
The publication of this volume culminates the Greek-French bilingual edition of the Greek Anthology initiated in 1929 by P. Waltz.\(^1\) Differences in style and editorial criteria among the volumes have unavoidably arisen due to the extraordinary duration of the writing of this publication, thereby diminishing the homogeneity of the collection. The present volume undoubtedly constitutes an excellent edition, introducing important new features which should be included on the occasion of a reissue of all previous volumes.

The work is the result of the collaboration of three specialists: J. Irigoin, who died in 2006, and F. Maltomini were responsible for the Greek text and the critical apparatus; P. Laurens was in charge of the introduction, the French translation and the additional notes, with the exception of the section on the manuscript tradition and several notes, due to F. Maltomini.

In the introduction, P. Laurens presents the division of the tenth book into three sections (1-16, 17-25, and 26-126). The Greek and Latin gnomological traditions are studied from their beginnings up to the late antique and medieval gnomologia, which receive special attention in this edition. Finally, P. Laurens analyzes the most relevant features of the epigrams of the 10th book, and accepts, on the one hand, the authenticity of the epigrams attributed to Lucian and, on the other hand, Palladas’ late conversion to Christianity, on which the author seems to align himself with K.W. Wilkinson when dating his life between c. 259-330 A.D.\(^2\) It would have been appropriate to devote a paragraph to the issue of the inclusion of Palladas’ epigrams in the *Cycle* of Agathias.\(^3\) P. Waltz, in his introduction to the first volume, omitted this issue and specifically postponed it to the introduction of the 10th and 11th volumes, which remained, in those days, still unpublished.\(^4\) In the introduction to the 11th book, R. Aubreton concluded that Agathias included Palladas’ epigrams in his *Cycle*, although this hypothesis was later dismissed by A. Cameron.\(^5\) This issue remains highly debatable and deserves greater attention.

---

3) He briefly mentions this issue in note 53 (p. XXVIII), following those who think that Palladas’ epigrams were not included in Agathias’ *Cycle*.
4) Aubreton 1929, 1, p. XXIII, n. 1.
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In the section on the manuscript transmission, F. Maltomini studies the presence of the epigrams of Book 10 in the two codices through which these epigrams have been transmitted, namely Palatinus gr. 23 and Marcianus gr. 481, and in the so-called syllogae minores. With respect to these latter collections, F. Maltomini points out which manuscripts are irrelevant for the constitution of the text and should therefore be discarded since they are only copies of other well-known codices. This simplification of the textual tradition should be highlighted as one of the main innovations of this edition. In this edition, the readings traditionally attributed to the apographa of Palatinus gr. 23 are assigned to their authors, some of whom are cited in the bibliographical list of authorities. This is the case, for example, for C. Saumaise, for whom Maltomini strikingly mentions the manuscript Berolinensis Spanhemianus 44, although this ms. does not contain any epigram of the 10th book. Furthermore, the adscription of its apograph Leidensis Vossianus gr. O 8 to F. Sylburg is highly controversial. On the other hand, more precision would have been appreciated for the manuscript sources of J.P. d’Orville’s conjectures.

As for the edition of the text, not only has the punctuation been altered on numerous occasions, but important new readings have also been accepted, some of which remain questionable. Among these, I include the excessive conservatism in 20.2, where the reading of the codices (ἕρκων) is preferred pudicitiae causa to Jacobs’ conjecture (ἕρχεων), the latter having been accepted by all modern editors. And in the following epigram (21.1), the lectio difficilior of P has been chosen (δικαίων / σύμμαχε instead of δικαίοις / σύμμαχε), as in the editions by Gow-Page and Beckby. However, it is likely that the copyist was influenced by the genitive plural ending of the following two verses. Similarly, in epigram 93, βέλτερον ἔστι with the infinitive and the dative of person is common since Homer (Il. 15.197-8, Od. 17.18-9). Moreover, the choice of Planudes’ reading (θλιβομένης), which is easily explained by the influence of the preceding genitive, goes against the overall editorial judgement expressed by F. Maltomini in the introduction (p. XLII).

---

7) In addition to the manuscripts and printed books with manuscript notes collected by d’Orville for his edition of the Anthologia Graeca currently hosted at the Bodleian, we know of the existence of a copy, with J.P. d’Orville’s manuscript notes, of the Florilegium diversorum epigrammatum (Venetiis: apud Aldi filios, 1550) (see Thorpe, Th. 1842. Catalogue of the Most Extensive, Valuable, and Truly Interesting Collection of Curious Books (London) 23 (n. 258)).
8) Σύμμαχος with the dative of person is more frequent than with the genitive; cf. A. Ch. 2, 19, 497, Hdt. 7.178, and see Sider, D. 1997. The Epigrams of Philodemos (Oxford) 92-3.