

Taylor S. Coughlan*

Lovely Earth (Leonidas of Tarentum *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 = Gow/Page, *HE* 11)

<https://doi.org/10.1515/phil-2020-0113>

Abstract: Scholars and editors of Hellenistic epigram have often discounted the authenticity of dialectal variance attested in the manuscript tradition, either privileging the dialectal variant that conforms to the predominant dialect in the epigram or even choosing to change attested dialect forms to produce a uniform coloring. This article argues that the addresses to earth at lines 2 and 10 of Leonidas of Tarentum *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 = Gow/Page, *HE* 11 were originally Doric. I show that there are paleographic as well as literary grounds for the reading. In particular, the presence of Doric forms at these two points in the epigram evoke the language of tragic lament. The findings of this article have potentially significant implications for the editing of dialectal mixture in the *Greek Anthology*.

Keywords: dialect, textual criticism, epigram

In this note I re-examine the dialect usage in lines 2 and 10 of Leonidas of Tarentum *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 = Gow/Page, *HE* 11, where the two manuscript witnesses diverge in their transmission of the dialectal form of ‘earth’ (γᾶ v. γαῖα). All previous editors of the epigram have chosen to print the Attic-Ionic form, which, though consonant with the dialectal coloring of the epigram as a whole, is itself a correction by the Corrector of the *Palatine Anthology*. This editorial choice reflects a longstanding practice of privileging the dialectal variant that conforms to the predominant dialect in the rest of the poem or even changing dialectal forms to create a uniform coloring; however the publication of the Milan papyrus (PMil. Vogl. VIII 309) containing epigrams by Posidippus has shown clearly that dialectal mixture and variation with individual poems and across authorially organized collections were part of the poet’s presentation of his text. Recent scholarship on the dialectal choices of Posidippus and other Hellenistic epigrammatists has demonstrated the significant impact dialectal choice has on

*Corresponding author: Taylor S. Coughlan, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Classics, E-Mail: tsc43@pitt.edu

dialectal forms that are unobtrusive against the Attic-Ionic color of the remainder of the epigram, and avoid the metrical harshness of hiatus. Despite all this, there are several good reasons, both textual-critical and literary in nature, to question the editorial *communis opinio* and reconsider the forms transmitted in Planudes as an alternative and possibly better reading.

I begin with the uncorrected readings of *P*, which suggest that the scribe's exemplar also transmitted Doric forms. In line 2, the scribe of *P* appears originally to have written γὰρ,⁵ completely unwelcome in the context and perhaps a mistake easily arising from a confusion between ι and ρ or an attempt to make sense of the non-sensical γαῖ in the exemplar. When reviewing *P*, *C* corrected γὰρ to Attic-Ionic poeticism γαῖ in elision with ἀμφέχανες. In line 10, *P* transmits the corrupted phrase γαῖ ἐρατῆι; the dative ἐρατῆι is grammatically inappropriate and likely reflects the best attempt of the scribe of *P* to make sense of the confusing γαῖ. Again, *C* remedies the corruption by adding an apostrophe, thus turning the γαῖ into an elided vocative γαῖ', and erasing the iota (and circumflex?) in ἐρατῆι to create vocative ἐρατῆ'.⁶ The ungrammatical readings in *P* evince that the Doric readings transmitted in *Pl* were also part of the textual tradition in *P*.

Planudes' copy of the poem offers substantial support for the argument that γᾶ was the reading in *P*'s source. The epigrams in Planudes' anthology divide into two groups. The first and larger group of poems comprise Planudes' original anthology (*Pla*). At some later point, Planudes gained access to a different and fuller source of the poems that formed the basis of his anthology (*Pla*) and produced an addendum (*Plb*; folios 82r–100r) in order to include poems that had been absent from the original source. Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 = Gow/Page, *HE* 11 is transmitted in *Plb* (folio 91v). When compared to *P*, *Pla* displays a marked tendency to regularize Doric to Attic-Ionic, whereas *Plb*, as Alan Cameron demonstrated, “retains doricisms almost as consistently as” *P*.⁷ This difference in the retention or elimination of Doric forms between *Plb* and *Pla* is most clearly illustrated in the few instances when Planudes copied a poem in *Plb* that he had already included in *Pla*. In Bianor *Anth. Pal.* 7.388 = Gow/Page, *GP* 3, for example, *P* and *Plb* are in almost complete agreement in their transmission of a mixture of Attic-Ionic and Doric forms, whereas *Pla* regularizes all of the Doric forms to Attic-Ionic. In another instance *Plb* very likely retains an original Doric form not transmitted in any

⁵ The letter is *in rasura*; Stadtmüller (1894–1906) reports in his *apparatus criticus* “γὰρ (non γαν)”. Gow/Page (1965) erroneously report that *P* wrote γᾶ and *Pl* γὰρ.

⁶ The apostrophe in γαῖ' is almost certainly in the hand of *C* and the erasure of the ι from ἐρατῆι is visible in high-resolution photos of the *Palatine Anthology*. An original circumflex over the η is not visible from the photos, but just possibly may be seen by autopsy.

⁷ Cameron (1993) 364.

of the other exemplars. At *Mnasalces Anth. Pal.* 9.333 = Gow/Page, *HE* 15, *Plb* alone preserves, as Alan Cameron has convincingly suggested, the Doric relative pronoun ᾗς that best accords with the dialectal coloring of the epigram as a whole. *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 further exemplifies the tendency in *Plb* to retain doricisms from his source, and though *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 does not occur twice in Planudes, if the epigram had appeared in *Pla* there remains the possibility that Planudes would possibly have ionicized the forms. On this view, the consistent transmission of γᾶ in *Plb* is strong evidence that these forms are original.

The hiatus created by Doric γᾶ is easily explained by Leonidas' well-known metrical roughness.⁸ Excluding hiatus in correction, there are four instances of hiatus in the epigrams of Leonidas. These four examples occur once in the 2nd foot of the hexameter (*Anth. Pal.* 7.736.1 = Gow/Page, *HE* 33.1), twice in the 5th foot of the hexameter (*Anth. Pal.* 6.200.3 = Gow/Page, *HE* 38.3 and *Anth. Pal.* 7.463.1 = Gow/Page, *HE* 69.1), and once at the end of the 5th foot of the hexameter (*Anth. Pal.* 7.648.7 = Gow/Page, *HE* 10.7). In comparison to other early Hellenistic epigrammatists, Leonidas is rather liberal in his use of hiatus, which is indicative of his metrical practice on the whole.⁹

Author	# of hiatus in <i>corpus</i>
Anyte	5: Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 1.3; Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 4.1; ¹⁰ Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 4.2 (bis); Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 10.3
Asclepiades	0
Callimachus	1: Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 44.3
Hedylus	0
Nicias	4: Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 5.3; Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 6.2; Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 6.3; Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 7.3
Nossis	0 ¹¹
Perses	2: Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 3.3; Gow/Page, <i>HE</i> 7.7

Hiatus at the diaeresis of the pentameter in *Anth. Pal.* 7.440.2 (γᾶ, ἀμφέχανες) is quite rare but not wholly exceptional in Hellenistic epigram. The anonymous erotic Hellenistic epigrammatist of *Anth. Pal.* 12.130.4 = Anon. Gow/Page, *HE* 27.4

⁸ Geffcken (1896) 144 attributes Leonidas' metrical freedom to his engagement with Homeric style.

⁹ For a comparison of Leonidas' metrical practice with other early Hellenistic epigrammatists see Guichard (2004) 120–133.

¹⁰ The line is daggered by Gow/Page (1965).

¹¹ For the possibility of a hiatus at the diaeresis of the pentameter at Nossis *Anth. Pal.* 5.170.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 1.4 see n. 12.

(τοῦτ' ἔπος, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐμῇ ἴσχετ' ἔρωσ κραδίῳ) offers our prime example from the period. Here the hiatus effectively draws the readers' attention to the graphic word order that figures the embrace of *eros* in the speaker's heart.¹² In *Anth. Pal.* 7.440.2 the hiatus accentuates the repetition of α sounds in the line (more so if one prints *Pl*'s οἶον) that sonically punctuate the elegiac lamentation of the poem. While not on the same order of the hiatus at line 2, the epigram features other moments of metrical roughness. Word-end follows the contracted biceps of the second foot (ῥίριον οἶον) in line 1; at line 2 γᾶ or γαῖ is monosyllabic word (which is not a prepositive or article) preceding the caesura; and the initial liquid in λαλίην at line 8 lengthens the preceding short final syllable in εὐκύλικα. The hiatus at lines 2 and 10, then, is not entirely unwelcome in the context of the freedom of versification on display throughout the epigram. On metrical grounds, C's correction is not significantly more acceptable. Elision at the caesura of a pentameter is generally avoided as well, although not to the same degree as hiatus. Where this elision appears, it does so more commonly with particles and pronouns than with substantives as we would have here with γαῖ.¹³ This is the case in Leonidas.

There is also a possible literary resonance to these metrical exceptions. Besides being a fine public speaker, Aristocrates also knew how to mingle socially with the lower classes, and the metrical roughness in an otherwise refined literary epigram may well go some way to underscoring the deceased's identity as a man equally at home in the public square and set before drinks. Indeed, Christophe Cusset has recently highlighted another productive moment of metrical inconcinnity in Leonidas that bolsters the readings under consideration. At *Anth. Pal.* 6.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 52, a dedication of implements by the fisherman Diophantes, the first word of the epigram εὐκαμπές (*Pl*), which describes the dedicator's "well-bent" fishhook (ἄγκιστρον), creates an unmetrical sequence for the hexameter (— — ∪), unless the adjectival form is resolved as a dactyl in analogy to ἀνδροτήτα at Hom. *Il.* 13.363 and *Il.* 24.6 as proposed by Jacobs and Geffcken.¹⁴ Cusset has

¹² Wilamowitz (1924) 1.136 claims that Nossis "läßt in der Pentametermitte Hiatus" at the much discussed Nossis *Anth. Pal.* 5.170.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 1.4, if one reads κῆνα ἄνθεα for C's κῆνα τ' ἄνθεα.

¹³ See West (1982) 156 and 158. For examples of this elision with particles or prepositions in Leonidas, see (e.g.) *Anth. Pal.* 7.656.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 18.4 (ποτ' ἐγώ); *Anth. Pal.* 7.442.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 22.4 (λίην δ'); *Anth. Pal.* 6.296.6 = Gow/Page, *HE* 50.6 (γήρωσ δ'); *Anth. Pal.* 7.731.2 = Gow/Page, *HE* 78.2 (καλέει μ'). Elisions of adjectives or verbs across of the caesura of the pentameter are much fewer: *Anth. Pal.* 6.281.6 = Gow/Page, *HE* 44.6 (ἐτίναξ' ἔνθα); *Anth. Pal.* 9.744.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 82.4 (εὐπώγων' ᾧδ); and *Anth. Pal.* 6.266.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 87.4 (οὐδῶκοντ' ἐξεπέρησ'). I do not count any examples of elision with a substantive.

¹⁴ Salmasius emended εὐκαμπές to εὐκαπές (— ∪ ∪); however this adjectival form is unattested and κάπτω is not compounded in this form elsewhere (cf. Cusset 2017, 39).

argued that the unmetrical form, particularly as it features in the epigram's incipit, purposefully opposes the metrical heaviness of the term with the lightness of the required dactyl. Thus the rhythm of the line metapoetically expresses "la courbure que le vers fait subir à la langue" in a poem that bends together elevated poetic language with humble subject matter.¹⁵

Taken cumulatively, the evidence suggests that we should strongly consider Planudes' Doric γᾱ in line 2 and γᾱ ἐπατά in line 10, although rhythmically harsh due to hiatus, to be the readings in the exemplars to *P* and *Pl* and thus very plausibly original to Leonidas' text. Indeed, larger patterns in the behavior of dialect transmission in the two manuscripts to the *Greek Anthology* offer further support for the adoption of the reading of *Pl*. As stated above, *P* is the generally more reliable manuscript when it comes to the transmission of common dialectal variants, such as the α/η interchange between Doric and Ionic, whereas *Pl* demonstrates a clear pattern of regularization of Doric forms to their Ionic equivalents. That we find, then, in *Pl* the preservation of dialectal *lectiones difficiliores* of the type commonly corrected by the Byzantine editor may actually suggest that Planudes faithfully copied the dialectal variance before him in his exemplar, a variance, as we have shown, which confounded the less educated scribe of *P*. No other solution can account for the consistent doricization we find in *Pl*.

Further support for this proposed reconstruction of the text of Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 is offered by the epigram that immediately follows it in book seven of the *Greek Anthology* ('Archilochus' *Anth. Pal.* 7.441 = Page, *FGE* 3). Here we find another Doric vocative address to the earth in hiatus (which too traditionally has been emended to avoid the metrical breach):

ὕψηλούς Μεγάτιμον Ἀριστοφώντᾱ τε Νάξου
κίονας, ὧ̃ μεγάλη γᾱ̃, ὑπένερθεν ἔχεις.

2 γᾱ̃ *P*: γᾱ̃? Jacobs

The placement of these two epigrams side-by-side in a long Meleagrian sequence of epitaphs (*Anth. Pal.* 7.406–506) is significant for our understanding of the dialectal mixture attested in both poems.¹⁶ As studies of the artistic organization of Meleager's *Garland* have shown, the anthologist paired or juxtaposed epigrams, which on his reading had some type of thematic, stylistic, or linguistic relationship.¹⁷ Dialectal coloring also influenced the organization of *Garland* sequences.¹⁸

¹⁵ Cusset (2017) 39.

¹⁶ See the table in Cameron (1993) and Gutzwiller (1998) 314.

¹⁷ For the editorial practices of Meleager, see Gutzwiller (1997) and Gutzwiller (1998) 276–322.

¹⁸ Coughlan (2016) 56–67.

This is certainly also the case with *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 and 7.441. Like Leonidas in Aristocrates' epitaph, the poet of *Anth. Pal.* 7.441 celebrates two nobles, whose names – Megatimos and Aristophon – echo the upper-class ring of Aristocrates. More significantly, both epigrams incorporate an emotional address to the earth. The use of Doric vocative γᾶ as an apostrophe to the earth is quite rare in Greek literature apart from Attic tragedy,¹⁹ which further suggests that the appearance of such a dialectal figure in two epitaphs associated with the death of noble men is unlikely to be merely fortuitous or the product of scribal error. Given, then, Meleager's editorial practice of artfully pairing epigrams, it is quite plausible, I posit, that these two epigrams were placed together because they shared a novel Doric apostrophe of γᾶ. Since the ascription of the epitaph for Megatimos and Aristophon to Archilochus is patently spurious, it is impossible to date the composition of the epitaph beyond a *terminus ante quem* of the publication of Meleager's *Garland* sometime at the turn of the first century BCE. Accordingly, the 'Archilochus' epigram may be one possible model for Leonidas' choice to incorporate a Doric address to earth into an epitaph for a noble figure, but we also cannot rule out the opposite, namely that this epigram is itself modeled on Leonidas' usage. Nevertheless, the presence of this rather unique dialectal collocation across the manuscripts of two related Hellenistic epigrams further supports my argument for printing the readings of *Pl* in *Anth. Pal.* 7.440.

The insertion of a Doric vocative into these epitaphs affects the meaning of the verses. There is evidence from both inscribed and literary epigram that the studied mixture of Doric forms into epitaphs was designed to evoke a tragic pathos. For example, in an inscribed verse epitaph from Hellenistic Kios (*SGO* 09/01/03) the grief of the deceased's mother is reinforced by a sudden shift to Doric (μήτηρ δὲ ἐν οἴκοις, ἅ τάλαινα, ὀδύρεται), a dialectal practice we find replicated in several other inscribed epitaphs.²⁰ Read against the backdrop of tragic lament, it is possible that the Doric vocatives in *Anth. Pal.* 7.440 and 7.441 also evoke a tragic atmosphere that connects the commemoration of their noble deceased subjects (cf. the use of ἐσθλός as a descriptor for Aristocrates at line 6 of the epigram under discussion

¹⁹ Leonidas' γᾶ ἐπατά (*Anth. Pal.* 7.440.10) is a unique *iunctura*. Apostrophes to earth, Doric or otherwise, appear nowhere in Archaic or Classical verse inscriptional antecedents, and Doric vocative γᾶ, in particular, is absent from Archaic and Classical lyric, apart from Attic tragedy, and attested only once in Hellenistic book epigrams at Meleager Gow/Page, *HE* 56 = *Anth. Pal.* 7.476 (γᾶ παντρώφε). For Doric vocative γᾶ in Attic tragedy, cf. e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 640, Aesch. *Ag.* 1537, and Aesch. *Supp.* 890 and 900; Eur. *Med.* 148, Eur. *Heracl.* 748, Eur. *Phoen.* 1290, and Eur. *Or.* 1373. On apostrophes to natural phenomena in Attic tragedy, see Wagener (1931).

²⁰ Coughlan (2018) pace Prodi (2017) who suggests reading the interjection ᾗ̃. The inscription does not include diacritical markings.

and at Leonidas Gow/Page, *HE* 10.1 = *Anth. Pal.* 7.648.1, if this Aristocrates is read as the same man) with the mourning of dead tragic figures.²¹ In support of this possible reading of the dialect, see the apostrophe to earth (ὠ γᾶ γᾶ) by the Chorus at Aesch. *Ag.* 1537 over the dead body of their king, and Soph. *OC* 1480–1481, while not exactly parallel but nevertheless suggestive, where the Chorus beseech Zeus to be kindly disposed to themselves and their “mother earth” (γᾶ / μητέρα), which will receive Oedipus, soon to be heroicized, apparently as his grave and site of cult worship. Lastly, the Phrygian slave in Eur. *Or.*, whose sudden appearance before Electra and Orestes has been described as “one of the most astonishing moments in Greek tragedy”,²² includes an address to earth – γᾶ, γᾶ (1373) – as part of his extremely emotional messenger speech-cum-aria, an exemplar of the New Music and likely intertext in the Hellenistic period.

Additionally, the targeted use of doricisms in *Anth. Pal.* 7.400 to affect poetic meaning is consonant with dialectal practice observable elsewhere in the *corpus Leonideum*. In his series of dedications by craftspeople, Leonidas consistently uses Doric forms of τέχνη, including in dialectally mixed contexts, when referring to the artisanry of his dedicants.²³ Given the self-reflexive nature of these ornately composed epigrams that celebrate craftsmanship, I have argued elsewhere that the persistent use of doricisms in the context of the language of artistic skill “functioned as [a] signature of Leonidean aesthetics”.²⁴ Indeed, Antipater of Sidon registers his reception of Leonidas’ doricization of τέχνη in his imitation of Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 6.13 = Gow/Page, *HE* 46, a dedication of hunting implements by three brothers. In the first line of his imitation, Antipater substitutes the periphrasis ἄρμενα τέχνας for Leonidas’ τὰ δίκτυα. In the context of a verse that echoes much of Leonidas’ original language, ἄρμενα τέχνας signals to the knowledgeable reader that Antipater is positioning his epigram as a reworking, since those who recognize the Leonidean parallels will also know that the ἄρμενα τέχνας are in fact nets. Consequently the choice of a Doric coloring for τέχνας further evokes Antipater’s Leonidean model, since *Anth. Pal.* 6.13 = Gow/Page, *HE* 46 both contains the admixture of Doric forms and recalls Leonidas’ penchant for doricizing τέχνη in his poems for rustics and craftsmen.²⁵

²¹ A comic tone to the use of this tragic motif in the context of Aristocrates epitaph, as suggested by the anonymous reviewer, cannot be entirely ruled out, but is unlikely to be the primary connotation.

²² Wright (2008) 5.

²³ *Anth. Pal.* 6.204.4 = Gow/Page, *HE* 7.4; *Anth. Pal.* 6.205.6 and 10 = Gow/Page, *HE* 8.6 and 10; *Anth. Pal.* 6.4.7 = Gow/Page, *HE* 52.7.

²⁴ Coughlan (2016) 47.

²⁵ Coughlan (2016) 46–47.

I have argued that the addresses directed to Earth in line 2 and 10 were originally written in Doric. The textual grounds for printing the readings in *Pl* are supported both by what we know of Planudes' habits as copyist and editor and by a close re-examination of the *Palatine Anthology*. The admixture of Doric forms also deepens the emotional content of the epigram through the evocation of tragic lament as witnessed elsewhere in epigram. Moreover, the targeted use of doricisms, as exemplified by the doricized forms of τέχνη, to affect poetic meaning is a feature of Leonidas' style. Lastly, the argument for reading these two Doric forms has potentially significant implications for how scholars edit epigrams from the *Greek Anthology* in the future. As this article has demonstrated, the editorial methodology that privileges dialectal uniformity must be revisited and adapted to better take into account the poetics of dialect mixture that were operative within the genre.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Benjamin Cartlidge, Arianna Gullo, Kathryn Gutzwiller, Kathleen Kidder, Francesco Pelliccio, and the two anonymous reviewers for the journal for their advice and help at various stages in the writing of this article.

Bibliography

- Anthologia Graeca Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*, ed. H. Stadtmüller, Leipzig 1894–1906.
- Anthologia Palatina: codex Palatinus et codex Parisinus phototypice editi*, ed. K. Preisendanz, Leiden 1911.
- Further Greek Epigrams*, ed. D. L. Page, Cambridge 1981.
- The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vol., ed. A. F. S. Gow/D. L. Page, Cambridge 1965.
- L. Bettarini, “Posidippo e l’epigramma epinicio: Aspetti linguistici”, *ARF* 6, 2004, 9–22.
- A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993.
- D. L. Clayman, “Callimachus’ Doric Graces: 15 GP = 51 Pf.”, in: E. Sistakou/A. Rengakos (eds.), *Dialect, Diction and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram*, Berlin 2016, 23–36.
- F. Cairns, *Hellenistic Epigram: Contexts of Exploration*, Cambridge 2016.
- T. S. Coughlan, “Dialect and Imitation in Late Hellenistic Epigram”, in: E. Sistakou/A. Rengakos (eds.), *Dialect, Diction and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram*, Berlin 2016, 37–70.
- T. S. Coughlan, “A Tragic Mother at SGO 09/01/01, 7”, *ZPE* 207, 2018, 39–40.
- C. Cusset, “Léonidas, poète de l’humilité: L’exemple des pêcheurs”, in: D. Meyer/C. Urlacher-Becht (eds.), *La rhétorique du ‘petit’ dans l’épigramme grecque et latine*, Paris 2017, 37–44.
- J. Geffcken, *Leonidas von Tarent* (Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 23), Leipzig 1896.
- L. A. Guichard, *Asclepiades de Samos: Epigramas y fragmentos: Estudio introductorio, revisión del texto, traducción y comentario*, Bern 2004.

- K. J. Gutzwiller, "The Poetics of Editing in Meleager's *Garland*", *TAPhA* 127, 1997, 169–200.
- K. J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigram in Context*, Berkeley, CA 1998.
- K. J. Gutzwiller, "Poetic Meaning, Place, and Dialect in the Epigrams of Meleager", in: R. Hunter/A. Rengakos/E. Sistakou (eds.), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads*, Berlin 2014, 75–95.
- B. M. Palumbo Stracca, "Differenze dialettali e stilistiche nella storia dell'epigramma greco", in: G. Bolognesi/V. Pisani (eds.), *Linguistica e filologia: Atti del VII congresso internazionale di linguisti tenuto a Milano nei giorni 12–14 settembre 1984*, Brescia 1987, 429–434.
- E. E. Preodi, "SGO 09/01/03, 7", *ZPE* 201, 2017, 40.
- A. Sens, "Doricisms in the Old and New Posidippus", in: B. Acosta-Hughes/E. Kosmetatou/M. Baumbach (eds.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309), Washington, DC 2004, 65–83.
- A. P. Wagener, "Stylistic Qualities of the Apostrophe to Nature as a Dramatic Device", *TAPhA* 62, 1931, 78–100.
- M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982.
- U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, Berlin 1924.
- M. Wright, "Enter a Phrygian (Euripides *Orestes* 1369)", *GRBS* 48, 2008, 5–13.