Galli Calderini, "Gli epigrammi di Edilo: interpretazione ed esegesi," *AAP* 33, 1984, 79–118.

[2] Or her; cf. D. Geoghegan, *Anyte: The Epigrams*, Rome 1979.

[3] That Strabo identifies the poem as an ἐλεγεῖον does nothing to distinguish it as either an epigram or elegy, as these last two terms were used loosely (and unhistorically) from Hellenistic times onward. Similarly, Athenaeus identifies (i. a.) Simonides *eleg.* 25 West as an ἐπίγραμμα what his own context clearly describes as an orally delivered elegy.

the mere feeling that an epigram is "unMeleagrian" is no reason for refusing to accept it as the work of an author found elsewhere in his *Stephanos*.[4]

Any scholarly edition of a Hellenistic epigrammatist must cover familiar ground: the development of this literary genre both from archaic and classical inscribed epigrams and from orally presented elegies; the first epigram books of single authors; the first anthologies, most notably those of Meleager and (if relevant) Philip; the tenth-century omnium gatherum of Cephalas and its abridgements in the mss now in Venice and Heidelberg; the copies of the former and the apographs of the latter; the publishing history of the Anthology; then chapters on the particular epigrammatist's place in epigram history, which includes subject matter and metrics. All this Floridi does with magisterial familiarity. Particularly welcome is her section on the Vienna Epigrams Papyrus, a collection of incipits published on 2015, some of which display affinities with Hedylean themes.[5] Perhaps the least useful in this section is the metrical analysis, which, as Floridi herself is aware, is almost statistically meaningless in so tiny a corpus. In considering the outer metrics, she tends to count long vs. short syllables and concludes that Hedylus is in line with his fellow Hellenistic epigrammatists, but I would also like to see a table of comparative line shapes. Hedylus' 29 hexameter lines offer 10 of the 32 possible, which are among Homer's top 13. This makes him sound quite classical in this regard; but, although Homer's huge corpus offers all 32, there is a sharp decline after the third (12.62 to 8.04% for the fourth most common shape). Yet Hedylus' second- and third-most common line shapes (SSDSD and DSSDD) each occurs less than 4% in Homer. To be fair, each is tied with more common shapes and his most common shape is Homer's number two, but these findings stand out in even so small a sample, suggesting that Hedylus was oblivious to tendencies that prevailed well into the classical age with Empedocles. The larger point is that with a small sample, while one statistical oddity is meaningless, a rash of them stands out. Another such is Hedylus' disregard for the C-caesura in six lines, an occurrence of 20%, with which contrast Callimachus' complete adherence.

If I had to note any disappointment in the introduction, it would be the lack of information on how epigrams were published, circulated, anthologized, and read. This is less important for those in the *Greek Anthology* as we now have it, since this has been treated in full many times elsewhere, but I for one would like to know more about Athenaeus' use of epigrams, since he is our sole source for eight of the fourteen Hedylean ones. The question is of

[4] D. Sider, "Posidippus old and new," in B. Acosta-Hughes *et al.,* eds., *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, Cambridge, Mass. 2004, 29-41.

[5] P.J. Parsons, H. Maehler, F. Maltomini, eds., *The Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (G 40611)*, Corpus Papyrorum Raineri 33. Berlin 2015, Floridi's frequent references to "*CPR*" deserves an explanation in her list of abbreviations on p. 191.

wider interest in that he is also the only (pre-Byzantine) source for a further ten epigrams by other Meleagrian authors. Clearly we need something (at whatever appropriate length) equivalent to Zizza's work on Pausanias.[6]

The heart of the book is its text and commentary. The shortest review would simply state that no scholar concerned more than passingly with Hedylus will dare ignore this book. Its reception in and its influence on future scholarship will in a sense form a lengthier and more amorphous review of its worth. I will start the ball rolling with a few comments on matters that took my fancy. Disagreement is normal; indeed, one of the hallmarks of a good commentary is that it lays out the problems and its arguments so clearly that it makes disagreement all the easier.

2 *HE*/F (*AP* 5.199) οἶνος καὶ προπόσεις κατεκοίμισαν Ἀγλαονίκην κτλ. One minor textual point aside, I accept Floridi's text.[7] The question posed by this epigram is one familiar from modern discussions of date-rape, aptly summarized by the phrase "he said, she said," although here it is "he thought, she thought." As Floridi clearly lays out, the situation has been understood in various ways (not to be rehearsed here), but always from the point of view of one of the two participants, when as I see it, Hedylus is allowing each to think that he or she has "won." The ambiguity of such real-life situations is embedded in Hedylus' language. While the man Nicagoras thinks that he has gotten the virgin Aglaonice into bed with his wine and talk, deflowering her while she was asleep (1 κατεκοίμισαν, 6 ὕπνου) after getting her drunk;[8] she, on the other hand, sacrifices (i.e., offers) her clothes to Aphrodite much as a victorious soldier sacrifices his weapons of war (3–4 πάντα μυδῶντα | κεῖνται παρθενίων ὑγρὰ λάφυρα πόθων). No soldier sacrifices weapons after a defeat. That is, Aglaonice thinks that she has obtained what *she* wanted, which is the loss of her virginity, which is alluded to at the very end of the list of offerings of thanks to Aphrodite, all of them defined in apposition by the phrase ὕπνου καὶ σκυλμῶν τῶν τότε μαρτύρια, where the force of σκυλμῶν, ignored or misunderstood by interpreters, refers to the "plucking" of her virginity.[9] The epigram, drenched in the various forms of moisture

[6] C. Zizza, *Le iscrizioni nella* Periegesi *di Pausania: Commento ai testi epigrafici*, Pisa 2006.

[7] On v. 5 I prefer to read μαστῶν ἐνδύματα (apograph V in margine; ἐκ- P), μίτραι. ἐκ- seems wrong, appearing elsewhere only seven times accompanied by only two genitives, ὄφεως and σταφυλῆς, where it clearly refers to naturally occurring skins, quite at variance with μίτρα(ι), which, unlike modern brassieres, wraps around the torso, not just the breasts, to keep them in place. Sometimes *lectio facilior potior est*.

[8] Cf. Philod. *ep*. 14.6 Sider (*AP* 5.123), where, as I argue, there is another act of love-making while the woman is asleep.

[9] Cf. Judith 16.4 τὰς παρθένους μου σκυλεῦσαι. Virginity lost goes to the man who deflowered the girl; cf. Sappho 114 «παρθενία, παρθενία, ποῖ με λίποισα †οἴχηι;» | «†οὐκέτι ἤξω πρὸς σέ, οὐκέτι ἤξω†», Plato *epigr*. (*AP* 5.79.1–2) τῷ μήλῳ βάλλω σε· σὺ δ' εἰ μὲν ἑκοῦσα φιλεῖς με, | δεξαμένη τῆς σῆς παρθενίης μετάδος, [Aesch.] *epist*. 10.3 λαβέ μου,

produced by such an evening (1 οἶνος, 3–4 her cloths are μύροις ἔτι πάντα μυδῶντα… ὑγρά), allows both Nicagoras and Aglaonice to think themselves each the victor.[10]

Hedylus has it both ways in another epigram, 5 *HE*/F (Athen. 11.472f)

> πίνωμεν· καὶ γάρ τι νέον, καὶ γάρ τι παρ᾽ οἶνον
> εὕροιμ᾽ ἂν λεπτὸν καί τι μελιχρὸν ἔπος.
> ἀλλὰ κάδοις Χίου με κατάβρεχε καὶ λέγε «παῖζε,
> Ἡδύλε». μισῶ ζῆν ἐς κενόν, οὐ μεθύων.

Floridi points out that the anaphoric repetition produces the "andamento franto" of someone who has already had a good amount to drink (as the present tense of πίνωμεν suggests, "let's keep drinking"), but she could go further in detailing how the careful phrasing of vv. 1–2 specifically represents the slow and cautious actions of someone quite drunk speaking and walking slowly, making sure not to slip, but probably unable to pass a sobriety test. The first καὶ γάρ can be understood as "for in fact…, but the second καί turns the first into a connective, so we now have [1]καὶ … τι νέον [2]καὶ … τι … (εὕροιμ᾽ ἂν) λεπτὸν [3]καί τι μελιχρὸν ἔπος. Perfectly correct, but do we really need three τι's? Floridi thoroughly points out the programmatic and peculiarly Hellenistic message of "new, sophisticated, and pleasant" language, but it should also be noted that this important view is voiced here by a drunk.

I give 6 *HE*/F (Athen. 11.473a) in English: "Night and day, day and night, Socles drinks from *kadoi* that hold four *choes*; and then suddenly, there's no telling when (εἶτ᾽ ἐξαίφνης που τυχὸν οἴχεται)—he leaves. But when he's drinking, he composes poetry that's much sweeter than what Sicelidas [i.e., Asclepiades] produces, and he's a whole lot sturdier (στιβαρώτερος). As long as you've got the gift, my friend, stay drunk and write (γράφε)!"

Because of the drinking and composing, everybody, Floridi included, takes it for granted that the setting is sympotic, but with the exaggeration of a polar expression ("night and day, day and night," as Cole Porter puts it), the poem is saying that Socles writes all the time, stopping only at odd moments (τυχόν). This cannot be at a symposium, but only at home; nor does one *write* at a symposium. Socles not only writes more sweetly than Asclepiades; he also outdrinks him, being sturdier (στιβαρώτερος, a word that the commentators should not find odd). Socles is otherwise unknown, but whether fictional or not, I suspect that that he is here being likened to Socrates, who also was famous for holding his drink and conducting his

---

Σκάμανδρε, τὴν παρθενίαν, ibid. 10.6 τὸν Σκάμανδρον, ᾧ τὴν παρθενίαν ἔδωκα.

[10] Theocr. 27 is another poem in which the male and female each think themself the "victor"; cf. D. Sider, "Theocritus 27: Oaristys," *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 25, 2001, 99-105..

business nonetheless. Note in particular the end of the *Symposium*, where Socrates outdrinks even Aristophanes and then goes off to do his stuff: τὸν οὖν Σωκράτη, κατακοιμίσαντ' ἐκείνους [i.e., outdrinking Aristophanes and Agathon], ἀναστάντα ἀπιέναι, καὶ <ἐ> ὥσπερ εἰώθει ἔπεσθαι, καὶ … ὥσπερ ἄλλοτε τὴν ἄλλην ἡμέραν διατρίβειν. At this point one notices that even their names are similar, differing mostly by the element *-krat-*, "strength," which reminds us of στιβαρώτερος. In English, Socles can say "strength is my middle name."

In sum, then, this is a most welcome book.

David Sider
New York University
david.sider@nyu.edu