

J. L. LIGHTFOOT, *Hellenistic Collection. Philitas-Alexander of Aetolia-Hermesianax-Euphorion-Parthenius*. Edited and translated by J. L. L., Cambridge, Mass.-London: Harvard University Press, 2009, pp. 666, ISBN 978-0-674-99636-6.

Lightfoot's most welcome anthology assembles in a volume of more than 650 pages the "minor" Hellenistic poets from the early third to the first century BC: Philitas of Cos, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax of Colophon, Euphorion of Chalcis, and Parthenius of Nicaea.

A common point with all these authors is the fact that only fragments of their works have been transmitted to us, although it is usually admitted that they were important representatives of the Hellenistic literature – not unknown authors whose works are fragmentary, but poets who, along with Callimachus, Apollonius, and Theocritus, shaped Hellenistic poetry: Philitas exerted a great influence on the following Alexandrian poets; Alexander was a famous *poeta grammaticus*; Hermesianax is the author of the most substantial fragment of the (otherwise lost) Hellenistic elegy; Euphorion was popular at Rome and much read by the Late Antique literates (Nonnus above all), and Parthenius was a very influential model among Latin elegists.

L. is a well known scholar in the field of Hellenistic and Late Antique poetry, and the author of the most authoritative edition of Parthenius (Oxford 1999). Three of the poets whom L. deals with have been recently (and accurately) edited: Philitas (Spanoudakis, Leiden 2002–Sbardella–Dettori, Rome 2000), Alexander (Magnelli, Florence 1999), Parthenius (Lightfoot, see above); as to the remaining two, an important and thorough analysis by Magnelli (*Studi su Euforione*, Rome 2002) enables us to tackle with confidence the difficult verses of Euphorion (van Groningen's 1977 edition is notoriously inadequate), and an old, but very good dissertation (O. Ellenberger, *Quaestiones Hermesianactae*, Gießen 1907), still provides its readers with valuable informations on the text of Hermesianax. Even so, L.'s book is most useful, as she takes into account all recent bibliography and treats the problems of these difficult texts with care and ingenuity, offering in many a case an updated text (see for instance Hermesian. [?] fr. 13). Her critical choices are sound: she always selects the most convincing emendations and the most likely supplements (see her text of Euphorion, which greatly improves that of van Groningen). The poetical fragments are provided with a apparatus which is richer than that usually printed in the Loeb series; footnotes are obviously selective, but learned and helpful. In what follows, I will be concerned with a few passages of the texts.

Alex. Aet. fr. 8.4 (p. 128) = 5 Magnelli: *Ἀν Μιμνέρμου δ' εἰς ἔπος ἄκρος ἐὼν* ("being very good at the verse of Mimnermus"), scil. the erotic elegy? Hermesian. fr. 3.81 (p. 172): I think that Bergk's *λύγοις*, which suits both *πικνά*

and ἐσφίγξατο, should be printed in the text (cf. M. Di Marco, “L’ira di Afrodite: Ermesianatte rivisitato (fr. 7.79-94 Powell)”, *La cultura letteraria ellenistica. Persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione* [...] a cura di R. Pretagostini - E. Dettori, Rome 2007, 89 – though Di Marco’s explanation of the passage does not seem to me fully convincing). (Hermesian. ?) fr. 13 col. i. 18 (p. 182): something like μετ[έ]θηκε βέλος should be supplied (“deflected”, like in the famous Iliadic scene – actually, Hutchinson’s supplement is more elegant [CR n. s. 42, 1992, 484] ἀλλ’ ἄλιόν οἱ] ἔθηκε – cf. indeed Nonn. D. 29.81 καὶ φονίην ἀλίωσεν in a similar context); *ibid.* vv. 22-3 *possis* πλῆξε βίη] κρόταφον σύν [τ’ ὁ]στέα πάντα ἄραξεν / αἶψα διέκ[ρι]νῶν ἔκπεσεν [ἐγ]κέφαλος. Euph. fr. 49 (p. 282): *ft.* καὶ Ψῖλιν Ἀσκανίων τε <παρ’ ὕδασι> Ναυαίθοιο (cf. fr. 73 Μυσοῖο παρ’ ὕδασιν Ἀσκανίοιο). fr. 101.3 (p. 332): *ft.* <κυανέου> ναρκίσσου ἐπιστεφές πλοκαμίδας (a dative, like that supplied by Meineke’s κλήμασι ναρκίσσοιο κτλ. is not necessary, because ἐπιστεφής + gen. is a regular construction, cf. Archil. fr. 21.2 W.2 ὕλης ἀγρίας ἐπιστεφής, already quoted by van Groningen). fr. 108. col. i. 21 (p. 342) οἶος ἀεῖραι is likely and recalls Call. Cer. 34 ἀρκίος ἄραι at verse end. fr. 116.3 (p. 358): *ft.* Λυκωρέος ἐρκία Φοίβου. fr. 122 (p. 362): ὅτι should perhaps be attributed to the witness of the fr. (so van Groningen). fr. 162 b (p. 390) ἡδ’ ἐπαπειλήσας Ζωστηρίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι: *ft.* <φ>ῆ δ’ ἐπαπειλήσας. fr. 191 B 2.6 (p. 422): *possis* ἄλι]ς (cf. Hippon. [?] fr. 193.10 Degani φυκία πόλλ’); v. 7: *possis* στόματο]ς βρεκτῶν τε κομάων; v. 10: *ft.* ἀτὰρ <ρ> ῥιγηλὰ βεβή[λοις (βεβή[λοις Ll.-J.-Pars.). Parth. fr. 14 (p. 504): *ft.* Ἰβηρίτῃ κέλσεν ἐν αἰγιαλῷ (*quavis praestaret* -την κέλσεν ἐς αἰγιαλόν). fr. 27 a.2 (p. 516): *ft.* ὦν, φίλος, εἵνεκα (cf. vv. 8 et 12 φίλος); *ibid.* 5: *ft.* τῇλε καταφθι]μένου / κήκ]ιεν ὀθνεῖν <π>επυρωμένα λ[εῖψανα γαίη; 8 *ft.* μάλα πυ[κνὰ δακρύσας. fr. 34.1 (p. 524): *ft.* μάρτυρα δ’ ἄμμιν τῇλ’ ἐπὶ Γαδείρᾳ λίπε μῦθον [μῦθον Ll.-J.-Pars.], *pro* μῦθον *possis etiam* θεσμόν (vd. Lightfoot 1999 ad loc.).

On the content of the fragments, L. tells us, as I said, all that we need to know in order to understand the texts.

A tiny remark: at Euph. fr. 108 col. i.26 (p. 342) μ]ηκάδες οὐ πατέουσιν L. 146 explains: «i. e., in a high place» (her point of view is not very different from van Groningen’s: “il y est question probablement d’une région où les chèvres ne vagebondent pas [...] c’est à dire d’une région d’extrême désolation”): I think that it could also be a holy place, where shepherds cannot lead their flocks, like Eur. Hipp. 75, cf. Barrett *ad* 73-6.

A few problems: at Euph. fr. 15 (a) (p. 228) we should read κοτέσσαα (and so in the reconstruction of Livrea, *ibid.*). fr. 32 (p. 260): as the fr. is also quoted by the ancient scholia on Lycophron, not only by Tzetzes’s commentary, I think that Leone’s edition of the former (Lecce 2002) should also be mentioned (p. 88.9-14). fr. 62 (p. 294) στεψαμένη θαλεροῖσι συνήντετο δικτάμνοισι: we know that the subject is Eileithyia: but why translating *tout court* “she met her”? To be sure, the person met by the goddess is probably a pregnant woman, but a further explanation would be welcome.

The only relevant shortcoming is at Parthen. T 8 (p. 482-4). The edition of the Arabic-Latin translation of Gal. *Propr. Plac.* should not be quoted accord-

ing to Kalbfleisch: instead, L. should have mentioned the, recent, authoritative edition of V. Nutton (*CMG* V 3, 2, Berlin 1999, p. 54, 5-18). But even that would be perhaps needless, because the Greek original has been finally discovered: Véronique Boudon-Millot–A. Pietrobelli, “Galien ressuscité: édition princeps du text grec du *De propriis placitis*”, *REG* 118, 2005, 168-213; the passage on Parthenius is at p. 172.1-16.

In the bibliography there are a few small mistakes: p. 104 read “Euripide in Alessandro Etolo”; p. 105 read “Alessandro Etolo poeta di ‘provincia’”.

Henceforth, students and scholars seriously dealing with Hellenistic poetry will have to pay the closest attention to L.’s *Anthology*.

CLAUDIO DE STEFANI
II University of Naples
cdestefani@libero.it

